THE WORKS OF THE REVEREND and LEARNED Henry Hammond, D. D.

The Second Volume,

CONTAINING

A COLLECTION OF DISCOURSES

In Defence of

The Church of England.

The Second Edition.

With ADDITIONS and CORRECTIONS
From the Authour's own Hand.

LONDON,
Printed for *R. Royston*, Bookseller to the King's most Sacred MAJESTY;
and *R. Davis*, Bookseller in *Oxford*. MDCLXXXIV.

THE WORKS

THE CONTENTS OF THIS VOLUME.

I. Againſt the Romaniſts.

A View of ſome Exceptions to the L. Falkland's *Diſcourſe of Infallibility.* Oxf. 1646. 4°. These are thought fit to be here added, that the Reader may have a joint View of the Objections and Anſwers of each.

Another Anſwer to the ſaid Diſcourſe; With the L. Falkland's *Reply.* Lond. 165 . 4°.

Alſo Three Letters of like Subject. Lond. 1641. 4°.

A Reply to the Catholick Gentleman's Anſwer to the moſt material parts of the Book of Schiſm. *With an Account of* H. T. *his Appendix.* Lond. 1654. 4°. The Treatiſe of Schiſm is in Vol. 1.

The Diſarmer's Dexterities Examined. In a Second Defence of the Treatiſe of Schiſm. Lond. 1656. 4°.

The Diſpatcher Diſpatch'd. A Third Defence of the Treatiſe of Schiſm. Lond. 1659. 4°.

A'IE'N 'AΛHΘE'TEIN, *or, A Brief Account of a Suggeſtion of the* Romaniſt *againſt the Diſpatcher Diſpatch'd.* Lond. 1660. 4°.

II. Againſt other Adverſaries.

A Vindication of the Diſſertations concerning Epiſcopacy, *from the Exceptions of the* London *Miniſters.* Lond. 1654. 4°. The Diſſertations may be found in Append. Vol. 4.

An Anſwer to the Animadverſions on the Diſſertations touching Ignatius's *Epiſtles, and the* Epiſcopacy *in them aſſerted.* Lond. 1654. 4°.

A Second Defence of H. Grotius; *or, A Vindication of the Digreſſion concerning him.* Lond. 1655. 4°. This Digreſſion is in the foregoing Anſwer, Chap. 5. Sect. 21.

A Continuation of the Defence of H. Grotius. Lond. 1657. 4°.

The Baptizing of Infants *Reviewed and Defended from the Exceptions of Mr.* Tombes. Lond. 1655. 4°.

An Account of Mr. Cawdrey's Triplex Diatribe, *concerning Superſtition, Will-worſhip, and* Chriſtmas *Feſtival.* Lond. 1654. 4°.

ΈΚΤΕΝΕΣΤΕΡΟΝ; *or, The Degrees of Ardency in Chriſt's Prayer Reconciled with His* fulneſs *of Habitual Grace.* Lond. 1656. 4°.

ΈΥΣΧΗΜΟΝΩΣ, ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑΞΙΝ; *or, The Grounds of Uniformity Vindicated.* Lond. 1657. 4°.

A VIEW

A

VIEW

OF SOME

EXCEPTIONS

Which have been made by

A ROMANIST

TO THE

L. Viſc. Falkland's Diſcourſe

OF THE

INFALLIBILITY

OF THE

CHURCH of ROME.

Submitted to the CENSURE of all ſober *CHRISTIANS*;

Together with

The DISCOURSE it ſelf of *INFALLIBILITY*

Prefixed to it.

AS ALSO

Another ANSWER to the ſame DISCOURSE,

WITH

The Lord of *FALKLAND*'S REPLY.

ALSO

Three LETTERS of the like Subject.

LONDON.

TO

The READER.

THE *length and quality of this inſuing trouble, will ſeem to have been given the Reader ſomewhat impertinently, if a brief account be not firſt rendred of the occaſion thereof.*

The ſad effects of the preſent differences, *and diviſions of this broken* Kingdom, *having made* peace, *and* unity, *and* infallibility, *ſuch pretious deſirable things, that if there were but one wiſh offered to each man among us, it would certainly, with a full conſent, be laid out on this one treaſure,* the ſetting up ſome Catholick Umpire, or Daies-man, ſome viſible infallible Definer of Controverſies; *the Pretenders to that* Infallibility, *having the luck to be alone in that pretenſion, have been lookt on with ſome reverence, and (by thoſe who knew nothing of their grounds, or arguments) acknowledged to ſpeak, if not* true, *yet* ſeaſonably; *and having ſo great an advantage upon their Auditours (their inclinations, and their wiſhes to find themſelves overcome, going along with every argument that ſhould be brought them) and ſo a fair probable entrance, by that inlet of their* affections, *to their* minds, *they began to redouble their* induſtry, *and their* hopes; *and inſtead of the many particulars of the Romiſh doctrine, which they were wont to offer proof for in the retail, now to ſet all their ſtrength upon this one in groſs, and by the compendiouſneſs of that courſe, to expect a more eaſie reception, than formerly they had met with; the very gains, and conveniences, that attend this doctrine of theirs, if it were true, being to fleſh and bloud (which all men have not the skill of putting off) mighty Topicks of probability that it is ſo.*

To diſcover the danger of this ſweet potion, or rather, to ſhew how far it is from being what it pretends, and ſo to exchange the ſpecious *for the* ſound, *the* made-diſh *for the* ſubſtantial food *(allowing the* Univerſal Church *the* authority *of an* irrefragable teſtimony, *and the preſent age of the* Romiſh Church, *as much of our belief, as it hath of conformity with the* Univerſal *of all ages) but not a privilege of not being able to ſay falſe, whatſoever it ſaith; and ſo to ſet us in the ſafer though longer way, thereby to whet our induſtry in the chaſe of truth, inſtead of aſſuring our ſelves that we cannot err, (which is not a virtue, but an excellency, not a grace to be crown'd, but a great part of the crown it ſelf, reſerv'd for another world, a felicity, but not a duty) this Diſcourſe of the Lord Viſcount* Falkland's *was long ſince deſigned; as alſo to remove the great ſcandals, and obſtacles, which have obſtructed all way of hope to that univerſal aim of all true Chriſtians, that* Καθολικὴ ἁρμονία, Catholick harmony *which* Iamblicus *talks of in the* ſpheres *above, but would ſound better in this vault (this arch to bear up thoſe ſpheres) the Church below, the* Univerſal peace of Chriſtendom; *for to this, nothing is more unreconcileably contrary, than pretenſions to* Infallibility *in any part of it; all ſuch, making it unlawfull either for themſelves to mend, or others to be endured, ſhutting out all poſſibility either of* compliance, *or* charity, *or* reformation *in their own, or* mercy *to other mens errours. What was thus by his Lordſhip deſigned in all juſtice, was by an intire lover of peace and truth publiſhed in all charity, to reſiſt and check a threatning tempeſt, which riſing from our preſent evils, was apt (if it did not begin) to ſhake ſome. The printing of this Tract, preſently provoked an Aſſertour of that* Infallibility, *to take upon him the* anſwering *of it, and to complain that an* Anſwer *which had been by the ſame hand given it formerly, was not permitted to attend it into publick. This then being a* ſecond Care, *was probably to have arrived to a higher degree of* perfection; *and indeed among the Favourers of that perſuaſion, was cried up for ſo ſatisfactory a piece, that it was delivered to a* Member *of the* Church *of* England, *as unanſwerable. From him it came to thoſe hands, which returned it to the Authour with this enſuing Rejoynder, withall intimating, that ſince in his, he ſeemed to wiſh the ſame freedom of the* Preſs, *which his* Lordſhip *had found, both the Anſwer and the Reply ſhould be recommended thither, if he pleaſed.*

After he had detained the Reply ſome weeks, he was pleaſed to return it with a proteſtation, That he neither intended, nor would permit his to become publick, pretending (that I may give you his own words) his Treatiſe to have been no finiſh'd work, but onely a firſt draught, or inchoation, ventured abroad, to explore the judgments of one or two intelligent Adverſaries, that ſo the Authour by his ſecond *(he might have ſaid third)* thoughts, might be better able to underſtand, what was to be altered in it, what added or what taken away, either as ſuperfluous, or offenſive, and till that act was done, and withall till an approbation and licence

given by thoſe, to whom it belonged, neither the work, nor any line of it, is to be acknowledged or vouched by the Authour. *And ſo both were returned with ſome few alterations and additions in his Anſwer, and marginal Notes on the Reply, and one ſheet at the end of them, containing a new Scheme of probation, of the pretended* Infallibility, *and a* præloquium *to it, wherein the paſſage juſt now mentioned, is* in terminis *recited.*

This the Replicant (to avoid all appearance of ſeverity) was content to accept for ſad earneſt, and therefore freely expreſt his willingneſs to give the Authour leave to provide a new Anſwer to his Lordſhip's Treatiſe, which he might be willing to own in publick, which when he ſhould doe, promiſe was made to prepare a ſpeedy Anſwer thereunto, and on thoſe terms to be content to lay aſide the former.

That this ſhould be done, was affirmed on one part, and on the other expected ſome months with patience; till at length the Anſwerer's pleaſure was made known, that that reſolution was put off, and that inſtead of ſo mean a combat either with his Lordſhip, *or this* Replicant, *he was pleaſed now to deſign a full diſcourſe on that Subject, without taking notice of either, any farther, than he ſhould think fit to take in his way any thing by them objected againſt his* poſition, *and that this ſhould be printed beyond the* Seas.

When this will be performed, I cannot tell. Onely this is now diſcerned (ſomewhat contrary to expectation) that what hath been diſclaimed by him, is extolled by others, and the weakneſs of the Replicant *ſufficiently deſpiſed; Wherein though he hath not much temptation to think himſelf injured, being ready to acknowledge the emptineſs of theſe Papers (and more than ſo, to render a reaſon of it,* viz. *the fate which they were under, by a neceſſity of attending this* Apologiſt κατὰ πόδα, *which yielded them occaſion of little variety, unleſs they would extravagate.) Yet could he not reſiſt the Reaſons which charged it on him as a* duty, *thus confidently to importune the Reader with the view of the whole matter, as far as it hath paſt between them; ſetting down that* Anſwer *to, and this* Vindication *of his* Lordſhip's *Arguments by Chapters, and then (not doe him the leaſt injuſtice) adding in the end of all, the* Anſwerer's *marginal* Replies, *and that concluding Sheet (that even now was mentioned) with a Rejoynder to that alſo.*

By all this, endeavouring to lay grounds, for all men to judge, how little truth there is in that ſo Epidemical *perſuaſion, that there is no middle, betwixt aſſerting an* Infallible Judge, *and the falling headlong into all the* Schiſms *and* Hereſies *of this preſent age.*

My Conſcience aſſuring me, that the grounds on which the eſtabliſh'd Church of England *is founded, are of ſo rare and an excellent mixture, that as none but intelligent truly Chriſtian minds can ſufficiently value the compoſition, ſo there is no other in* Europe, *ſo likely to preſerve* Peace *and* Unity, *if what prudent Laws had ſo long ago deſigned, they now were able to uphold; For want of which, and which onely, it is, that at preſent the whole Fabrick lies polluted in confuſion and in bloud, and hopes not for any binding up of wounds, for reſtauration of any thing, that looks like Chriſtian, till the faith of the reformed* Engliſh *have the happineſs to be weighed prudently, and the* military *Sword being timely ſheathed, the Power and Laws of Peace be returned into thoſe hands, which are ordained by GOD the Defenders of it.*

H. H.

OF

OF THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH of ROME.

A DISCOURSE

Written by the

Lord Viſcount Falkland.

Section 1. TO him that doubts whether the Church of *Rome have* any errours, they anſwer, that She *hath* none, for She never *can* have any. This being ſo much harder to believe than the firſt, had need be proved by ſome *certainer* arguments, if they expect that the belief of this one, ſhould draw on whatſoever elſe they pleaſe to propoſe: Yet this is offered to be proved by no better ways than thoſe by which *we* offer to prove She *hath erred*: Which are, arguments from *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, and Ancient Writers; all which *they* ſay themſelves, are fallible; for nothing is not ſo, but the Church; which if it be the onely infallible determination, and that can never be believed upon *its own* authority, we can never *infallibly know* that the Church is infallible: for theſe other ways of proof (they ſay) may deceive both them and us; and ſo neither ſide is *bound* to believe them.

Section 2. If they ſay, that an argument out of *Scripture* is ſufficient ground of *Divine faith*, why are they ſo offended with the Proteſtants for believing *every part* of *their* Religion upon that ground, upon which they build *all theirs* at once? and if following the ſame Rule with equal deſire of finding the truth by it, (having neither of thoſe qualities, which *Iſidorus Peluſiota* ſays, are the cauſes of all Hereſies; ἀυθάδειαν καὶ πρόληψιν, *pride* and *prejudication*) why ſhould God be more offended with the one than the other, though they chance to err?

Section 3. They ſay the *Church* is therefore made *infallible* by God, that all men may have ſome *certain* Guide; yet though it *be* infallible, unleſs it both plainly *appear* to be ſo, (for it *is* not certain to whom it doth not *appear* certain) and unleſs it be manifeſt *which* is the *Church*, God hath not attained his end; and it were to ſet a Ladder to Heaven, and ſeem to have a great care of my going up, whereas unleſs there be care taken, that I may know this Ladder is *here* to that purpoſe, it were as good for me it had never been ſet.

Section 4. If they ſay we *may know* it, for that *general* and conſtant *Tradition* inſtructs us in it; I anſwer, that *ignorant* people *cannot know* this, and ſo it can be no Rule for *them*; and if *learned* people miſtake in this, there can be no condemnation for *them*. For ſuppoſe, to know whether the *Church* of *Rome* may err, (as a way which will conclude *againſt* her, but not *for* her; for if She *hath* erred, certainly She *may*; but though She *hath not* erred hitherto, it follows not, that She cannot err) I ſeek whether She *have* erred; and conceiving She *hath contradicted* her ſelf, conclude neceſſarily, She hath *erred*; I ſuppoſe it not *damnable*, though I err in my judgment: becauſe I try the *Church* by one of thoſe Touch-ſtones her ſelf appoints me; which is, *Conformity with the Ancient*. For to ſay, I am to believe the *preſent Church* that it differs not from the former, though it ſeem to me to doe ſo, is to ſend me to a Witneſs, and bid me not believe it.

Section 5. Now to *ſay* the *Church* is provided for a *Guide* of faith, but muſt be known by ſuch marks as the *ignorant* cannot *ſeek* it by, and the *learned* may chance not to *find* it by, though ſeeking it with all diligence, and without all prejudice; can no way ſatisfy me.

Section 6. If they ſay, God will *reveal* the truth to whoſoever ſeeks it in theſe ways *ſincerely*; this ſaying *both ſides will* (without means of being confuted) *make uſe of*; therefore it would be as good that *neither did.*

Section 7. When they have proved the *Church* to be *infallible*; yet, to my underſtanding, they have proceeded nothing further, unleſs we can be ſure *which is it*; for it ſignifies onely, that God will *always have* a *Church* which ſhall not err; but not that ſuch or ſuch a *Succeſſion* ſhall be always in the right; not that the *Biſhop* of ſuch a place, and the Clergy that adheres to him, ſhall always continue in the *true* faith. So that if they ſay the *Greek* Church is not *the Church*, becauſe by its own confeſſion it is *not* infallible; I anſwer, that it may be *now* the *Church*, and may *hereafter* err, and ſo not be *now* infallible; and yet *the Church never* err, becauſe before *their* fall from truth, *others* may ariſe to maintain it, who *then* will be the *Church*; and ſo the *Church* may *ſtill* be infallible; though not in reſpect of any ſet perſons whom we may know at all times for our Guide.

Section 8. Then if they prove the *Church* of *Rome* to be the true *Church*, and not the *Greek*, *becauſe their* opinions are conſonant either to Scripture or Antiquity, they run into a circle, proving their *tenets* to be *true*, firſt, becauſe the *Church holds* them, and then theirs to be the *true Church*, becauſe it *holds the truth*: which laſt, though it appear to me the onely way, yet it takes away its being a Guide which we may follow *without examination*, without which, all they ſay beſides, is nothing.

Section 9. Nay, ſuppoſe they had evinced, that *ſome ſucceſſion* were infallible, and ſo had proved to a *learned* man that the *Roman Church* muſt be *this*, becauſe none elſe *pretends* to it; yet this can be no ſufficient ground to the *ignorant*, who cannot have any *infallible* foundation for their belief, that the *Church of Greece pretends* not to the ſame; and even to the *learned* it is but an *accidental* argument, becauſe if any other company had likewiſe claimed to be *infallible*, it had overthrown all ſo proved.

Section 10. Nay, it is but an *arbitrary* Argument, and depends upon the pleaſure of the Adverſary; for, if any *ſociety* of Chriſtians would *pretend* to it, the *Church* of *Rome* could make uſe of it no longer.

Section 11. The chiefeſt reaſon why they diſallow of the *Scripture* for *Judge*, is, becauſe when differences ariſe about the *interpretation*, there is no way to end them; and that it will not ſtand with the goodneſs of God, to damn men for not following his will, if he had aſſigned no infallible way how to find it. I confeſs this to be wonderfull true, ὃ δ' ὅπου πάλαι ἐγὼ ὡς ἕτερα λέγειν παῤ ὃ φρονῶ, and let them excuſe themſelves that think otherwiſe. Yet this will be no argument againſt him, who believes that to all who follow their *reaſon* in the *interpretation* of the Scriptures, and ſearch for *Tradition*, God will either give his *grace* for aſſiſtence to *find* the truth, or his *pardon* if they *miſs* it: and then, this ſuppoſed *neceſſity* of an infallible Guide, with this ſuppoſed *damnation* for want of it, fall together to the ground.

Section 12. If they command us to believe *infallibly* the contrary to this, they are to prove it falſe by ſome *infallible* way, (for the concluſion muſt be of the ſame nature, and not conclude more than the premiſſes ſet down,) now ſuch a way, *Scripture* and *Reaſon*, or *infuſed faith* cannot be, (for they uſe to object the *fallibility* of them, to thoſe that build their Religion upon them) nor the *Authority* of the *Church*, for that is part of the queſtion, and muſt be it ſelf *firſt* proved, and that by none of the former ways, for the former reaſons.

Section 13. The *Pope's infallibility* can be no infallible ground of faith, being it ſelf no *neceſſary* part of the faith; (and we can be no ſurer of any thing proved, than we are of that which proves it) and if *he* be fallible, no *part* is the more *infallible* for his ſiding with them. So if the *Church* be divided, I have no way to know which is the *true Church*, but by ſearching which agrees with *Scripture* and *Antiquity*, and ſo judging accordingly. (But this is not to ſubmit my ſelf to her opinions as my *guide*, which they tell us is neceſſary.) Which courſe if they approve not of, as a fit one for a *learned* man, they are in a worſe caſe for the *ignorant*, who can take no courſe at all, nor is the better at all, for this Guide, the Church; whilſt two parts diſpute *which is it*, and that by arguments he underſtands not.

Section 14. If I granted the *Pope*, or a *Council* by him called, to be *infallible*, yet I conceive, their Decrees can be no ſufficient ground (by their own axiomes) of *Divine faith*. For *firſt* (ſay the moſt) No *Council* is valid not approved by the *Pope*, for thus they overthrow that held at *Ariminum*) and a *Pope* choſen by *Symony*, is *ipſo facto* no Pope. I can then have no certainer ground for the *infallibility* of thoſe *Decrees*, and conſequently for my belief of them than I have that the choice of him was neither directly nor indirectly *Symoniacal*; which to be certain of, is abſolutely impoſſible.

Section 15. *Secondly*, Suppoſe him *Pope*, and to have *confirmed* the *Decrees*; yet that *theſe are* the Decrees of a *Council*, or that he *hath confirmed* them, I can have but an uncontradicted atteſtation of many men, (for if another *Council* ſhould declare *theſe* to have been the Acts of a *former* Council, I ſhould need again ſome certain way of knowing how *this* declaration is a *Councils*) which is no ground (ſay *they*) of faith, I am ſure not ſo good and general a one, as that Tradition by which we prove that the Scripture is Scripture, which yet they will not allow any to be certain of, but from them.

Section 16. *Thirdly*, For the *ſenſe* of their Decrees, I can have no better expounder to follow than *Reaſon*; which if, though I miſtake, I ſhall not be *damned* for following, why ſhall I, for miſtaking the ſenſe of Scripture? Or why am I a leſs fit interpreter of *one*, than of the *other*, where both ſeem equally clear? And where they ſeem ſo (I mean equally clear) and yet contradictory, ſhall I not as ſoon believe *Scripture*, which is, without doubt, of at leaſt *as great* authority?

Section 17. But I doubt whether *Councils* be fit deciders of Queſtions; for ſuch they cannot be, if they beget more, and men have cauſe to be in greater doubts *afterwards* (none of the *former* being diminiſhed) than they were at firſt.

Section 18. Now I conceive there ariſe ſo *many* out of this way, that the learned cannot end *all*, nor the ignorant know *all*. As (beſides the fore-named conſiderations) *Who* is to *call* them, the Pope, or Kings: *Who* are to have *voices* in them; Biſhops onely, or Prieſts alſo: *Whether* the *Pope* or *Council* be *ſuperiour*; and the *laſt*, need the approbation of the *firſt*, debated among themſelves: *Whether* any Countries not being *called*, or not being there (as the *Abiſſines*, ſo great a part of *Chriſtianity*, and not reſolvedly condemned by them for *Hereticks*, were abſent at the Council of *Trent*) make it not *general*: *Whether* if it be one not every where received (as when the Biſhops ſent from ſome places have exceeded their Commiſſion, as

in

in the Council of *Florence*) it be yet of neceſſity to be ſubſcribed to: *Whether* there were any *ſurreption* uſed, or *force*, and *Whether* thoſe diſanull the Acts: *Whether* the *moſt voices* are to be held the Act of the *Council*, or thoſe of *all* are required, (as *Canus* ſaith, *All the Council cannot err, the moſt may*; which never yet agreed) or *Whether two parts* will ſerve (as in the *Tridentine* Synod,) a conſiderable doubt, becauſe *Nicephorus Calliſtus* relating the reſolution of a Council at *Rome* againſt that of *Ariminum*, makes them give three reaſons; One, *That the Biſhop of Rome was not preſent.* The ſecond, *That moſt did not agree to it.* Thirdly, *That others thither gathered were diſpleaſed at their reſolutions*; which proves, that in their opinions, if either *moſt not preſent* agree not to it, or, *all preſent* be not pleaſed with it, a *Council* hath no power to bind. All theſe doubts, I ſay, perſuade me that whatſoever brings with it ſo many *new* queſtions, can be no fit ender of the *old.*

Ἔτεροι δὲ ὁ Νικηφόρος Καλλίστος κἂν συνόδῳ φησὶ γενέσθαι τῶν μὲν μὴ παρόντων τοῖς δὲ ἀγωνιῶσιν ἄπιστα ῥήσκοντα. *Tom.* 2. *p.* 272.

In thoſe things in which, *before* a General Council have *defined*, it is lawfull to hold either way, and damnable to doe ſo *after*; I deſire to know how it agreeth with the Charity of the Church, to *define any thing*, and ſo beſtow upon the Devil one path more for us to walk in to him? *Section* 19.

If the *infallibility* of a *General Council* be a point of faith, I deſire to know *why* it is ſo? Scripture and Tradition ſeem to me not to ſay ſo: But if they did, ſo, I ſuppoſe, you will grant they do of this doctrine, [*That the ſouls of the Bleſſed ſhall ſee God before the day of judgment, and not be kept in ſecret Receptacles:*] For, elſe the doctrine of prayer to Saints cannot ſtand: and yet for denying this, doth *Bellarmine* excuſe Pope *John* 22. (of which belief they know he was not alone) becauſe the *Church* (he means, I doubt not, a General Council) had not then condemned it. I deſire to know, why ſhould not *he* be condemned as well without one, as many *Hereticks* that are held ſo by their Church, yet condemned by *no General Council?* which if he makes to be the rule of *Hereſie*, it had been happy to have lived before the Council of *Nice*, when no opinion had been damnable, but ſome againſt the Apoſtles *Council* at *Hieruſalem*, becauſe there had *yet* been no other *General* Council: *Section* 20.

At leaſt, why ſhall not I be excuſed by the ſame reaſon, though I believe not a *Council* to be *infallible*, ſince I never heard that any Council hath decreed that they are *ſo?* Neither, if it have, can we be bound by that Decree, unleſs made certain ſome other way, that it ſelf is ſo. *Section* 21

If you ſay, we muſt believe it, becauſe of *Tradition*; I anſwer, *ſometimes* you will have the *not believing any thing*, though not declared by a Council, to have power enough to damn; that is, when it makes *againſt us:*) at *other times*, the *Church* hath not decreed, unleſs a Council have, and their errour is pardonable, and they good Catholicks. *Section* 22.

Next, (as I have asked before) how ſhall an *ignorant* man know it? for he, in likelihood, can ſpeak but with a few, from whom he cannot know that *all* of the Church of *Rome*'s part do *now*, and in *paſt* Ages have believed it to be *Tradition* ſo *certainly* as to make it a *ground of Faith*, (unleſs he have ſome revelation that thoſe deceive him not.) Neither indeed can thoſe that ſhould enform him of the opinions of former times, be *certainly* enformed themſelves; for truly if (as they would perſuade us) the relation of *Papias* could coſen ſo far *all* the prime Doctours of the Chriſtian Church into the belief of the doctrine of the *Millenaries*, ſo as that *no one* of thoſe two firſt Ages oppoſed it, (which appears plain enough, becauſe thoſe that after roſe up againſt this opinion, never quoted any for themſelves before *Dionyſ. Alexandrinus*, who lived at leaſt 250 years after *Chriſt.*) Nay, if thoſe firſt men did not onely believe it as *probable*, but *Juſtin Martyr* ſays *he* holds it, and ſo do *all* that are *in all parts orthodox* Chriſtians, ἐγὼ καὶ ὅσοι τινὲς ὀρθόδοξοί εἰσιν πάντα χριστιανοί. * *Irenæus* ſets it down directly for a *Tradition*, and relates the very words that *Chriſt* uſed when he taught this; (which is plainer than any other *Tradition* is proved, or ſaid to be (out of Antiquity) by them.) If (I ſay) *theſe* could be ſo deceived, why might not *other* of the Ancients as well be by others deceived in other points? And then, what *certainty* ſhall the *learned* have, when after much labour they think they can make it appear that the Ancients thought any thing *Tradition*, that indeed it was ſo? and that either the folly, or the knavery of ſome *Papias* deceived them not? I confeſs it makes me think of ſome that *Tully* ſpeaks of, who *(arcem amittunt, dum propugnacula defendunt) loſe the fort, whilſt they defend the out-works*; for, whilſt they anſwer this way the arguments of *Tradition* for the opinion of the *Chiliaſts*, they make unuſefull to themſelves the force of *Tradition* to prove any thing elſe by. For which cauſe it was rather wiſely than honeſtly done of them, who before *Fevardentius* ſet him forth, left out that part of *Irenæus* which we alledge (though we need it not much, for many of the Fathers take notice of this belief of his:) Yet he juſtifies himſelf for doing it, by a worſe blow to them than this it ſelf, which is, *ſaying*, that *if they leave out all Errours in the Books they publiſh*, that is, I ſuppoſe, all opinions contrary to the Church of *Rome*) *bona pars Scriptorum Patrum Orthodoxorum evaneſceret, a good part of the writings of the Orthodox Fathers muſt vaniſh away.* *Section* 23.

Dial. cum Tryph. p. 307. * *l.* 5. *c.* 33.

But the *Tradition* that can be found out of Ancients (ſince their witneſſing may deceive us) hath much leſs ſtrength when they argue onely thus; Sure ſo *many* would not ſay this is *true*, and joyn in opinions, if there were no Tradition for them. I would have you remember, they can deliver their opinion poſſibly, but either *before* the controverſie ariſe in the Church (upon ſome chance) or *after*. If *before*, it is confeſt that they write not often *cautiouſly* enough; and ſo they anſwer all they ſeem to ſay for *Arius* and *Pelagius* his faith, before *themſelves*, and ſo conſequently, their *controverſie* (though it may be not their opinion) aroſe. If *after*, then they anſwer often (if any thing be by them at that time ſpoken againſt them) that the *heat of diſputation* brought it from them, and their reſolutions to oppoſe *Hereticks* enough: I deſire it may be lawfull for *us* to anſwer ſo too, either one of theſe two former ways; or that it is (as often they ſay too) ſome *Hyperbole*, when you preſs us in any thing with the opinions of Fathers. At leaſt, I am ſure if they may deceive us with *ſaying* a thing *is* a *Tradition*, that *is not*, we may be ſooner deceived if we will *ſay* and conclude it for a *Tradition*, when they ſpeak it onely as a *Truth*, and (for ought appears) their *particular Opinion.* *Section* 24.

For beſides, if when *Salvian*, comparing the *Arians* with evil Livers, (and that after they were condemned by a Council) extenuates, (by reaſon of their believing themſelves in the right) with much inſtance the fault of the *Arians*, and ſays, *How they ſhall be puniſht for it in the day of judgment, none can know but the Judge*: If (I ſay) they confeſs it to be his opinion, they muſt alſo confeſs the doctrine of their Church *Section* 25.

Church to be different from that of *Salvian*'s times; becauſe he was allowed a Member of *that*, for all this *ſaying*; whereas he of the Church of *Rome* that ſhould ſay ſo of *us*, would be accounted *Seſqui-hæreticus*, a Heretick and a half: Or elſe they muſt *ſay* (which they can onely ſay, and not prove) that he was ſo earneſt againſt ill men, that for the aggravation of their crime, he leſſened that of the Hereticks, and ſaid, what at another time he would not have ſaid; which if they doe, will it not overthrow wholly the authority of the Fathers? Since we can never *infallibly* know what they thought at *all times*, from what they were moved to *ſay* at ſome one time by ſome *collateral conſideration*.

Section 26. Next to this certain and undoubted *damning* of all out of the Church of *Rome*, which averſeth me from it; comes their putting *all to death*, or at leaſt pains, that are ſo, where they have power: which is an effect, though not a neceſſary one, of the firſt opinion; and that averſeth me yet more; for I do not believe *all* to be *damned* whom they damn, but I conceive *all* to be *killed* whom they kill. I am ſure if you look upon *Conſtantine*'s Epiſtle, written to perſuade concord upon the firſt diſagreement between *Alexander* and *Arius*, you will find that *he* thought (and if the Biſhops of his time had at firſt thought *otherwiſe*, he would have been ſure better informed) that *neither* ſide deſerved either death or damnation, (and yet ſure this queſtion was as great as ever roſe ſince:) For having ſpoken of the opinions as things ſo indifferent, that the *Reader* might almoſt think they had been fallen out at Spurn-point or Ketle-pins, he adds,

Niceph. *Tom.* 1. *pag.* 555. Τὸ δὲ ἀναμάχητον ἐν ἔᾳ, ἀεὶ τὰ θείας προνοίας συμφωνεῖν πάντας καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πίστιν, *For that which is neceſſary is one thing, that all agree and keep the ſame faith about divine providence.* I am ſure in the ſame Authour, *Moſes*, a man praiſed by him, refuſing to be made Biſhop by *Lucius* becauſe he was an *Arian*, and he anſwering, That

Tom. 2. *p.* 206. *he did ill to refuſe it before he knew what his faith was*; Anſwered, ἡ γὰρ πίστις δείκνυσι τὴν ὅπου κόπων ἀφορεία, *The baniſhing of Biſhops ſhews Enough your faith.* So that it is plain, he thought *puniſhing* for opinions to be a mark which might ſerve him to know *falſe* opinions by.

Section 27. I believe throughout Antiquity you will find no putting any to *death*, unleſs it be ſuch as begin to kill firſt, (as the *Circumcellians* or ſuch like:) I am ſure *Chriſtian Religion*'s chief glory being that it increaſed by being *perſecuted*, and having that advantage of the *Mahumetan* (which came in by force) methinks,

De Regno. (eſpecially ſince *Syneſius* hath told us, and reaſon told men ſo before *Syneſius*, that τοῖς ἐναντίοις, τὴν συνεξάνλων ἕκαστον φθορέα, *Every thing is deſtroyed by the contrary to what ſetled and compoſed it:*). It ſhould be to take ill care of *Chriſtianity*, to ſeek to hold it up by *Turkiſh* means: at leaſt, it muſt breed doubts, that if the Religion had always remained the *ſame*, it would not be defended by ways ſo *contrary* to thoſe by which it was propagated.

Section 28. I deſire recrimination may not be uſed: for though it be true that *Calvin* hath done it, and the Church of *England* a *little*, (which is a little too much) for, *Negare manifeſta non audeo, & excuſare immodica non poſſum*, yet She, confeſſing She *may* err, is not ſo chargeable with any fault, as thoſe which pretend they *cannot*, (and ſo will be ſure never to mend it:) and beſides, I will be bound to defend no more than I have undertaken, which is, to give reaſons *why the Church of* Rome *is* fallible.

Section 29. I confeſs this opinion of *damning* ſo many, and this cuſtom of *burning* ſo many, this breeding up thoſe who know nothing elſe in any point of Religion, yet to be in readineſs to cry, *To the fire with him*, and, *To Hell with him*, (as *Polybius* ſaith in a certain furious Faction of an Army of ſeveral Nations, and conſequently Languages, μόνον τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο κοινῇ συνίεσαν, τὸ Βάλλε, *All of them underſtood onely this word, Throw at him*) this I ſay in my opinion, was it chiefly which made ſo *many* ſo *ſuddenly* leave the Church of *Rome*, that indeed, to borrow the Authour's phraſe, ὑ παρακλήσεως δεῆς ἔπραξαν, ἀλλὰ ἀγγέλε μόνον ἐδεήθεσαν —— *They needed not perſuaſion to doe it, but onely news that others had begun:* For, as this alone, if *believed*, makes *all* the reſt be ſo too; ſo one thing alone *miſ-liked*, (where Infallibility is claimed) overthrows alſo *all* the reſt.

Section 30. If it were granted that, becauſe it agrees not with the *goodneſs* of God to let men want an *infallible Guide*, therefore there *muſt* be one; and that the *Church* of *Rome* were that *one*; yet if that teach *any thing*, to my underſtanding, *contrary* to God's *goodneſs*, I am not to receive her doctrine, for the ſame cauſe for which they would have me receive it, (it being *as good* an argument; This *Guide* teaches things contrary to God's *goodneſs*, *therefore* is not appointed by God; as to ſay, It is agreeable to his *goodneſs* there ſhould be a *Guide*, *therefore* there is one.) And ſure it is lawfull to examine *particular* doctrines, whether they agree with that principle which is their *foundation*; and to *that* (methinks) to damn him that neither with *negligence* nor *prejudication* ſearcheth what is God's will, though he miſs of it, is as contrary as the firſt can be ſuppoſed.

Section 31. I would know, *whether* he that *never heard* of the Church of *Rome*, ſhall yet be damned for not believing her *infallible*. I have ſo good an opinion of them, as to aſſure my ſelf they will anſwer, *he ſhall not*. I will then ask, *whether* he that hath ſearched what *Religions* there are, and finds *hers* to be one, and *her infallibility* to be part of it, if his reaſon will not aſſent to that, ſhall he be damned for being *inquiſitive* after *truth*? (for he hath committed no other fault greater than the other) and *Whether* ſuch an *ignorance* (I mean after impartial ſearch) be not of all other the moſt *invincible*?

Section 32. Nay, grant the *Church* to be *infallible*, yet, methinks, he that *denies it*, and imploys his reaſon to *ſeek* if it be true, ſhould be in as good caſe as he that *believes* it, and *ſearcheth not* at all the truth of the propoſition he receives: for I cannot ſee why he ſhould be *ſaved*, becauſe, by reaſon of his *Parents* belief, or the Religion of the *Country*, or ſome ſuch *accident*, the *truth* was offered to his underſtanding, when had the *contrary* been offered, he would have received that; and the other damned that believes *falſhood*, upon as good ground as the other doth *truth*; unleſs the Church be like a Conjurer's circle, that will keep a man from the Devil, though he came into it by chance.

Section 33. They grant that no man is an *Heretick*, that believes not his Hereſie *obſtinately*; and if he be no Heretick, he may ſure be ſaved. It is not then *certain damnation* for any man to deny the infallibility of the *Roman* Church: but for him onely that denies it *obſtinately*, and then I am ſafe; for I am ſure I do not.

Section 34. Neither can they ſay, I ſhall be damned for *Schiſm*, though not for Hereſie; for he is as well no *Schiſmatick*, though in *Schiſm*, that is *willing* to joyn in communion with the *true* Church, when it appears

to

to be ſo to him; as he is no *Heretick*, though he hold heretical opinions, that holds them not *obſtinately, that is* (as I ſuppoſe) with a deſire to be informed if he be in the wrong.

Why, if it be not *neceſſary* always to believe the *truth*, ſo one believe in general *what the Church would have believed*, (for ſo they excuſe great men that have held contrary opinions to theirs now, before they were defined, or they knew them to be ſo) why (I ſay) ſhall not the ſame *implicit aſſent* to whatſoever God would have aſſented to (though I miſtake what it is) be ſufficient? When indeed, to believe *implicitly* what *God* would have believed, is to believe implicitly likewiſe what the *Church* teacheth, if this doctrine be within the number of *thoſe* which God commands to be believed. *Section* 35.

I have therefore the leſs doubt of this opinion, that I ſhall have no harm for not believing the *infallibility* of the Church of *Rome*, becauſe of my being ſo far from *leaning* to the contrary, and ſo ſuffering my *will* to have power over my *underſtanding*, that if God would leave it to me, which Tenet *ſhould* be true, I would rather chooſe that that *ſhould*, than the contrary. For they may well believe me, that I take no pleaſure in tumbling hard and unpleaſant Books, and making my ſelf giddy with diſputing of obſcure queſtions, and dazled ὥσπερ οἱ ἐκ πυρὸς ὑφηλῆς ἀκροωτείας εἰς ἀχανὲς καταπίπτοντες πέλαγος, If I could believe, there ſhould *always* be (whom I might always *know*) a ſociety of men, whoſe opinions muſt be *certainly* true, and who would ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν ἅπαντα ἀγχινόως ἁλίσκεσθαι, labour to diſcuſs and define all ariſing doubts, ſo as I might be excuſably at eaſe, and have no part left for me but that of obedience, which muſt needs be a leſs difficult, and ſo a more agreeable way, than to endure endleſs volumes of commentaries, the harſh *Greek* of *Epiphanius*, and the as hard *Latin* of *Irenæus*, and be pained by diſtinguiſhing between different ſenſes and various lections; and he would deſerve not the loweſt place in *Bedlam*, that would prefer theſe ſtudies, before ſo many, ſo much more pleaſant; that would rather *employ* his underſtanding, than *ſubmit it*; and if he could think God impoſed upon him onely the *reſiſting temptations*, would, by way of addition, require from himſelf the *reſolving of doubts*. I ſay not that *all theſe Books* are to be read by *thoſe* who underſtand not the Languages; for *them*, I conceive, their ſeeking into *Scripture* may ſuffice. But if I have, by God's grace, skill to look into them, I cannot better uſe it than in the ſearch of his will, where *they ſay* it is to be found; that I might aſſent to them, if there I find reaſon for it; or if I do not, they may have no excuſe for not excuſing *me*. *Section* 37. Cæſarius. Syneſius.

For whereas they ſay, it is *pride* makes *us doubt* of their infallibility; I anſwer, that their too much *lazineſs* and impatience of examining, is the cauſe many of *them* do *not doubt*. *Section* 38.

Next, what *pride* is it, never to aſſent before I find *reaſon* for it? (ſince *they*, when they follow their *Church* as *infallible*, *pretend reaſon* for it, and will not ſay they would, if they thought they found none:) and if they ſay, we do *find* reaſon, but will not *confeſs* it, then pride hinders not our *aſſent*, but our *declaration* of it; which if it do in any one, he is without queſtion, αὐτοκατάκριτος, *condemned by himſelf*, and it muſt be a very partial advocate that would ſtrive to acquit him. *Section* 39.

One much prevailing argument which they make, is this; that whoſoever leave them, fall into *diſſention* between themſelves, whereas *they* in the mean while are always at *unity*. I anſwer, *firſt*, in *this* whereof the queſtion is now, they *all* conſent. *Secondly*, when there is *fire* for them that *diſagree*, they need not brag of their uniformity who *conſent*. *Thirdly*, *they* have many *differences* among them (as *whether* the Pope be infallible; *Whether* God predeterminate every action; *Whether* Election and Reprobation depend upon foreſight;) Which ſeem to me as great as any between their adverſaries; and in the *latter*, the *Jeſuits* have ancienter and more general *Traditions* on their ſide, than the Church of *Rome* hath in any other queſtion; and as much ground from reaſon for the defence of God's *goodneſs*, as they can think they have for the neceſſity of an *infallible guide*; yet theſe arguments *muſt not* make the *Dominicans Hereticks*, and muſt *us*. *Section* 40.

If they ſay, The *Church* hath not *reſolved* it (which ſignifies onely, that *they are not agreed about it*, which is that we object) I anſwer, It *ought* to have done, if conformity to the *ancient Church* be required; in which *all* that ever I could hear of before Saint *Auſtin* (who is very various I confeſs in it) delivered the contrary to the *Dominicans*, as not doubtfull; and to ſay, it is *lawfull* for them to diſagree whenſoever they *do* not agree, is ridiculous: for they cannot doe both at once about the ſame point. *Section* 41.

And if they ſay, they mean, by the Church's *not having concluded* it, that a *Council* hath not; I anſwer, *Section* 42. firſt, that they condemn ſome without any, and why not theſe? *Next*, I ſay that the opinion of the *Diffuſed* Church is of more force than the concluſion of a *Repreſentative* (which hath its authority from the other) and therefore if all extant for the firſt four hundred years taught any thing, it is more Hereſie to deny that, than any Canon of a Council.

But may not, howſoever, *any* other company of People (that would maintain themſelves to be *infallible*) *ſay* as much, that all other Sects differ from one another, and therefore *ſhould* all agree with *them*? Would thoſe not (think they) aſcribe all other mens diſſentions, and learned mens falling into divers Hereſies, to their not allowing *their infallibility*? to their not aſſenting to *their* Decrees? and not ſuffering them, διδασκάλους τῶν ζητουμένων καθίζεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ἐν μαθηταῖς ποιεῖσθαι ὑπακούσεσθαι ἔχειν, *to ſit as teachers* of thoſe things that come in *queſtion*, and to have all *others* in that place of *Diſciples obedient* to them? which is that which *Nilus*, a *Greek* Biſhop, profeſſeth, that becauſe the *Greeks* would not allow the *Romans*, was the chief cauſe of ſeparation between them. *Section* 43.

They uſe much to object, How could errours come into the Church without *oppoſition*, and *mention* both of them, and the oppoſition to them in Hiſtory? I anſwer, they *might* come in not at *once*, but by *degrees*; as in the growth of a Child, and the motion of a Clock, we ſee neither in the preſent, but know there was a preſent when we find it paſt. *Next*, (ſo many Authours being *loſt*, who can make it *certain* to me, that from none of thoſe, we ſhould have had notice of this *oppoſition*, if they had come to us?) *Next*, I ſay, there are two ſorts of errours, to hold a thing *neceſſary*, that is *unlawfull* and *falſe*, or that is but *profitable* and *probable*: Of the *ſecond* ſort that errours ſhould come in, it appears not hard to me, and eſpecially in thoſe Ages where want of *Printing* made Books, and conſequently learning not ſo common as now it is; where the few that did ſtudy, buſied themſelves in School-ſpeculations onely; when the authority of a man of chief note had a more general influence than now it hath, and ſo (as *Thucydides* ſaith, *Section* 44.

the Plague did in his time, διέξῃ διὰ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος τὸ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ πρῶτον ἱδρυθὲν κακὸν, the diſeaſe that *firſt ſetled in the head, eaſily paſſed through all the body*] conſidering how apt all men are to deſire that all men ſhould think as they do, and conſequently, to lay a neceſſity upon the receiving that opinion, if they conceive that a way to have it received: And then if it were believed *generally profitable*, (as for example, *Confeſſion*) who would be apt to oppoſe their calling it *neceſſary*, for the ſame cauſe for which they called it ſo? *Beſides*, if this errour were delivered by ſome Father in the *hot oppoſition* of ſome *Heretick*, it may be, none of his ſide would oppoſe it, leſt the adverſaries might take advantage by their diſſention, and he that diſputed for the Orthodox ſide, might loſe by it much of his authority.

Section 45. The word [*neceſſary*] it ſelf is often uſed for *very convenient*; and then, from *neceſſary* in that ſenſe, to *abſolutely neceſſary*, is no *difficult* change, though it be a *great* one. The Fathers uſe *Heretick*s ſometimes in a large ſenſe, and ſometimes in a ſtricter, and ſo differ in the reckoning them up; Some leaving out thoſe that others put in (though they had ſeen the precedent Catalogue:) and ſo the doubtfulneſs of the ſenſe of thoſe words might bring in errour. Names alſo, as [an] *Altar*, *Sacrifice*, *Maſs*, may have been uſed firſt in one ſenſe; and the *name* retained, though the *thing* ſignified received change; which may have been the art of the Church of *Rome*, as it was once of an Emperour of *Rome*, *Cui proprium fuit nuper reperta* (I leave out *Scelera*) *priſcis verbis obtegere*, *whoſe property it was to cover things newly found out, with ancient terms*. And the ſame Authour tells us, that the ſame State was as it were cheated out of her liberty, becauſe there did remain, *Eadem Magiſtratuum vocabula*, *The ſame titles of Magiſtrates*; and I believe, that if the Proteſtants beyond the Seas would have thought *Biſhops* as good a word as *Superintendents*, (and ſo in other ſuch things) many, who underſtand nothing but *names*, would have miſſed the ſcandal they have now taken.

Section 46. Theſe ways (I think) things may have come, without much *oppoſition*, from being thought *profitable* to be done, and *probable* to be believed, to be thought *neceſſary* to be both: and how many things *little by little* may have been received under *old* names, which would not have been ſo at *once* under *new* ones it is not hard to conceive. (The firſt of theſe being no ſuch ſmall fault, but that part of the *Montaniſts* hereſie was, thinking *uncommanded* faſting-daies *neceſſary* to be obſerved, which without doubt might *lawfully* have been kept, ſo that no neceſſity had been impoſed.)

Section 47. But my main anſwer is, that if for an opinion to be in the Church without known precedent *oppoſition*, be a *certain* note of being received from the beginning; let them anſwer, how came in the opinion of the *Chiliaſts*, not contradicted till two hundred years after it came in.

Section 48. To conclude, if they can prove that the Scripture may be a certainer teacher of truths to *them* than to *us*, ſo that *they* may conclude the *infallibility* of the Church out of it, and *we* nothing; If they can prove the Churches *infallibility* to be a ſufficient *Guide* for him that *doubts* which is the Church, and cannot *examine* that (for want of learning) by her chief mark, which is *conformity* with the Ancient; If they can prove that the *conſent of Fathers* long together (if they had it) is a ſtronger argument againſt *us*, than againſt the *Dominicans*; If they can prove, that though the firſt of them affirm that ſuch a thing is *Tradition*, and believed by all Chriſtians (and this aſſertion till a great while after uncontradicted) yet *they are not* bound to receive it, and, upon leſs grounds, *we are*; if indeed *any* can prove by *any infallible way* the infallibility of the Church of *Rome*, and the neceſſity under pain of damnation for all men to believe it, (which were the more ſtrange, becauſe *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus* among the Ancients, and *Eraſmus* and *Ludovicus Vives* among the Moderns, believe ſome Pagans to be ſaved) I will ſubſcribe to it, And

Sophoc. Ὅστις εὔνους τῇδε τῇ πόλει, θανὼν
Καὶ ζῶν ὁμοίως ἐξ ἐμοῦ τιμήσεται.

Section 49. If any man ſhall vouchſafe to think either *this*, or the Authour of it, of value enough to confute the *one*, and enform the *other*, I ſhall deſire him to doe it with proceeding to the buſineſs, and not ſtanding upon any ſmall ſlip of mine, (of which ſort this may be full) and with that civility which is fit to be uſed by men that are not ſo paſſionate, as to have the definition of reaſonable Creatures in vain; (remembring that *truth*, in likelihood, is where her Authour *God* was, in the *ſtill voice*, and not in the *loud wind*; And that *Epiphanius* excuſeth himſelf, if he have called any Hereticks in his anger, *Deceivers*, or *Wretches*, εἰ παροξυνόμενός τι λέγω ἀπατεῶνας καλῶν ἢ ἀθλίους) and I requeſt him alſo to help to bring me to the *Truth*, (if I be out of it) not onely by his *Arguments*, but alſo by his *Prayers*: which ways, if *he* uſe, and I ſtill continue on the part I am of, and yet do neither ἑκὼν ψευδώνυμον, nor ὁρῶν ἀναισχυντεῖν, neither am *wilfully blind*, nor deny *impudently* what I *ſee*, then I am confident that neither *he* will have reaſon to be offended with me in this world, nor *God* (for that) to puniſh me in the *next*.

FALKLAND.

A VIEW

A VIEW of the EXCEPTIONS, Which have been made by A ROMANIST TO THE L. Viſc. Falkland's Diſcourſe OF THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH of ROME.

SEPTEMB. 11. 1645.

THIS day there came to my hands, *A Treatiſe Apologetical, touching the Infallibility of the Church Catholick, in anſwer to another of the like argument lately publiſhed.* And although I have no temptation to ſpend any more time upon it, than a ſingle reading hath coſt me; nor to think it ſo dangerous a piece, that I ſhould not venture it abroad with the weakeſt Sons of my Mother, without an appendant antidote, or defenſative againſt the poiſon of it, eſpecially being not obliged (in any other notion, than that of the reſpect I bear to the honour and memory of that *noble Lord*) to *vindicate* his Diſcourſe from the exceptions here offer'd; yet being not ſure, that I can excuſe the ſo exceſſive thrift of a few hours (which yet I could very gladly otherwiſe employ, than in drawing one end of a ſaw in a controverſie of this nature) I ſhall give the *Authour* of the Exceptions or Apology, (in as few words as is poſſible) the reaſons why I am not moved by them, much leſs perſuaded that they are ſo extraordinarily lucky, as to give, as is pretended, full anſwer, to all that Maſter *Chillingworth's large Book hath ſuperſtructed on this foundation.* And this I ſhall doe in ſuch a manner, that it may appear, that I deſire onely to ſatisfie his reaſon, and not make him payment *of his ſcoffs or triumphs*, in that ſpirit of meekneſs, which is proper for the reſtoring of one *overtaken* in an errour, (hoping in *charity* that he is ſuch) of an *infirm*, not a *malicious* miſtaker. And the firſt thing we have to view, is that which is entituled. A

A Note upon the Title of the Adverſary's. C. 1.

We againſt whom this Enquirer writes, or rather to whom he propounds his difficulties, with a pretending deſire of procuring a ſatisfaction, are defenders of the Catholick Churches Infallibility; which Churches chief Paſtour, or Metropolitan, though he be particular Biſhop of Rome, *as of ſome one place or other he muſt be, yet nevertheleſs from*

that one portion of it, is not the whole and universal Church aptly to be styled the Church of Rome, *as in the Enquirer's Title it is called, no more than the Church of* England *can be rightly termed the Church of* Canterbury, *or the Protestants of* England *the Canterburians, as the* Scotch *Puritans have called them, onely because the chief Bishop and Primate of the whole Kingdom hath his seat at* Canterbury. *By the self same reason then cannot we justly be called Romanists, as it hath pleased some Protestants to entitle us. The reason of this assertion, is, That* Rome *and* Canterbury *are but small, and onely material portions of either Church, and therefore no way sufficient to give a denomination to the whole. As then the Church of* England *is wrongfully called the Church of* Canterbury, *so, in like manner is the Church Catholick wrongfully styled the Church of* Rome, *or as such, controverted to be fallible, or infallible, forasmuch as this perfection of being infallible is not claimed by her as she is Church of* Rome, *but as she is the Catholick, and, according to the appointment of* Christ, *governed by St.* Peter, *and his Successours. For this cause we have altered the Title, and stated the question in terms more proper and formal, enquiring not whether the Roman Church, but whether the Catholick be infallible, and this ought to be the Title.*

But before we enter upon the examination of particular difficulties, the Reader may please to know, that this same Enquiry was written by the Authour diverse years agoe, in his Catholick Mother's life-time, and was by her mediation forthwith answered at large, and the answer sent unto the Enquirer fairly bound up; in whose hands, though it rested long, yet had it never any reply made unto it, though it was sometime threatned it should. At that very time Chillingworth's *Book began to be in moulding, and it may be, that same new labour diverted the Enquirer, and altered his design. Now at length in a time most unseasonable, by the frivolous officiousness of I know not whom, these old papers are forced to see the light, and to leave their answer behind them. After so mean and creeping a fashion do they appear now unto the world. But although no notice hath been taken of any answer made already, or of giving licence for any other to be made hereafter, or, if made to be published in print, and have the advantage to be dispersed abroad in many Copies; yet are we not by this discouraged from composing one; for, though for want of the Printer's help, it shall lie concealed, and in much restraint, yea, and be in danger to perish, as the other did before it, yet may this small labour fall, at least, into some few hands, and remove out of their way such dangerous stumbling-blocks as have been cast into it by this Enquirer, who, by his casting of doubts, about the method of resolving faith, hath thereby, amongst all those who are not much versed therein, endangered the stability and safety of the whole fabrick, not of Catholick Religion onely, but of Christian in general.*

As for the Papers themselves, and their particular contents, they, in a word, are Chillingworth's *Book in little, and an Embryo of his large volume grown up after, made big and bolstered out with many new materials borrowed from* Baron *the Scotch Minister, and that impious Authour* Volkelius, *the veins of whose poisonous doctrines and discourses, are observed to run branching throughout all* Chillingworth's *work. Wherefore this small collection containing the substance of the other larger Book, the confutation of this Enquirer's allegations, cannot but in substance contain a confutation of all* Chillingworth's *delated errours and sophistications, wherewith so many souls have been perverted, or brought into great troubles and perplexities.*

C. 1. *Answer to C.* 1.

To the Exceptions made against the *Title* of the *Lord Viscount Falkland's* Discourse, I answer, by saying these few things,

Section 1. First, That it is no news to hear of the *Catholick Roman Church*; it hath frequently been used and avowed by your own Writers, and, as I conceive, is by your self acknowledged, when you say, *the perfection of being infallible is not claimed by her (i. e.* the *Church Catholick)* as *she* is the *Church* of *Rome*, but *as she is the Catholick*; which words by the rules of discourse must suppose you to think the *Catholick Church* to be capable of a double appellation, *Roman* and *Catholick*, though the *perfection* there spoken of, belong to it onely under the second notion. And beside, you say in another place, that the *Roman Church is the Catholick*;

B. whence it will follow, that the *Catholick* is the *Roman*; And if this be not propriety of speech, his Lordship is not to be blamed for it, but you, whose dialect he is fain to use.

Section 2. This then being presumed to be granted by your Writers, and, as I conceive, also by you, that the *Roman Church* is the *Catholick Church*, or that the *Roman* and *Catholick* are two names for the same Church, it will certainly follow, that he that affirms the *Catholick Church* to be *infallible*, must affirm the *Roman Church* to be so too, though not *quatenus Roman*. For any particular man being affirmed to be a *Christian*, whatsoever will be true to be said of this *Christian*, will be true to be said of this man (by the

C. rule of *quicquid prædicatur de prædicato, prædicatur de subjecto*) if this *Christian* have a promise made, a privilege instated on him, this man hath so also, and if any that yielded the former, shall deny the latter, it will never be sufficient ground or authority for such denying, to affirm, that it was made to him as a *Christian*, and not as a man; for the whole man being a *Christian*, and not onely some part of him, even that which belongs to him onely for *Christianities* sake, doth as truly belong to him, as that which his *humanity* gives him title to.

Section 3. Or secondly, If you have sprang a *subtlety*, and by help of that, mean to disclaim the expression of other your friends, and therefore will not allow the *Roman* Church to be, in propriety of speech, the *Catholick* Church, and yet will agree with them in all but in the expression; truly you have revealed no great *mystery* to the world. And as long as you define (as you do) the *Catholick Church*, (as it is the subject of the pretended *Infallibility*) to be that which is governed by Saint *Peter* and his *Successours*, we that mean no more by the *Roman Church* than that which is so governed, shall assoon believe the *Roman Church* to be infallible, as the *Catholick* under your notion of it.

Section 4. The short of it is, we shall never agree upon any thing till the equivocal terms be explicated, and one single sense of this, as of all other phrases, agreed on betwixt both parties. Tell us then plainly, that by the *Catholick Church* you mean the *Universal* all the world over, without any kind of restriction, and not that onely which is governed by the *Pope of Rome*, which is a great restriction of the word *Catholick*, (and must be not onely affirmed but proved by you to be none) And then I shall thus far consent with you;

First,

Section 5. First, That the *Universal Church* is in *fundamentals infallible* (not from any thing inherent in it self, but by a *prerogative* acquired, *i. e.* by the promise of *Christ*, *that his spirit shall lead them into all truth*, and *that he will be with them to the end of the world*, and the like;) but then this *Infallibility* must signifie no more, or be no farther extended, than that *Christ* doth and will so defend his Church, that there shall be for ever, till the *end of the world*, a *Church Christian* on the Earth, *i. e.* that the whole Church shall not at once make an *universal* defection, err from the foundation, or doe any thing by which there shall cease to be a Church on earth.

Section 6. But then secondly, I say that this very *Universal Church*, though it be in this sense *infallible* in *fundamentals*, is not yet a *Rule*, or *Canon*, or *Guide*, or *Judge infallible*, even in *fundamentals*; *visible* it is, *infallible* it is, but 'tis not a *visible Judge*, or *rule infallible*. And the reason of this assertion is this, that its *Infallibility*, explained as we have explain'd it, is all that can be certainly inferred from *Christ*'s words, (and that belongs not at all to *judicature*) and so any other *Infallibility* that shall be pretended to belong to *judicature*, must be inferred from some other tenure, or else it will not be inferred.

Section 7. If you cannot be thus liberal to us, and tell us that by *Catholick* in this question, you mean that *Catholick* without restriction; Tell us then secondly, that you mean a representation of that *Catholick*, *i. e.* a *Council General*, *Oecumenical*, and then I shall acknowledge many privileges to belong to that; An *humble*, though not an *absolute* obedience, and in a word, that nothing is to be preferred before it, but the *Word* of *God*, or the *Church* truly *Universal*. Yet after all this, that it is not *infallible*, or *inerrable*, I have the judgment of *Panormitan*, and shall add his reason also to back it; *Because*, saith he, * *the General Council is not truly, but onely by representation, the Universal Church, and supposing such a Council to err, it would not yet follow, that the Universal Church or multitude of all Christian's do err, because 'tis possible that some out of the Council do not err, yea, and in the Council too, though a major part overcome the better.* In this I have the concurrence of *Occam. dial. p.* 3. *tr.* 1. *l.* 3. *c.* 5. *Cardin.* Cameracensis, *c.*1. Waldensis *Doctrin. fid. l.* 2. *artic.* 3. *c.* 26. *& quest. vesp. arg.* 3. *ad lit.* O. Antoninus, *to.*1. *de sacram. l.* 2. *c.* 19. *Card.* Cusanus *in summarum par.* 3. *tit.* 23. *de concil. general. c.* 2. *sect.* 6. *l.* 2. *Concord Cathol. c.* 4. *Et* Nic. *de* Clemangis, *Collat.* 2. *p.* 64, & 73. with this farther confirmation of it from the opinion of the † Ancient Fathers, evidenced by their practice; *In that* (saith he) *it was solemnly accustomed by them at the beginning of such a Council, by fasting and praying to implore the assistence of the Spirit, which had been a piece of useless diligence, if they had been before assured, that they could not be deceived or fail in those things for which they were assembled.* Which argument, if it do not infallibly induce the conclusion to those that pray for those things which they are sure of; yet is it an evidence, that they that use it, are of the opinion which they infer by it, and will be of force to those, that from the mention of some of the Ancients praying for the dead, conclude them to be in a mutable state; as I conceive some of your friends are wont to do. To this assertion of ours I might also cite the *Concordance* of the *Jesuits* generally, who that they may fasten all *infallibility* in the *Pope* alone, attribute nothing at all to a *Council* but this, that the errour of a *Council* cannot be confirmed by the *Pope*, which is in effect no more, than that *Councils* begin to be *infallible*, when the *Pope* confirms them, *i. e.* when the *Council* is at an end, (which kind of *Infallibility* they will afford, I presume, to every *Heretick* (and to me while I thus write) that my errour cannot be confirmed by the *Pope*) unless they will be so bountifull to add also, that such a *Council* cannot err, if it follow the instructions of the Pope, which will also be acknowledged true of any the meanest *Lutheran*, or *Calvinist*, as well as of that *Council*.

* *Licet concilium generale repræsentet totam ecclesiam Universalem, tamen in veritate ibi non est verè Universalis ecclesia, sed repræsentativè, quia Universalis ecclesia constituitur ex collectione fidelium, & ista est ea ecclesia quæ errare non potest. C. significasti. ext. de Electio.*

† *Antiquis patribus concilium celebraturis solenne fuit jejuniis, orationibus, spiritus assistentiam implorare; inutili sanè diligentiâ, si exploratum habebant se non posse falli aut deficere in his propter quæ fuerant congregati.*

Section 8. If neither of these two be it you mean, then be ingenuous, and tell us, you either mean the *Pope* of *Rome*, as the *Jesuits* do, or else that you mean those parts of the *Catholick* that are governed by him, and then as we shall tell you, that it is the very thing which we learn't from you to mean by the *Roman Church*, so you that affirm that to be the notion of the *Catholick Church*, must acknowledge to affirm the same thing to be *Infallible*, which we say you do affirm, when we propose the *Question* of the *Roman Churches Infallibility*; and in this there is no matter of deceit or difficulty, but that that *Church* under the government of the *Pope*, which we affirm to be *fallible*, even in the highest degree, *fallible* in *fundamentals*, you undertake and contest to be *infallible*. 'Tis true, this we call the *Roman Church*, conceiving it to be your *Dialect*, and if you say it is not, we will consent to you, and in obedience to your example, call it so no more; on condition you will be but as reasonable, and give it some other title; whether that of the *Western Church*, which were a good large Province, (and yet of that Saint *Basil* complains in no lower style than this, That *they neither know nor endure the unity of Faith*) Ep. 10. or any other title, besides that of the *Catholick Church*, which we are sure cannot properly be allow'd it, unless it appear, First, that all *Christians* ought to be govern'd by the *Bishop of Rome*; and Secondly, that all they which are not so governed, are no longer members of the *Catholick Church*; and if you affirm both these, we profess to deny them, and then that must be the matter of debate; and till that be agreed, there will be no other question *seasonable*, to be proposed in this matter, and when it is, there will be no other *needfull*.

Section 9. And for the parallel of the *Canterburians*, which you use to prove the unfitness of the *question* under these terms, it is but a thin fallacy, (easily seen through) if it be thought to conclude any thing. To the clearing of which, be pleased to observe, that the *Bishop* of *Canterbury* may be considered in a three-fold relation: First, to his particular *Diocess* of *Canterbury*, of which he is *Bishop*; Secondly, to the whole *Province* of *Canterbury*, of which he is *Metropolitan*; Thirdly, to the whole *National Church* of *England*, of which he is *Primate*; his two former relations are terminated in *Canterbury*, under the two significations of the word, but the third is terminated not in *Canterbury*, in any notion of that word, but in all *England*; and thence it follows, that the Church of *Canterbury* (whether as a *Province*, or a *Diocess*, which are the onely two *Notions* we in *England* have of it) being not of the same latitude with the *Church of England*, it will be improper to call the *Protestants* of *England*, *Canterburians*: But then on supposition that there were a third *notion* of it, whereby the *Church* of *Canterbury*, and the *Church* of *England* were of the same latitude, or to him that were confidently persuaded that they are so, it were no impropriety at all to call all

Engliſh Proteſtants by that denomination; and if to prove it were improper, it ſhould be affirmed that 'tis but an *accident* that he that is *Primate* of all *England* ſhould be *Biſhop* of the particular *See* of *Canterbury*, there would be no force in that proof; Firſt, becauſe that which is *true per accidens*, is nevertheleſs *true*, and denominations being *ad placitum*, are many times accidental, yet for all that, *denominations* as much, as if they had been by *nature* or *per ſe*; and Secondly, becauſe we are now upon a ſuppoſition (though it be but a ſuppoſition) that there is a *National Church of Canterbury*, as well as a *Province* and *Dioceſs*. And therefore I ſay, on this ſuppoſition, if it had ſo happened, or been agreed on, that all that are under the *Primate of Canterbury*, ſhould be called the *Church of Canterbury*, as it hath been agreed on, that all that are under the *Metropolitan of Canterbury*, ſhould be called the *Province of Canterbury*, we ſhould never challenge any man of improper ſpeaking, that ſhould call us *Canterburians*. As for the *Scotch Puritan* you ſpeak of, that calls us ſo by way of reproach; you cannot be ignorant of his meaning, or think it pertinent to the purpoſe, to which you apply it; It was uſed by him onely in relation to the preſent doctrines of the then *Biſhop of Canterbury*, (and onely ſome men ſcoffed at under that title, as followers of his (as they erroneouſly conceived) particular, or perſonal doctrines) which is quite another notion of the word, than that which you have occaſion to ſpeak of.

Section 10. From all this it will conſequently appear to be as unreaſonable for you, who acknowledge a notion of the *Roman Church* equipollent with *Catholick*, and affirm the whole *Catholick Church* to be govern'd by the *Primate*, or *Pope* of *Rome*, and urge the neceſſity of *Chriſt*'s precept, that the *Church* which you pronounce *infallible*, muſt be ſo governed, (or elſe that it is no longer *Catholick*) to make any difference between the ſtyle of *Catholick*, and of *Roman Church*, or of *Catholicks* and *Romaniſts*; no man among us fetching the denomination of *Roman*, or *Romaniſt* (when he thus ſpeaks) from the relative *Dioceſs* of *Rome*, as the *Pope* is a *Biſhop*, or from the relative *Province* of *Rome*, as he is a *Metropolitan*, but from the relative *Church* of *Rome*, the whole number of thoſe *Chriſtians* who acknowledge the *Pope* their *Primate* or *Patriarch*, which you that affirm him to be *Primate* of all *Chriſtians* by full right and ſucceſſion from Saint *Peter*, muſt acknowledge him to be of the whole *Catholick Church*; In which acknowledgment becauſe we agree not with you (but contend that his *Patriarchate* is limited as well as his *Dioceſs* or *Province*) as we cannot therefore ſpeak throughout in your language, and call that the *Catholick Church*, which is but a part of the *Catholick*, or debate the *Infallibility* of the *Catholick Church* with them, that mean by that phraſe onely thoſe that are under the *Roman Communion*, or government of the *Pope* of *Rome*, whilſt we mean *Catholick* without any reſtriction, (or if we ſhould ſo ſpeak, ſhall be guilty of leaving a main equivocation in the words of the queſtion, which ought of all things to be avoided by diſtinguiſhing, before we go about to debate any thing; and after diſtinction made and greed on, that by Catholick is to be meant onely thoſe which are in *obedience* to the *Pope*, we will then debate it under that title alſo;) ſo may we very reaſonably uſe your dialect, when we agree in the meaning of it, as in the phraſe [*Roman Church*] we do (meaning both of us, all thoſe who are govern'd by the *Pope*) of which *Church* in that notion we now enquire, whether that be *infallible* or no? And ſo much for the phraſe of the *Queſtion*, or *Title* of that *Treatiſe*.

Section 11. And then I ſhall add no more to the ſecond part of the firſt Chapter, than by acknowledging the Treatiſe of that *excellent Lord* to have been written many years ſince, and now not unſeaſonably publiſh't at a time when ſome arts were uſed (though, bleſſed be God, improſperouſly) to pervert unſtable minds, and this pretended *Infallibility* a main auxiliary call'd in for that purpoſe; As for any anſwer long ſince framed to it, I am perſuaded that that *Lord* thought it not ſuch, as that his reputation ſhould be concerned in providing an anſwer for it; And for the *Publiſher* 'tis very poſſible that he might never hear of any ſuch, (which I gueſs alſo by my ſelf, who had long ſince a copy of the one, but till I read it here, never heard of the other,) or if he did, had reaſons which he could juſtify to any ingenuous man, why he did not publiſh it alſo. Which being now ſaid to you (and which you had before no ground of thinking to be otherwiſe) you will hardly give a civil account, why you ſhould charge (and now not ask pardon for charging) on the *Publiſher* a *frivolous officiouſneſs, by which that anſwer is forced to ſtay behind* (though it were alſo ſufficient to tell you, that when you ſet out all your Books at *Rome* or *Doway*, with our anſwers annext to them, we will then publiſh this of yours at *Oxford*) or on the *Edition*, the ſtyle of *a mean and creeping faſhion of appearing to the world*; which words being ſo contrary to truth, (which is punctually this, the Book was licenſed by the *Vicechancellour*; Printed by the *Printer* to the *Univerſity*; The Authour's name put in the Title page; and all this proclaimed on every wall and corner of the City, on purpoſe that every one that had kindneſs to the *Roman Church* might reade it) if they ſignifie any thing, have onely this interpretation of which they are capable, that he that wrote them cared not how abſolutely groundleſs his accuſation was, but onely was willing to accuſe.

Section 12. What you mean by the next words, [*that no notice hath been taken of giving licence for any other anſwer to be made hereafter, or if made to be publiſhed in print, and have the advantage to be diſperſed abroad in many copies.*]

D. I profeſs I cannot tell; and yet was inſolent enough to think, that I could have conſtrued a piece of Engliſh, of which I underſtood every word ſingle; but now find, I had overvalued my own abilities, and ſhould be more modeſt hereafter, but that by finding in the * ſixth line of the Book the nominative *Metropolitan* without any verb after it, I am inclined to think that it is part of your ſtyle to neglect thoſe vulgar rules in which they had been inſtructed.

* The place to which theſe words reply, are upon this admonition mended by the Apologiſt in his reviſal, by putting in after the word [*Metropolitan*] theſe words [*is the Pope, who*] and two lines after inſtead of [*it*] [*His Dioceſs.*] He might as reaſonably have mended the other alſo.

Section 13. E. As for the ſad news that you acquaint us with, [that *this other anſwer of yours ſhall lie concealed, and in much reſtraint, yea and be in danger to periſh*] Though that be a heavy aggravation of the miſery of theſe wicked times, yet ſure this Paper is not the onely ſufferer in that kind, and may both be thought to have deſerved it as well, and be as able to bear it with ſome patience, as many other good ſons of the *Church Catholick* have been; and yet if it will but ſue out its *habeas Corpus*, I doubt not but the law will be open for its plea, and in the mean I have deſigned this preſent Paper to offer it bail, and obtain its enlargement through

through this City, ſo it will promiſe faithfully not to go farther, than its ſurety is ready to attend it. By this means, if it be accepted, it ſhall have leave to viſit all its Catholick friends, and others to whom it deſires to perform any civility, or from whom to receive any kindneſs.

In the mean, how his Lordſhip's Treatiſe [*hath caſt dangerous ſtumbling-blocks, which may endanger the ſtability and ſafety not onely of Catholick Religion, but of Chriſtian in general*] I ſhall promiſe to conſider with you, when you proceed to any proof of it; and till then, onely adviſe you and all my fellow Chriſtians, to conclude no more againſt any Creature, than you produce premiſſes to juſtify; For by ſo doing, you will appear not onely injurious to him with whom you deal, (in raſh cauſeleſs anger and cenſure) and ſecretly reproachfull and contumelious to the Reader (by conceiving him ſo tame, ſo unworthy of the reaſonable ſoul, which God hath given him, on purpoſe to diſtinguiſh betwixt reaſon and no reaſon, betwixt proof and libel, betwixt argument and confidence) but withall you will teach others an evil leſſon againſt your ſelves. If you pleaſe I ſhall give you an *Example* of each of theſe. *Section* 14.

That which you add in the bottom of the Chapter concerning Maſter *Chillingworth*'s Book, beſides that it is utterly impertinent to the confuting of this, which is the preſent buſineſs (nay it is an argument on this ſide, both for the ſeaſonableneſs of publiſhing it (as an *Epitome* uſefull and gainfull to ſuperſede the trouble of reading the larger Book) and for the leaving the former anſwer behind, if the Publiſher had known there had been any; becauſe, as you before intimated, the publiſhing of Maſter *Chillingworth*'s Book then, was conceived to have taken away all force and conſiderableneſs from that anſwer) is firſt, very unjuſt to Maſter *Chillingworth*, in ſaying without any proof, that he borrowed his new materials from *Baron* and *Volkelius*. Secondly, it is contumelious to the Reader's judgment, who is ſuppoſed to be ſo eaſy, as to conclude that to be an ill Book, which is affirmed to borrow materials from a *Scotch Miniſter*, and an *impious Authour*; from which contumely I conceive he is able to vindicate himſelf, by telling you, Firſt, that what is ſuppoſed to be borrowed from the *Scotch Miniſter*, is very authentique *Engliſh* Divinity; and indeed, that *Baron* is content to profeſs himſelf to have borrowed (and that in this particular) from our Writers, eſpecially (if my memory fail me not) from Biſhop *White*, and the firſt edition of the *Biſhop of Canterbury*'s Book under his *Chaplain's* name, from whom alſo Maſter *Chillingworth* might borrow, if he were in any want, and not from him; and yet, I believe, would not, if he were alive, be aſhamed to have profited by ſo worthy a *Scotchman* as *Baron* was. Secondly, that *Volkelius* his being an *impious Authour*, cannot extend to every part of his work, nor conclude, that that which is ſuppoſed to be borrowed from him, is therefore *impious* or poiſonous (if it be, let it be produced and proved to be ſo, by ſome other proof, than that of the *impiety* of the *Authour*) but rather, that Maſter *Chillingworth* had the skill of diſcerning, and took nothing but *balſome*, and *antidote*, where if he had been apt to miſtake, he might have faln on *poyſon*. Thirdly, this will teach others, if they be apt to learn, an evil leſſon againſt your ſelves; I mean not that of *repaying evil with evil* (God forbid that any injuſtice in others, ſhould ſo provoke us, ἐξομοιοῦσθαι, to be *like* them) but onely this particular leſſon, which hath coſt us little pains to peirce or conſtrue, that if this Tract of yours be a *ſatisfactory anſwer* to all Maſter *Chillingworth*'s Book, then a *ſatisfactory anſwer* to this your Treatiſe, will be ſufficient anſwer alſo to the three great *Latin Volumes*, which they ſay, you have written againſt Maſter *Chillingworth*. And this I ſhall be more glad to have obtained by your own rule of concluding, than patient to try by reading them over, whether it be truly ſo, or no; eſpecially if thoſe that have taſted them, paſs a right judgment upon them. *Section* 15.

Thus far I have given my ſelf ſcope to take up almoſt every word you ſay in your firſt Chapter, but am unwilling to think, that thereby I am engaged to doe the like in all that follows, Truly upon reading on, I ſee the ſubtilty of compoſure, and the particulars incident are not of ſuch weight, as that I can promiſe my ſelf *patience* to examine it ſo ſtrictly; I mean not *patience*, as it is oppoſed to *anger* or *paſſion* (for by God's help I ſhall not yield to any temptation, that ſhall bring me into that) but as it is oppoſed to *wearineſs* and *laſſitude*; and I muſt be pardon'd, if I think I could ſpend my time better to my ſelf and the benefit of others, than in following the Exceptions line by line, and giving them a large anſwer; for that any man may be *patient* to doe ſo, or to reade it when 'tis done, it is neceſſary, that the Text, which muſt bear that Comment, muſt have ſomewhat either of *difficulty*, or *ſubtilty*, or *profit* in it; either of which, whenſoever I can find, I profeſs I ſhall be moſt ready to enlarge upon it, (and now acknowledge it an obligation from the Authour, if he will point out to me, where I ſhall have fail'd) and in other particulars be more mercifull to the Reader, and my ſelf. *Section* 16.

To the firſt Section Chap. 2.

True it is, and we grant it willingly, that every proof that is ſolid and good, muſt be, à notioribus, *and that every ſure concluſion muſt alſo be deduced from no other premiſſes or principles, than ſuch as be known, and, at leaſt, be as certain as we deſire the concluſion ſhould be. Nevertheleſs we do abſolutely deny, that this aſſertion of ours touching the Churches infallibility, is by us offered to be proved by ways no better than our Adverſaries offer to prove that ſhe hath erred, as this Inquirer pretends we do; for we affirm that our Churches infallibility is proved by reaſons which are real and true, and that on the other ſide, the Adverſary offers to prove the contrary, onely by ſuch as be no more than ſeeming and pretended. Now true reaſon or authority is a way quite different from pretended, and much better than it, and therefore the Inquirer's charge is falſe, or, at leaſt, light and ineffectual. Muſt all controverſies in Philoſophy be undecidable, becauſe both ſides pretend reaſon; or no ſuits of Law be judged, becauſe both ſides pretend Law? Certainly, whatſoever both ſides do pretend, yet there is but one ſide that hath it, as namely, but one ſide of Philoſophers have true reaſon, and but one ſide of contendents have true Law, and ſo in like manner but one ſide of contending Chriſtians have true reaſon for them, Scripture, or Tradition, howſoever both may pretend it, and therefore we do not go about to prove the Church is infallible by the ſelf-ſame ways that you go about to prove that ſhe hath erred, but by ways that are quite different from them, and the ſame but in name onely, and no farther; By which it follows, that, either you are deceived, or we, and it is not neceſſary that both. And ſo much for this great and principal difficulty which troubled the Inquirer ſo much as he writ to* London *for the ſolution of it, which thing, ſurely, was more* *Section* 1.

than

than needed, for it might have been done at Great Tue *without conſulting* London *about it, or either of our two Univerſities.*

We do not maintain, as he falſely ſuppoſes, that Reaſon, Scripture, and Fathers be all fallible, univerſally ſpeaking, but, in ſome caſes onely, as, namely, reaſon is not fallible in ſuch verities as be evident, but in other that be not ſo, it is. Again, Scripture is a moſt certain rule whenſoever it is certainly expounded, otherwiſe it is not. Laſtly, the Fathers be aſſured and undoubted witneſſes of the Doctrines which were held in their time, though not undoubted definers of them. And, by this anſwer, all the three main props of this Authour's diſcourſe are overthrown, and fall unto the ground *.

* In this place the Apologiſt in his reviſal put in theſe words [*So that in fine all theſe three be infallible*] I muſt a little wonder, to what purpoſe. For if they belong to the words immediately precedent, they will then ſignify, that the three props of his *Lordſhip*'s diſcourſe are *infallible*. But if to the former part of the Section to ſignify *Reaſon, &c.* to be *infallible*, they are then either to be underſtood, that they are *infallible* in all caſes, and then that is point-blank contrary to what he had ſaid [that they were *fallible* in ſome] or elſe that they are *infallible* onely in ſome; and then that he had ſaid diſtinctly before, and needed not to have again anew repeated.

Chap. 2. *Anſw.* to the ſecond Chapter.

Section 1. To the ſecond Chapter, I need onely to put you in mind, that when his Lordſhip ſaith [*the ways of proof that the Church of* Rome *can never have any errours, are no better than thoſe by which we offer to prove ſhe hath erred, and* nameth *three heads of Arguments, from Scripture, Reaſon, and ancient Writers, and proveth you to affirm all theſe are fallible, becauſe nothing is in your opinion infallible but the Church; and from thence concludes that we can never infallibly know that the Church is infallible, becauſe all the means propoſed to induce that knowledge, being of neceſſity ſomewhat elſe beſide that onely infallible, muſt needs be fallible*] it will be very inſufficient in you to reply, that his Lordſhip hath not ſaid true in the firſt particular, upon no other ground of proof, but onely becauſe you [*affirm that the Churches infallibility is proved by Reaſons which are really true, and that the contrary is by us offered to be prov'd onely by ſuch as be onely ſeeming and pretended*] for this very thing that you affirm, *viz.* that thoſe your *Reaſons are real and true*, is a part of the very queſtion in hand, and as much denied by us, as the infallibility of your Church, and therefore, by your own rule of proceeding *à notioribus*, cannot be proper means to conclude, that his Lordſhip erred, to him that will far more eaſily be brought to believe, that your Reaſons are not real, than that his Lordſhip erred in this particular, and that will as readily confeſs he errs, as that thoſe Reaſons are real.

Section 2. It appeared ſtrange to me that you ſhould begin with ſuch a *petitio principii*, untill by reading on, I diſcerned that this one mean Sophiſm hath run through moſt *Paragraphs* of your following Treatiſe, which is a ſhrewd infirmity in a confutation, to take that for a principle granted, and ſo beſtow no proof upon it, which is by you known to be denied by us, and yet to conceive that this will be able to ſatisfy our other importunities.

Section 3. Secondly, You muſt obſerve that his Lordſhip had ſaid onely this, [that your Churches *infallibility is offered to be proved by no better ways, than thoſe by which we offer to prove ſhe hath erred*] which is an undertaking of his Lordſhip, and not a bare *aſſertion*, and ſure you cannot ſay he offers to prove it *by reaſons onely ſeeming*, for you as yet know not particularly, what thoſe reaſons are, any farther, than that they are from the ſame heads, by which you offer to prove the contrary.

Section 4. And thirdly, if the Arguments which he offers, be onely *ſeeming* on his ſide, yet if you mark it, they are ſo *ſeeming* to him, and as long as they *ſeem* to *him* to conclude that the *Church* hath *erred*, the very ſame Arguments, or thoſe that are no more ſeeming, cannot aſſure him, that ſhe is *infallible*; for by your own confeſſion, every *ſolid proof muſt be ex notioribus, i. e.* not onely by *media* which are *more true*, but which are *more known* to him, to whom this proof is offered; and, if you mark, that is it to which his *Lordſhip's* argument drives, that the reaſons by which you prove the *infallibility of your Church*, are ſuch as you confeſs your ſelves to be *fallible*: Mark, not which you confeſs to be *falſe*, but *fallible*; your confeſſing them *fallible* is enough to his *Lordſhip's* turn, though they ſhould have the luck to be *true*, becauſe the infallibility of your Church, on which, as on a foundation and principle, you muſt build in many after-difficulties, had need be *infallibly* aſſerted and known, or if it be but *fallably*, will it ſelf be *fallible* (no concluſion aſcending higher, than the premiſſes have aſcended) and ſo, though it were *true*, yet not fit to commence a *principle* of all other *truths*.

Section 5. Now that theſe reaſons or premiſſes of yours are fallible and by you acknowledged to be ſo, his Lordſhip was not content to affirm, (and ſo is himſelf far enough from giving you example of begging the queſtion) but proves it by this argument, *becauſe with you nothing is not infallible but the Church.* This may be diſſolved into an hypothetical ſyllogiſm, whereof you muſt deny one propoſition, or elſe the concluſion in forfeited. *If with you the Church be the onely infallible, then with you any other reaſons, by which you prove the infallibility of the Church, are not infallible; but with you the Church is the onely infallible; therefore with you any other reaſons by which you prove the infallibility of the Church are not infallible.* Now if you look over your anſwer again, you ſhall find that your onely exception cometh not home to any part of this ſyllogiſm, for you do not ſo much as ſay, that any thing is *infallible* but the *Church*; Or, if now you will ſee your want, and make additions to your anſwer, then ſay diſtinctly, is any other thing beſide the *Church infallible*, or no; If it be, let it be named; if it be not, the concluſion is granted us And till this addition be thus made (*i. e.* for this preſent anſwer of yours) 'tis, I conceive manifeſt, that you have ſaid no ſyllable to the prime part of his *Lordſhip's* firſt Section.

Section 6. As for your inſtances of *Philoſophy* and *Law-ſuits*, they can prove nothing againſt his *Lordſhip*, unleſs you can name ſome ſect of *Philoſophy*, that hath not onely truth, but infallibility, and tell us which it is, and prove that by arguments which are confeſt to be *infallible*; till you have done that, your inſtance is not pertinent; and if ever you ſhall doe it, 'twill not be concluding againſt us, unleſs you produce the like arguments for the *infallibility* of your *Church* againſt us, which muſt be ſome other than are yet propoſed.

As

As for *Law-ſuits*, that they are determined to one ſide by the Judge, doth not prove that that *Judge is infallible* (which is the onely matter of debate,) and if the contenders are bound to ſtand to his award, it is, becauſe the Law and ſupreme Magiſtrate have commanded them to do ſo, and becauſe this is evident and infallible, that they have done ſo, by the commiſſion which the Judge hath from them. And when the like is produced for your Church, I hope all your Subjects will ſubmit to it; but then it muſt be moreover proved, that all Chriſtians are ſuch *Subjects*, or elſe we hope we ſhall not be involved under that obligation. *Section* 7.

As for your long deduction from whence you conclude that either we are deceived, or you, and that it is not neceſſary that both ſhould, we grant it, and profeſs our opinions, that though both you and we are *fallible*, yet onely you are, or can be deceived in this particular, (which we conceive is clear, becauſe onely you pretend *Infallibility*, which we not pretending, but affirming that we are not ſo, cannot in this be deceived, unleſs we be *infallible*) but ſee not what it concludes againſt his *Lordſhip*, whoſe argument depends not on any ſuch aſſertion, that both parties are deceived, but onely that your pretended *Infallibility* is by you proved by no other arguments, than thoſe which you confeſs are *fallible*. *Section* 8.

What you add by way of *triumph* and *ſcoff*, I muſt not anſwer, but by yielding you free leave thus to pleaſe your ſelf, and (if this recreation tend at all to your health) to adviſe you to doe ſo ſtill, and (whenſoever it may be for your divertiſement) to reckon up the names of *London*, *Great Tue*, *and the two Univerſities*. *Section* 9.

After the ἐπινικον ſang, you at length bethink your ſelf that his *Lordſhip* had affirmed, that *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, *and Fathers*, *are by you maintained to be all fallible*; and to this you anſwer by a diſtinction of *univerſally ſpeaking*, and *in ſome caſes onely*, and acknowledge that you affirm them all to be fallible *onely in ſome caſes*. Now firſt you ought to have given anſwer to his *Lordſhip's* proof for what he ſaid, which was this, that you affirm that onely the *Church* is *infallible*; from whence it is a concluſion, that therefore *Reaſon*, and *Scripture*, and *Fathers*, are by you affirmed to be *fallible*; whereas you letting the *premiſſes* alone, apply anſwer to the *concluſion*, which is as much againſt *Logick* as to *deny* it, without denying the premiſſes, or ſhewing the falſeneſs of them. But then ſecondly, that which is *fallible in ſome caſes onely*, is by that acknowledged to be *fallible*, and by that, is proved unſufficient to prove another thing to be *infallible* in all things, for if it be *fallible* in any caſe, it may be *fallible* in this, that it pronounces that other to be *infallible*; and till there be ſome *infallible* argument produced that it is *infallible* in that particular pronouncing, its *Infallibility* in other things will avail nothing; or if it do, it may avail alſo for us to prove what we offer to prove from it, that your *Church* hath erred. *Section* 10.

There is no poſſible avoiding of this, but by ſaying and proving it *infallible* in inducing your concluſion, and falſe as well as *fallible* in inducing ours, (for if it be *true*, though it be *fallible*, it will ſerve our turn; but it muſt be both, or will not ſerve yours, you being obliged to prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church* by ſomething which is it ſelf *infallible*, becauſe it muſt be matter of *faith* with you, which nothing is, but what is *infallibly* induced; but it is ſufficient for us to believe you and your *Church fallible*, though we ſhould make it no matter of *faith* that you are ſo) which becauſe you endeavour not to doe in this place, it will be impertinent to examine the truth of what elſe you add (concerning the caſes wherein you affirm *Reaſon*, *and Scripture*, *and Fathers to be infallible*) any farther than thus, that by your own explication of the diſtinction, and enumeration of caſes, I ſhall conclude, that *Reaſon* doth not prove *infallibly* that your *Church* is *infallible*, becauſe the *Infallibility* of your *Church* is not an *evident verity*; *Scripture* doth not prove it ſo, becauſe it is not *certainly expounded* to that probation; *Fathers* do not prove it ſo, *becauſe it was not a doctrine held in their time*, and affirmed by them to be ſo. Each of which negations of mine, though they were as ſufficient proof as what you have offered to the contrary, yet I ſhall undertake to make good againſt you, if you ſhall think fit to call me to it, by ſetting down your reaſons to the contrary. *Section* 11.

And ſo, if on your ſuppoſition, his Lordſhip's *three main props were fallen to the ground* (which is another *boaſt* that had no more relation to the preſent matter, than ground in truth; and therefore I beſeech you leave out ſuch exceſſes hereafter) yet your ſuppoſition being not ſo much as endeavoured to be proved, the props ſtand as firmly as is deſired. *Section* 12.

To the ſecond Section, Chap. 3.

The Enquirer is here much miſtaken, for we are not at all offended with Proteſtants for their alledging Scriptures, but for their doing of it after a way which is fallible and uncertain; in which caſe we ſay Scripture can be no foundation of faith. Wherefore though they alledge Scripture and we alſo, yet doth it not follow thence that the Proteſtants diſprove the infallibility by the ſelf-ſame media or means, by which we endeavour to prove the ſame. It is true, they attempt to do ſo, but that they doe it, is denied. The Scripture when ſurely ſenſed or expounded, is a different medium from the ſame Scripture ſenſed unſurely or expounded falſely. Now he that takes an unſure way, which no reaſon or diſcretion commends unto him, and leaves the ſure, which reaſon does perſuade him to be ſuch, if that man chance to err, it is eaſy to underſtand why God ſhould be more offended with him, than with others that do not ſo, but hold a prudent and contrary courſe.

The ſumme is, that holy Scripture, after ſuch time as it comes to be known certainly for Canonical, and ſhall be expounded according to the interpretation of the Church, foundeth an argument ſtrong and invincible; but when otherwiſe, one that is probable onely, or ad hominem; *and this latter we ſay is your caſe, and out of this give a reaſon why your reſolves are temerarious and preſumptuous, and,* in fine, *ſuch wherewith God may be diſpleaſed juſtly, foraſmuch as no man ought to go about this work unadviſedly, or expoſe his ſalvation without all need, to chance and uncertainty, as if he meant to build upon the ſand.*

C. 3. *Anſwer to the third Chapter.*

I anſwer, that through this whole Chapter the ſame fallacy returns again, of ſatisfying his Lordſhip's argument by a bare affirming (but not proving) a thing which is as much denied by his *Lordſhip*, viz. *that* *Section* 1.

your alledging of Scripture for the infallibility of your Church, is by an infallible and certain way, but our alledging of it for every part of our religion, is by a fallible and uncertain.] (For though you in terms affirm onely the latter of theſe, that which is againſt us, yet in charity to you I ſhall ſuppoſe you imply the former; or if you will ſay you do not, I ſhall then anſwer, that the granting of what you ſay, doth not vindicate your *Infallibility*, but onely accuſe us, not clear your ſelves) or if that which you add by way of explication, may paſs for a proof of it, *viz. that holy Scripture when it ſhall be expounded according to the interpretation of the Church, foundeth an argument ſtrong and invincible, but when otherwiſe, onely probable, and* ad hominem.] I anſwer, that this being applied to the matter in hand to you and us, muſt, if it ſignify any thing, have this importance, that the places of Scripture which you bring for the *infallibility* of your *Church*, are *expounded according to the interpretation of the Church*, but the places which we bring for the ſeveral parts of our Religion, are not ſo *expounded*. And then I anſwer, that by the *Church* you may (and I conceive ought to) mean the *Univerſal Church* truly ſo called, without your ordinary clog or reſtriction; and then all that we require of you is to make your affirmation good, and produce the places of *Scripture* which that *Univerſal Church* hath ſo expounded to the aſſerting the *infallibility* of your *Church*, (which till you do produce, 'tis *petitio principii* again) and then we ſhall ſhew our ſelves ingenuous and (though we might reply ſomething, which *ad homines* might be anſwer) yet ſhall we part with all other advantages of defending our ſelves, and in plain ground yield you the cauſe, and contend no longer with you.

Section 2. But if you mean by the *interpretation of the Church*, the *interpretation of the Church* in the notion wherein we enquire, whether it be infallible, *viz.* that *ſociety of Chriſtians which have been govern'd by the Pope*; Though then we might deny, that you have any ſuch *interpretation* of *Scripture* for your *infallibility*, and juſtify the denial, (for if you pleaſe we will undertake to ſhew that ſome eminent *perſons* in the *Church* of *Rome*, perhaps *Popes* themſelves, never interpreted any Scripture to the aſſerting the *infallibility* of your *Church*, and that many other differ among themſelves, what is that *Church* which they affirm from *Scripture* to be *infallible*, and that will amount to the ſame alſo) yet we ſhall content our ſelves with this other anſwer, that the *interpretation* of that *Church*, unleſs Saint *Peter* himſelf, or ſome other acknowledg'd to be inſpired, joyn in it, is not *infallible*, and for you to ſay it is, and not to prove it, is a *petitio principii* again; And for any other notion of the *Church* which ſhall be ſaid ſo to interpret, when you ſhall faſten on it, we ſhall undertake to make good either that it doth not interpret the Scripture to the aſſerting the *infallibility* of the *Church*, or elſe that the *Church* in that notion is not *infallible*.

Section 3. As for the other part of your aſſertion, which you principally inſiſt upon in this Chapter, that our caſe is contrary to yours, *i. e. that we found not our Religion on Scripture expounded according to the interpretation of the Church*, we utterly diſclaim it, (and for you to affirm it without proof, is *petitio principii* again) and to put it to a fair iſſue, we make this offer, that whatever propoſition we affirm without ſhewing *Scripture* for it, and that expounded according to the *interpretation* of the *ancient Church*, we will preſently forgo, on your firſt inſtance; and if you will pay us the like offer, and your party make it good, I doubt not but as turbulent a Sea as the ſtate of *Chriſtendom* is at this time, the whole Church might quickly be at peace, or at leaſt, the diſſentient party not be conſiderable. I remember a paſſage in Saint *Hilary*, depredicating the *Biſhops* of *France* as very happy men, *quòd aliam non cognoviſſent confeſſionem, &c. that they knew no other confeſſion than that ancient and moſt ſimple which through all Churches from the Apoſtles age had been received.* And I am a little confident, that that which firſt made, and hath ever ſince fomented the breaches of that pretious body, is the multiplying and impoſing of new *confeſſions* and *articles* of belief from the ſuggeſtion of *private* or leſs *publick* ſpirits, and that hath made the body like *Ariſtotle's inſectils*, which for want of *bloud* run out into a multitude of *legs*; every ſuch new *article* ſo multiplied (above the number of thoſe which *Scripture* in the truly *Catholick interpretation* of it, will authorize, not onely as true, but neceſſary to be ſo acknowledged) being an effect of ſome want of *bloud*, I mean *charity* in the Authours, (for though to teach any man any certain truth, be an act of *charity*; yet to make an *article*, *i. e.* to require every man to believe whatever we conceive to be truth, is a great uncharitableneſs) and a cauſe or occaſion of more; the adding to the neceſſary *truths*, ordinarily being a forerunner of the abatement of the inventory of the neceſſary *performances*, I mean of thoſe which are indiſpenſably required of us under *Chriſt*. Theſe laſt few lines I confeſs to be a πάρεργον, which I hoped might not be unwelcome to you; If they be, I am ſorry you were troubled with it; the ſeeing that there was nothing more in your Chapter, which wanted anſwer, gave me temptation and liberty for it.

To the third Section Chap. 4.

The third Section is all true, but concerns us nothing, becauſe amongſt ours there is care enough taken for ſhewing which Church it is that is the true and infallible, and on the other ſide much negligence and partiality in the enquirers after it, in many of them, at leaſt, though not in every one.

Chap. 4. Anſwer to the fourth Chapter.

Section 1. In your fourth Chapter, though you are juſt in acknowledging the perfect truth of his Lordſhip's third Paragraph, yet muſt you not be believed on your bare word, that you are not concern'd in it. For, I conceive it clear that you are, becauſe that argument from *Reaſon* (for ſuch is that which is mentioned there, as in the ſecond Paragraph the argument from *Scripture*, and in the fourth the argument from *Fathers* or *Tradition*) which you uſe to prove the *infallibility* of your *Church*, viz. *that it is therefore ſo made by God* (or that it is *reaſonable* to think that *God* therefore ſo made it) *that all men may have ſome certain Guide*] can never be able to conclude any thing, unleſs it be made known by *God* as certainly (or ſo offered by *God* to our knowledge, that 'tis our fault if we know it not) both that there is ſuch an *infallible Church*, and which it is. Now that God hath ſo made known theſe two, it being impoſſible for reaſon to aſſure us, any otherwiſe than by ſhewing us ſome *ſure word of prophecy*, I mean ſome *revelation* from *God*, with ſufficient evidence that it is *revelation*, and this being not by you pretended to be ſhewed, it avails little that you tell us, that *among yours there is care enough taken to ſhew which Church it is that is the true and infallible*; for if by [*ſhewing*] you mean *demonſtrating* any way that it is ſo, this

you

you know we deny, and saying it again without proof, is *petitio principii*; but if by *shewing* you mean the *pointing* us out that for the *true* and *infallible*, of which you are a member, we have little obligation or encouragement to believe you say true, being a witness in your own cause; I am sure no evidence that (if you speak according to your judgment) you are *infallible* in that shewing or telling; For if we had, we must be supposed to have that evidence of your *infallibility* without (because before) your *shewing*, and so to stand in little need of it.

To the fourth Section, Chap. 5.

The answer is, that people illiterate may have evidence sufficient whereby to resolve and satisfy themselves without making any search into Histories, Fathers, or Scripture; and therefore this Enquirers supposition is false, and indeed it were a hard case, if no man might be able to understand what he was to believe, without looking into all these; and yet as hard as it is, doth this Enquirer impose it upon all, if not in expres terms, yet by the consequence of his doctrine. As for our selves alone, what need can we have for seeking out the true sense of Scripture, and a conformity of doctrine with the Ancient, more than other Christians have? Surely according to this method of his, all true Religion, whether in our Church, or any other, would be impossible to be learned by the illiterate, and very hardly by any other men.

But what evidence can the illiterate have, or rather from whence? Out of the present face, condition, and visible practice of religion in the Church, out of the ancient monuments yet remaining that give in their depositions, out of common fame and unsuspected testimonies, out of the manifest perfections and excellencies both of the Church and Religion; out of all which, as from so many clear signatures and characterisms of truth, ariseth an evidence of credibility, that this Church and this religion are the true, and whatsoever is once so creditable, cannot possibly be false, because for the verity of that, the veracity of God doth stand engaged, as Ric. Victorinus *hath long since declared. For it is a clear case that all such things be true, which God makes evidently credible and worthy of acceptance by the publick acts of his own providence; for otherwise that providence should publickly entangle and deceive us by obliging us, or, at least, publickly and potently inducing and persuading us to believe that which were false; and so by following that way which God hath signed out for us, we should go astray; which thing can neither be done, nor yet permitted to be done, without imposture, as all the ancient Schoolmen do observe. By this means then are prudent publick motives able to make a certainty, though not by their own virtue, yet at least by the virtue of the Supreme veracity which goes annexed with them.*

Moreover, this measure of evidence perceptible by the illiterate and weak, though it be not so ample as others have, or stand in need to have, yet is it sufficient to sway their understanding, and to call in the divine assistence for the supplying of whatsoever by reason of ignorance or incapacity, is wanting in them. Cum simplicibus est sermocinatio mea, *saith the Wiseman. Therefore it is false and injurious to say, as this Enquirer seems to do; namely, That such men as these do assent to truth upon no better grounds than others do to falshood.* Prov. 3. 32.

The Enquirer's inference against the Church is this. We think she hath erred, therefore she may: The inference is good, but the antecedent is infirm, and ought not to have been made, because he cannot have so great reason to judge she hath erred, as on the contrary that she hath not; in regard that it is far more likely he himself erred in making that judgment of the Church, than that the Church erred in making that judgment of the truth, or that she hath contradicted her self; it being far more probable, that a private man should be deceived, than a whole Church. Wherefore it is a great act of presumption and temerity in any single man, though never so intelligent, to judge the whole Church hath erred, rather than himself.

The Enquirer saith, that he tries the Church by her conformity with the Ancients, as she her self appoints. But what then? Doubtless she is not that way to be convinced, forasmuch as every intelligent man will suppose that no particular man is able to examine that so well as she her self hath done before him, and therefore may be pleased to understand that this pretended non-conformity of hers ought to be discovered very clearly and perfectly before he adventure to condemn her; and this great discovery having yet not been made and manifested to the world, may justly be thought an act impossible, and be judged in such as make pretensions of it, a work rather of a strong apprehension, than of any solid judgment. If then our Enquirer in this case should be rejected, let him not complain of us, as if we sent him to a witness, and after bid him not believe it, but rather bid him not believe himself, and his own judgment more than the Churches; that is to say, more than he ought; nor suffer himself to be misled by the testimony of a witness to whom we did not send him, I mean himself, in hearkning unto whom self-love too much inclines him, and made him over-credulous, as to their great grief it hath made very many.

Now for the better understanding this point of conformity with the Ancients, of which this Enquirer, and Chillingworth *his confederate do talk so much, and seek to urge against us; the Reader may please to know, that they themselves are bound to solve this knot, as well as we; for it will be both as necessary and as hard for them to find out the conformity of their doctrines with the Ancients, as it is for us to find out ours; and again, the conformity of this modern Scripture with the ancient; and these present copies of the Greek and Hebrew with the Original, or Archetype of the same languages, as it is to find out a conformity of this Church and her Doctrines with the Ancients; and so these Authours have made a rod wherewith to whip themselves, as commonly wrangling people do.*

Secondly, That there be other notes of truth besides this conformity, and therefore the enquiry after it, is not necessary for any man.

Thirdly, That we may know this conformity by the truth a great deal easier, than the truth by conformity; because truth may be known by the present notes, and such as are before our eyes; but conformity must a great way off, and through a thick mist of many Ages, if it be sought after by examination of particulars.

Fourthly, That the enquiry after conformity by examining the ancient rites, and the innumerable dark passages and decisions of Antiquity cannot be a general method for the instruction of all, or of the greater part of Men; for it is a long business, and so cannot be ready at all times, but rather after divers years: it is also so difficult, that few have learning or ability to go through with it; for the passages of Antiquity be very intricate, and require a great light of understanding for their discovery. You see the Enquirer, Sect. 37. *confesseth he was much vext with the harsh Greek of* Evagrius, *and the hard Latin of* Irenæus, *and with distinguishing between different senses, and various lections, &c.*

If this learned Gentleman found ſo much difficulty in the ſearch; what muſt become of the greater part of Men, if there were no way but this? for in compariſon of the reſt, few have ſo much wit as he, or ſo much leiſure; few underſtand Greek or Latin either, whether harſh or pleaſant, few ſo painfull. Muſt no man that is not acquainted with Evagrius *or* Irenæus, *come to the knowledge of the truth? nor any man be able to know the Creation of the World, and the Old Law, without he can reade in Hebrew, or learn the New Law without reading the New Teſtament in Greek? Theſe were very hard conditions, and certainly ſuch as God never impoſed upon us.*

Doubtleſs we are not obliged to find out the Original Copies of Scriptures and Fathers, of which ſort, as I ſuppoſe, there be none extant, nor trouble our ſpirits with judging about various lections; we are not bound to impoſſibilities for our inſtruction and ſalvation, but have a ready way aſſigned us, which is the conſpicuous body of the preſent Church, which body is like a City built upon a hill, and that hill is a rock not to be undermined.

It will be therefore ſufficient that we can any ſure way come to the knowledge of the truth without taking care whether it be conform unto the Ancients or no; for ſure we are, all truth is conform to that it ſhould be, abſtracting from the conſideration either of Ancient or New, and this alone may be ſufficient to content any man.

Yet if he would know conformity, I will ſhew him a readier way than examination of places; let him but take the voluntary confeſſion of the Magdeburgians *in their ſeveral Centuries, and he need ſeek no further; for they acknowledge all that we deſire, and this acknowledgment of theirs cannot but ſatisfie, for they make it neither out of ignorance of the truth, nor out of affection to us.*

Chap. 5. Anſwer to the fifth Chapter.

Section 1. Your fifth Chapter is a very long one, and by that length and the contents of it, puts me in mind of him that owing his Fellow Sixpence, being not able to pay him, offered him a hundred Counters one after another in a ſudden motion of his hand, in hope that at length his eyes might dazle, and take ſome one of them for coyn, or if not, yet rather chuſe to loſe his Sixpence, than to venture ſo many cheats by awaiting that payment. For I am perſuaded that when I have but repeated to you his *Lordſhip*'s Argument in the fourth Paragraph, you will ſpare me the pains of ſhewing that you have not anſwer'd it, by confeſſing you have not ſaid one word to the τὸ κομψὸν, or rational importance of it.

Section 2. The intent of the Paragraph is to prove that *Tradition* or *Authority* of the *Ancients* is not a proper means to prove the *infallibility* of the *Church*. The means of inferring the concluſion are, Firſt, the diviſion of men (to whom this Argument is ſuppoſed to be brought) into *ignorant* and *learned*. Secondly, the inſiſting on the propoſition in relation to each of them, to the *ignorant* becauſe they cannot *know*, to the *learned* becauſe they cannot *infallibly know*, that *Tradition* doth prove this *Infallibility*.

Section 3. Firſt, To the *ignorant*, proving that *Tradition* cannot prove the *Infallibility* to them, becauſe the *ignorant* cannot know what is the voice of general and conſtant *Tradition*; Which if it be true, is an *infallible* argument to induce the concluſion; (for that, *Tradition* cannot prove another thing till it ſelf be proved, which it is not to him at leaſt, who neither doth nor can know it) and that it is not true, you do not ſo much as pretend, but rather help to prove it more plainly, than his *Lordſhip* thought neceſſary to do. And this is all that you do return to the firſt part of the proof, ſave onely by pretending that this knowledge or trial of *Tradition* cannot be neceſſary to the *ignorant*; which as it is true, ſo is it nothing againſt his *Lordſhip*, who had no uſe of ſaying that it was neceſſary, but rather the contrary; and by ſaying it is impoſſible, implies he cannot think it neceſſary; and therefore when you affirm of his *Lordſhip*, that by conſequence of his *Doctrine* he impoſes this impoſſible task upon the illiterate, and do not ſo much as pretend to mention that conſequence, this is ſo clear a prevarication, that you cannot take it ill at any friend's hands, to call upon you to confeſs and retract it; and of that nature is that other ſuggeſtion here, that *his Lordſhip ſeems to ſay, that ignorant men do aſſent to truth on no better grounds than others do to falſhood*,] there being no ſuch ſyllable here affirmed, (and if afterwards there be, we ſhall there meet with it.)

Section 4. The ſecond part of the *Argument* is in relation to the *learned*, proving that *Tradition* cannot to them *infallibly* prove the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, or be a rule by which to ſquare your belief in this particular, ſo far at leaſt, as to make it to them neceſſary to be believed, (as your friends do and muſt ſay it is) becauſe it is poſſible they may miſtake in it, and that miſtake will not be damnable in them, if they fall into it with a good conſcience, as poſſibly they may (*i. e.* if they uſe their beſt diligence to find the truth by Tradition, and are not kept from it either by *prejudice* or *paſſion*) though it ſhould fall out they do not find it.

Section 5. This Argument thus drawn out at length, his *Lordſhip* confirms by a clear and pertinent inſtance; ſuppoſe me in my inqueſt, whether the *Church* may err, to enquire whether it ever hath erred, and in that inqueſt ſuppoſe me to meet with ſome motives which really perſuade me that the *Church* hath contradicted her ſelf, (which if ſhe hath done, ſhe hath certainly erred, becauſe both branches of a contradiction cannot be true, but one of them muſt needs be falſe) in this caſe it follows, that I believe ſhe hath *erred*; Wherein though it is poſſible that I may *err* (becauſe the premiſſes which I believed true, may be falſe) yet becauſe it is but an errour in my judgment that did ſo think (and that being reconcileable in this caſe with ſincerity, will not be damning to me) it will follow, that it will be pardonable in me, though never ſo learned, that Tradition doth not convince me of the truth of that, which I did really conceive it ſhewed me to be falſe; it being as pardonable in the *learned* to believe that errour which they conceive *Tradition* tells them, as it was impoſſible for the *unlearned* to know what is *Tradition*.

Section 6. The whole weight of this part of the *Argument* lies in this, that whatever is neceſſary to be believed, muſt be offered to be proved by a means wherein the *learned* at leaſt cannot err pardonably, and therefore the *Infallibility* of the *Church* offered to be proved by *Tradition* (that *Tradition* being a thing wherein the learned may err pardonably) is not proved by that means to be neceſſary to be believed. Or in a Syllogiſm thus; That *wherein the learned may err pardonably, is not a means to prove the Infallibility of the Church to be neceſſary to be believed; but Tradition is a means wherein the learned may err pardonably; therefore Tradition is not a means to prove the Infallibility of the Church to be neceſſary to be believed.*

This

This is the ſumme of what his Lordſhip ſaith in the other part of that Paragraph; and to no part of this Syllogiſm, or of the materials there, out of which I have formed it, do you return the leaſt anſwer or denial, but rather confirm the *Minor*, Firſt, by uſing Arguments to prove, that it is a difficulty and knot, *common to Papiſts with Proteſtants, to find out the conformity of their doctrine with the Ancients*; which difficulty being granted, will prove, that in that matter the learned may err pardonably. Secondly, by aſſerting that there be *other notes of truth beſides this of conformity with the Ancients, and therefore that enquiry after that, is not neceſſary to any man*; which ſeems a diſclaiming of that as of an unfit Argument. Thirdly, by ſaying that *we know the conformity by the truth, much eaſier than the truth by conformity.* From whence it will follow, that conformity is a very ill Argument, and the worſe the Argument, the more pardonable the errour in it. And fourthly, by the profeſſed unfitneſs of this Argument, at large dilated on by you, with this concluſion, that the *conditions for the underſtanding of Tradition are ſo very hard, that certainly God never impoſed them on us.* On which grounds you offer us another means of proving it, (which ſhews that this was unſufficient in your opinion) *viz. the conſpicuous body of the preſent Church*; which if it be not a very fallible means alſo (as in many reſpects I might prove it were, particularly by this, that the compaſs of Chriſtians that are of that *Church* of yours, is not by common computation a third part of the *Chriſtian* world) is certainly very diſtant from *Tradition*; which that it is not a means *infallible* in this matter, is all that his Lordſhip now contends in that preſent Argument. *Section* 7.

The onely thing that is by you produced againſt this difficulty of uſing this means, (and ſo pardonableneſs of erring) is the laſt period of the Chapter, which commends the *reading of the* Magdeburgians *as a readier way to know conformity, than examination of places.* *Section* 8.

To which I anſwer, that if they have voluntarily confeſſed that there is conſtant Tradition for the infallibility of the *Roman Church*, then have you fitly cited them; if they have not, or if upon my preſent inſtance you do not ſhew that they have either directly, or by certain conſequence, then have you wronged them in this your affirmation, and left your ſelf no means to prove your concluſion by that *medium.* *Section* 9.

This is all I ſhall ſay to that long Chapter, and in that I have ſhewed, that through it you much miſtook the Argument propoſed in the title of the Chapter, the confutation of the fourth Paragraph, of which there being two parts, you ſpake no word againſt either of them; and therefore if I ſhould allow every word of that Chapter to be true, though you would be beholding to me, yet would it be no advantage to you againſt his Lordſhip's preſent reaſoning, to which all you ſay, is very extrinſecal and impertinent. But that I may not lay too great an obligation on you by ſo liberal a grant, I will mention to you ſome infirm parts in that your diſcourſe. *Section* 10.

I have touched on three already; and your *evidences* (that your *Church* and *Religion* is the true) which you mention for the illiterate, and are no one of them *evidences*, may be added to the number; which I need not prove, becauſe you have not attempted to *prove*, but onely aſſert the contrary. And ſo alſo your Divinity cited out of *Ric. Victorinus*, if applied to your purpoſe: [*that whatſoever is once ſo creditable* (as you have there made the *Infallibility* of your *Church*) *can never be falſe*] Which beſide other falſities, muſt infer other things to be *infallible*, beſide that onely infallible; for 'tis ſure that other things may by you be made ſo creditable, and as ſure, that whatever elſe cannot be falſe (God's veracity ſtanding engaged for it) is *infallible* alſo; and (not to mention your proofs of that Divinity) ſuch is your aſſertion, that the *Enquirer's* inference againſt the Church is, [*we think ſhe hath erred, therefore ſhe may err*] for his inference is onely this; *if ſhe hath erred, certainly ſhe may*; which I ſhould ſay is another great injuſtice, by changing his Lordſhip's words, but that it is repaired and expiated with another act of more kindneſs to us, though of as little force of reaſon; *that the inference is good, but the antecedent is infirm*; whereas in truth the Inference had been nought, but the Antecedent either true, or onely in the power of the *Searcher of thoughts* to diſprove in him; ſo again, that *the diſcovering the non-conformity of your Church with the Ancients, may juſtly be thought impoſſible*; when if we had not *actually* done it, yet hereafter we might; and when in the preſent buſineſs we affirm (and you go not about to diſprove) that your pretending to the *Infallibility* of your *Church*, is inconformable to the *Ancients*, becauſe they did not ſo pretend; and ſurely ſuch is your affirmation, that *to ſend one to a witneſs, and yet bid him not believe himſelf in what he conceives that witneſs tells him, is not as bad, as to ſend him in like manner, and bid him not believe the Witneſs*; there being no poſſibility of believing what the Witneſs ſaith, but by believing himſelf, affirming that that Witneſs ſaid it: For if you ſay it be by believing of you (*i. e.* another Witneſs) that that Witneſs ſaid it; I anſwer, that that will include a believing himſelf alſo, *viz.* himſelf affirming that you teſtified that the other Witneſs ſaid it. *Section* 11.

I ſhall trouble you with no more at once, leſt you count me uncivil; one thing onely more I ſhall let you know I take notice of, that in the compaſs of very few words you caſt off much of the reſpect due to Antiquity, by ſaying, that it is ſufficient, if we can by *any ſure way come to the knowledge of the truth* (mentioning at that time onely the *conſpicuous body of the preſent Church* for ſuch) *without taking care whether it be conform to the Ancients, or no*, &c. By which as you acknowledge your preferring the *conſpicuous body of the preſent Church* (for the finding out of truth) before *Antiquity*, which is the ſtrangeſt ſpeech I could have look'd for from a defender of *Tradition*; ſo I confeſs I ſee the reaſon, why a Section that undertook to prove that *Antiquity* was no *infallible* proof of your *Churches Infallibility*, had in a long Chapter of anſwer to it, never a word ſaid in confutation of it; and ſo I very friendly take leave of it. *Section* 12.

To the fifth Section, Chap. 6.

Out of that which hitherto hath been ſaid, it appears plainly how the concluſion which the Enquirer would infer in this fifth Section, is no way applicable to our manner of probation of the Churches Infallibility: for we do not, as he ſurmiſeth, maintain that our Church the Guide of Faith, is to be known by ſuch marks by which the Ignorant cannot ſeek it, and the Learned may chance to miſs, although with all diligence and without prejudice they enquire after it; for we affirm that our firſt principles of probation are certain and manifeſt, and out of them, we with certainty, though not with evidence, evict the Church. By which manner of proceeding it is clear, that our probations are logical and

conformable to the rules prescribed for the hunting out of truth by Aristotle *in his Analytiques, and the Philosophers in general.*

Some peradventure will deny our Churches verity to be evidently credible: If any do it: the matter must be remitted to an equal trial between us. But, say you, who must be the Judge? I am no Socinian, nor inclining to that sort of mis-believers, yet nevertheless, I say, right reason must be he, and every man's own conscience; and of these Judges, I hope all men will allow, and it is reasonable sure they ought to doe so, because reason is in all questions the last and the interiour Judge, without whose assent and approbation, no exteriour is sufficient and compleat. For exteriour Judges be as spectacles to the eyes; and as spectacles, be they never so good, cannot see without eyes, so cannot revelation, be it never so manifest, give the last sentence about any doctrine, nor be sufficient without reason.

It may be farther replied, that these principles of ours are also question'd. Admit they be, yet nevertheless may they be certain and evident, otherwise we should grant nothing to be certain; for there is no one thing so evident, which is not question'd by some or other.

Chap. 6. Answer to the sixth Chapter.

Section 1. That which you say to the fifth Section, is in effect the denying the *conclusion*, when the *premisses* are either not deny'd, or not confuted; for that which his Lordship saith in that Section, you acknowledge to be a conclusion, and is so indeed of all that went before; all directly tending to this, That *the Church provided for the guide of faith, is offered by you to be known by such marks, as the ignorant cannot seek it by, and the learned, though never so honest in his search, may chance not to find it by.* This then being the conclusion of all the discourse, you profess to deny, upon no other proof but by affirming, that *your principles of probation are certain and manifest, i. e.* by saying the direct contrary to his conclusion, but not thinking needfull to prove it; And so beside that other absurdity in *Logick*, there is *petitio principii* again.

A.

Section 2. In doing this you were, I conceive, very much resisted by your own spirit; for the satisfying of which you are fain to say this strange thing, that *your principles of probation are certain and manifest, and out of them you evict the Church with certainty, though not with evidence:* where either you must affirm to think that [*evident*] and [*manifest*] are not all one, or else that the conclusion is not *evident*, when the *premisses* are; either of which you shall have free liberty to take the choice of, and maintain in your reply. And when you have shewed your skill in so doing, you then shall have leave to boast, that your *probations are Logical and conformable to the rules of* Aristotle *in his Analytiques, and the Philosophers in general*; but till then 'twas to no more purpose to say that of your self, than 'twill be to the edification of any that I have repeated it to you.

Section 3. Having thus confirm'd the conclusion with that great popular argument (that prevails with so many)

B. a bare confidence of affirming it, it is very remarkable what your next attempt is; why, instead of that hard task which lay so heavy upon your shoulders, to get an easier, if 'twere possible; and therefore you foresee that some may peradventure deny your *Churches verity* to be *evidently credible.* Good Sir, what is this but to suborn a weaker adversary to challenge you, that you may be excused from fighting with the stronger? we desire plain dealing, that you will prove *your principles of probation to be certain and manifest* (which is the thing you affirm'd) and not to think to put us off with more obscure and less containing terms of *your Churches verity being evidently credible.* For first, your *Churches verity* (*i. e.* I conceive its being the true *Church*, for I hope you speak not now of its *Metaphysical* verity, or its being *truly* a Church; for so it may be, and be very *fallible*, and very corrupt) is an equivocal phrase, and, in whatever sense, is not so much as your *Churches infallibility*; for it may be a *true Church*, and not be *infallible*; *i. e.* upon supposition, that whatever now it taught, were actually true, 'twere yet possible it might err, even when it doth not; nay, if its verity should signify that it were a *true Church* (as perhaps you mean) exclusively to all others, *i. e.* that the *Catholick Church* were the *Roman Church*, and the *Roman* the *Catholick*; yet speaking of the present state of the *Church*, *i. e.* of the present *Roman Church*, though it were supposed to be the present *Catholick Church*, yet may that be fallible again, because those that are now in the truth, may fall into errour, and others rise up, as they fall, to be defenders of the truth, and so the promise of God of keeping his *Church* from final or total falling, be made good still.

Section 4. As for that other largest notion of the *Catholick Church* (under which we confess it to be infallible) that of the *Universal Church* all the world over, without any restriction; I conceive it impossible, that by your *Church* (which is the *Church* with an eminent restriction) you should mean that; and upon that ground it was, that I affirm'd, that the *verity* of your *Church*, in whatever sense, is not so much as its *infallibility.*

Section 5. Then again your phrase of *evidently credible*, is not sure so much as *certain and manifest*; for though *evidently credible* sound strangely, (and if it have any sense in it, hath also some obscurity) yet I shall suppose you mean by it, that which is *credible*, or may be believed, and of which it is *evident* that it may; the words grammatically can bear no other sense than this, that it is *evident that they are credible*; now certainly to be *evident and certain*, is much more than to be *credible*, though it be never so *evident* that it is *credible.* For suppose me actually to acknowledge that you have some probable arguments that your *Church* is the *true Church*; nay, suppose it is so evident that you have such arguments, that every man that hath common understanding will be ready to acknowledge you have so, doth it thence follow, that I, or all others, do and must acknowledge that you have demonstrated it? this is to make no difference between the two sorts of Arguments in Logick, topical and demonstrative; or in a word, to conclude that to be *infallible*, which you durst not say was any more than *credible*; for as for the word [*evidently*] added to it, it cannot have such an influence on the word, *credible*, as to make that quite another, or higher sort of things than it was; *Credible* in the cleerest or highest degree, is but *credible* still, as the eminentest or excellentest man in the world, is a man still; and therefore in brief, if we should help you to fewer adversaries than you have, and take off that suborn'd enemy of yours, whom you suppose to deny your *Churches verity* to be eminently credible, you would have gain'd by it but little peace from his Lordship, who would still require you to make good your pretension of *infallibility*, which will be a much harder

harder Theme to declaim for popularly, (I am ſure Logically) than the credibility of the verity of your Church.

Section 6. As for your way of anſwering that objection, becauſe the objection is not needfull for us to make, Any reply, or confutation of your anſwer, will be as unneceſſary. I ſhall onely report to other men from your own pen, one notable deciſion of yours, that in a trial of huge importance, concerning the *credibility* of the verity of your *Church* (I muſt be fain to uſe your phraſe) *right reaſon and every man's own conſcience muſt be the Judge*; which being ſo great an act of compliance and favour both to thoſe which aſſert *reaſon*, and to thoſe that maintain the private ſpirit to be the Judge of Controverſies, *i. e.* to two ſorts of men, which have hitherto been believed oppoſite enough to your *infallibility*, it will be but gratitude to reward ſo great a bounty, with a favourable interpretation of a good meaning, and he ſhould be very rude and uncivil, who would not grant upon ſuch your demand, that you are no *Socinian*, nor inclining to that ſort of *miſ-believers*; for ſure he that makes *right reaſon* the *Judge* of his very principles, muſt needs be ſo *rational*, and ingenuous, that he can never be an *Heretick*, though he ſay the very things that *Hereticks* do.

Section 7. As for your very excellent ſimilie of the *eyes* and the *ſpectacles*, I ſhall not have a word to ſay to it, ſave onely this, that although you have gotten the incloſure and monopoly of *ſpectacles*, (I mean of impoſing of an *exteriour Judge* upon us) yet other men may be allowed to have *eyes*, as well as you, *i. e.* to have *reaſon and conſcience* to judge of your Judge, and then the iſſue (according to your premiſſes being granted to you) will be this, that they whoſe reaſon and conſcience tells them, that 'tis not *evidently credible*, that your *Church* ſhould be the *true Church*, excluſively to all others, ſhall not be obliged to believe it is ſo (for *their own reaſon*, ſay you, *and conſcience is to be judge*) that they whoſe *reaſon*, *&c.* tells them it is ſo *credible*, may believe it, if they pleaſe; nay, if they have no arguments as credible to the contrary, and upon impartial ſearch can find none, it is very reaſonable for them to belive what to their conſcience is ſo *credible*; but if they have ſuch arguments to the contrary, or if it be their fault that they have not, they are ſure no farther bound to believe it (if they are not Subjects of your Church) than thoſe dictates of their conſcience do extend to oblige them, or (if they are Subjects, yet) no farther than the doctrine of obedience rightly ſtated (which will be too long a work for a parentheſis) hath influence on mens opinions; but then ſtill, whatever their caſe be for believing the *verity* of your *Church*, they can no way from thence be obliged to believe your *infallibility*.

Section 8. You confeſs there may farther reply be made to you, that theſe principles of yours are alſo queſtion'd, but take no notice upon what grounds of reaſon or Scripture they are queſtion'd, and ſo think you can deal with ſo unarm'd an adverſary, as you pleaſe, by telling him they may be certain and evident, though they be queſtion'd; and perhaps I ſhall confeſs to you, that if they were onely *queſtion'd*, and no *reaſon* that were not by you eaſily anſwered, brought to juſtify ſuch *queſtioning*, it were ſufficient which you ſay, that *queſtioning* doth not diſprove *certainty*; (and yet if every man's *conſcience* be the *Judge*, as you acknowledge, then unleſs you can make it *evident* that that man's *queſtioning* is againſt *conſcience*, you will have no way to keep it from being *certain*, and *evident* to him) but when there be arguments produc'd to back that queſtioning, which you have no way to anſwer, but by ſaying they may be *certain* and *evident* for all that; he that diſputes with you, will be excus'd to think he hath more reaſon to ſay (and that, you ſay, muſt be judge) that it may be otherwiſe.

To the ſixth and ſeventh Sections, Chap. 7.

No doubt there can be, but God will reveal his truth to all ſuch as ſeek it with ſincerity of heart; and though both ſides, as the Enquirer objecteth, may make uſe of this for an exteriour allegation, yet not as of interiour help and preparation; and therefore this ſincerity is not a diſpoſition unprofitable, though it be a proof inefficacious, and thus much we grant willingly, neither do we challenge it as an argument of truth.

We grant him alſo, that before ſuch time as we can believe the Church, we are to acquire ſufficient principles for informing us which is ſhe; and alſo before we can believe upon her determinations, we muſt have principles of knowing ſhe is infallible, and all this we make profeſſion we do, de facto, *know. Neither do we take this Church to be a* Proteus, *that is to ſay, ſometimes of one ſhape, ſometimes of another, but a conſpicuous body conſtantly adorned with the robes of truth, and annexed to a ſucceſſion of Paſtours legitimate from one age to another.*

Chap. 7. Anſwer to Chap. 7.

Section 1. A. Your anſwer to the ſixth Section is by giving a diſtinction to tell us how both ſides make uſe of the *pretence of ſeeking truth ſincerely*] and concludes, that *ſincerity is not a diſpoſition unprofitable*, though it be a *proof inefficacious*; which becauſe you are willing to grant, I will contain my ſelf from ſpringing any game or recreation for the Reader at this time (of which he that were playſomely diſpoſed, would find aboundant matter in the review of your diſtinction here applied) and give you preſent payment for your favour, by acknowledging, that that which you grant, is all that is begg'd from you, *viz.* that God's promiſe of revealing of truth to thoſe who ſeek it ſincerely, is not at all an argument, that they that pretend to the benefit of that promiſe, muſt have real title to it; or conſequently, that they that have no other arguments to prove their Churches *Infallibility*, but that they ſeek truth *ſincerely*, and yet after that *ſincere* ſearch, are of that opinion, are to be heeded in their pretenſions. This juſtifies his Lordſhip's ſixth Paragraph, as fully as if you had ſubſcribed it without your diſtinction.

Section 2. His Lordſhip's ſeventh Paragraph conſiſts of two things; Firſt, a reſuming of a part of his former argument, which had been onely mentioned, but not inforc'd before, that [*ſuppoſing the Church were proved to be infallible, yet were not that ſufficient to give any man certain knowledge which were it:*] Secondly, a ſolid proof of this affirmation, by plain reaſon, becauſe the granting the *Infallibility* of the *Church*, did onely conclude, that God would always have a Church that ſhould not err, but not that this was appropriated to any particular *Church*, to ſuch a Succeſſion, to the *Biſhop* and *Clergy* of ſuch a place, *&c.* Thirdly, by a lively

lively inſtance of the *Greek Church*, which though it were now in the right, might hereafter err, and ſo the *Greek Church* be now fallible, and yet at the time that that erred, another *Church* might ariſe the Champion of truth, and ſo ſtill the *Church* be *infallible*.

Section 3. To theſe two parts of the *Paragraph* your diſpatch is ſhort, (and annext to the nothing that was replied to the former Section) to the firſt, a liberal Grant of that which no man thanks you for, (that *it is as neceſſary to know which that infallible Church is, as that the Church is ſo*) but then ſaying and profeſſing, that *you do*, de facto, *know which is the Church, and that ſhe is infallible*; which (beſide that it is your old
B. beloved *petitio principii*, to ſay you *know* it, and offer no proof for it, but your profeſſion and a latin word, (when the very thing that his *Lordſhip* was juſt a proving, was, that you neither did nor could know it) comes not at all home to his Lordſhip's matter of ſhewing that the acknowledgment of the *Infallibility* of the *Church* doth not evict, which is ſhe: For if 'twere acknowledged that you did know it, yet might it be by ſome other means, and not by proving and confeſſing the *Church* to be *infallible*.

Section 4. As for his Lordſhip's proof and inſtance added to his propoſition, 'twas ſo deſpicable a thing, that 'twas not worth taking notice of; but inſtead of any ſuch thing, you give us a declaration of your own opinion, that *the Infallible Church was not a Proteus, but a conſpicuous body conſtantly adorned with truth*, &c. which is again the meaneſt begging of that which was juſt then denied, and diſproov'd; and muſt ſo ſtand, till you can annex reaſons to your opinion, and anſwers to his Lordſhip's reaſons.

To the eighth Section, Chap. 8.

We never go about to prove our Church to be the true, therefore, becauſe it holdeth with the truth, or teacheth true doctrine, as this Enquirer ſeemeth to ſuppoſe we do; but rather contrariwiſe, becauſe it is the true Church of Chriſt, *therefore we infer it teacheth true doctrine; but that it is the true Church, we prove firſt of all and originally by*
Pſal. 104. 27. *real revelations, called in the Scripture,* Verba Signorum, *that is, by ſigns, oſtenſions, or motives of credibility; which motives for a great and ſufficient part of them, are the ſame by which we prove to Infidels the truth of Chriſtianity it ſelf. For theſe ſame motives, though when they are conſidered but in general, and as it were afar off, do perſwade Chriſtianity but in general, without deſigning out in particular this or that individual Chriſtianity; yet nevertheleſs the ſelf-ſame being underſtood diſtinctly, do deſign out a diſtinct and individual Chriſtianity, and are applicable to none elſe; as for example, the ſame ſpecies which ſhew me a man in general afar off, the ſelf-ſame afterwards, when he comes nearer, being diſtinctly perceived, do ſhew me that man is this individual;* as Plato *for example, and no other: For real ſpecies do not repreſent unto us,* Entia rationis, *or* Individua vaga, *but determinate Individuals, namely as often as thoſe ſpecies are diſtinctly and compleatly underſtood. As for the Circles into which both this Enquirer and* Chillingworth *would caſt us, and make us dance within them whether we will or no, they are but Chymerical conceptions of fidling and trifling diſpoſitions, which love to have toys wherewith to entertain themſelves, and in this point of reſolution, as we have declared it already, have no ſemblance of reality.*

Chap. 8. *Anſwer to the eighth Chapter.*

Section 1. His *Lordſhip* ſuppoſing in *charity* that you had attempted to prove the *Roman Church* to be the *true Church*, by its agreement with Scripture and Antiquity, which is in effect, by holding the truth, You plainly tell
A. him he is miſtaken in you. It ſeems you deſie ſuch mean ways of proving yours to be the Church, as accordance with *Scripture* or *Truth*; you muſt have it by ſome more noble way of demonſtration; and if you would ſtand to this piece of gallantry, and never urge *Scripture* or *Fathers* to prove your opinions, but content your ſelf with your being the *true Church*, to prove all after it, as I confeſs I ſhould not charge on you that *Circle* which his *Lordſhip* doth in this particular (ſuppoſing, as he thought favourably to you, that you had proved the truth of the *Church* by the *truth* (and conſonancy to Scriptures and Fathers) of your *doctrines*) ſo I ſhould have two quarrels more againſt you, inſtead of that one compoſed. Firſt, that you would diſclaim *Scriptures*, and fly to *Miracles*, (for ſuch are your *real revelations*, as you
B. interpret them by the *verba ſignorum*, in the Pſalm, the *ſigns* being there interpreted by the *wonders* that follow) that you would fly to God's extraordinary providence, when I preſume you conceive his ordinary would have ſerved your turn; for ſure if at another time a man ſhould have asked you, is not your accordance with the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* a prime proof that you are the *true Church?* I doubt not but you would be ſo well natured as to confeſs it; and why now ſhould the *Devil*'s infirmity, the fear of a *Circle*, make you ſo cowardly, as not to dare to own ſo popular an argument? eſpecially when your fire comes down ſlowly, or your *bath Col the voice from Heaven*, (which is the onely proper notion that I know of a *real revelation*) is not very audible to us that are afar off: nor if we were to be put upon the rack, do we know, or can confeſs at this day, that we or any of our Fathers ever heard that 'twas ſo ever revealed, that the *Roman Church* is the *true*, or the *infallible Church*. And beſides, when you know, we Proteſtants are a little hard of belief, and dare not credit your own report, that you have ſuch *oſtenſions*, and *revelations*, and *ſigns*, when you neither produce witneſs, nor tell us, when or what they were, but give us farther ground of jealouſie, by an odd phraſe let fall by you, that thoſe *real revelations* of yours are *motives* (no more than) of *credibility*, whenas true *miracles* acknowledged to be ſuch, are *grounds of Faith*, and he is an *Infidel* that *believes* them not; and to be but a *motive of credibility*, is but a petty thing that every topical argument will take place of, *probable* being more than *credible* in the ordinary notion of the words.

Section 2. The ſecond quarrel that your words have brought upon you, is your telling us (without proof, that it is ſo, but onely by giving a ſimilitude to ſhew that it may be ſo, and ſo, in your phraſe, *to be a motive of*
C. *no more than credibility*, which in him that concludes it is ſo, is *petitio principii* again) that the *ſame motives you uſe to prove the truth of Chriſtianity againſt Infidels, will prove yours to be the true Church*; which being confidently ſaid, we are ſo vile in your eyes, as not to be vouchſafed ſo much as the mention what they are (unleſs by your former words we conclude you mean *miracles*) much leſs any *evidence* concerning them; And yet by the way, the miracles by which we prove the truth of *Chriſtianity* to *Infidels*, muſt be thoſe which

which we meet with in Scripture, and not those other in your *Legends*; and upon a strict survey and recollecting of all them (and so *coming* as *near* to them as can be) I must profess I cannot see your Churches being the *true Church* in those *miracles*, near so clearly and distinctly, as I can see the man afar off, to be one of my acquaintance, when he comes near me, which you undertook I should, and made me try; and therefore I hope, will recompence me for the loss of my labour, by giving me your reasons next time for your assertion, that I may try again, whether your proofs are more lucky than your experiments.

Section 3. D. But then I cannot see why you should be scurrilous upon both his *Lordship* and Master *Chillingworth*, for thinking you were in danger of the Circle, in which *sure* Baron *had deprehended* your Friend *Turnhull*, and in which you had been engaged infallibly, if you had but gone about to prove your *Church* the *true Church*, by the *truth* (or consonancy to *Scriptures* and *Fathers*) *of your opinions*; which way of proving methinks 'tis possible you may stand in need of, before you come to the end of your answer. In the mean, as the calling down *Hercules* upon the Stage, was wont to be a *Character* of a *Tragick* Poet, *i. e.* of a fabulous, wonderfull undertaker, *Cum fabulæ exitum explicare non potuerit*, so to fetch us in *miracles and ostensions*, to E. prove that divine truth that you confess must not be proved by the Scripture, will pass for a piece of *Poetry*, I fear, instead of a motive of *credibility*; and those that are chearfully disposed, will be apt to tell you, that you were fain to *conjure* hard, and doe, or pretend *miracles*, or else you had been enclosed in that *Circle*.

To the ninth and tenth Sections, Chap. 9.

To these I answer in a word, that neither the Greek, nor any other Church can pretend the primacy or principal succession of Pastours, that is to say, from the President of the Apostles, Saint Peter; *none, I say, besides* Rome, *can pretend this; and without this one, none can be authentical or sufficient to prove a Church, or a succession of Pastours Ecclesiastical; and so the Enquirer's starting-hole in the Greek Church, into which he always makes his retreat is prevented and shut up against him.*

By this also is the tenth Section answered; for whatsoever Churches claim unto succession shall be alledged, it can no way evacuate that of Rome, *as hath before been shewed.*

Chap. 9. Answer to the ninth Chapter.

Section 1. Your answer to the ninth and tenth Sections, signifies a great deal, *viz.* that you were so put to it by the conviction of his Lordship's argument, that to disintangle your self you have ventured to vent a piece of very severe divinity, which my charity to you makes me hope you will not justify; and if you will, yet your no argument produced, gives me nothing to answer, nor otherwise to reply, than by denying as mercifully and obligingly to the world, as you do cruelly affirm; *viz.* that *without succession* [*sufficient*] *from Saint* Peter, *there is no succession sufficient to prove a Church, or a succession of Pastours Ecclesiastical*] and this is so strange a news to our ears (who were confident, that whatever you deem of the other two parts of three of the *Christian* world at this present, you had allowed liberty to *Apostles* to ordain *Churches*, as well as (and without succession from) Saint *Peter*; and indeed, that that which in the *second* and *eighth* line of your Chapter, you call the *Greek Church*, might have been acknowledged to be a Church in the *seventh*) that had you not said it in the most evident terms (*None beside* Rome *can pretend this*; *and without this one, none can be sufficient to prove a Church*, &c.) and had there been any way imaginable but this, to answer his *Lordship*'s argument, I should never have thought, this had been your meaning; till I see you again own this severe doctrine, I shall not take pains to confute it; and when I see that, I must say, that his *Lordship* presumed you had not been so bloudily minded, when he proposed to you the argument in those two Sections.

Section 2. And yet after all this, I doubt not but with a little change, his *Lordship*'s argument will still hold against you, even after you have ventured on such strange practices, to secure your self from it, Thus; suppose you had evinced that the *succession* from Saint *Peter* were infallible, and so proved the *Roman Church* to be so, because none else pretended to succeed Saint *Peter*, yet this can be no sufficient ground of belief to the *ignorant*, who cannot have any infallible foundation of *belief*, that the *Greek Church* doth not pretend from Saint *Peter*, whether by Saint *Mark* at *Alexandria*, who might be ordained by Saint *Peter*, whose right hand, they say, he was in the penning of the *Gospel*; or by *Evodius* at *Antioch*, where Saint *Peter* was *Bishop* seven years (as your own *Baronius*) or by any other, or (to the ignorant it matters not) by no other known way; and even to the learned, it is but an accidental argument, because if any other company had likewise claimed *succession from Saint* Peter (as they of * *Antioch* do) it had overthrown all that probation; nay, it is but an arbitrary argument, which the Adversary can confute by but denying; for if any society of Christians so called, would pretend to be from Saint *Peter* some other way, than by succeeding him at *Rome*, or submitting to his government, your *Church* could make use of it no longer.

* Euseb. *hist. l.* 3. κεφ. λε.

Section 3. As for that which you add in a word of answer to the tenth Section, that whatever *Churches* claim unto succession, shall be alledged, it can no way evacuate that of *Rome*; if it be applied to his *Lordship*'s argument, it is absolutely false; for if *Rome*'s claim to *Infallibility* together, and to *succession* to Saint *Peter*, be to be proved by this, because none else pretends to it (which is the argument which his *Lordship* here confutes) then sure any other *Churches* claim, or pretending to it, will evacuate that claim or title, that by that argument is pretended; and contrary to this there is yet nothing shewed.

To the eleventh Section, Chap. 10.

What mercy God will use in pardoning the errours of those men who do seek sincerely and yet miss, makes nothing at all against the ordinary provision and necessity of a guide, because those misses or mistakings be cases extraordinary. Besides, I would know why any pardon should need for such innocent errours which be defects involuntary, and so can be no crimes; wherefore methinks the discourse of our Enquirer in this Section is not coherent.

Chap. 10. *Anſwer to the tenth Chapter.*

Section 1. His *Lordſhip*'s argument Sect. 11. is very ſtrong againſt the collecting a neceſſity of an *infallible* Guide for the interpreting of *Scripture*, from the *topick of God's goodneſs*, by propoſing another way of reconciling *God*'s providence with his goodneſs in this matter, (which if it may be done, concludes that other unneceſſary) *viz.* by mentioning a doctrine of more *Evangelical* œconomy; in which, errours may be reconcileable with mercy, when *God* doth not give grace to the diligent ſeeker to find out truth; or by this *dilemma*, that without ſuch an *infallible* Guide, upon the uſe of Reaſon in the interpretation of *Scripture*, and ſearch for *tradition*, God will either give grace to *find what is ſo ſought, or pardon if he miſs*; and ſo, though it ſtand not with God's goodneſs to damn him for every errour, to whom he hath aſſigned no *infallible* way to find out all truth; yet to him that is confident, that God will not damn any man upon ſuch terms, as the ſervant laid to his charge, when he told him he was an *auſtere man*, &c. to him that teaches not ſuch legal bloudy doctrine againſt God, this argument of the *Romaniſts* will not be preſſing at all; this expedient of the *Goſpel-grace* or *Goſpel-mercy* being as fit for the turn of infirm Souls, as an *infallible* Guide would be; as indeed the ſtate of imperfection wherein we are placed, is as fit for our turns, when the ἐπιείκια of the Goſpel is revealed, and proportioned to it, as *Adam's Paradiſe*, of *ſupernatural* all-ſufficient *ſtrength*, and innocence would be.

Section 2. To all which, all that you return is onely this, that all this is nothing *againſt the ordinary proviſion and neceſſity of a guide*; *becauſe thoſe miſſes or miſtakings are caſes extraordinary*: To which I anſwer, Firſt, that if it were ſuppoſed, that againſt the *ordinary proviſion of a guide*, the argument were not of force, yet ſure it might againſt the *neceſſity* of it; and then, that is all that is pretended to by his *Lordſhip*, and that which alone is deſtructive to you; and therefore 'tis ſtrange you ſhould couple them together as ſo ſocial things, which are ſo diſtant and ſeparable; for ſure, though *Evangelical* grace and mercy do not exclude an *ordinary proviſion* of an *infallible* way, but leave it *in medio*, that *God* may if he will, make that *ordinary proviſion*; yet notwithſtanding this, it follows not, that ſuch a proviſion is required, or neceſſary; There is a wide diſtance betwixt [*poſſible if God pleaſe*] and [*neceſſary to the vindicating of God's goodneſs:*] now againſt the latter onely it is that his Lordſhip argues, and is not at all concern'd in th'other, and therefore I ſhall not need to examine whether the firſt be true, it being ſo clear, that the ſecond hangs ſo looſe from it, and will alone ſerve our turns as well.

Section 3. B. But then ſecondly, I profeſs not at all to underſtand what you mean by that reaſon of your aſſertion, [*becauſe the miſſes or miſtakings be caſes extraordinary*] for firſt, how can it be denied in this imperfect infirm ſtate of mortality, that now we are in, but that *errours* and *miſtakings* are very *ordinary?* That they are common, there is no doubt; and as little, that they are agreeable to that order or courſe that is now among men; and to you that ſay in the next words, that you know not why ſuch defects ſhould need any pardon (and to us that acknowledge that they that reform all other, and pray daily, *dimitte debita*, ſhall through *Chriſt* have pardon of courſe for theſe) ſure they cannot paſs for *extraordinary caſes* in either ſenſe; for that would imply, that now under the Goſpel it ſhould be ordinary, or regular to puniſh *involuntary* errours (which you ſay can be no *crimes*) and *extraordinary* either for us to *commit*, or for *God* to *pardon* them.

Section 4. But then ſecondly, if it were true that theſe *miſſes*, &c. were *caſes extraordinary*, yet can I not ſee how theſe words can be annext to your former, as a proof of their being anſwer to his *Lordſhip* (becauſe how *extraordinary* ſoever the *miſſes* may be, the pardon for miſſes, may doe as well for you, as an *infallible* Guide) unleſs you mean ſomewhat elſe by *ordinary* caſes, than what my capacity hath reacht to, and till you pleaſe to inſtruct me better, I ſhall ἐπέχειν, and by exerciſing my charity in not judging what I do not underſtand, invite yours to inſtruct me that I may.

Section 5. As for the *coherence* of his Lordſhip's diſcourſe, you have little temptation to doubt of that, when you have ſaid that he conceives *that ſuch errours or miſſings ſhould need pardon*, for to that, all that he ſaith is *coherent*; It ſeems you are not of his opinion for the truth of that; and whether is in the right, I ſhall not now examine, or enlarge to any ſo accidental and extrinſecal diſcourſe, but onely tell you, that believing as you do, you ought to have ſaid [*not true*] when you miſtook, and ſaid [*not coherent.*] C.

To the twelfth Section, Chap. 11.

To this charge we anſwer, that our proofs of a ſure guide, are themſelves alſo ſure; and what proofs thoſe are, we before have ſignified, Chap. 8. *and Sect.* 8. *and before Chap.* 5. *Sect.* 4.

Chap. 11 *Anſwer to the eleventh Chapter.*

Your next Chapter being but a reference to what you had before ſaid (and that before examined by us) my anſwer ſhall be anſwerably onely a reference alſo, without taking more pains, to put you in mind, how unfit your *Verba ſignorum* (which you there affirmed to be motives of *credibility*) are now to proceed or commence *infallible* proofs, for thoſe are they which his *Lordſhip*'s argument requires in his twelfth Section.

To the 13, 14, 15, 16, Sections, Chap. 12.

The infallibility of Popes or Councils is no point of doctrine neceſſary to be known diſtinctly, before any reſolution of faith can be made, becauſe it is ſufficient to learn out of Catechiſms and the common practice of the Church, what is to be believed: Neither is there any more probable fear of miſſing which is the See Apoſtolick, and which the Churches living in communion with it, than there is of a Subject's being ignorant to what Kingdom he belongs; and, as for doctrine of belief, it is found out as readily, and as ſurely as the other, by thoſe means of inſtruction which we have ſignified already.

ready. As for the Simony objected, Sect. 14. *it is no impediment of his power, ſo he be received peaceably by the Church, and not called in queſtion for it. The like may be ſaid of the decrees and definitions of Councils, together with the ſenſe or meaning of them. And by this the* 15, *and the* 16 *Sections are anſwered.*

Chap. 12. *Anſwer to the twelfth Chapter.*

His Lordſhip in *queſt* after your *infallible* ground of faith, took into conſideration the *Pope's Infallibility, Section* 13. the *Infallibility of a Council by him called, Section* 14. and produced arguments, I conceive, convincing againſt each. *Section* 1.

To theſe your onely anſwer is, that neither of theſe *Infallibilities* are neceſſary to be known diſtinctly before any reſolution of faith can be made; and you give your reaſons for it, *becauſe*, &c. which is in plain terms to grant and prove the thing which his Lordſhip deſires, and proves; for if they were the ground of *faith*, they would be neceſſary to be known diſtinctly before any reſolution of *faith*, the foundation being abſolutely neceſſary to the ſuperſtruction in *material* edifices; and in *intellectual*, the diſtinct knowledge of a ground of faith being as neceſſary to a diſtinct reſolution of faith, as the ground it ſelf, which works not upon any man's underſtanding (the ſeat of this *Faith*) any further than it is *known*. This conceſſion of yours being all that is demanded of you at this time, we ſhall not need inſiſt on, nor debate farther, what influence the caſe of *Simony* may have upon the *Pope's Infallibility*; If he be *infallible* at all, He, or He and a *Council*, you ſay 'tis not neceſſary to ground *faith*, (which is the onely uſe we have of it in this preſent enquiry) for it ſeems the *Catechiſms*, or common practice of the *Church*, are ſufficient to teach what is to be believed. *Section* 2.

What? Is the *Pope's* and *Councils Infallibility* made unneceſſary? and is a Catechiſm and common practice of the Church ſufficient for the grounding of *faith infallibly?* Certainly we are grown very low, and are ſuppoſed men of very moderate deſires, if it be thought we ſhall thus be content with the *infallibility* of a *Catechiſm:* For whatſoever is ſufficient for the grounding of faith *infallibly* (remember [*infallibly*] muſt come in, for otherwiſe 'tis not to his *Lordſhip's* diſcourſe) muſt it ſelf be acknowledged *infallible*. Which if you ſhall pleaſe to affirm of any of your *Catechiſms*, as I ſhall firſt deſire to be directed which *Catechiſm* it is, that of *Trent*, or what others, (that I may not miſtake in the choice of my Guide) ſo I ſhall make bold to demand whence this *Infallibility*, or authority of this prime guide of *faith* is to be fetcht? It will be ſure from the authority of the *Pope* (or *Council*) of that time when 'twas compiled and confirmed, and then ſtill we fall back to the infallibility of the *Pope*, or *Council*, which it ſeems, in the laſt reſolve, is become neceſſary again to the grounding of *Faith*, and ſo again, muſt be known before any reſolution of *Faith* be built (even upon the *Catechiſm*) which was the thing you juſt now denied: As for the common practice of the *Church*, that that ſhould be a ground of *faith*, or ſufficient for us learn by it, what is to be believed (beſides that this is a weaker ground than *Catechiſms*, as much as errours are more likely to get into the practice of the many, than into the Books of the Learned, or *Authentick* Writings of the *Church*; and accordingly 'tis obſervable in the particular of *images*, that the common practice of men is much more groſs, than the Writings of the Learned) 'tis impoſſible that that ſhould ever be a guide, *quâ eundum, which way we are to go*, till it be ſome other way proved, that we ought to go that way. *Section* 3.

For the improbability of miſſing the *See Apoſtolick*, and which be the *Churches* that live in communion with it, we have no obligation lying on us to deny it; his *Lordſhip's* words gave you no occaſion to aſſert it; nor can we ſee what at this time you can get by it, when you acknowledge the *infallibility* of *Pope* or *Council* unneceſſary to be known before any reſolution of faith can be made. *Section* 4.

You add [*and as for doctrine of belief*, &c.] This I ſhould conceive you had ſpoken of before in thoſe words [what is *to be believed*] and then your memory was ſhort, to put it in again within five lines, as if it had been a new matter. *Section* 5.

I told you 'twas not neceſſary, after you had confeſſed the cauſe, to inſiſt on the matter of *Simony*, which was an argument of his Lordſhip's to defend it. Yet that you may not complain that any word of yours is neglected, or loſt upon us, I have conſidered that alſo, and ask you whether it be not true what his *Lordſhip* ſaith, that a *Pope* choſen by *Simony* is, *ipſo facto*, no *Pope*, you (durſt not, I conceive, becauſe you) did not before deny it; and if now you will take more courage, let your mind be known, and we ſhall not doubt to bring as *Claſſick Authours* as your ſelf againſt you. If it be true, then is your anſwer of no validity, becauſe of no truth; for either that infallibility, or whatever other power, muſt be annex'd to him as a man (which he may be indeed, though he be not *Pope*) or under ſome other relation, which *infallibly* belongs to him, (neither of which, I conceive you will affirm, for then ten thouſand to one, ſome other will communicate with him in that claim) or elſe he muſt be *Pope*, when he is, *ipſo facto*, no *Pope*; or elſe that power muſt be annext to him by ſome body, that may think him *Pope* when he is not, and then either *God* muſt run the errour, or that power be given him from ſome other, for that *God* ſhould know him to be no *Pope*, and yet give that power of *infallibility* (for if you ſpeak of any other power, it is not pertinent) to him, as long as he is peaceably received, muſt, Firſt, conclude that a *no-pope* may be *infallible*; And ſecondly, that whoſoever is ſo received by the *Church*, is ſo; which unleſs there be ſome promiſe of *God's* to aſſure me that he hath promiſed it to the *Churches* blind reception, will, for ought I yet ſee, conclude again, that either the *chair* or the peoples *errour* gives him that prerogative. *Section* 6.

To the fifteenth and ſixteenth Sections, you reply no one word, but refer it to your former anſwer; whither, if I knew which part of your anſwer it were (for that immediately precedent I conceive 'tis not, for I hope the *Simoniacal* election hath nothing to doe with the decrees of *Councils*) I ſhould attend it, but the ſcent being cold, I am at a loſs, and ſo muſt be content to give over the game. *Section* 7.

Yet ſeeing I am on this matter of the *Pope's Infallibility* (becauſe you have wholly avoided that queſtion, and by a kind of ſtratagem diverted it, and ſo not given me any occaſion to defend his *Lordſhip* in that matter) I ſhall a little conſider the Reader, (to whom I am much obliged, if he ſhall have had patience to reade thus far, *i. e.* to endure the penance of ſo much *Nothing*) and give him a few collections of my *Section* 8.

own, to this purpoſe of the *Pope*'s Infallibility; not that I conceive they will from me find any better entertainment than his *Lordſhip*'s reaſonings had done, but becauſe they are for the moſt part the conceſſions of your own men, from whence I here tranſcribe them.

Section 9. That the Pope is not onely *fallible*, but even judicially ſubject to *errour*, deviation, defection, and (in *Ocham*'s phraſe, *hæreticabilis*) to *Hereſie*, Apoſtacy, Atheiſm, and in his practice to ſin of any the moſt hainous kind, and conſequently to damnation irreverſible; I ſhall aſſert no farther than theſe honourable Names will avow and authorize me. Among your own Writers, (I mean *Pontificians*) Lyra *in* Matth. 16. Waldenſis, *l.* 2. *doctrin. fidei antiq.* Gerſon. *de exam. doct. conſid.* 1. 2. 3. Adrianus *Sextus* the Pope, *in* 4. *ſent. de confirm. qu. ult.* Driedo *de libert. Chriſt. l.* 2. *c.* 2. Cardin. *de* Turrecrem. *l.* 2. *c.* 16. Almainus *de author. Eccleſ. c.* 8. *ad* 6. *&* *c.* 10. *&* *de dom. civ. nat. & Eccl. concl.* 3. Archidiaconus Bononienſis, *in Grat. gloſſ. in diſt.* 19. *contra* Auxentium. Catharinus *in* Gal. 2. Yea, and the *Councils* of *Conſtance* and *Baſil*, and the Fathers generally there aſſembled, which I hope took not up this doctrine from *Luther*'s or *Calvin*'s dictates.

Section 10. To this purpoſe is it that we reade of *Childebert* King of *France*, that he ſent *Ruffinus* his Legate to [a] *Rome*, to enquire of *Pelagius* the *Pope*, whether he had violated the Faith, as [a] *Baronius* teſtifies; the ſame was ſuſpected of him by the *Biſhop* of *Tuſcia*, and other *Biſhops of Italy*, to whom he ſent his *Apology*, ſaith the ſame [b] *Baronius*. So *Gregory* the Firſt, being under the like ſuſpicion, wrote his [c] *Apology* to *Theodolinda* Queen of the *Longobards*. So the *Popes* generally laboured to approve themſelves to the *Emperours*, and purged themſelves before them; *Sixtus* before *Valentinian* concerning the crime laid to his charge by [d] *Baſſus*, *Symmachus* upon an accuſation of forgery, ſaith an [d] Authour in *Goldaſtus*; all which are arguments that the *Pope*'s Infallibility was in thoſe days unknown to the world, and the *Popes* themſelves were not very perfect in it; if they had, they would have been more confident than to have made *Apologies*.

[a] *Ad ann.* 556. *n.* 25.
[b] *Ib. n.* 30.
[c] Greg. *l.* 2. *ep.* 4.
[d] Anonym. *de ætat. eccleſ. c.* 7. *ap.* Goldaſtum *in monar. t.* 1. *p.* 29.

Section 11. Farther yet, the *Biſhops* of *Germany* met at *Brixia*, the *Biſhops* of *France* at *Mentz*, condemned the *Pope* for a diſciple of *Berengarius*. Or if the condemnations of ſuch will not be of value againſt the *Pope*, you gave *Reaſon* even now leave to be the *Judge*, and that, and common ſenſe may be ſo in this matter, if you will but reade the * Epiſtle of *Pope Zachary* to *Boniface*, *è Cathedra*, a *Papal* and definitive *reſcript*, wherein he condemns one *Vergilius* for an *Heretick*, for affirming that there were *Antipodes*; which whether it were an errour in him, I leave you to judge, and profeſs my ſelf to be of opinion, that though it were, 'twas yet more tolerably diſcreet and pious, than that of [f] *Gregory* the Seventh, that *there is but one name under Heaven, that of the Pope, to whoſe Seat whoſoever paid not obedience, became preſently an Idolater and a Pagan*; and if you will undertake to defend this, I will reward you by adventuring to juſtify the other. That ſpeech of *Gilbert*, *Biſhop* of *Rhemes*, that after was *Pope*, ſhall with me be ſufficient to expiate for either; *Audaciter dicam, &c, I ſhall boldly ſay, that the Biſhop of* Rome *himſelf, if he have offended any Brother, and will not hear the admonitions of the Church, ought to paſs for an Heathen and a Publican.*

Diſt. 81. §. *Si qui ſunt.*
* *Inter Epiſtolas Hyber. p.* 49.
[f] Greg. *Ep. l.* 2.
In Epiſt. ad Sequinum Senonenſem.

Section 12. But all theſe are but trifles, if they be compared with other known paſſages of ſtory, how *Stephanus* was reprehended by *Cyprian*, *Liberius* by *Athanaſius*, *Honorius* almoſt by all *Chriſtians*, of no leſs crimes than Hereſie it ſelf. Or becauſe that is but one piece of *carnality*, and there be many others beſide that, as probable, and conſiderable errours, and carnalities, I beſeech you review either in your memory, or in *Onufrius*, and *Platina*, the lives and manners of the *Popes*, the *inceſts*, and *ſorceries*, and *cruelties* of *Alexander* the Sixth, the *idolatrous* Sacrifices of *Marcellinus*, *Caleſtin*'s uſing the help of *Magicians* and *Devils* to come to the *Papacy*, and then tell me your opinion, whether *Popes* may not *err*; and when you have replied, by way of diſtinction of *manners* from *doctrines*, be then pleaſed to anſwer [g] *Nilus* (by ſome more ſatisfactory way than by calling him *pratling Greek*) this queſtion, πῶς ἔχρις ἐνδείκνυται ὁ Πάπας ἀρνεῖσθαι Θεὸν, λόγοις ὃ ἔργοις οὐ δύναται; *how it falls out that the Pope can deny God in his works, but cannot by any means in his words?* (what charm or amulet kept his tongue inerrable, when his whole body was ſubject to thoſe darts of Satan) and when you have done that, I beſeech you to fanſie to your ſelf what kind of crimes you conceive thoſe *Popes* would have committed, if they had been fallible.

[g] *De Papatu.*

Section 13. I ſhall not enlarge this ſupernumerary trouble any farther, or expect your anſwer to every of theſe paſſages in Books; if I have wronged any by miſciting, I ſhall be glad to hear of it; and if they make not all together one probable argument or proof of the *fallibility* of the *Pope*, I beſeech you pardon me for this unneedfull importunity.

To the ſeventeenth and eighteenth Sections, Chap. 11.

I noted before, that the knowledge of all theſe particulars recited by the Enquirer, are no way neceſſary to the Believer, and therefore both this Authour and Baron *the Scotch Miniſter ſtruggle in vain, whenas with ſuch care and vehemency they preſs them againſt us. I conclude then, that in the Church of God,* Councils *do not multiply doubts, but diminiſh them.*

Chap. 11. *Anſwer to the eleventh Chapter.*

Section 1. To the ſeventeenth and eighteenth Sections, the anſwer is a reference again to a note dropt from you before, which truly I ſhould not have been likely to apply to this buſineſs in hand, if you had not given me that ſeaſonable admonition. Your *note*, I conceive, refers to your diſcourſe in the precedent Chapter, how *Catechiſms*, and the *common practice of the Church teach all, what is to be believed.* And (as then the *Pope's Infallibility*, ſo now) that of *Councils* is unneceſſary to be known, and by that means all theſe particulars alſo; for if the *infallibility of Councils* were neceſſary to be known (as it muſt be, if they were deciders of queſtions) then all theſe particulars mentioned by his *Lordſhip*, would be *neceſſary* to be known alſo, becauſe they are incident to every *Council*, and the knowledge of its *infallibility* (becauſe of its deciſions, and even being it ſelf) depends on theſe.

Section 2. And the fitneſs of *Councils* to decide Controverſies being the thing his *Lordſhip* had now in hand, and which *Baron* treats on, when he uſes the like arguments, ſure neither of them ſtruggle in vain; but you rather

rather (who 'twas thought in reaſon would have been no wiſer than your fellows, and ſo would have aſſerted that fitneſs of *Councils*) have become a very ſlippery Wreſtler, gliding out of their hands, when their arguments began to lay hold on you; and after ſuch an eſcape as this, I confeſs 'tis matter of wonder to me, how you could think fit to end with a θριαμβευτικὸν, *triumph* preſuppoſing *victory*, and *victory reſiſtence*, and none of theſe here are to be heard of, but onely a concluſion, that what his Lordſhip had ſaid and proved, he had ſaid falſely (a *petitio principii* again) that *Councils do not diminiſh doubts, but multiply them.* Which propoſition and proof of his Lordſhip's, having no need of defending any farther, I ſhall onely interpoſe one caution, which I deſire may be obſerved in his *Lordſhip*'s diſcourſe, that it being ſuppoſed, that *Councils* are not deciders of controverſies, (meaning thereby *infallible* ones) they be yet of good *authority* and *uſe* in the *Church*, to help to decide them, and (notwithſtanding all the doubts that his Lordſhip ſaith they do multiply) be onely denied by us the privilege of *infallibility*, not that other of being very *uſefull* and *venerable* in a lower degree, and (ſuch the *Council* may be) even next to the *Word* of *God* it ſelf.

To the ninteenth Section, Chap. 13.

He maintains here a ſtrange paradox, and one very improbable, namely, that to define any thing of new, is to beſtow upon the Devil one path more for us to walk in towards him. If you ask why, he tells you, becauſe, before the definition made, it was lawfull to hold either ſide, but after, it is damnable. Belike then with this Authour the manifeſtation of divine truths is the high-way to damnation; but I ſuppoſe few men are of his mind. Certainly moſt are of opinion, that every ſuch verity we learn, had rather been a new ſtep towards Heaven, becauſe knowledge of things divine do enable men for the attaining of ſalvation; and therefore the Apoſtles by their inſtructing our underſtandings in them, ſhewed the world ſo many more paths to Heaven. It may be indeed that by accident minds blown up with ſelf-conceit, may by their reſiſting ſuch revealed truths, take an occaſion to tranſgreſs, but that is their own faults, not the fault of them that teach, or of the verities that are declared, and therefore this cavil of the Enquirer's againſt the definitions of Councils was very frivolous. It ſhould ſeem he had a great mind to be quarrelling with Councils, that was content to take ſuch a frivolous exception as this againſt them.

Chap. 13. *Anſwer to the thirteenth Chapter.*

Section 1. Your great quarrel to his *Lordſhip*'s ninteenth Section, comes now to be conſidered; wherein the paradox in, and improbability of his *Lordſhip*'s concluſion, will not be ſo great, if you obſerve but one thing, that the matter of definitions of *Councils*, which he ſpeaks of, is not *divine truths*, (as the following words ſuppoſe them, and upon that preſs them with abſurdity) but, as I conceive, ſuch things as have been defined by *Councils*, being not before defined by *Scripture*, and ſo though affirmed to be *truths*, yet not as *divine truths*, at leaſt of which it is not *infallibly* true, that they are ſo: of which nature I might inſtance at large in your Councils of *Lateran*, *Conſtance* and *Trent*; for to the *ancient general* Councils I confeſs to bear ſuch reverence, that I ſhall challenge any of you to exceed me.

Section 2. Now to clear his Lordſhip from the guilt of a frivolous quarrel at this time, I muſt add, that in ſuch deciſions of Councils, the worth of the matter, and inconvenience of leaving it undecided, are the main things worth conſidering; and ſo it is poſſible that the deciſion may be ſuch, that it may tend, Firſt, to ſome publick end, whether the clearing of obſcure Scripture, or the recovering of ſome venerable and uſefull practice, or doctrine of the Church. Secondly, to the ſetling and eſtabliſhing of peace, by interpoſing ſuch a judgment which may probably ſway with both pretenders; And in theſe, and the like caſes, the advantages being ſo intrinſecal to the deciſion, and withall ſo great, the inconvenience mentioned by his Lordſhip ought not to prevail to the diſparaging of Councils, becauſe though it be an inconvenience, yet is it over-weighed with other conveniences, and therefore the argument I confeſs is not infinitely or unlimitedly true.

Section 3. But then the caſe may be, that the matter of the definition is of no ſuch great weight or uſe, that there is no ſuch aſſurance acquirable from Scripture, that either ſide is true, (nay, it may be audacious and untrue) and as little from any other κριτήρια, that either ſide will peaceably ſit down and acquieſce in the deciſion, (but in matters of *opinion* probably prove *opiniatour*) and ſo the deciſion will then rather widen the breach than compoſe it.

Section 4. In this caſe, or when indeed in other reſpects the ballance is even ſet, the good of defining counterpoiſed with the ill, then there is place for his *Lordſhip*'s argument, and 'tis true that then, upon that preſent ſuppoſition (that before deciſion 'twere lawfull to hold either way, and damnable after) it were uncharitable to define; my reaſon is, becauſe when *charity* doth not move to doe a thing, *i. e.* when no advantage ſhall ariſe to mankind by it, but on the other ſide, *charity* ſhall adviſe to abſtein; ſome one, (though accidental) hurt, being foreſeen to ariſe on the other ſide, there to doe that thing, is uncharitable.

Section 5. Thus have we heard of an expreſſion of *Biſhop Tunſtall* of *Durham*, who died in your communion, that if he had been *Chaplain to Pope* Innocent *the Fourth*, he would have begg'd on his knees, that he would not define *Tranſubſtantiation*, as knowing it would tend to the breach of the peace of the Church; and thus in matters of controverſie about *Predeſtination*, &c. you know the *Pope* hath in *charity* abſtein'd to define, and the *Apoſtles* (or whoſoever elſe were the compoſers of it) in their Creed defined but a few things; and generally thoſe Churches that have avoided multiplying of Articles, have by wiſe men been thought the moſt Chriſtian, becauſe the moſt *charitable*; and even in matters of rites and humane laws, the rule is, that they muſt not be *multiplied* unneceſſarily; and the reaſon is, becauſe they would conſequently *multiply* ſnares on mens conſciences, as unneceſſarily; which is juſt his *Lordſhip*'s reaſon in this place.

Section 6. Which you will rather gueſs, becauſe 'tis clear his *Lordſhip* ſpeaks of *thoſe things in which before a Council hath determined, it is lawfull to hold either way*, perfectly *lawfull*, (not excluding alſo that other circumſtance that I have added, *viz.* when there is no real gain expectable by defining) And when the [*thoſe things*]

are by his Lordſhip ſo *limited* and *reſtrained*, I know not how (to make up your *paradox*) you could think fit to change the phraſe from [*thoſe things*, &c.] to [*any thing*] and after, to [*divine truths*] and [*things divine*] and [*verities*] in general, when 'tis improbable that he did (I am ſure very poſſible and probable that he did not) ſpeak of any ſuch, as are *new ſteps toward Heaven*, but ſuch as onely fill mens brains, puff up their fancies (and oft make men to think themſelves pious men for being of ſuch opinions, and to neglect works of *piety* and *charity*, as not near ſo conſiderable) and ſo are to them even that believe them, accidentally *paths to damnation*, much more (if the doctrine of deciſions of Councils be to be extended to whatſoever uſeleſs *definitions*) to thoſe that do not *believe* them.

Section 7. Having ſaid thus much for defence of this ſuppoſed *paradox* of his Lordſhip's, I muſt deſire, (once for all) theſe two things from the Reader, which *Equity* will require of him to *grant* me; Firſt, that his *Lordſhip*'s arguments be not extended *infinitely*, but onely be ſuppoſed to undertake to conclude as far as is neceſſary to the preſent matter; and no farther, (an example of which this Chapter hath afforded you.) Secondly, that his arguments being by him brought onely to enervate the *Infallibility* of the *Roman Church*, be ſo cautiouſly taken, as that they be made uſe of onely to that end, and not at all inclined, or wreſted to the leſſening the *authority* of the *Church* or *Councils univerſal*; for this would be very unjuſt, and ill inferred, there being a wide difference betwixt *authority* and *infallibility*, as alſo betwixt *Univerſal* and *Roman*, though (by reaſon of the manner of his Lordſhip's diſcourſe, being, according to the deſign, wholly *deſtructive* of the one, and not *aſſertive* of the other) the Reader may perhaps be tempted to think otherwiſe; and therefore I thought it not impertinent thus to fortify him againſt this prejudice.

To the 20, 21, 22, Sections, Chap. 14.

It is true, we condemn ſome doctrines which general councils have not condemned, and we have great reaſon for it, becauſe though Councils be one rule of faith, yet not the onely. Again, theſe we hold to be infallible, becauſe they are the Compendium *and quinteſſence of the Church, and the body repreſentative thereof, as a King and the three States be of the whole Kingdom.*

The cauſe of Pope John *XXII. is cleared ſufficiently by* Ciacconius *in his life, by* Coeffeteau *in his learned anſwer to* Pleſſy*'s iniquity, and by many others, and therefore needs not be argued any more. I grant it a point of faith that the ſouls of the juſt ſhall ſee God before the laſt judgment, and do deny that this doctrine was generally contradicted at any time. Nevertheleſs I do not know it to be of faith that all of them ſhall enjoy the ſame viſion before that great day, and that none of them ſhall be detained in ſecret receptacles, as the Ancients hold, till they, together with their bodies, ſhall be compleatly purged in the great fire of the worlds conflagration, as I have treated elſewhere.*

It was not needfull that Councils ſhould define in terms their own immunity from errour, becauſe a Council both in ſubſtance and ſemblance is the Church, who needs not define her own infallibility, and therefore needs not, becauſe that ſame is to be preſuppoſed to all her definitions as a thing known without them, before hand; for otherwiſe ſhe would not be believed in any of them at all, either touching her ſelf, or any other matter. Nevertheleſs though this definition be not in terms, yet it is virtually done, and in actu exercito, *as often as a Council defineth any thing, by the pronouncing of* Anathema *againſt ſuch as do not ſubmit, and counting them as Hereticks; It is done again in the uſing continually this old form,* Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto & nobis.

For a concluſion I demand of theſe eager impugners both of Church and Councils, what thing it is muſt regulate our belief, and keep us in diſcipline and unity; for if they let all men looſe upon themſelves, and make all men Judges in the Court of faith, as they, de facto, *do, controverſies will multiply apace, and no means left to reconcile them; and while all men have authority of deciding, no man hath it. Reaſon always did teach us, that confuſion would be the effect of this new licence; yet could we never underſtand it, till that now coſtly experience, the miſtris of the improvident, hath laid it open before our eyes. And now at length we ſmart for our leaving the venerable decrees and definitions of Church and Councils, and do behold all brought to miſery and ruine, both Church and State; yet ſuch is our blindneſs as we are not able to diſcern the true cauſes of all theſe evils. The daily growing up of new and new devices inſtead of the old faith, and the continual diſcords and diſſentions thereupon enſuing, evict unanſwerably the weakneſs and inaptitude of the rule of faith, and our young and preſuming wits may ſee how far ſhort they come of their forefathers wiſedom, and how much more unhappy than thoſe who were governed by Church and Councils.*

C. 14. *Anſwer to the fourteenth Chapter.*

Section 1. The firſt part of this *Chapter* in the *Apologiſt*, is anſwer onely to one of three or four proofs of his *Lordſhip*'s argument, Section 20. *viz.* to that againſt the *Councils* being a rule of *hereſie*, [*when ſome paſs for Hereticks that are not condemned by any Council*] To this I confeſs it were ſatisfactory (if it were proved) to ſay that *Councils* are a *rule*, but not the *onely rule*. But then, Firſt, there is no other rule ſpecified. And ſecondly, this argument of his *Lordſhip*'s is complicated with three others, being joined with which, it is of force to ſtrengthen one of them (though of it ſelf it were not ſufficient to conclude) and then neither of thoſe are taken notice of. Thirdly, 'tis meant but as a proof againſt this rule, not againſt any other. And yet fourthly, his *Lordſhip*'s method being to confute every one of them ſingle, as they lie; all others being diſproved, this muſt be concluded the *onely* one, or none at all; and however, no more can here be required, than that here he diſprove this from being the rule, not that he diſprove all others in this period.

Section 2. For your way of proof [that *Councils* are *infallible*] Firſt, that is not anſwer to the contrary proof; And ſecondly, it is by a *medium* as much denied, as it ſelf (the *Infallibility* of the *Church* whoſe *quinteſſence* it is) and ſo your old acquaintance, *petitio principii* again.

Section 3. Your ſecond part about *John* XXII. puts us off to *Ciaconius* and *Coeffeteau*, whom in obedience to your direction I ſhould advice with, but that I ſee from what you have learned from them, that either you have proved an ill Scholar (and 'twere inſolence in me to hope to be better) or elſe that their reſolutions are not pertinent to his *Lordſhip*'s argument; for the three things that you add (I conceive from their Writings) are nothing at all to it.

Firſt,

Firſt, not that which you grant, for his Lordſhip grants it. Secondly, not that which you deny, for his Lordſhip had not affirmed it (unleſs from theſe words, [*he was not alone*] you conclude, that that which he contradicted, was *generally contradicted*; and then what his *Lordſhip* ſaid, may be as truly ſaid to be generally *granted*, for he is not you ſee alone in ſo ſaying.) Thirdly, not that which you ſay you *do not know*, for his Lordſhip knows it as little, and indeed ſays never a word of it. Whereas the onely thing wherein the force of that part of his Lordſhip's argument conſiſted, *viz. Bellarmine*'s excuſing *Pope John* (in his denying of that which you believe) from the *no-Council* that had defined againſt him, hath no tittle ſaid to it, but continues in great ſecurity, to make good the argument, [*that you doe amiſs* (and withall either you or *Bellarmine* are very partial) to *condemn thoſe that are condemned by no general Council.*] *Section* 4.

Your Anſwer indeed to the twenty firſt Section, is nearer to the mark, but yet it hits it not; The argument is, that no *Council* ever decreed a *Council* to be *infallible*, therefore as far as the argument is drawn for belief, from the *infallibility* of the *Council*, I am not bound to believe it *infallible*. To this you anſwer, 1. *That for Councils ſo to define, was not needfull, becauſe a Council is the Church, and the infallibility of that, is a præcognitum in all her definitions, otherwiſe it would not be believed in any.* *Section* 5.

Here is excellent contrivance, 1. *For Councils to define that Councils are infallible is not needfull*; which ſure is *needfull*, if nothing be to be believed, but what the *Council* defines to be ſo; and that muſt be granted, 1. if the *Council* be the rule of belief; and 2. if the *Council* be the *Church* (as you ſay it is) for that is the *onely rule infallible*, if you be not deceived. 2. That the *Council is the Church in ſubſtance.*] I thought it had been in *repreſentation* onely, and that nothing is the Church in ſubſtance, but the Church in its full extent, of which you ſaid before, the Church is onely the *quinteſſence*, which ſure is not the ſame in *ſubſtance* with that whoſe *quinteſſence* it is, but onely the *repreſentation of it*. 3. That the *Infallibility of the Church is a præcognitum*; if ſo, then it is a *principle*; and if ſo, then I am ſure I muſt not look to ſee it prov'd, and then as long as we deny it, (as we do, you know) that is *petitio principii* again. 4. That *unleſs the Church were preſumed infallible before its determination, it could never be believed in any*: this ſuppoſes men very hard-hearted, that never will believe any thing, but what ſome preſumed *infallible* tells them. *Section* 6.

There is a *belief* (as well as a *certainty*) *cui non ſubeſt dubium, of which a man doth not doubt*, as well as *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum, in which there can be no falſity*; and the *Schools* have told you of a *certainty* of *adherence*, where there is none of *evidence*; and let me tell you, this is the difference betwixt *belief* and *knowledge*; the latter onely is infer'd *demonſtratively*, or by premiſſes that cannot be otherwiſe, the former being content with *probable* arguments, ſo they be *ſtrongly probable*, and ſuch as have not any the like, or of as conſiderable weight to be ballanced againſt them. And this ſure is the reaſon that *Faith* is by *God* thought fit to be *rewarded*, as being an act of the Believers *choice*, (and knowledge not, becauſe it is *neceſſarily* and irrefragably induced) and yet ſuch, as that it will be all obſtinacy and perverſeneſs to *reſiſt*, when it comes well provided with arguments *extremely probable*. *Section* 7.

For, if you mark it, the moſt weighty actions of our lives, and thoſe which we doe moſt conſtantly, and moſt confidently, are founded no deeper than on *probabilities*. We eat and drink for the ſtrengthning and refreſhing of our bodies, and yet conceive not our ſelves to have any certainty of *evidence* or *demonſtration*, that every bit we eat, or drop we drink, may not *choak*, or *poyſon* us; yet having *probabilities*, on which to ground a belief, that they are *wholſome*, and no ſtrong contrary *probability*, that our *Table ſhall become a ſnare*, or death unto us, we doubt not to feed as ſecurely, as if *Euclid* had been our ſurety by one of his *Demonſtrations*. *Section* 8.

So in every piece of land I buy, or eſtate I enjoy from my Anceſtours, 'tis poſſible, (and the contrary not *demonſtrable*, or certain in that ſenſe) that there may be ſome flaw which may undoe me, and yet when I have ſearcht my evidences, and have the opinion of wiſe men upon the matter, I ſit down, and trade, and live ſecurely, and all this but upon probabilities, without the παρρησία, or full armour of *infallibility* or *demonſtration*. *Section* 9.

And ſo in all matters of fact, which we ſee or hear not with our own eyes or ears, but as with *perſpectives* and *otacouſticks*, I mean where we are fain to truſt the relations of others, be it that there was a *Julius Cæſar*, or a *Henry* the Eighth, the ground of our belief is but a *probability*, viz. the *topick ab authoritate*, the argument taken *from the authority of the relatours*; which though it be never ſo ſtrengthened by the univerſal concurrence and nondiſſenting of all witneſſes, cannot yet aſcend higher, than to be *extremely probable*, and yet ſure is as firmly believed of us; and although it may *poſſibly* be otherwiſe (the contrary implying no repugnance, or contradiction in nature, and he that ſhould be ſo mad to affirm it, being not confutable either by *rational*, or *ocular demonſtration*) yet as little *doubted* of by any man in his right wits, and as little liable to any ſcruple, or matter of doubt, as what is moſt viſible before our eyes. *Section* 10.

This I have ſaid perhaps *ex abundanti* (yet ſhall not repent of it becauſe it is uſefull to be conſidered in order to other difficulties) to ſhew you the falſeneſs, and inconſequence of that argument, that unleſs the *Church were preſumed infallible before its determinations, it could never be believed in any.* For hereby it hath appeared, that that may be *believed*, nay cannot ſometimes without pertinacy and ſin be *not believed*, (as in caſe the arguments, though but probable, be exceſſively ſo) which brings not with it *demonſtration*, or any thing of equal power or force with it, and ſuch is *infallibility*. *Section* 11.

And from thence you will eaſily diſcern, how poſſible it may be for us *Proteſtants* to believe the *univerſal Church* in all things, wherein the teſtimony appears to be *univerſal*; nay to believe the *Church of Rome* in many things, wherein the arguments produced by her, do actually *perſuade* with us, (ſuch are her conſonancy with *antiquity*, and the like) and yet to remain conſtant to our preſent undertakings, that ſhe is not *infallible*. *Section* 12.

But it now appears that I might have ſpared this pains, in preſſing theſe inconveniences on that firſt anſwer of yours. For it ſeems by what follows, that all that anſwer was needleſs; For now upon better conſideration, 'tis true (with a diſtinction) that the *Council* doth *virtually*, and *in actu exercito*, define its own *infallibility*; and that you prove, Firſt, becauſe it pronounceth *anathema's* againſt thoſe that ſubmit not; Secondly, it doth it by ſaying [*Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto, &c.*] *Section* 13.

Not

Section 14. Not to examine your phraſe of *actus exercitus*, as 'tis here applied; To your arguments we anſwer, Firſt, that our *Councils* denounce *anathema's* too, yet you know, do not pretend to *infallibility*.

Section 15. That form, I conceive, ſignifies not, that all are damned that believe not what we *believe*, but that all they that ſhall *diſ-believe* may be excommunicated, if they be refractory; and that again, onely in reference to thoſe that are under dominion; but not that all others that are not under us, ſhould by us be ſo handled; or that thoſe that are not excommunicate, are in that other danger; or if theſe are, yet not for the ſin of diſ-believing an *infallible* doctrine, but for not believing our lawfull ſuperiours; which may be a damning ſin, though they be not *infallible*, their being in the truth, when they make ſuch conſtitutions, is ſufficient for that. Secondly, the form of [*Viſum eſt Spiritui Sancto*] is onely a form tranſcribed
A. from the *Acts*, arguing it their opinion (that uſe it) that this particular is the dictate of the *Holy Ghoſt*, not at all their belief, that the *Holy Ghoſt* was bound to *aſſiſt irreſiſtibly*: which he muſt (as well as *aſſiſt*) to make the *infallibility*; for otherwiſe when he *aſſiſts*, we may poſſibly not make uſe of his *aſſiſtence*. In plain, 'tis an evidence that they think they are in the truth, not that they cannot be in the wrong.

Section 16. To the twenty-fecond Section, though you anſwer not a word, yet you are as diſcreet as if you did, you doe another thing inſtead of it, you aske a queſtion, and harangue upon it at large; the *Queſtion* is pertinent enough (though not to this Section, yet) to the buſineſs in groſs, and we anſwer it in a word, that the Word of God muſt *regulate our belief*, and reaſon, in the uſe of all the means that you will commend to us, and you have given us a pledge already, that you will not quarrel with us for this anſwer; as for diſcipline, and keeping in unity, we had, bleſſed be God, means very ſufficient to that end, till the ſword wreſted them (as all other our lawfull poſſeſſions out of our hands; and I believe the *Infal-*
B. *libility of the Church* is not *weapon-proof*, or able to keep *Reſiſters* in *obedience*, or *Schiſmaticks* in *unity*.

Section 17. As for your uncharitable judgment, that want of an *Infallible Church* (which muſt be but want of that *inſolence* to undertake our ſelves to be *infallible*) is (that and no other) the * cauſe of all our preſent miſeries; and his Lordſhip's doctrine in this Book, (although never ſo remote) the cauſe of his death: This is but to let us ſee your change or variety, that you can uſe *non cauſa pro cauſa*, and not deal onely in *petitio principii*; thus was *Tenterden* Steeple the cauſe of *Goodwin Sands*, and that is all I ſhall return to your State-obſervation; the cauſe of our preſent calamities, I conceive, came not out of the *Church*, but when it was infamous, it fled to it for a Sanctuary, to give it an honeſt Name, and a protection together; and I could tell you that the League in *France* was once pretty parallel to ours, and then 'twas the obſervation of a knowing man, that if a true ſtory of the cauſes of that War ſhould be written, the buſineſs would be traced into ſuch or ſuch a brothel houſe, that made as if it came out gravely from the *Church*; a competition or animoſity, the αἰτία, or *true cauſe*, when religion was onely the πρόφασις, or the *pretended*. Beſides, let me tell you, that deciſions and anathematizings have ſometimes done as much hurt toward occaſioning of breaches, as licence and acknowledgment of *fallibility* hath done; (and if you mark, the onely colour of *charge* at this time againſt our Church, hath been the impoſing *too much*) and truly whatever your opinion is, I conceive *meekneſs* hath the promiſe of *this life*, and I never knew that pretending to *Infallibility* is the onely Symtome of that.

* That paſſage in the *Apologiſt* to which this was returned, is by him in his laſt thoughts held better to be omitted, and accordingly I have left it out there.

To the 23, 24, and 25 Sections, Chap. 15.

The argument of theſe three Sections is, how an ignorant illiterate man cannot be able to trace out all traditions which be truly Apoſtolical: and this is ſought to be perſuaded and made good, by ſundry intricate diſcourſes, all which I willingly do pretermit, and onely ſignify that they all fall wide of the mark; for, in a word, our anſwer to them is, that private men ſtand in no need at all of having any particular information of them, but, that it is ſufficient for them if they do learn what is the common doctrine of the preſent Church, without looking any higher to the Primitive and elder times: becauſe this doctrine now taught is credible and perſuaſive enough for ſatisfying of any wiſe man's underſtanding, and the ſetling of his judgment upon it: as for example, it is ſufficient for any man deſirous of knowing which is the River Thames, *to ſee it at* Graveſend *or* London, *without any laborious aſcending by it higher and higher, and tracing the ſhoars thereof, till he come unto the ſprings; and more than this would not be needfull for the diſtinguiſhing of it from* Severn, *or* Trent, *or any other River. For if this kind of aſſurance might not be ſufficient, then certainly few or none could ever have come to know which water was the famous River* Nilus, *of which few have ever ſeen the ſprings, and which, as it is very likely, do lie conceal'd in* Æthiopia, *and wholly undiſcovered even to this day.*

Againſt the poſſibility of ſearching out Traditions Apoſtolical, and diſcerning them from others that be ſpurious and falſe, his principal inſtance, and that in which he moſt confides, is the doctrine of the Chiliaſts or Millenaries; and the ſame example is vehemently preſſed and repeated often by his friend Chillingworth. *The ſubſtance of all they ſay conſiſts in this, namely, that their doctrine, although now generally received to be erroneous, was received in the firſt* 200 *years with one conſent, as a Tradition Apoſtolical. For making of this charge good, they both of them do jointly alledge Saint* Juſtin *as their witneſs. But that we may judge moſt favourably of this their allegation, we needs muſt tell them they are miſtaken groſly, for Saint* Juſtin *ſpeaking there of three ſeveral ſorts of Chriſtians which were in his time, af-*
Juſtin. in Dial. cum *Tryphone.* *firms, that of thoſe three but one of them held the doctrine of the Chiliaſts: The firſt of theſe three ſorts was, as he deſcribeth,* οἱ κατὰ πάντα ὀρθογνώμονες, *Thoſe, who as he conceived did in all points hold aright. The ſecond claſs conſiſted of ſuch other, who although they did not, like the former, in all things hold aright, yet nevertheleſs were,* ἁπλοῦς καὶ εὐσεβεῖς γνώμης *men of pure and pious judgment or belief, for ſo he expreſly ſtileth them; the third and laſt ſort were ſuch as denied the reſurrection, and were therefore cenſured by him to be Chriſtians rather in name than in reality, and juſtly to be compared with the Sadduces amongſt the Jews. Thoſe of the firſt ſort he telleth did hold the doctrine of the thouſand years. The ſecond ſort, as he expreſly witneſſeth, although they were orthodox and good, yet did not hold that doctrine. Thoſe of the third ſort, as he ſaith, were Chriſtians, but feignedly, and in name alone, and reſembling the Sadduces, yet not for their denying the errour of the thouſand years, for what relation could that have unto the Sadduces? But, contrariwiſe, for their denying the reſurrection, as the Sadduces did, and all this appears clearly, within the compaſs of a few lines, in the Greek text of Saint* Juſtin; *Beſides, if all at that time had been perſuaded of the truth of the Millenaries fancy, what needed Saint* Irenæus *have laboured ſo much, as he did, and ſpent ſo many Chapters in the proving of it? This being ſo, it appears as plainly that the Enquirer and alſo his Partner*

Maſter

Maſter Chillingworth, *were both of them deceived in ſeeking to father upon Saint* Juſtin, *that all Orthodoxal Believers of his time received the doctrine of the Chiliaſts, and that ſuch as did not, were held as Sadduces, or Hereticks; for, in the Text of* Juſtin, *there is no ſuch matter, but rather the quite contrary to it, as may appear fully by the Text it ſelf, and partly by the words before recited out of him; for, without all doubt, Saint* Juſtin's many of pious and pure judgment or belief, and were no Chiliaſts, *muſt needs be Orthodox, and could not be Hereticks, nor as the Sadduces amongſt the Jews, unleſs we will ſay that with one breath, he called them by both contrary names. Again, if, as theſe men ſay, all the whole Church were Chiliaſts during the firſt, ſecond or third hundred years, how could or durſt* Dionyſius *of* Alexandria *have oppoſed them, either without forcing his own Conſcience, or incurring the blame of Hereſie? Now, it is certain he was not counted an Heretick; and again, very unlikely he would ſtrain his Conſcience, by oppoſing any doctrine, received as orthodoxal by the whole Church. Again, it is probable Saint* Dionyſe *the Areopagite oppoſed that doctrine, therefore it cannot be certain, that during the firſt* 200 *years, it was not oppoſed: that Saint* Dionyſe *did it, appears by the works now extant bearing his name; and, that theſe works be his, is very probable, firſt, becauſe they are received for ſuch by the major part, both of the Weſtern and the Eaſtern Church; ſecondly, becauſe they were cited for his a thouſand years ago, and numbred amongſt the reſt of the Fathers ancient and undoubted Monuments, by an intelligent Authour,* Philoponus, l. 2. *de Operib. Creat.* c. 21. & l. 3. c. 9. & 13.

The like may be ſaid of the pretended tradition of the Quartodecimanes *touching the celebration of Eaſter after the manner of the Jews, which was wholly rejected and forbidden in the firſt* Nicene *Council, and before that time oppoſed by many, and principally by Pope* Victor, *who, as* Ciacconius *conceives, did not cut* Polycrates *and his Aſſociates from the body of the whole Church, but onely threatned it, or, as* Euſebius *ſeems to ſay, did doe it, but, yet at the inſtance of Saint* Irenæus, *and ſome others, if he had once paſt it, did not proſecute the cenſure againſt them, but let it fall; and, that it was ſo, is very probable, becauſe there is no memory made how the ſentence was received, whether with obedience, or otherwiſe; which particular, doubtleſs, would never have been omitted by Hiſtorians, no more than the ſentence it ſelf; or the intention of it was, if there had been any thing to regiſter; and beſides, becauſe we find not by any record, but that all proceeded with thoſe Aſian Churches, as formerly it had done, without any note or alteration. And, by this, is ſolved all that* Chillingworth *with ſo much animoſity, objecteth againſt the learned Cardinal* Perone.

Salvian, lib. 5. de Gubern. Dei, *where he ſpeaks in excuſe of ſome Arian Goths, ſpeaks not at all in excuſe of their Hereſie, but ſuppoſing that ſundry of them might have been innocently miſ-led, conceiveth more hope of ſuch mens ſalvation, than of ſuch Catholicks, who lived careleſly and lewdly. Now, what can this make againſt the tradition, or definition of the Church? Onely this Enquirer muſt ſay ſomething to his Mother, and be making difficulties where none is.*

Chap. 15. *Anſwer to the fifteenth Chapter.*

Section 1. To the three next Paragraphs, 23, 24, 25. you profeſs it needleſs for you to give any anſwer, and doe it ſo willingly, becauſe, as you ſay, the diſcourſes are intricate, *i. e.* ſuch as you cannot eaſily accommodate anſwer to; but eſpecially, becauſe it is *ſufficient for private men to learn the common doctrine of the preſent Church*; and therefore there will lie no obligation on me to reply any thing, ſave onely this, that his Lordſhip's arguments do ſtill prove ſufficient to the end, to which he deſigned them, to ſhew that Tradition is no infallible guide; which that you acknowledge, your diverſion ſeems to intimate, and your many proofs, that 'tis not needfull it ſhould be.

Section 2. But then it is in you a great injuſtice, not to take notice of his Lordſhip's deſign, to which his arguments are concluding, (but to impoſe another on him, to which he never thought himſelf engaged, nor could have foreſeen your pleaſure without the ſpirit of divination) and yet, to chide him for impertinence, and pretermit and deſpiſe all that he hath ſaid, upon this onely ground of diſpleaſure, becauſe he hath not proved what you now think fit to ſet him for his task.

Section 3. This onely you muſt pleaſe to note, that the appointing the ignorant to learn their belief from the common doctrine of the *Church* (as before you did from the *Catechiſms*) doth intimate your opinion, that your *preſent Church is infallible*, but is no ſhew of proof that it is ſo (and ſo *petitio principii*) nay, if your words ſignify, as they ſound [that your *doctrine thus taught is credible and perſuaſive enough*] I may conclude that your *Church* is not infallible; for whatever is taught by ſuch an one, is more than credible and perſuaſible.

Section 4. Your ſubtilty about the way of knowing the River *Thames* will as little come home to the buſineſs of Infallibility (though to Credibility it may) unleſs every Water-man on the River be as infallible as your *Church*, for of him it is that I learn it; and though his credit be great enough for a matter of this moment, and in it I would as willingly be ignorant or uncertain, as be at the trouble to ſeek out a better ſecurity; In matters of greater moment, I may be excuſed if I am not ſo credulous, if I chooſe not to believe them, whoſe intereſts are concerned, at leaſt if I think every *Catechiſm* on the ſtall, to be ſomewhat leſs than infallible.

Section 5. Having now ſufficiently diſclaimed *Tradition* (at leaſt ſhewn your opinion of it, that you have little need of it to ſuſtain your *Churches* infallibility) and ſo granted as much as his Lordſhip attempts to prove, yet for ſome former profeſſion of kindneſs to it, *you* will now take its part a little (rather than his *Lordſhip* ſhall be permitted to ſay any thing true) and vindicate it from the argument about the *Chiliaſts*. In which I muſt tell you, that what you here affirm of his *Lordſhip* and Maſter *Chillingworth*, is not true of his *Lordſhip* (whether it be of Maſter *Chillingworth*, is not *tanti*, as that, not having the book by me, I ſhould take the pains to examine it.)

Section 6. As firſt, this, that he ſeeks to father on Saint *Juſtin*, that all *orthodoxal* Believers of his time received the doctrine of the *Chiliaſts*, whereas all that his *Lordſhip* ſaith, is but the repeating of *Juſtin*'s own words (wherein he cannot be deceived in your opinion, for you before recite the ſame) and tranſlating them (wherein he is not deceived, for he doth it *ad literam*) and in a word affirming, that *Juſtin ſaith he holds it, and ſo do all that are in all parts orthodox Chriſtians*, which phraſe [*all that are* (*i. e.* which he ſaith are) *in all parts orthodox*] that it differs from this other of yours [*all orthodoxal believers*] I ſhall appeal to no

other judgment than that of your own conſcience, who in the former page affirm, that *Juſtin* ſpake of three ſorts of men; Firſt, Thoſe that did, as he conceived, in all points hold aright; the ſecond, which though they did not ſo in *all* things, yet were ἀ καθαρᾶς καὶ εὐσεβοῦς γνώμης, *of a pure and pious judgment*, (and thoſe which are ſuch, I ſhall ſuppoſe to be orthodoxal believers, though as it appears by your acknowledgment, they did not hold right in all things.) Or if your analyſing of the place do not ſufficiently convince you of this difference, (and the injury that conſequently you have done his *Lordſhip*) I ſhall then, (having long ago ſeriouſly weighed that place) Firſt, give you an account of it, ſuch as I doubt not will ſatisfy you; and when I have done ſo, Secondly, confeſs the weakneſs of that place to conclude any thing againſt *Catholick tradition*; and yet Thirdly, make it clear, that you have wronged his *Lordſhip* in your report of his citation.

Section 7. First, For the doctrine of the *millennium*, I profeſs to believe, that it appears not to be *Juſtin*'s affirmation, that it was not oppoſed by his *contemporaries*, but rather the contrary, which I conclude from theſe

P. 306. C. words, Πολλὰς γὰρ οὖν καὶ πρὸ ἐ καθαρᾶς καὶ εὐσεβοῦς ὄντων χριστιανῶν γνώμης, τοῦτο μὴ γινώσκειν ἐσήμανά σοι. *I have ſignified to you that many do not acknowledge this doctrine of the* 1000 *years, and thoſe many, Chriſtians that are of pure and pious opinion or judgment.* And that you may be beholding to me, I ſhall alſo profeſs, that I am not of the opinion of thoſe learned men that have conceived that period falſe written; and that either οὖν ſhould be changed into οὐ, (which would be a ſtrange and bold Criticiſm, of very ill example, if it were admitted againſt the conſent of Copies; and then Secondly, it would leave a very perplexed period of it:) or that μὴ ſhould be left out; For firſt, this would be as dangerous a Criticiſm, and of as ill example, which would make Authours opinions mutable into the quite contradictory; and yet ſuch, as is not without example among you, witneſs the diſputation between the *Regulars* and *Seculars* in the controverſie about the neceſſity of having an *Ordinary* here in *England*, upon occaſion as I remember, of a *Canon* of a *Council* concerning *Confirmation*, one ſide contending that [*non*] ſhould be in, the other that it ſhould be left out, a controverſie about a word, nay a ſyllable, but yet that of ſome concernment. Secondly, if either of theſe emendations ſhould be admitted, the antecedents and conſequents would not naturally and in good ſtyle connect, but the ſenſe of this period would be juſt all one with that that went before immediately.

Section 8. A ſecond proof of what I ſaid, I ſhall fetch from this, that *Trypho* in that place (though *Juſtin* had told him that he denied not the *Millennium*, yet) ſuſpected that *Juſtin* had equivocated with him, on this ground, becauſe other *Chriſtians* were not of this opinion, and therefore begins with εἰπέ μοι ἀληθῶς, *tell me whether you confeſs it ſincerely*, ἢ ἵνα δόξῃς ἡδέως ἀκοῦσαι, *&c.* and *Juſtin* anſwers, *that ſure he would not ſay it, if he had not thought it*, and thereupon repeats, that he had confeſt to him, ὅτι ἐγὼ μὲν, καὶ ἄλλοι πολλοὶ ταῦτα φρονοῦμεν, and promiſes he would ſet out a Book of this diſputation, and profeſs it openly to others as well as him, and adds, that he *means not to follow men and their doctrines, but God*; all which argues his acknowledgment that the opinion was not uncontradicted by men, nor generally conſented to by *Chriſtians*.

Section 9. P. 307. A laſt proof ſhall be, that thoſe words which ſeem moſt to the contrary [ἐγὼ δ' οὐ καὶ πάνυ εἶσιν ὀρθογνώμονες καὶ πάντα χριστιανοί] will not come home to the proof of it, nor indeed of any more than this, that he was of that opinion, *and ſome others in all things conſenting with him*; for it being ſuppoſed that he was of that opinion, it cannot be expected of him, that he ſhould affirm any that hold it not (though never ſo orthodox in other things) to be καὶ πάντα ὀρθογνώμονες, *of right opinion in all things*: becauſe every honeſt man ſuppoſing his own opinions to be right, (for elſe he will *change* them) muſt alſo ſuppoſe, that they that differ from him in one of thoſe, are not in that, (and ſo not *in all things*) of *right opinions*.

Section 10. For the truth is, he ſpeaks of three ſorts of men (wherein I ſhall not differ much from you) the firſt, that *denied the reſurrection and the* 1000 *years*, and thoſe he calls λεγόμενοι χριστιανοὶ, ἄθεοι, ἀσεβεῖς, αἱρετισταί; *nominal Chriſtians, Atheiſts, impious heretical leaders*; the ſecond, thoſe *that acknowledged the reſurrection and denied the Millennium*, and thoſe are contained under καθαρᾶς καὶ εὐσεβοῦς γνώμης ὄντες χριστιανοὶ, *Chriſtians of pure*

P. 306. *and pious opinions*; the third ſort, thoſe *that held both*, as himſelf, ἄλλοι πολλοὶ, *many others*, and εἰ τινὲς καὶ πάντα

P. 307. ὀρθογνώμονες, *if there were any that were orthodox in all things.*

Section 11. This being ſet down (if you pleaſe) by way of compliance with you in the firſt place, I ſhall make no ſcruple to add in the ſecond, that by *Juſtin* it cannot be concluded, that the 1000 years was a matter of *Catholick* belief in his time, but onely favour'd by him, and many others; and conſequently, though that were after condemned in the *Church*, would it not be from this teſtimony inferr'd, that a *Catholick* doctrine, (much leſs a tradition) were *condemned*.

Section 12. And therefore (which was the third thing I promiſed you) you may obſerve, that his *Lordſhip* ſpake very cautiouſly, and (as any man will now conceive) very *critically*, according to the importance of *Juſtin*'s words, that *Juſtin held it, and ſaid, that all that were in all parts* (that is in all particular points) *orthodox Chriſtians did ſo too*, but no more; which is much leſs than what you lay to his Lordſhip's charge, in the firſt place, that he *fathers on* Juſtin, *that all orthodoxal believers of his time received the doctrine of the Chiliaſts*; And infinitely leſs, than that which you lay to him in the ſecond part of the charge, that he *fathers* again

B. *on* Juſtin, *that ſuch as did not receive that doctrine were held as Sadducees or Hereticks*; To which I anſwer in a word, that ſure your memory of things is confuſed, and ſo apt to betray you to write things, which are apparently falſe, for ſo this particular is, his *Lordſhip* not ſaying one word to this purpoſe in this Paragraph.

Section 13. Which three things being thus cleared, I ſhall now proceed to view your dealing in that which his *Lordſhip* mentions from *Irenæus* in this matter.

Section 14. Of him indeed it is true, his *Lordſhip* ſalth, that he *ſets down the doctrine of the Chiliaſts* directly for a *tradition, and relates the very words that* Chriſt *uſed, when he taught this.* And to thoſe words of his *Lordſhip*'s,

P. 497. I ſhall make bold to add the words of *Irenæus* on which they ſeem to be grounded: *Preſbyteri qui* Johannem *viderunt, meminerunt audiſſe ſe ab eo, & hæc* Papias Johannis *auditor*, Polycarpi *contubernalis vetus homo, teſtata reliquit. The Preſbyters that ſaw* John, *remember that they heard this of him: and* Papias, *Saint* John's *Audi-*

P. 498. *tour, that dwelt with* Polycarpus, *an ancient man, left theſe things teſtified.* This ſurely ſounds ſomewhat towards a teſtimony of *Apoſtolick Tradition*, and if it be capable of an anſwer reconcileable with your doctrine of *Tradition*, (as that *Irenæus* was miſtaken in him, and with him Saint *Jerome*, in taking him for one

of

of Saint *John*'s Auditours, when ſaith *Euſeb. l.* 3. *c.* 39. he himſelf confeſſes ἀκριβῶς μὲν ἢ ἀυτόπτου ἑαυτὸν γενέσθαι, παρεληφέναι δὲ τὰ περὶ τῆς πίστεως ἅπερ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνοις γνωρίμων διήκουεν) may yet certainly be acknowledged a difficulty worth your taking notice of. And yet you that were ſo large on that of *Juſtin* to little purpoſe, have not vouchſafed to take notice of this of *Irenæus*, but on the other ſide affirm, that *Irenæus* laboured very much, and ſpent many Chapters in proving of it. From whence, I confeſs you are willing to aſſume, that all at that time were not perſuaded of the truth of the *Millenaries* fancies; but as that is a ſtrange way of concluding, from his ſpending pains and Chapters to prove it, to infer that it was not generally believed in his age (when 'tis poſſible, his ſo large a proving did make all men then of that opinion, and his proving it poſitively, and not againſt any adverſary, though it doth not prove he had then no adverſary, doth much leſs prove that he had) ſo is there not added by you any other, or indeed, any tittle of anſwer to what is brought by his *Lordſhip* out of *Irenæus*.

His Lordſhip ſaith alſo in this Paragraph, that they that were after againſt the *Millenaries*, never quoted any for themſelves before *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, who lived 250 years after *Chriſt*: this indeed ſounds ſomewhat toward concluding, that that was the doctrine of the firſt age, not oppoſed by any prime *Doctour*, and might be worth your pains in anſwering too, but you endeavour not that neither, but would make it improbable, that if it were ſo general a doctrine, *Dionyſius* ſhould dare to oppoſe it. This is very ill arguing againſt a matter of fact, to aſk how could or durſt he? there is nothing done ſo many years ſince, but ſome *probability* may, by a witty man, be brought againſt it; I confeſs I acknowledge my opinion, that there were in that age men otherwiſe minded (as out of *Juſtin* it appeared) and his *Lordſhip* ſaith nothing to the contrary out of any other evidences, (no more than we made it clear he did out of *Juſtin*) all that he ſaith is, that *Papias* had gotten the *prime Doctours* into the belief of it, and that no one of thoſe two firſt ages oppoſed it, that is, wrote or interpoſed in any conſiderable manner againſt it. *Section* 15.

And if I were apt to change my opinion in this matter, on eaſy terms, I ſhould go near to doe it upon the view of your proof of the contrary; ſo exceeding feeble and weak is it. For ſuppoſing all the eminent men for thoſe ages had been for it, upon the ſtrength of ſome places of *Scripture*, and *Papias* his report from Saint *John*; it would not yet be very difficult for a learned man, *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* (when no act of *Council* had interpoſed or bound up that doctrine) in the degree that he thought that thoſe places of Scripture were miſunderſtood, and that *Papias* had abuſed them, in the ſame degree I ſay, to declare his opinion and the grounds of it, and never force or *ſtrain his own conſcience*, or incur the blame of hereſie by ſo doing, *Section* 16.

For what think you of another opinion that *Irenæus* took up, juſt upon the ſame terms, of *Chriſt*'s being betwixt 40 and 50 years old, for which he vouched Scripture, as he did for tother, and the authority of *omnes ſeniores* (larger than *Presbyteri* in tother) *teſtantur qui in* Aſia *apud* Johannem *diſcipulum Domini convenerunt, id ipſum tradidiſſe eis* Johannem, *&c. All the Elders witneſs it, that were in* Aſia *with* John, *that he delivered it to them; & qui alios Apoſtolos viderunt, hæc eadem ab ipſis audierunt, & teſtantur de ejuſmodi relatione, they that ſaw the other Apoſtles, heard the ſame of them, and bear witneſs of ſuch a relation.* This is as high an expreſſion of *Apoſtolical Tradition* (if we will believe *Irenæus*) as univerſally teſtified to be ſo, as any could be thought to be. And yet ſure you would not think it a *ſin againſt conſcience*, or obnoxious to the cenſure of *Hereſie*, for any man of meaner parts and authority than *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, to have oppoſed this *phanſy*, and profeſt his opinion to the contrary; you muſt know, that there was not that perfect yoke of tyranny gone out upon all mens necks, as now your *infallible Church* doth glory of, that no man muſt oppoſe any the meaneſt aſſertion or opinion of the Doctours of the Church, (though not at all *de fide*) but preſently he muſt be an *Heretick*; at leaſt, *divinity* was not turn'd into ſuch an *art*, that it muſt receive no growth, or ſenſible *change*, but all go on in the ſame track, believe (nor underſtand) no more in Scripture, than the *preſent Church* underſtands, and ſo in effect have all their skill in *tongues* and *fathers* and even their judicative faculty, as ſo many unprofitable burthens upon them, that muſt not be made uſe of to the diſcovery of an errour, to the helping of the world to more light, reforming any thing that is amiſs in it. *Adverſ. hær. l.* 2. *c.* 39. C.

This which is one of the greateſt modern crimes in *Chriſtianity*, was not ſo ancient as thoſe purer days, wherein ill life was as cenſurable, as now falſe opinions, (I mean ſuch as though ſuppoſed falſe, are yet perfectly *extrinſecal* to the *analogy of faith*) wherein ἀσέβεια and εὐσέβεια, *impiety* and *piety*, divided the Church into erroneous and true members, and teaching of opinions not before embraced (ſo it were not with pride, or judging of others) could be well enough endured. And ſo (according to the old rule of *diſtingue tempora*) do but conſider how diſtant thoſe times are from theſe, amongſt you on one ſide, and your oppoſite extreme (that run from you ſo far, till they meet you again at the *Antipodes*) on the other, and you will give *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* leave to dare oppoſe that doctrine of the *Chiliaſts*, though it had (more generally than it did) prevailed amongſt them. *Section* 18.

Another argument you have againſt the general reception of that doctrine, [*that 'tis probable Saint* Dionyſius *the Areopagite oppoſed it*] I wonder one that aſſerts an *infallible Church*, ſhould deal ſo mightily in *probabilities*, juſt as if a profound *Geometer* ſhould uſe but *topical* arguments. Now to ſee how you prove this *probability*, *'Tis proved by the works now extant bearing his name.* *Section* 19. D.

What works thoſe are, and how improbable to be his, I could give you a large account by ſome hints which I remember *Photius* in his μυριόβιβλον helpt me to, but I ſhall ſatisfy my ſelf onely with anſwering your argument out of *Philoponus*, briefly thus. That in the places by you cited, he mentions onely an *Epiſtle* of *Dionyſius* to *Polycarpus*, in which you know, or may know, there is no word of the *Chiliaſts*, and then that will be a very aliene teſtimony, and very unable to countenance the bulk of thoſe books under *Dionyſius* his name; which may all be ſpurious, (and in them the teſtimonies againſt the *Chiliaſts*) though that letter ſhould be canonical; and now ſee, I pray, what your probability is come to. E.

For your diſcourſe about the *Quartodecimani*, I will not divine how it came in here, but am ſure it hath no right to be taken notice of by me; his *Lordſhip* having not ſaid one word of them, nor of any friend of theirs whoſe intereſts lie common with them; and therefore ſhall I return no word to that part of your diſcourſe, till you ſhew how I am obliged to it. *Section* 20.

Section 21. F. What his *Lordship* ſaith out of *Salvian*, you confeſs to be true, but ſee not what it makes againſt *Tradition*; If you be not modeſt in concealing your knowledge in this matter, but really ignorant, I ſhall then tell you. His *Lordſhip* proves by this, that the *Church* that ſuffers *Salvian* to be a member of it, while he refuſes to paſs ſentence of condemnation upon *Arians* (after they were condemned by a *Council*) either differs much from your *Church* (that will condemn any man for an *Heretick*, that ſhall profeſs not to condemn all Proteſtants) or elſe muſt ſuppoſe and admit the plea for *Salvian*, that he was ſo earneſt againſt *ill* men, that for aggravating of their crime he leſſens that of *Hereticks*. And then if it may be accepted in one *Father*'s behalf, that he could ſpeak *hyperbolically*, or paſſionately, why may it not be admitted in *another*, that one of thoſe, or ſome other collateral conſideration might have influence on any ſpeech that ſhould be cited from them, and then the authority of Fathers will ceaſe to be *infallible*.

Section 22. For this, by the way, you may pleaſe to obſerve of his Lordſhip's reaſonings about *Tradition* and *authority of Fathers*, (which before I gave warning of) that they are not deſigned, or fitted to the taking away all *authority* from them, to make them vile or mean to any, but onely to reduce them *in ordinem*, to prove them not *infallible*: the *Topick à teſtimonio humano*, is but a *Topick* ſtill; and though ſometimes, being heightened with circumſtances (of which it is capable) it is a very convincing *Topick*, yet is not for all this, a *demonſtration*; and ſo there is a *difficulty* which may exerciſe you inſtead of *ſcoffing* of his *Lordſhip* in the cloſe of the Chapter.

To the 26, 27, 28. Sections, Chap. 16.

The Enquirer ſeems to be troubled not a little, becauſe we will not ſay with him, that men may be ſaved in a falſe Religion, or becauſe we do not think our Religion falſe, or any other Religion true beſides our own; and in the ſame vein Chillingworth *his Commentatour runs very fluently, and upon this ill-ſounding ſtring is harping continually. Yet for all this harping, it will not be eaſily underſtood what offence againſt Charity it can be for us to judge, either that Chriſtianity alone is the ſaving Religion, or that our Religion is the onely true Chriſtianity. For ſay we ſhould be deceived in making this judgment, yet this ſame at the moſt can be but a want in our ſelves of right underſtanding, and not any breach of charity towards others, or any matter of exclamation, as ſome frivolous men of late have made it. Wherefore, if we will ſtate the queſtion rightly, we are not to enquire whether we want charity in holding that none but Catholicks and true Chriſtians can be ſaved, or in our holding that we onely are of that ſort; or again, whether our Adverſaries for their accuſing us, want not wit and charity together, or at leaſt one of them; but the queſtion between us ought to be, whether there be more ſaving religions than one? or whether ours be not that one? and this is the old controverſie in* Bellarmine *and others, and may be diſputed without any anger, or without diſguiſing, or multiplying of controverſies on ſet purpoſe, done by theſe Novelliſts, as it ſeems, for making more buſineſs than needed, or cauſing more diſtaſte and alienation than was before.*

The Enquirer is much diſpleaſed with us for damning, as he calls it, all that are not of the Church of Rome. *But for pacifying of his angry ſpirit, I demand of any for him, what ſin he thinks it in us to judge that all who die out of the Church of God, die in an evil ſtate; or what other, to think that our Catholick Church, which he diminutively calls the Church of* Rome, *is the onely Church of God. Let him ſatisfy me in this, and I will eaſily ſatisfy him in the other. In the mean time we are not nice to declare, That there is but one ſaving Religion. That there is but one true Chriſtianity, and that one is the ſaving Religion. That there is but one Catholick Church, and that this one Church is, by the inſtitution of* Chriſt, *and according to the conſent of Antiquity, to be governed by the See Apoſtolick, and by the Succeſſour of Saint* Peter, *as chief Paſtour and Preſident of the reſt. Now what hurt is there in all this, or what want of Chriſtian charity? It is not uncharitable to ſay that ſome offenders ſhall be damned, and if any, then why not thoſe who are truly and really Sectaries and men obſtinate, for it is like that they deſerve it as well as any. There wanted not one of this Enquirer's confraternity, who fancied ſometimes to himſelf, that all the damnation that was to fall upon the wicked, was an annihilation of them and extinction, and not a perpetuity of torments; which conceit is ſo charitable, that it exceeds the charity even of God himſelf, and controlls his revelations made to the contrary in the Holy Scripture, and condemns them as guilty of too much rigour and ſeverity, and therefore no marvail though we poor mortals cannot eſcape their cenſure.*

But now, leſt any man ſhould think our doctrine to be harſh and rigorous, he may pleaſe to be inform'd, that we do not hold every man for a Pagan and an Infidel who embraces Paganiſm, but onely ſo many of them as be guilty of their errour through affected, or culpable ignorance; which defect though it be a formal ignorance of the truth, yet it is a virtual knowledge of their errour, and an interpretative rejection of the truth, and alſo a reſiſtance to God and his divine veracity, manifeſted in his revelations; and therefore all theſe, whether Pagans or Hereticks, be hainous offenders, and αὐτοκατάκριτοι, that is to ſay, judged and condemned by their own Conſciences, of which doctrine it ſeems both this Enquirer, and after him his ſecond Maſter Chillingworth, *were ignorant, by their inſinuating that no man is an Heretick, or ſelf-condemned, but onely ſuch as adhere to a doctrine which he formerly knows to be erroneous, that is to ſay, onely ſuch as doe that which is impoſſible to be done; which concluſion is a covert affirmation that there be no Hereticks at all, nor can be any; and ſo all is ſafe, whether ſound or no.*

In like manner we do not hold to be an Heretick, or to be out of the Catholick Church every one who embraces an hereſie, but ſuch a number of them onely as doe it with an obſtinate mind, and without preparation to be reformed, or to hearken unto reaſon when it is told them. By which doctrine it appears, that we are not ſo ſtrict as we may ſeem, nor yet ſo large as ſome would have us. For on the one ſide, we do not maintain that Hereticks can be ſaved, or that hereſie is not a deadly or damnable ſin, as ſome Socinians and other Libertines would have us think: And on the other ſide, we dilate the ſpaces of the Church Catholick farther than every body conceives we do, and by that means comprehend within it many that in the eye of the world, ſeem aliens unto it; ſo that our charity is not irregular in judging Hereticks to be in good ſtate, but it is rather in concluding that very many are not Hereticks really and interiourly, though outwardly they ſeem to be. And thus you ſee we do not cry all men down to Hell, nor yet any more than we are compelled to do by the doctrine delivered to us about that point in Holy Scripture.

After this damning and firing men in the other world, of which the Enquirer hath wrongfully accus'd us, he proceedeth to blame us for ſending Hereticks to the fire in this, and therefore ſaith that he believes that throughout antiquity we ſhall not find the putting to death of any (for Religion) but onely of ſuch as began to kill firſt.

This provocation to antiquity, howſoever the matter be, can be of no force, unleſs antiquity did condemn that practice as unlawfull, becauſe antiquity did not all it might doe, but left divers things for poſterity to add as it ſhould ſee expedient.

Beſides,

Beſides, foraſmuch as concerns puniſhment of impious men and innovatours both by death and other ways, if the Authour had lookt better into antiquity, he could not but have believed otherwiſe, as our Authours do ſhew at large; for it is clear that amongſt the Jews it was the practice to puniſh impious people very ſeverely, and all ſuch as with new doctrines ſought to infect others, puniſhing according to the preſcript of Moſes's *law, ſome with death, other-ſome by other temporal puniſhments.*

The Canon-law alſo and the Imperial Decree the ſame, to all which the practice of the Church accords; and laſtly, reaſon her ſelf, and the common rules of equity and juſtice do permit, yea and preſcribe the ſame: and theſe ſuffrages are ſo powerfull and prevailing, as they ſuffice, not onely for the juſtification of the Churches preſent practice, but alſo for the condemnation of high preſumption and arrogance of all who ſhould be ſo hardy as to impugn or queſtion it.

Nevertheleſs this ſame practice of infliction of temporal puniſhments upon offenders againſt Religion, is not general without any limitation or reſtraint, as ſome may imagine it to be, as if forſooth none of a different Religion from ours could be exempted from them; but contrariwiſe it admits exception in many caſes, as we are about to declare preſently.

Know therefore that whereſoever any Kingdom or Commonwealth is ſettled in a juſt and a peaceable poſſeſſion of Catholick Religion, without any notable commixture of contrary profeſſions, as for example, in Italy *or* Spain, *at this preſent; In this caſe it is no cruelty or rigour to inflict temporal puniſhments upon all ſuch as ſhall adventure to diſturb that ſetled peace by introducing thither any new doctrines upon pretence of whatſoever reformation; and that this may be done, ſtands with ſo much reaſon as cannot be probably contradicted. Neither is this courſe of ſeverity any defence unneceſſary, foraſmuch as vitious and over-weening ſpirits are moſt efficaciouſly repreſſed and withheld from evil by fear of temporal puniſhments in this life, becauſe their chief aim is at temporal contentments in the ſame, being moved more with the preſent, than with thoſe other that are ſpiritual and to come, Conſcience and Religion having little influence into what they doe.* In fine, *they are governed more with ſenſe than reaſon, with ſtripes than with Philoſophy, inſomuch, that neither the Schools of Philoſophers, nor the Temples of God, can work half ſo much with theſe worms of the Earth, as temporal Tribunals can. Nor though the enemy be never ſo deſpicable, is he therefore to be neglected, becauſe the meaneſt Seducer may doe miſchief, as we find by the effects of the Tubmen; and again, becauſe the groſſeſt errours, if they tend to liberty, or be but new, may be perſuaded to the multitude, as, by the ſucceſſes of* Mahomet, *it is manifeſt; and the rather in this caſe of ours, becauſe we experience daily, that our people having been once poſſeſt, that the Religion of the See Apoſtolick, and of their own Forefathers was ſuperſtition, they are eaſily perſuaded, that the farther they depart from that Religion, the more pure and reformed they ſhall be, and ſo will be forward to run blindly on, till they paſs all the bounds of Chriſtianity, and reform all to nothing; for with ſuch bewitched minds as theſe, every new nonſenſe will be more acceptable, and be received ſooner, than any old ſenſe, and this is the effects of thoſe raylings againſt* Rome *which they have heard continually out of the Pulpits now for ſo many years together, without any intermiſſion.*

But, although this courſe of ſeverity be neceſſary for the preventing of diſturbances by innovation, yet nevertheleſs it is not to be extended unto all that any where amongſt us do teach, or profeſs erroneous doctrines, or Religions different from our own, but onely againſt corruptours or invaders, that is to ſay, ſuch as break in by fraud or violence, and diſturb the quiet of the Church. For, after ſuch time as the invaſion is paſt, and the invaders gone, and that they are ſucceeded by another generation, which is not guilty of making any irruption, but, with whatſoever errour they are tainted, it is contracted by the vice of education from their Parents and other ſuch inſtructours, and withall do behave themſelves peaceably, I ſay that againſt ſuch as theſe the Church doth not proceed, nor execute the ſeverity of the Laws in force againſt Hereticks; of this ſort be at this day, the deſcendents of firſt Proteſtants in this Kingdom, whoſe Anceſtours that were the invaders lived about King Edward *and Queen* Mary. *Againſt theſe deſcendents the Church doth not preſs the Canon-law, though againſt the former ſort it did, and had juſt cauſe given ſo to doe. Conformable to this difference between Proteſtant and Proteſtant, do the Catholicks in* France *and* Polonia *ſuffer the Proteſtants to live with them, without moleſtation, and to enjoy the liberties and privileges of the Kingdom, as formerly they had done in* Auſtria, Stiria *and* Carinthia, *till ſuch time is they became ſeditious, and conſpired againſt thoſe who gave them freedom.*

But now let it be noted and born in memory, that notwithſtanding theſe gentle proceedings of Catholicks towards the Proteſtants after ſo many loſſes and injuries ſuffer'd from them, the ſame Proteſtants being themſelves but juniours, and living by ſufferance, fall hotly upon perſecution of Catholicks whereſoever they grow to be the ſtronger ſide, and that alſo in moſt Provinces, after a very violent, mercileſs, and deſperate manner, ſlay, impriſon, rob, baniſh, defame, in fine, ſuffer Catholicks in no place where they are predominant, and this againſt all right and common equity. Which manner of proceeding I muſt tell the Enquirer, is much worſe and more unreaſonable than Turkiſh, for the Turks though Aliens, Barbarians and Conquerours, are ſenſible of the right the Chriſtians of their conquer'd Provinces have for the free exerciſe of their Religion, and therefore do not go about to reſtrain them from it, but let them continue quietly in that right of theirs, and ſo they do even to this day, to the great ſhame of Proteſtants and Puritans here in theſe Kingdoms, may it be ſpoken without offence, being, as all men ſee plainly, exceeded in juſtice, and civility by the Turks, "*Wherefore* "*no marvail that our Enquirer is forced to confeſs that* Calvin *is to blame in this point, and the Church of* England "*a little: which is a little too much, for, addeth he,* Negare manifeſta non audeo, & excuſare immodica non "poſſum. *Sure this Enquirer came with very little indifferency to give his judgment here, when he ſaith, the Church of* England *is guilty but a little, I would know of him what is a great deal, if all that we have ſuffer'd from it be but a little, But it is well he would acknowledge thus much, for it is more than others have done, and more ingenuity appears in him, than in them, and perhaps he would have ſaid more, if it might have been well taken, though in confeſſing this little he inſinuates all. Doubtleſs, no manner of proceeding can be more unworthy than for a latter generation to forget from whoſe loyns they came, and to become harſh and contumelious to their own Fore-fathers children, and perſecute them with all rigour, as if they were enemies and invaders, and aliens, onely for their honourable continuing in that faith which their Anceſtours did leave them and commended to them as chief inheritance in that faith, which hitherto they which aſſail it have never been able by any argument to prove it falſe; nor yet on the other ſide, to evict by any unanſwerable demonſtration that their own new faith was true. Wherefore ſince, if any have more right one than another for the exerciſe of their Religion in this Kingdom, it is we, and this right cannot be taken from us by any power under Heaven; and again, were your reaſons never ſo good, yet you are not to ſchool us, or to be our Tutours, or to compell us unto change: Therefore the ſeverity that hath been uſed over us hath no warrant for it, no preſident or example, nothing wherewith to countenance it in the ſight of the World, or to juſtify it in the ſight of God, but is every way abominable and foul, ſuch, in fine, as neither the Chriſtians uſed to the Pagans their Predeceſſours, nor Catholicks to the deſcendents of the formoſt and invading Proteſtants, nor any civil man would offer to another.*

" *If the Religion, ſaith the Enquirer, had always remained the ſame, it would not be defended by ways ſo contrary* " *to thoſe by which it was propagated. But now what ways are theſe? he means force and violence, and ſaying,* To the fire with him, *and* To hell with him, *for theſe are the Enquirer's own expreſſions. To theſe I add the ſlanderous and diabolical charges of* Chillingworth, *who knew much of the Enquirer's mind, although in all things he did not follow his direction.* " *You profeſs, ſaith* Chillingworth, *c. 2. Sect. 101. that it is lawfull for you to uſe violence* " *and power whenſoever you can have it for the planting of your Doctrine, and extirpation of the contrary. Thus he, but becauſe he cites no Authour for this ſo hainous an accuſation, we may juſtly ſuſpect that you your ſelves hold it lawfull for you to ſlander and calumniate for the defence of your own bad cauſe, and the overthrowing of the contrary whenſoever other means of doing it does fail you, as indeed it falls out continually. The ſame heavy charge he in foul terms reiterates, c. 5. Sect. 96.* " *You, ſaith he, teach plainly you may propagate Religion whenſoever you have power, by* " *depoſing of Kings, and invaſion of Kingdoms, and think when you kill the adverſaries of it you doe God good ſervice.*

For clearing of us againſt this malitious charge, I call into the Court Saint Thomas *of* Aquine *and all his with him in 2. 2. q. 10. art 8. as witneſſes ſufficient to juſtify our cauſe, and ſhew our innocency, even againſt the Devil himſelf that great calumniatour of our Brethren, and to them I add* Acoſta *in his book* De procuranda Indorum ſalute, *and* Mariana *in his hiſtory of* Spain *in ſundry places, and might add many more ſufficient to confute the adverſary, and make him hatefull to every honeſt heart. Beſides though in ſome caſes we, as other profeſſions alſo doe, make uſe of penal Laws wherewith to keep off invaders, and yet not for any interiour preſervation or defence: In like ſort we ſeek, by the help of the ſword and force of Arms to keep the Turks out of Chriſtendom; ſhall we all be blamed for doing ſo, or ſhall it be ſaid therefore, that we defend the Chriſtian Religion by Arms and violence, and by other means than it was propagated at the firſt? nothing leſs, we uſe reaſons to perſuade and plant our faith, we uſe the like to defend it againſt Infidels, Socinians, and all other Sects, how then is our Religion planted, propagated, or defended by violence? It is one thing to be fenced exteriourly and afar off with Statutes of temporal ſeverity againſt invaders, which courſe is a thing expedient and avowed both by us and all, and it is another thing to defend it interiourly by the ſame means, that is to ſay, to juſtify the right and truth of Religion by them, and this we diſavow, neither do we practice it any where, as it is moſt manifeſt.*

The Enquirer was very provident when he deſired that, in theſe accuſations of violence, no recrimination ſhould be uſed, for he muſt needs ſee there was more matter returnable, than either could be gratefull, or they could juſtify, yet ſince he will needs talk of killing, and caſt the blame upon our ſide, he muſt be content if we make ſome reflexion upon the miſdemeanours of the Adverſary, as well as upon our own innocency. I deſire therefore, the intelligent Reader to conſider, whether in this laſt age, the Catholicks have put to death more Miniſters or half ſo many, as the Proteſtants of England *have done Prieſts, who it is well known they have ſlain and butchered with great barbariſm and immanity.*

But ſetting aſide theſe heavy crimes of bloud deliberately ſhed, who is it have afflicted others more in their Eſtates and Fortunes, they, or we? and for proof of this, we will offer fair, let them reſtore all they have taken with a ſtrong hand from us in livelihoods, both ſpiritual and temporal in all the Provinces of Europe, *and we will reſtore all we have taken from them, and in that go no farther than this ſeventeenth Age which is now paſſing, be it in this Kingdom, or in thoſe about it. It is well known that in all thoſe Provinces, where both Religions are profeſſed and live intermingled, none be on the ſuffering hand but we, none perſecutes but they; and it is we who are the* Aborigines, *as I may ſo term us, and thereby have as much right for all indemnity as our Anceſtours could divolve upon us. We are not inſenſible of the wrong we ſuffer daily by having it printed and pronounced in publick Aſſemblies, on purpoſe to countenance injuries, and to excite againſt us the ignorant multitude, that our Religion is deſtructive of all others, and that amongſt us it is a main principle or maxime, that all other are to be invaded and deſtroyed by us, and this is affirmed confidently, though againſt all probability and experience. It cannot indeed be denied but truth is deſtructive of falſehood by the own power, as light is of darkneſs, and one contrary of another, but for external coaction or violence, we leave that to the Accuſers, and do not own it.*

Maſter *Pym* in the Parliament Houſe.

By this it is not hard to make a judgment who have been the encroachers, and who have propagated and maintained themſelves by violence, you, or we? and who are the deſtructive party and live by the ſpoils and oppreſſion of others; let not thoſe who poſſeſs other mens goods cry out of wrongs, or make any brags of juſt dealing, for neither of theſe can come well out of their mouths.

This Enquirer confeſſeth both ſides are in fault, but we in more, and for this aſſertion of his brings in ſome light ſophiſtry, becauſe forſooth Proteſtants hold that they may err, but we maintain we cannot, and ſo will be ſure never to mend. That Proteſtants may err is granted him, and needs no other probation than experience, whereby we find they have filled all this Kingdom with diſſentions, and theſe diſſentions with civil wars, ſo that by this that you have erred, we know you may. But ſo frequent poſſibility of erring doth not extenuate but aggravate your crime. For if you may err ſo foulely, how dare you undertake to tutour others? how preſcribe laws? with what face perſecute? If your rule be ſo weak as it cannot contain you all in one body, but lets you diſperſe into multitude of Sects, and fall in pieces as now you do; why do you not forſake it and ſeek a better for it, or elſe have none at all; if you can find out a ſurer, why do you not learn wit by experience, but wallow on ſtill in the ſame mire; If this Enquirer ſpeak ſo ill for his Clients, we will not entertain him for our Advocate. The Proteſtants ſide ſets down for a rule of religion every ones private judgment in the interpretation of Scripture, and ſo doth Maſter Chillingworth *the diſciple of* Volkelius. *We doe all that, yet we do not pleaſe them; nay more, we muſt be puniſhed by them for the reſult; what is this but to bid us doe a thing, and then puniſh us for doing it? Is not this extreme perverſity? certainly if the rule they give be a ſufficient warrant for their receding from the faith of their Anceſtours, and for their breaking off from the Church, and ſtanding in defiance of her, then doubtleſs much more may it warrant us to continue on and to keep off from any new doctrines, either of the Proteſtants, or any other Innovatours whatſoever, and ſure this is great reaſon and cannot be gainſayed.*

Beſides, if we were to yield, to whom were it to be done? There is a world of diſtracted Sectaries now in this Kingdom, all ſprung from the ſame root, or from the rule of faith which is common to you all, of which one ſort imagines there is no Papacy, and theſe were the firſt Ring-leaders of all the rout; another, that there is no Epiſcopacy; a third, that there is no Clergy, but that Lay-elders is all in all, and muſt rule the roaſt; a fourth, that there is no Church nor Church-government at all, but that the Church is like a School of Philoſophers, where every man may believe and doe what he pleaſes without being accountable to another, or any obligation of conformity; and peradventure the Enquirer was one of this number, together with his confederate Mr. Chillingworth; *a fifth ſort, that there is no Trinity; a ſixth,*

that

that there is no Sacrament, or at leaſt none neceſſary, or effectual. Is it not fit think you that theſe divided Chriſtians ſhould come and write Laws to others, or puniſh any man for non-conformity? nothing more improbable. It is a Comedy to ſee Doctour Featly *a Proteſtant, and* Page *a Puritan make Catalogues of Hereticks, and when they have done, can find no way whereby to exempt themſelves, nor give a reaſon why they themſelves ſhould not be of the number, as much Sectaries as any other of the Catalogue.*

The Enquirer charges us that becauſe we pretend to be infallible we have leſs reaſon to preſcribe to others; but on the contrary, methinks we ſhould have more, for, as he who is really infallible is fitteſt to guide and govern others, ſo he that thinks himſelf to be, is at leaſt in his own judgment more fit than he that does not. He adds, that this pretence of infallibility makes us ſure never to mend, or as his Scholar Chillingworth *ſpeaketh, makes us incorrigible. True if it were a mere pretended one, but that is not yet proved, either by him, or any, although he ſay here in this twenty eighth Section, he undertakes to give reaſons why the* Church of Rome *is fallible. But, if, on the other ſide, it be a reality, and that the Enquirer's reaſons are but pretended, then ſurely will not this infallibility keep us from mending, but contrariwiſe from erring or having any thing to mend, or, which is all one, from any errours to correct. And thus we ſee that our Religion is maintained by the ſelf-ſame arts that bred it, that is to ſay, not by force, or violence, but by reaſon, and revelation, and ſpiritual induſtries, contrary to the ſurmiſes of this Enquirer.*

Chap. 16. *Anſwer to Chap.* 16.

Your doctrine of damning all that are out of the *Church* of *Rome*, you have enlarged much above the occaſion that invited you to it, for all that his *Lordſhip* had ſaid on that Theme was onely this, that *your certain and undoubted damning of all out of the Church of* Rome, *averſeth him from it*. Which if it be true, you cannot blame him; (for ſure they that hear the puniſhment of *judging*, Matth. 7. [*being judged of the Lord*] will have little love to that piece of *ſenſuality*, (or conſequently, to the religion that requires them to run upon this danger.) And that the charge is true of you, you do at firſt acknowledge, by labouring to prove that there is no *uncharitableneſs* in it. Secondly, that it is neceſſary for you to maintain, or that otherwiſe you muſt fall into ſome great abſurdity, particularly this, that there is any *Church but that which is governed by the See Apoſtolick*; which is a rare *petitio principii* again, and ſaves us the pains of ſaying one word more in defence of the truth and juſtice of thoſe true words of his *Lordſhip*. *Section* 1.

For indeed, that encloſure of the *Church*, *Chriſtianity* and *Salvation*, to thoſe that are under the *Roman* ſubmiſſion, is the *uncharitableneſs* that you are charged of. The envy of which, it ſeems (after all your confidence) you are willing to remove from you, and therefore add an handſome lenitive, to keep any from thinking that your doctrine is rigorous or harſh. And truly if you might be taken at your word, he were very unkind that would require more charity of you than you yield even to *Pagans* themſelves, whom you will not hold *Pagans*, unleſs they be *guilty of their errour through affected or culpable ignorance*; and then ſure you will be as good to us, (that would be a little above *Pagans*) and till you can prove us to be guilty of *errour*, and that through *affected or culpable ignorance*, with an obſtinate mind, without preparation to be reformed, or hearken to reaſon when 'tis told us, (which till your arguments are more convincing, undoubtedly this diſcourſe of yours will not evidence us to be) we are in full capacity of your *charity*, and therefore ſhall not follow you any further, (leſt we provoke you again) in this point. *Section* 2.

Eſpecially ſince you are at leaſt in ſo good humour, that you utterly diſclaim this damning and firing men in another world. I beſeech God to confirm you in this temper, and deſire you may be taken at your word, and that witneſs may be called of this charity of yours, for ſure there be others of your brethren that have not uſed to grant ſo much. *Section* 3. On occaſion of this or the like ſpeech of mine anſwer, the *Apologiſt* in his review thought fit to add theſe words at the end of his ſixteenth *Chapter*: [*Three propoſitions there are which we maintain; Firſt, that none but true Chriſtians can be ſaved. Secondly, none but true Catholicks can be ſaved; for true Catholicks and true Chriſtians be all one. Thirdly, none be true Catholicks but ſuch as live under the obedience of the See of* Peter, *and many do ſo, that through ignorance do not ſeem to do. The Gentiles find fault with the firſt propoſition, divers Sectaries with the ſecond, and now the Proteſtants with the third. All theſe have been pretended by ſome or other to be falſe, but how to be uncharitable is very hard to be underſtood.*] To all which ſaying onely ſaid, not attempted to be proved, I ſhall onely ſay that I am ſorry to ſee him out of his good mood ſo ſoon, and deſire he will not expect we ſhall be ſo tame as to think him *charitable*, that ſaith none of any other See but Saint *Peter's* can be ſaved.

As for that of burning men here for religion, you ſeem unwilling to be tried by *antiquity* in this point, becauſe, ſay you, *Antiquity did not all it might, but left ſomewhat to poſterity to add*; yet ſure this was a little unlucky, that your additions to antiquity ſhould be of this bloudy complection; *Chriſt's* addition to the Ancients was, to *love, and bleſs, and pray for enemies*, not to retaliate injuries upon any terms; and your ἄκρον φιλοσοφίαν, your improvement of the ancient doctrine and practice, is of ſomewhat a diſtant making, your *Sermon on the mount* (*Ebal* it ſeems) to your diſciples, is perſecuting and maſſacring of friends, which never provoked you but by not being entirely of your opinion. *Section* 4.

But it ſeems you mean to prove it too, that this bloudy doctrine is no ſtranger to *antiquity*; and your firſt proof is from the *Jews*, whoſe *practice* it was *to puniſh impious people*, and *ſuch as with new doctrines ſought to infect others*; To which I anſwer, that thoſe againſt whom thoſe *Jewiſh* ſeverities were in force, were *Atheiſts*, and *Idolaters*, and *falſe Prophets*, that would take men off from the acknowledgment of the one *God* to *Gentiliſm*, which is ſure ſomewhat a diſtant ſtate from that of *Proteſtants* at this day. *Section* 5.

Your ſecond proof is from the *Canon*, and your third from the *Imperial law*; of which ſeeing you give us no taſte in either, and yet becauſe ſome men may have appetite to ſee what grounds you had for ſuch affirmation, I conceived it a probable courſe to know your mind, by looking into *Bellarmine* your great *Champion*; from the view of whoſe *Collections*, *l.* 3. *de laicis*, *c.* 21. this will be the reſult. *Section* 6.

That for the *Canon-law*, the authorities are not fetcht from the ancient *Canons* of any of the firſt or general *Councils*, but onely *c. ad abolendam*; *cap. excommunicamus ext. de hæret. & cap. ſuper. eo, de hæret. in* 6. (all which is no more than if you had cited it from your *Popes* (who muſt not look to be ſo authentical in this caſe) and yet will hardly come home to the burning of your fellow *Chriſtians*, onely becauſe they will not ſubmit to the *Pope of Rome*, the onely thing for which we were even now to be damned) and from the *Council of Conſtance*; which beſides that it is of a ſhort ſtanding, about 200 years ago, is made infamous *Section* 7.

A. infamous in this matter, by that vile reſolution of the [*no Faith to be kept with Hereticks*] the groſneſs of which poſition may make it reaſonable to expect this bloudy doctrine from them, but withall, to deprive it of all authority with others.

Section 8. As for the *Imperial law*, theſe places he produces; Firſt *L. Manichæos, cod. de hæret.* and to this I anſwer, that that Law makes not *hereſie capital*, but at the utmoſt makes it capable of an action after death, ſuch is the action of *infamy*, *&c.* and ſo they that have died *Hereticks*, may for the warning of others, be proceeded againſt, (as you know Traitours after death are infamous, *i. e.* their Children deprived of their honour, though the Father died unpuniſhed, becauſe undiſcerned) but that comes not home to our preſent purpoſe of burning or killing. Then *L. Ariani, Cod. eodem.* where indeed death was the puniſhment of the *Manichees*, who you know were a high rank of Hereticks, making two principles (which is in effect *two Gods*) the *good* and the *evil*, *God* and the *Devil*. But for others, *viz. Arians* and *Macedonians*, though thoſe were Hereticks, condemned by the firſt general *Councils*, and are expreſly there named, there is yet no ſuch puniſhment appointed them; and laſtly, *L. quicunque, cod. eodem*, in which, ſaith *Bellarmine*, *jubentur occidi omnes qui prava docere tentant, all are commanded to be put to death who attempt to teach wicked things*. But you muſt obſerve that that law being againſt the *Eutychians*, many penalties are there aſſigned to the ſeveral degrees of the guilt of that hereſie; *pœna exilii, ſi Epiſcopos & Sacerdotes conſtituerint; ſcripta eorum nemo habeat ſub pœna deportationis perpetuæ; nemo eos audiat ſub pœna* 10 *librarum auri; ultimo ſupplicio coerceantur qui illicita docere tentaverint. Baniſhment if they conſtituted Biſhops or Prieſts; perpetual baniſhment upon having any of their books; 10 pounds or libres of gold to any that heard them; and capital puniſhment to thoſe that attempt to teach unlawfull things*. Which laſt clauſe (that cited by *Bellarmine*, and by him extended to all *falſe doctrine*) belongs peculiarly to the *Eutychians*, for of them onely before the diſcourſe was; and beſide, the rule is, *odioſa reſtringenda, laws of puniſhments, &c.* muſt always be taken in the moſt *reſtrained* ſenſe; and ſo the utmoſt that any of theſe extends to, is onely in theſe two *hereſies* of *Manichæiſm* and *Eutychianiſm*, and that in caſe of teaching the contrary to *law*, and abuſing the people, and that after fair warning and prohibition; and all this, if it were granted (as truly I know no obligation that lies on all *Chriſtians* to think themſelves regulated by the Laws of the *Emperours*) would amount to very little againſt *Proteſtants*, who may well paſs for as moderate *Hereticks*, as *Arians* and *Macedonians*, who were not puniſhed with death.

Section 9. 'Tis true indeed, there is ſomewhat of this nature to be found againſt the *Donatiſts* (though *Bellarmine* mentions it not) *L. Si quis rebaptizare, C. ne ſanctum baptiſma iteretur*; but this was not again for opinion, but onely in taking upon them to *re-baptize* any, and peculiarly on the *Circumcellions*, which were a bloudy kind of people, and their vileneſs of this nature, guilt enough to own that ſeverity; whereas, on the other ſide, we find that *Idacius* and *Ithacius* were condemned by the Biſhops of *France* for being authours of puniſhing ſome *Pricillianiſts* with the ſword; and in the *Eaſt* a whole Synod was condemned for conſenting to the burning of *Begomyle*; and ſo much for your authorities, or more whenſoever you pleaſe to produce them. From whence will appear the wide diſtance of your practices in theſe and other Kingdoms, from that, that the moſt *Popiſh Canons* or *Imperial Conſtitutions* were bloudy enough to determine; there, neither *Arians*, nor *Macedonians*, but that prodigy of *Manichæiſm*, and the *Eutychians* teaching, and that (as I conceive by *prava & illicita*) things *contrary* not onely to *wholſome doctrine*, but to the *laws* of the

B. *Empire*; This I ſay, becauſe if the crime were onely their *opinions*, I cannot imagine why the *Arians* and *Macedonians* ſhould fare ſo much better than the *Eutychians*, nay, why *Apoſtates* ſhould onely be fined, and *Jews* onely under ſome reſtraints (as from *Polygamy*) and payments, and not put to death, ſave onely in caſe of keeping their *Purym* (which was for the great contumely done to *Chriſt* in that feaſt, the hanging *Haman* in *effigie*, and *Chriſt* next to him) and I ſay, onely *Eutychians* put to death, unleſs there were ſomewhat elſe in it beſide there doctrine. And then if you will make the compariſon to go no farther, than our ſelves, what ſholes of poor perſons (far enough from the *docere illicita & prava, teaching illegal things*, even from teaching at all) were in *Queen Mary*'s days *πολὺς πολὺν*, *whole hecatombs* at once offered up to your fury.

Section 10. So remarkable are your proceedings herein, that I fear it was not a jeſt of him that ſaid at *Geneva*, Servetus *occidendus eſt, ne apud exteros Eccleſiæ noſtræ malè audiant*; *That* Servetus *was to be burnt, that their Churches might not hear ill abroad, i. e.* that the *Papiſts* might not be ſcandalized; (and a * Friend of theirs of late juſtifying that act of *Calvin*'s againſt the diſlikes of a learned Proteſtant, hath theſe words, *At Pontificii ipſi, Jeſuitæ dico ipſi*, Calvinum *pro eo facto nunquam damnârunt*. Servetum *quinimo rectè damnatum confitentur*) which if it were the conſideration that mov'd in that matter, then have you more bloud lying at your door, than what you have ſpilt, even that which in care and caution, thoſe whom you recriminate, ſhed by your *example*, and that you might not be ſcandalized at their mercy and lenity.

* Salmaſ. *under the name of* Simplic. Verinus *de lib. poſth.* Grotii.

Section 11. This were I confeſs an ill excuſe to them that were ſo carefull to tranſcribe that bloudy leſſon, (and which is worſe, if you will have mine opinion, they have no better) but yet will be an argument that you are not overfit to accuſe them for it. *Eraſmus* among you, and *Caſtellio* among us, were, about the beginning of the *reformation*, very bitter againſt ſuch dealing: the former, you may ſee his notes upon Saint *Jer. Ep. ad Læt. t.* 1. *p.* 39. where he can hardly allow them the name of *Chriſtians* that fight for religion (kill for religion) though againſt the *Turk*, as if war were wont to make *Chriſtians*, *cum ipſi Turcam in pectore geramus, when the very uſing of this violence is a prime piece of Turciſm*. The latter wrote a book on purpoſe againſt that practice; I wiſh the whole *Chriſtian* world of both parties would ſuffer themſelves to be repreſented by a couple of ſuch meek and honeſt *proxies*; be you pleaſed to convert as many as you can to the doctrine of neither killing nor damning, and I will promiſe you to doe the like, and that will be better employment for us than this debate. For ſure that of *Lactantius* was no unchriſtian divinity, *Si ſanguine, ſi tormentis, ſi malo religionem defendere velis, jam non defendetur illa, ſed polluetur atque violabitur. Such are not the means of defending, but of violating and defiling religion.*

Section 12. And becauſe *examples* are the moſt popular arguments, I will help you to one of this nature, and leave you to apply it; *Nero* went through *Greece* a contending in the *Muſica certamina* with all that pretended to that skill; if he had the better of it, he was crowned, if not, he took care that they that had the better

better of him, were put to death. The iſſue of it was, that they that had skill did on purpoſe play as ill as they could; he conquered wherever he came, was crowned when he was there, and when he was gone, was counted a mad-man.

I ſhall onely add, what upon more exact enquiry upon that hint of the *Canon-law* I find, that the elder *Canons* or *Decrees* of *Gratian* as they never mention the putting Hereticks to death; ſo in many paſſages out of Saint *Auſtin*, they do diſſuade the *Emperour* from it, and onely mention ſome other mulcts and reſtraints for them. The new *Canons* or the *Decretals* of your *Popes* are generally for delivering to the *ſecular arme*, but name not *pœnam mortis* neither; but what that ſignifies the *Chriſtian* world now knows well enough; onely one piece of hypocriſie I heard of (and by requeſt or propoſal of *Spalatenſis*, *L. 6. c. 5. Sect.* 171. do gueſs the truth of the report) in your proceedings in this matter; your Spiritual Courts when they ſo deliver up, are wont to interpoſe [*ita tamen ut non admittant pœnam mortis* (or to that purpoſe) *but ſo that they proceed not to death*] when yet they knew well enough, that that is the meaning of your delivering. Nay the *Canons* that require that the ſecular hand muſt proceed with all rigour againſt Hereticks thus delivered to them, will ſoon *excommunicate* any that do not thus underſtand their meaning. *Section* 13.

Beſides theſe arguments *ab authoritate*, you have another drawn, as you ſay, from *Reaſon*, and the common rules of *equity* and *juſtice*, (but add not one word to prove what you ſay ſo very improbably, but onely condemn all of high *preſumption and arrogance who ſhould be ſo hardy as to impugn or queſtion it*) one would think you an inchanted Knight, that when you have never a weapon in your hand, nor Second near you, (but onely the names of ſo many men, and arms, to call for) it ſhould yet paſs for *arrogance*, *preſumption* and *hardineſs* in any to combat with you. *Section* 14. C.

That you did not fitly produce your teſtimonies to your purpoſe, 'tis plain enough by what follows, the limitations and reſtraints that this doctrine, you ſay, muſt be bounded with, whereas your citations were general without any reſtraint. *Section* 15.

Your reſtraint or exception is, that where a *Kingdom is in a peaceable poſſeſſion of Catholick religion, there 'tis no cruelty to inflict theſe puniſhments on the Teachers of new doctrines.* And for this you ſay there is *reaſon*, which cannot probably be contradicted, but are ſo very uncourteous and contemptuous to us, as not to think us worthy to partake of the leaſt ſyllable of ſuch *reaſon*, unleſs that muſt go for one, that wicked men aim at temporal contents, and are conſequently with-held by temporal puniſhments, which ſhall be acknowledged a reaſon, when difference in *opinion* appears to be an impiety of ſo much *deſign*, and all whom you call *Hereticks*, are by you proved to be *worms of the earth*, deep-worldly *deſigners* alſo. *Section* 16.

For truly I confeſs, to all thoſe things which are committed by any, who may juſtly be preſumed to commit them againſt conſcience, for ſome worldly intereſt, I ſhould give my willing ſuffrage that ſome temporal bitterneſs ſhould be apportioned; that ſo ſeeing their *Errour*, and finding temporal *pains* inſtead of temporal *advantages* to be their portion, they may be diſciplin'd to better and more honeſt thoughts; nay, if the doctrines *tend to liberty*, I mean either as *Mahomet*'s did to all kind of voluptuous living, or that other liberty (that ſome of your friends, and ſome others that call themſelves *reformed*, but in my opinion are very far from it, have been guilty of) the ſhaking off the yoak of civil obedience to the Magiſtrate ſet over them by God, it is then lawfull to coerce ſuch *innovatours*, if the prudence of the State ſhall think fit. But difference in *opinion* (though it be in a Kingdom never ſo peaceably poſſeſt of the *Catholick* Religion) if it tend not to any of theſe dangers, nor be convincible of thoſe impieties and deſigns, will by no reaſon or conſequence be involved in that number. *Section* 17.

This you ſeem to be content with, when you add *that this ſeverity muſt not be extended to all that any where teach or profeſs erroneous doctrines*; but upon better conſideration of your following words, 'tis clear that your reſtraint or exception looks another way, *viz.* that againſt thoſe that are *not the firſt invaders, but another generation ſucceeding them, whoſe errour is contracted by the vice of education*, &c. *the Church doth not execute the ſeverity of the laws.* In which words, though we of this, and all other *Proteſtant Kingdoms* at this day, have ſo far our parts, as that, if it were never ſo much in your power, you ought upon theſe grounds not to hurt us, becauſe we are the progeny, and not the firſt invaders; yet ſeeing all the reſtraint is for the *execution onely of the ſeverity of the laws*, and thoſe laws are ſuppoſed by you to be *in force againſt Hereticks*, and ſo againſt us, whom you call by that name; we have great reaſon to think, there is little kindneſs in this preſent reſtraint of yours. *Section* 18.

For to the utmoſt of my underſtanding of your words, it remains ſtill free to you, after this conceſſion, to be as ſevere to any, as your power will enable you. And if by us at any time any claim of favour ſhould be put into your Conſiſtory, your anſwer probably would be by this *dilemma*; either you are *invaders*, (and ſeeing beginnings are always weakeſt, all that are not able to reſiſt or defend themſelves, ſhall go for *invaders*) and then you have no title to mercy by this tenure; or elſe you are a numerous *off-ſpring and progeny of them* (and ſo poſſibly able to *reſiſt*) and then you ſhall have *mercy*; If we ſtand on theſe terms with you, and your order for reſtraint of *ſeverity* hold no longer than our ſtrength to reſiſt you, then we ſhall ſcarce acknowledge the obligation, but think our enemies on the other extreme as kind as you; for both of you are good at being mercifull, when you are on the weaker party, but both very tyrannical when you begin to be ſtrong. *Section* 19. D.

If you were ſo conſtant to your articles of reſtraint, as that all the proſperities of war, advantages of place, and auxiliaries, could not tempt you to a maſſacre of any, ſave onely ſome one (ſingle *corrupter* and *invader*) or two in an age, I might then have reaſon to think I might have miſtaken your meaning; but certainly you have been as cruel on the cubs, as ever you were on the old foxes, and made as little ſcruple to put many thouſands to death in one night (whom you could not think to be all *leaders* in factions, or *invaders*) (as the ſtories of *France* will teſtify, and the very words of the *bull* of *Urban the eighth*, to encourage the King of *France*, to root out the *quadrupedes in Galliâ ſtabulantes*, &c. as any one *John Huſs* alone by himſelf at another time. And that you will have this latitude to let looſe your reſtraint again, when time ſerves, it may ſeem probable by what you add of *Auſtria*, *Stiria* and *Carinthia*, whoſe privileges it ſeems laſted no longer than you thought fit; For as ſoon as you thought it ſeaſonable, they were preſently pronounced *ſeditious* and *conſpiratours*, and ſo put to the ſword; and for *France* and *Poland*, I wiſh *Section* 20.

E. the names of *Maſſacres* had never been heard in either of them, or at leaſt that the *Pictures* of them with words of papal approbation, were not to be ſeen at *Rome* to teſtify what is the cauſe of your preſent kindneſs, (*viz.* the difficulty of the work) that the *Proteſtants* there at this time are not moleſted.

Section 21. As for your recrimination againſt *Proteſtants*, ſeeing it is very *univerſal* (*ſuffer Catholicks in no place*) and very ſharp, (*that they perſecute Catholicks whereſoever they are ſtronger, after a very violent, mercileſs, deſperate manner, ſlay, impriſon, rob, baniſh, defame*, &c.) I muſt beſeech you either to prove it againſt this your Country, or elſe to make it reparations, and remember when time ſerves, that when *Proteſtants* are thought to perſecute you, then preſently 'tis a *proceeding much worſe and more unreaſonable than the Turkiſh.*

Section 22. As for the truth of your ſuggeſtion, certainly the number and ſtrength of *Proteſtants* hath for many years ſurmounted that of *Papiſts* in this Kingdom; and yet I ſhall be confident you will be poſed to pro-

F. duce the *example* of any one ſince *Queen Mary*'s days that in this Kingdom was put to death merely for *religion*, without being guilty of ſomething elſe, which by the known laws of the *Realm* is liable to the puniſhment of *treaſon*. And for the other *penal* laws in this Kingdom, which are not *capital*, but *pecuniary* mulcts, *&c.* I ſhall ſay that 'tis ſomewhat hard; that we muſt be thought worthy of all thoſe bitter invectives, which you yet farther add, becauſe I conceive there was never any Kingdom, that own'd any *religion*, but there was ſome difference made betwixt that, and all other, in reſpect of temporal *privileges*, and *favours*, and *immunities*; and any ſuch difference reaches near as high, and goes as deep as pecuniary mulcts. And beſide it is not irrational to ſay, that the inflicting ſuch mulcts may very probably tend to the quiet, and ſo to the advantage rather, than to the oppreſſion of ſuch ſufferers; it being not without example, that the ſuſpicions of the people, and jealouſies that the eſtabliſhed religion ſhall be diſcountenanced, (having no deeper ground than an imagination that the *Prince* may have inclined to give *toleration* to the other party, or but *immunity* from theſe puniſhments) hath brought ſuch *odium* upon the preſent government, and ſharpneſs on thoſe thus thought to be favour'd, that in compariſon with theſe ill *accidents*, a few *pecuniary mulcts* might paſs for a *privilege*, as the letting of bloud is to be eſteem'd by thoſe who are entring into a *pluriſie* for want of it.

Section 23. If upon theſe conſiderations ſuch mulcts as theſe may not be conceived ſupportable, I muſt confeſs 'tis an hard lot to be placed in a throne betwixt two contrary pretenders, and as unhappy for any ingenuous man, to make any confeſſion to you, who from his *Lordſhip*'s acknowledgment, that the *Church of* Enggland *is a little to blame in this point*, conclude, that *in confeſſing this, he inſinuates all.* This 'tis to deal with men who cannot imagine it poſſible, that a man's words and thoughts ſhould be of the ſame latitude. Should I by the ſame Logick conclude, that you, by confeſſing that all *invaders for Religion* muſt be *put to death*, do intimate, that all kind of *Proteſtants* muſt be executed, I hope you would ſay you had wrong done you. And yet to tell you truth, the ſubtlety of your next diſtinction would give any man that obſerved it, great temptation ſo to conclude of you. For after your citation of S. *Th. of Aquine*, and the *Schoolmen*, you are pleaſed to communicate to us a notable *Myſtery*, [*that you do uſe reaſons to perſuade, and plant your faith*, (and truly the telling us you cannot *err*, and upon that bottom building all your moſt irrational concluſions, is no ſpecial exerciſe of the *reaſonable* faculty) *and onely fence it exteriourly, and afar off, with ſtatutes of temporal ſeverity againſt invaders, which*, ſay you, *is another thing from defending it interiourly by that means*, i. e. *from juſtifying the right and truth of religion by them.*]

Section 24. I ſhould never have been ſo uncivil as to have affixt ſuch a ſenſe to your diſtinction, had you not been

G. your own interpreter. It is, as if you had ſaid, you are not to be accuſed for planting religion by *arms*, becauſe your *ſwords* do onely force men to be of your minds, do not give them any reaſons why they ſhould. And truly I have not heard any man ſay, that your arms did *fence religion interiourly*, (being the unapteſt thing in the world, to *juſtify the right*, and *truth of religion*; and therefore you need not diſavow that ſo providently.) The great *Turk* could ſend a letter to your *Pope*, and anſwer and confute his *bull* of inciting the *Princes* of *Chriſtendom*, to take up arms againſt him, for crucifying their *god*, and tell him, that as 'twas a great falſity to charge on him what was proper to the *Jews*, the crucifying of *Chriſt*, (the *Turk* being deſcended from the *Trojans*, and therefore deſiring the *Pope*'s aid againſt the *Grecians*, to avenge their murther of the *Trojan Hector*, a kind of *god* of theirs) ſo if the *Pope* were truly a worſhipper of *Chriſt*, he would never *invade* any nation upon quarrel of *religion*; ſo far is this kind of fighting (in the knowledge of all, even of *Turks* themſelves) from juſtifying of the truth, that it is a very great argument of the falſeneſs of any ſect of *Chriſtian* Religion; a plain demonſtration that they do not obey the *Chriſt* whom they worſhip.

Section 25. The uſing *the ſword as an exteriour means of propagating your religion*, is all that is laid to your charge, and that it ſeems you are content to yield us. Though, within a page or two more, you have forgotten your ſelf again, and ſay, that *for publick coaction or violence you do not own it.* I wiſh you did not.

Section 26. And that you may for the time to come deal clearly, and never have mind to ſuck in your words, and own it again, I ſhall in paſſing mention to you a narration concerning an honeſt Philoſopher in *Valens* his time; It was *Themiſtius*, who before his death turn'd from *Ariſtotelian* to *Chriſtian*, but I conceive was not yet converted, when this ſtory is related of him. *Valens in Antioch*, ſaith the [a] Hiſtorian, *had vehemently perſecuted the Chriſtians that were not of his opinion, had not a book of* Themiſtius *the Philoſopher recall'd him, in which he perſuaded him, that he ought not to be cruel to any* [b] *for a difference of Eccleſiaſtical opinions, ſeeing among the Pagans themſelves there were more than* 300 *ſects differing all from one another; And perhaps this might be more* [c] *acceptable* (at leaſt more pardonable) *before God, becauſe God is not eaſily known, and is glorified in different manners, on purpoſe that every man may* [d] *fear the more, the more he wants of the integrity and perfection of that knowledge of him, either how he is, or how qualified, or how great he is. By the reaſons of* Themiſtius, ſaith he, *mitior factus eſt Imperator, the Emperour became more mild.* It may not be unfit for your friends to conſider the example, and doe ſo to.

[a] *Hiſt. Trip. l.* 8. *ex* Sozomen.

[b] *Propter diſcordiam Eccleſiaſticorum dogmatum.*

[c] *Forte hoc deo gratum magis eſſet.*

[d] *Magis timeat, i. e.* be more humble, as *fear* by Saint *Paul* is oppoſed to *high-mindedneſs*, and *fear and trembling* is by the *Greek* Fathers rendred *humility.*

As

As for your challenge to us, that if we will reſtore all we have taken from *Papiſts* in *Europe*, you will reſtorewhat you have taken from us, it is a good ſafe *boaſt*; you know that it is not in any replyer's power to ſtrike the bargain. Yet, if all the *pecuniary* mulcts under the reign of the three laſt *Princes* in this Kingdom be price enough to ranſom and fetch back the bloud ſhed by you in *Queen Mary*'s days, I doubt not but I ſhall be as forward as you to accept that challenge. *Section* 27.

Mean while for the juſtification of our ſevereſt Laws in this point, you cannot but confeſs that in moſt *Kingdoms* ſtrong preſumptions have been thought ſufficient to make liable to puniſhment. In the *Canon-law* the proving of *nudus cum nudâ*, that ſuch a man and woman were *taken naked* together, is preſumption enough to bring the puniſhment of adultery on any. And when our *Queen* had run ſo many dangers by *Prieſts*, and thereupon *Capital* Laws were made, that no ſuch ſhould come into the *Kingdom*, or if they did, they ſhould be preſumed *traiterouſly* diſpoſed, and puniſhed accordingly; and this *Statute* thus legally made, conveyed to the knowledge of all ſuch, it hath been a very rational preſumption againſt any that ſhould be ſo found; Though as 'tis poſſible that *nudus cum nudâ* may be no *adulterer*, ſo ſuch a *Prieſt* may have no *traiterous* purpoſe. And yet if you mark it, (unleſs ſince theſe times of troubles) very few of you have ſuffered among us by this Statute. *Section* 28. H.

Sir, you had great leaſure, when you could enlarge ſo to triumph over us for acknowledging our *Church fallible*, and profeſs to diſcharge his *Lordſhip* from being your Advocate, if he ſpeak ſo ill for his *Client*. This you might have done long ſince, and unleſs your favour may be had upon ſome other terms, than undertaking the *Infallibility* of mere creatures, we muſt all be content to be diſcharged by you. *Section* 29.

Yet after all your turning away, and ſlighting, we ſhall never be ſo provoked, as to *puniſh you for the reſult of what we preſcribe you*. If your beſt uſe of reaſon in the interpretation of *Scripture* (and not any prejudice, or paſſion, or fault of yours) have ſincerely brought you to your opinions, and no light that is offer'd hath been neglected, and yet all prove unſufficient to convince you, I ſhall never ſeverely pronounce againſt you; and if you will ſay, and make good as much to me, our affections may meet, though not our brains, and both of us have *charity* enough to *cover* in eace other, *a multitude of errours*. *Section* 30. I.

Your catalogue of *Sects* in this *Kingdom*, I ſhall not go about to examine, but onely tell you, that your *Infallibility* hath been liable to ſuch miſadventures alſo, and had not the *charm* or skill of keeping all within its *circle*; if it had, there would then at this time have been no body to diſpute againſt you. *Section* 31.

In the cloſe of your long Chapter, I wonder you ſhould be ſo covetous or ambitious of lengthning it one page farther, by charging on his *Lordſhip*, that he *charges you, that becauſe you pretend to be infallible, you have leſs reaſon to preſcribe to others*; whereas his *Lordſhip* charges no ſuch thing upon you, but onely ſaith, that *ſhe that confeſſes ſhe may err, is not ſo chargeable with any fault, as they that pretend they cannot*; which is quite another matter. *Section* 32.

To conclude, when the buſineſs is thus laid by you, that your *Infallibility* is not yet proved to be onely pretended, and yet you have no other ground of ſaying ſo, but becauſe you ſay 'tis not, (though all his *Lordſhip*'s arguments for ſo many Sections have driven all to that concluſion, and never a one of them is yet anſwered by you) it will be a moſt unreaſonable thing (and a ſound *petitio principii* again) to affirm without any one word of proof, that that *Infallibility* is a *reality*, and ſo will not *keep* you from *mending*, whereas nothing can keep you from *mending*, if this do not; this contemning of arguments againſt you, and affirming magiſterially without any. *Section* 33. K.

To the twenty ninth Section, Chap. 17.

This opinion, ſaith he, of damning ſo many, and this cuſtom of burning ſo many, this breeding up of thoſe who know nothing elſe in any point of religion, yet to be in readineſs to cry, To the fire with him, To hell with him. *All theſe be empty words, as we have ſhewed before. As for our breeding up of men, I think we doe it as well as any of our neighbours doe; and by the way, muſt tell you that we do not take children from their parents onely to breed them up in our religion; we do not offer that hard meaſure either to Turks or Jews, but hold it an act flatly againſt the law of nature, an impious violation of parents right, which ought to be held ſacred; and laſtly, a way of propagation of religions wholly violent and Un-chriſtian, ſo far are we from propagating our religion by force; and if all others with whom we have to doe, had been of that mind, it had been better with them; for God hath not bleſſed that way, foraſmuch as by ſad experience we have found, that none have proved greater ſcourges to their King and Country, than ſuch as have had that ſort of breeding given them, and contrary to their parents will, been violently ſeduced in their youth; and this is no ſecret, but known to all the three Kingdoms to their coſt. But enough of this, for it is a diſtaſtfull buſineſs.*

Chap. 17. *Anſwer to the ſeventeenth Chapter.*

To his Lordſhip's twenty ninth Paragraph you have no return, but that *theſe are empty words as you have formerly ſhewed* (and I fear we have ſhewed they are not, but ſhould be very glad to be miſtaken, and can truly ſay, that I wiſh vehemently that your judgment were right in this matter) But upon occaſion of his *Lordſhip*'s mention of [*your breeding up thoſe that know nothing elſe in religion. To cry to the fire, to hell with him*] you are pleaſed to take occaſion of ſome liberty, in ſhewing what good *breeding* you beſtow upon men in your *Church*, and ſo divert to a complaint againſt thoſe *that take children from their parents, &c.* and are ſomewhat paſſionate and *tragical* on that ſubject; but this being nothing to his *Lordſhip*'s words or argument, I deſire to ſee that better anſwered by you, before I will enter any new combat about ſo *extrinſecal* an impertinency. And ſo enough of this alſo, for whatever 'tis, 'tis nothing to the matter of preſent handling. *Section* 1.

To the thirtieth Section, Chap. 18.

" *If it were granted, ſaith the Enquirer, that becauſe it agrees not with the goodneſs of God to let me want a guide* " *infallible, and that the Church of* Rome *were that one; yet if that teach any thing contrary to God's goodneſs, I am*

" *not to receive her doctrine, for the ſame cauſe they would have me receive it, it being as good an argument, This* " *guide teaches things contrary to God's goodneſs, therefore it is not appointed by God; as to ſay, it is agreeable to God's* " *goodneſs there ſhould be a guide, therefore there is one. So he.*

The Enquirer ſeeks to delude us with a fallacy, by altering his terms; for in the firſt place, he ſpeaks of a thing contrary to God's goodneſs, not abſolutely, but according to his underſtanding. In the ſecond place he ſpeaks of it, not as it is in his underſtanding, but as it is ſimply in it ſelf, which is a thing quite different from the former; for many things may be in his underſtanding thus or thus, or as he ſaith, contrary to God's goodneſs, which in themſelves are not ſo, but rather, quite otherwiſe, for indeed it is no good conſequence to argue on this ſort, This in my underſtanding is contrary to God's goodneſs, therefore it is ſo, becauſe your underſtanding is ſubject to errour, and therefore ſome things may ſeem to it to be, which are not. Chillingworth, *who followeth this Authour's footſteps, argues after the ſelf-ſame manner, and hath been anſwered elſewhere by himſelf. I grant then the conſequence when as he ſaith, this guide teaches ſomewhat contrary to God's goodneſs, therefore it is not appointed for a guide. But I deny the Antecedent; and afterwards when he proves it, ſaying, it ſeems ſo to my underſtanding, therefore it is ſo, I deny the conſequence, and admit the Antecedent.*

At leaſt, ſaith he, if it ſeem ſo to my underſtanding, whether in the mean time it be ſo or not, I am not to receive it, becauſe I am to be guided by my own reaſon and underſtanding. If it ſeem ſo to your underſtanding after ſuch time as you have weighed all things as rightly as you can, I grant it; But if it ſeem ſo onely before you have done that, then I deny it, for then it is not to be followed but forſaken, or reformed if it be found erroneous, as in this caſe of yours it is. For in this caſe your underſtanding is to conſult other underſtandings wiſer than your own, if you can find any ſuch; and according to that, is to determine of the matter, and not to rely wholly upon your own ſingle underſtanding. But if you doe ſo, you will find your own ſingle underſtanding was deceived, and that the guide of which we treat, teacheth nothing that is againſt the goodneſs of God. For it is to be ſuppoſed her underſtanding is brighter and more capacious than yours, and therefore is to be thought knows much better what doctrines be agreeable to the goodneſs of God, than yours can do what is againſt it; and therefore your own reaſon and underſtanding teaches you, that the Churches underſtanding is to be preferred, and that yours muſt ſubmit; and again, that this is the rational way, and not the other: this the way of underſtanding, and that of errour. And ſo much in anſwer to this fallacy, wherein I perceive, both he and Maſter Chillingworth *conſide very much.*

As for particular doctrines, it is true, as you ſay, you may examine whether they agree with the Principle, that is foundation, yet nevertheleſs cannot you from thence conclude any thing againſt the doctrines or infallibility of the Church, but rather for it, and this for the reaſon before ſpecified. Neither do we, therefore, ſend you to a witneſs, and bid you not believe it, but rather, to believe it as far as in right reaſon you are to believe it, and not farther, that is to ſay, you are to truſt to your own particular diſcourſes, as to particular diſcourſes, and no farther, but to the reſolves of the Church as to the dictamens of a higher underſtanding, by the light of which you are to judge and cenſure of the reſt, and by doing thus, you are ſure you doe wiſely and ſafely, and, in fine, ſo, as although you ſhould chance to err, you might anſwer the buſineſs at the latter day, by ſaying, I did in this caſe what I ought to doe, for I followed what my reaſon taught me, and more than this was not required at my hands. But if I follow my own judgment, and in confidence of that do adventure to condemn the Church, In that I offend againſt my reaſon and true judgment, and ſhould not be able to make a good apology for my ſelf, or any way make it good that I followed my reaſon, which faculty is the rule that God hath ſet me.

For a concluſion of this diſpute, I anſwer in brief, that putting the Enquirer's argument as he ought to have put it, namely, thus as followeth, This guide, to my underſtanding, or, to my ſeeming, teaches things contrary to God's goodneſs, therefore it is not appointed by him for a guide; putting, I ſay, the argument on this manner, it is nothing ſo good, or ſo concluding an argument, as this other is, videlicet; *This guide teaches ſuch and ſuch doctrines, therefore they are not againſt the goodneſs of God, and therefore again, my underſtanding was deceived in holding them to be ſo; and therefore laſtly, notwithſtanding all this, ſhe may be an infallible guide and appointed by God for ſuch: Note, that we infer hence ſhe may be, but not that ſhe is, as the Enquirer would impoſe upon us: for, we do not ſay that the Church is appointed a guide therefore, becauſe it is agreeable with God's goodneſs to make her ſo, but becauſe we for other reaſons know he hath ſo made her: becauſe we are not now to learn but that many things are agreeable to God's goodneſs to be done, which yet are not done, nor peradventure ever will be. Wherefore, when we are to judge what is, or will be, we are to conſider, not what his goodneſs may admit, but what his will determines ſhall have a being, for of that laſtly depends the exiſtence of things, and not of the other.*

Chap. 18. *Anſwer to the eighteenth Chapter.*

Section 1. In your report of his Lordſhip's argument, *Section* 30. you leave out thoſe words [*therefore there is one*] and ſo make nonſenſe of that period, which in his Lordſhip's ſetting of it is excellent reaſon. But I can believe that this was but a ſlip. As for your anſwer to the parallel caſes, wherein, ſaith his *Lordſhip, God's goodneſs is equally concerned*; do you think you can ever ſatisfy any reaſonable man in ſaying, [*that the firſt thing he ſpeaks of, is onely contrary to God's goodneſs in his Lordſhip's underſtanding, not abſolutely; but of the ſecond, he ſpeaks, not as it is in his underſtanding, but as it is ſimply in it ſelf*] from whence you conclude, that he *changes the terms*] Certainly, Sir, in deſpight of your *exception*, the argument is good, Thus;

Section 2. If it be ſufficient to conclude an *infallible guide*, becauſe it agrees not with *God's goodneſs* to let men want one, then any man that conceives that *Church* to teach any thing which he conceives againſt *God's goodneſs*, by the ſame reaſon is not to receive her doctrine; The caſe is clear, becauſe nothing concludes to any man any farther, than it is conceived by him; and that is not a proof to me, which I do not conceive to be ſo; which makes his *Lordſhip*'s arguing to be far from fallacious; For the matter of this *paragraph* is not whether it be really true, that it agrees not with *God's goodneſs* to let men want an *infallible guide*, but (ſuppoſing it to be ſo) whether it will follow the *Church* is *infallible*, or whether he whoſe underſtanding is convinced and perſuaded of that truth, [that *it is not agreeable to God's goodneſs to let us want ſuch a guide*] be enforced to confeſs it *infallible*.

A.

Section 3. This alſo his *Lordſhip* diſputes not againſt (but will willingly acknowledge the conſequence, ſuppoſing that the Antecedent were true) onely by the ſame argument proves another thing, that he that conceives the *Church* to teach any doctrine contrary to *God's goodneſs*, or that, which is ſuch to his underſtanding,

or

or he that ſuppoſes the Church to teach ſo, muſt not believe that Churches doctrine. So that if you mark, the ſuppoſition is equal on both ſides, not taken for true on one ſide, and onely pretended on tother, but one taken to be true by you, (that, *not to provide an infallible guide is contrary to God's goodneſs*) and tother taken to be true by his Lordſhip *(that God's damning thoſe that err without either negligence or prejudication, is contrary to his goodneſs alſo)* and if the argument be of force on one ſide, it muſt be ſo alſo on tother; and for you to ſay that what you ſuppoſe, is true, but what his Lordſhip ſuppoſes, is not ſo, is a terrible *petitio principii* again, and no ground of a confutation againſt his Lordſhip; The ridiculous arguments that you put in his Lordſhip's paper, without his privity, will be matter of reproach to you, (who if you underſtood (as I ſuppoſe you did) were willing to deprave his diſcourſes) and not unto his Lordſhip. B.

Section 4. As for your way of ſatisfying his Lordſhip's underſtanding, that what the Church teaches is not contrary to the goodneſs of God, [*becauſe the Church knows what is ſo, better than he*] 'twill ſure prevail little with any, that is a diſputing whether the Church is *infallible* or no, (as you ſee his Lordſhip now is) for if ſhe be *fallible*, ſhe may miſtake in that judgment, and that ſhe doth not miſtake, there will be no aſſurance from her ſaying it, as long as the controverſie depends about her *Infallibility*, which to affirm not to depend, or to be no controverſie, is *petitio principii* again. C.

Section 5. As for your Concluſion of this diſpute, wherein you ſet the compariſon betwixt two Arguments, and ſay yours is much the better; I ſhall not need debate that with you, becauſe they are not the two Arguments betwixt which his Lordſhip makes the compariſon. The firſt I confeſs you have rightly ſet down, [*This Guide to my underſtanding teaches things contrary to God's goodneſs, therefore it is not the Guide*] and this will be as good an argument, as this other, [*'Tis to my underſtanding contrary to the goodneſs of God, that the Roman Church ſhould not be an infallible Guide, or that there ſhould be no infallible Guide, where there is none but the Roman Church, therefore the Roman Church is ſo*] In this compariſon the conſequences are equally true, and built upon the ſame ground, that that which is againſt God's *goodneſs* cannot be; and the *Antecedents* equally affirmed according to ſeveral underſtandings; and then whether the other Argument which you bring, be comparable to either, it matters not.

Section 6. But when at laſt you give us a note, that the argument from *God's goodneſs* doth not conclude that your *Church* is *infallible*, but onely that it may be ſo; I confeſs you make me repent of all this unprofitable attendance I have paid you, in following your argument thus far, when your ſelf have given me directions to a ſhorter cut of anſwering, *viz.* by granting that it may be *infallible*, that is, that nothing in nature reſiſts, but that, if God's pleaſure were ſo, it might be *infallible*; but ſay we, we have no evidence from God that it is his pleaſure it ſhould, and therefore we conclude it may be deceived, or may be *fallible*; betwixt which two, though there may be ſome difference, (as there is betwixt *falli* and *fallibilem eſſe*) yet unleſs ſome evidence can be brought againſt one, which cannot againſt the other, they will be both equally true, as far as reſpects our knowledge or debate of them. D.

Section 7. And when you add, that 'tis from other reaſons that you conclude ſhe is *infallible*, and not from this of *God's goodneſs*, I anſwer, that 'tis clear that his *Lordſhip* was now diſputing onely againſt that reaſon taken from *God's goodneſs*, which it ſeems you confeſs was no *reaſon*; and for your other reaſons, they are either confuted in other Paragraphs of his *Lordſhip*'s Treatiſe, or when you produce them, ſhall be. E.

To the thirty firſt Section, Chap. 19.

This Section *is ſpent in the inquiring whether a man ſhall be damned for making a diligent and impartial enquiry after the true religion, of which he finds the infallibility of the Church to be a part, ſuppoſing that his reaſon, when all is done, will not aſſent. This is his Quære, and the ſame may be made concerning any other verity, or point of doctrine; as namely, of the holy Scripture, whether or no it be the word of God; and what ſhall become of that man whoſe reaſon, after an impartial ſearch made, will not aſſent; or again, about the truth of Chriſtian Religion, unto which, after ſuch a ſearch made, his reaſon will not condeſcend.*

I anſwer firſt, that it is a mockery to ask whether or no any man ſhall be damned for making a good enquiry without ſucceſs; and in effect it is the ſame as to enquire whether a man ſhall be damned for doing a deed that's commendable and good. For this Queſtion ſuppoſes that either the Enquirer, or we were very ſimple Creatures, and did not underſtand our ſelves, or elſe that the Gentleman-demander was not in earneſt, but propounded it onely for his recreation, though at a time ill choſen and unſeaſonable, and alſo in a matter about which there ought to be no jeaſting.

I anſwer ſecondly, that in a place where inſtruction and information may be had, the caſe he puts is morally impoſſible to happen out; for we deny that where the ſearch is diligent, impartial, and without prejudice, and where again information ſufficient is to be had, that there the reaſon ſhall not be able to aſſent, and that whereſoever it cannot, that ſame happens, either through weakneſs, or inhability of judgment and capacity, or elſe by reaſon of ſome diſordinate paſſion of the will, by which the underſtanding is miſled and darkened, as in thoſe, who are refractory, it for the moſt part falls out. Which paſſion and prejudices ariſe, ſometimes from cuſtom and education, ſometimes from vitious inclinations, ſometimes from a crookedneſs and perverſity of nature, which doth refuſe inſtruction. Wherefore as it is no ſufficient excuſe for an Infidel to ſay, I have ſearched diligently whether or no Chriſt *be the true Meſſias, or whether the Scripture be the word of God or no, and after all endeavours uſed, my reaſon will not aſſent; ſo in like manner it is as little ſufficient to alledge, that after enquiry made about the true Church, and her Infallibility, your reaſon would not aſſent, for in theſe caſes, we cannot grant any ignorance invincible, or free that errour which poſſeſſes them from guilt. Now what ſhall become of others who want inſtruction ſufficient, and have no crookedneſs or backwardneſs in their will, and dye in ignorance, is another point, and different from this of ours, and is to be reſolved in the Queſtion about the efficacy of implicit Faith, to which I refer my Reader.*

Chap. 19. *Anſwer to the nineteenth Chapter.*

Section 1. In this Paragraph his Lordſhip asks a Queſtion, Whether, ſuppoſing [*that he that never heard of the Church of* Rome, *ſhall not be damned for not believing it infallible*] it can be thought, that he that hath made

diligent ſearch, and uſed honeſtly all means afforded him, and yet doth not believe the *Church infallible*, ſhall be *damned* for that not-believing? this is the Queſtion; and to weigh it down on one ſide [*that that latter ſhall not be damned, when tother is not*] this reaſon is put in, that in this matter all that that Man hath done in the ſecond caſe more than in the former, is onely the having *diligently enquired*, which is preſumed to be no *damning ſin*.

Section 2. Inſtead of the Queſtion thus put, you ſet another ſomewhat diſtant, but I will ſuppoſe tending to the ſame effect, whether a Man ſhall be damned for making a good enquiry without ſucceſs; which you ſay *is a mockery*, and ſo, as I conceive, ridiculous to affirm it; and ſo, Sir, after all your deſcanting on his Lordſhip for asking this queſtion, it is apparent by our explication of it, that upon the denying of that which you ſay, 'tis ridiculous not to deny, it inevitably follows, that that Man ſhall not be damned for denying the *infallibility* of your Church.

Section 3. And though you take pains to perſuade that this caſe is morally *impoſſible*, yet you muſt give us leave from your ſtating of the caſe, wherein you ſay it is ſo, (*viz. when information ſufficient is to be had*) to con-

A. clude your proof a *petitio principii* again; for when we deny your Church to be *infallible*, and moreover affirm, that if it be, it cannot be *infallibly* known to be ſo, how can you think that we ſhall ever yield (without any offer of proof) that there is *ſufficient inſtruction* to be had for any man in this point? be-

B. ſides, for you to ſay that every mans not acknowledging this, proceeds either from *weakneſs* or *paſſion*, what is that but uncharitableneſs firſt, and then ſhortneſs of diſcourſe, when the caſe was, on ſuppoſition that there was no fault of which his ſearch was guilty) and *petitio principii* again?

To the thirty ſecond Section, Chap. 20.

Whoſoever admits of truth upon no better grounds than others do admit of falſhood, doth not receive it rightly, ſolidly, and as he ought, but after a way defective and infirm. Again, whoſoever ſearches and is loath to find, and would not ſee it when he might, this man refuſeth truth as badly and weakly as the other doth receive it; and as the truth will not benefit the one, ſo the enquiry will not advantage or excuſe the other. As for ſuch as are bred up in a true Religion, and which, without particular examination, they accept, it were raſh judgment to ſay all theſe received truths upon no better grounds, than others did falſhood; for firſt, according to this account, the greateſt portion of Chriſtian men on all ſides would be in a hard condition: amongſt whom the ſimple and illiterate, who are not able to reade Epiphanius *either in Greek or Latin, nor yet the Bible either in Hebrew or Greek, or otherwiſe to make any ſtrict ſearch into Antiquity, for their making diſcoveries which Faith was the Ancient and Apoſtolick. But though they be unable to doe this, yet do they not therefore take up their Religion at random and by chance, or conſult paſſion about it, and not reaſon, but contrariwiſe, do find their reaſon ſatisfied each one according to their ſeveral models, or meaſure of capacity, by the preſent view of the majeſty and divine perfections of the Catholick Church and Faith therein profeſſed, together with the aſſurances from publick fame and creditable relations. By means of which the divine providence and veracity ſhews them infallibly what ways they are to take, and what doctrines to receive as revealed from above. And thus, regularly ſpeaking amongſt orthodox Believers, where Religion may appear like it ſelf, every man of capacity, though illiterate, may ſee ſufficient to reſolve him, which ſatisfaction from any falſe Religion he could not receive; for though to a heedleſs eye, and before a diligent enquiry made, ſome grand falſhoods may ſeem more probable than truths, and that as* Ariſtotle *teacheth,* multa falſa ſunt probabiliora veris, *many falſhoods are more probable than truths; yet, not to a diligent Enquirer after the ſearch is made, and eſpecially, in buſineſſes of great concernment, becauſe God and Nature have laid theſe kind of truths more open to our view, and ſet marks upon them by which they might be known and diſcerned from falſhood. Wherefore, in the law of nature, it was more credible, even to the illiterate, that there was a God, than that there was none; and now Judaiſm is not ſo probable as Chriſtianity is, though ſometimes it hath been, nor Mahumetiſm at any time ſo perſuaſible as Chriſtian Religion, or Hereſie ſo credible and ſatisfactory as orthodoxal Chriſtianity, or the Greek ſchiſm as the Greek unity; wherefore though the Parents belief, and the Religion prevalent in the Country have great influence into the minds of men, and are great and powerfull Perſuaders, yea oftentimes Seducers alſo, and thoſe very dangerous; yet nevertheleſs in thoſe places where truth is taught, they do not hinder men from the right apprehenſion of it, and from making true judgments about it, but rather like a proſperous gale of wind to Veſſels under ſayle, cauſe them to move towards the Port deſired more ſwiftly than otherwiſe they would. And thus much may ſuffice for taking off the ſlander and ſcandal which this Enquirer, and after him* Chillingworth, *with great acerbity, have almoſt in the very ſame terms, labour'd to caſt upon right believing Chriſtians, therewith to diſparage their faith, as if forſooth, they believed truths invalidly and upon no better reaſons than others believe falſhood. Thus have both theſe conſpired againſt the truth, for both indeed are but one Authour in effect, one the Text, and the other the Commentary; wherefore the Publiſher of this ſmall work hath ſhewed us all the Well-head to which* Chillingworth *went to draw, which Well before was unknown to the moſt part of men, and ſo might have ſtill remained, had it not been for this Publiſher's unſeaſonable diligence.*

Chap. 20. *Anſwer to the twentieth Chapter.*

Section 1. Your miſtake is very remarkable in this Paragraph, and your pains very prodigally miſpent in diſpro-

A. ving of that which is by his Lordſhip mentioned onely on ſuppoſition of ſomewhat elſe affirmed by you, and by that means demonſtrated to be infirm.

Section 2. His Lordſhip's preſent reaſoning is, that ſuppoſing your *infallibility* true, yet he that denies it, and withall uſes his beſt reaſon to ſeek if it be true, will ſure be in as ſafe a condition, as he that believes it, and ſearches not. And this he proves, becauſe the *one believes that ſuppoſed falſhood on as good grounds, as the other doth that ſuppoſed truth.* Which is ſo fully concluded from thoſe premiſſes, (and ſo needs no farther proof) that indeed theſe premiſſes are able to conclude more; *viz.* that in that caſe, that Man believes that ſuppoſed falſhood on better grounds (*viz.* upon impartial ſearch) than the other believes that ſuppoſed truth; and then 'twere unreaſonable to think, that God that rewards mens *actions*, and not their *fates*, their *choices*, and not their *ſtars*, ſhould condemn the one, more ingenuous and guiltleſs, and reward the other meaner and more criminal part of the parallel.

All

All this you in a manner confirm, by ſaying, that *he that thus admits of truth, admits it not ſolidly, rightly, and as he ought, but after a defective and infirm way.* Which being borrowed from you out of this Chapter, the reſt will appear to belong very nothing to his Lordſhip's argument, and therefore I chooſe not to inſiſt on any reply to it. For of thoſe which do find their reaſon ſatisfied in your *infallibility*, of which you ſpeak a-while, his Lordſhip ſpeaks not; and for the truths that God and Nature have laid ſo open to our view, of which you ſpeak again, ſure this of *infallibility* is none. *Section* 3.

As for your diſpleaſure expreſſed again (without any new occaſion) againſt the unſeaſonable Publiſher (which if you and ſome others of your Friends were mere Students and Votaries, to *pray* for, and ſtudy the *peace of Hieruſalem*, and not too active Infuſers and Enterprizers in theſe troubled waters, might indeed be acknowledged leſs ſeaſonable) it is the very thing you ſaid before, and then was ſufficiently proved to be unſeaſonable. *Section* 4.

To the 33, and 34. Sections, Chap. 21.

That the Enquirer did not deny with obſtinacy the infallibility of the Church of Chriſt, *or any other Article, we are willing to believe, yet nevertheleſs how ſafe he was, we know not. For a man may be obſtinate and yet not think ſo, though he may peruadventure have juſt reaſon to ſuſpect it. It is not likely that* Arius *for example, or any other Arch-heretick did think themſelves to be obſtinate, although it is not to be doubted but they were, for in the heart of man there be many dark corners in which obſtinacy may lurk and be unſeen; many paſſions that do corrupt the intention, which without great diligence are not eſpied, eſpecially in men that are lovers of the world, or be poſſeſſed with prejudices before-hand. For which the wiſe man wiſely ſaid.* Verebar omnia opera mea, *I diſtruſted all my works. And ſo hath every man reaſon to doe in this univerſal corruption of nature and manners. The thirty fourth* Section *hath no difficulty in it which may require an Anſwer.*

Chap. 21. *Anſwer to the twenty firſt Chapter.*

Your Anſwer to the thirty third Section is very ſtrange; you firſt grant very freely, that you *believe that his Lordſhip did not deny with obſtinacy the infallibility of your Church*; and yet in your next words you interpoſe againſt him, that *a man may be obſtinate, and yet not think ſo*; and on that, ground your Anſwer to that Section. But ſure, Sir, whoſoever elſe may be obſtinate, or what grounds ſoever he may have to ſuſpect he is, yet this cannot by you be ſaid of him at the ſame time when you acknowledge he is not obſtinate. *Section* 1. A.

I beſeech you compare your Anſwer with that Paragraph of his Lordſhip's again, and tell me whether this would not be very ſtrange dealing. Suppoſe a Friend ſhould make this Syllogiſm for you; an honeſt Catholick ought not to be denied the liberty of this Town, but this Gentleman is an honeſt Catholick, *ergo:* and to the *major* I ſhould anſwer by ſilence, (*i. e.* conſent) and to the *minor* [*that you are an honeſt Catholick I am willing to believe*;] Nevertheleſs, whether you ought to have the liberty of this Town, I know not, for you may be a diſhoneſt Catholick, and yet not think ſo. *Section* 2.

I pray how would you like this way of diſcourſe? would you not firſt tell me that I did in effect deny the concluſion, *i. e.* make ſcruple how you ſhould be dealt with, after I had acknowledged, both that all honeſt Catholicks ought to be uſed as you deſire, and that you are an honeſt Catholick? And ſecondly, that I did ſuck in my conceſſion of your being an honeſt Catholick, as ſoon as I had made it; for if that Reply belong to me, then is it doubted, whether I am ſuch or no. Be pleaſed to compare the caſes, and this is directly your Anſwer. *Section* 3.

What you mean by the *no-difficulty* in the thirty fourth Section, (which you confeſs, and which therefore requires no Anſwer) I do not perfectly know, but ſhall ſuppoſe you mean, that there is nothing of doubt or queſtion in it, and then I am ſure I have nothing to reply, but that by the ſame reaſon the thirty third Section muſt be granted alſo, for the *medium* is the ſame to infer both thoſe concluſions. *Section* 4.

To the 35, and 36. Sections, Chap. 22.

To believe, *ſaith he*, implicitly what God would have believed, is alſo to believe implicitly what the Church teacheth, if this doctrine be one of thoſe which God commands, to be believed. *My anſwer to this is negative, and my reaſon of denial is, becauſe one implicit faith doth not contain another, but it is an explicit aſſent and no other that contains within it an implicit. To the point then I anſwer, that if that ſame general belief, which he falſly calls implicit, be ſincere and cordial, we then grant that it may, as he ſaith, implicitly contain the other. But what will he deduce from thence? what? that all who pretend to believe on that manner doe it ſincerely? It is improbable, for if it were ſincere, it would in knowing men, not ſtay within the narrow compaſs of an implicit aſſent, but quickly dilate it ſelf, and become explicit. Indeed this great profeſſion of believing in a preparation of mind all which God would have believed, and goes no farther, ſeems in moſt men to be but feigned and deluſory, and ſo no great truſt can be repoſed in it.*

Chap. 22. *Anſwer to the twenty ſecond Chapter.*

The force of the argument, Section 35. you deny upon a ſhew of ſome *ſubtlety*, becauſe, ſay you, *one implicit faith doth not contain another.* This you affirm, but afford us not the leaſt offer of proof for the affirmation. I muſt therefore beſeech you to look over your *principle* again. Suppoſe me to believe by an *implicit faith*, that you are an honeſt man, may not that belief contain in it an *implicit belief* to every propoſition by you aſſerted? Nay, what need this circumlocution? is not his Lordſhip's argument moſt clear being put into a Syllogiſm? *Section* 1. A.

If God commands the Church to be believed, then he that implicitly believes all the commands of God, implicitly believes that the Church is to be believed: but God commands the Church to be believed, *Section* 2.

lieved, *ergo*. See now which Propoſition you will deny, the *major* is evident, the *minor* I preſume you will not deny, whoſoever elſe doth, and then I beſeech you be good to the concluſion.

Section 3. But that it ſeems you will grant too, but ſuſpect that that general belief is not ſincere and cordial; But that I am ſure is not for us to diſpute of, or diſcern, and I am as ſure 'tis nothing to the caſe where 'tis ſuppoſed to be ſincere, and if it be not, no man ever thinks it can be relied on.

To the 37, 38, and 39. Sections, Chap. 13.

Admitting the formoſt of theſe Sections as probable; To the 38, *I anſwer, that as ſome are made obſtinate by pride, ſo again otherſome lazineſs detains in ignorance. But what of that? I grant you that it is not pride in you or any man never to aſſent, till you find good reaſon for it, but rather wiſedom. Nevertheleſs it may be pride which blinds a man and hinders him from the ſeeing a juſt reaſon of aſſenting, yea even then when it is not onely perceptible, but alſo eaſie to be perceived; for the eye of the proud ſees not the truth, but overlooks it. The* 39th *Paragraph containeth in it no buſineſs conſiderable in the matter of controverſie between us.*

Chap. 23. *Anſwer to the twenty third Chapter.*

Section 1. The 37, Section you admit as probable; and now methinks I underſtand your dialect ſomewhat better than before I did; Doth not [*admitting as probable*] ſignify [*not underſtanding?*] Truly it had been more ingenuouſly done to have uſed that other phraſe; for the truth is, it might have been done at this time without any diſparagement to your underſtanding; for in the beginning of this Section there was at the firſt Edition clearly an errour in the print. It ſhould be thus as 'tis now mended; To the *Greek* that concludes the former Section ſhould be adjoined in the ſame period, *If I could*, &c. and no new Section be there made; and as the ſenſe, by that miſtake of the Printer, lies broken in the firſt Impreſſion, it is *non-ſenſe*.

Section 2. Now this being ſaid, It is a little odd that there ſhould be but one piece of non-ſenſe in the Book, and that ſhould have the luck to be in your favour, and by you be confeſtly admitted as *probable*. But this was but a misfortune. Your Anſwer to the 38th is not ſo excuſable, being not one ſyllable to the matter in hand, [that *ſluggiſhneſs may as probably bring a Papiſt to grant your infallibility, as pride a Proteſtant to deny it*] Inſtead of denying or anſwering of which, you onely reply, that *pride may poſſibly blind a man*. Sure this Paragraph you might have admitted alſo, (as well as the other two that encompaſs it) much better than to have ſaid nothing to the purpoſe.

Section 3. The 39th I would not diſcourage you from granting (it had been much for my eaſe, if you had granted the whole Treatiſe) otherwiſe I could ſhew you, that it contains an argument perfectly concludent againſt your cauſe, in ſatisfying one main objection of yours againſt us.

To the 40. 41. 42. Sections, Chap. 24.

We Catholicks do not diſagree in points of faith, neither where there is fire to keep us in awe, nor where there is none, and therefore this exception againſt our unity is frivolous. It is the clearneſs and perfection of our rule that draws us all to unity, and not any of the four Elements. If we follow this rule we are at peace, and we do well know how to follow it: contrariwiſe, follow your rule as well as you can, and yet you are at variance; wherefore you aſſign a rule, which though it in it ſelf be not uncertain, yet which is as bad, you are uncertain of it. Now as in Logick a maxim, or axiome, if unknown, or uncertain, is no good principle of argumentation; ſo in matter of belief, a rule not certainly diſcernible and underſtood, is no good rule of faith, though never ſo perfect in it ſelf: and this is juſt your caſe.

The differences amongſt thoſe of our Church are not differences in matters of faith or religion, as it is evident; but on the other ſide it is manifeſt and confeſſed, that yours are. Our differences are in Philoſophy onely, or in ſome Scholaſtick and undefined point, and ſuch in particular is, that now ſome years agitated between the Dominicans, and ſundry of their party on the one ſide, and the Jeſuits, and Sorbon Doctours, and many more, on the other. For theſe contend not as we do, with the Calviniſts, namely, whether we have free will or no; all of them agreeing in that verity of faith; but they contend about a queſtion onely Philoſophical, which hath ſome relation to it, namely, whether with this freedom of will acknowledged by both ſides, Phyſical predeterminations or premotions can conſiſt: which queſtion is no queſtion of faith. Now admitting, as many think, that theſe predeterminations could not ſtand with the doctrine of free-will, yet the ſaid doctrine of faith is not hurt thereby: for the oppoſition between them and free-will, is either diſcovered by the Dominicans, or not. If not, then is it dormant, and ſo, though never ſo ill, it cannot doe hurt to faith, or work it any prejudice. If it be diſcovered, then it can work nothing, foraſmuch as thereupon it will be relinquiſht and abandon'd preſently: becauſe the doctrine of free-will is received by an aſſent of faith, and the other but by a philoſophical or opinative; the former being the ſtronger, muſt needs command and expell the latter, as ſoon as they begin to fall at variance. Wherefore it would in that caſe be a good conſequence with them, viz. *Man hath free-will, therefore there is no predetermination, and not contrariwiſe, (as it is with the Calviniſts) there is predetermination, therefore no free-will. Therefore in the holding of predeterminations there is a vaſt difference between a Calviniſt and a Dominican, even as much as between an obedient Catholick, and a perverſe and obſtinate Heretick, and that is difference enough. And ſince you would needs know, this is the reaſon why theſe arguments make you Hereticks, and not the Dominicans. That the Church ought to have reſolved the point in difference, between thoſe two orders, is more than the Enquirer can prove, for neither of their doctrines do hinder conformity with the Ancients in any one thing, wherein conformity was requiſite; for men are not bound to conform with the Ancients in the reaſons of their belief, but in their belief onely. The* 42. *Section we grant, as making nothing againſt our doctrine. And thus* Chillingworth *is alſo anſwered who inſiſts upon this ſame point, and alſo in the ſame faſhion with this Enquirer, ſo that all things conſidered, both theſe make but one Authour, and require but one anſwer to what they have objected. And by this the* 41, *and* 42. *Sections be alſo anſwered.*

Chap. 24. Anſwer to the twenty fourth Chapter.

His Lordſhip ſaith that the conſent is little thank-worthy, becauſe that may be an effect of *fear, when there is fire for them that diſagree.* To this you anſwer, that you diſagree not in matters of faith, *neither where there is fire to awe, nor where there is none.* *Section 1.* A.

Sir, is not that a ſtrange anſwer in you, that know there is *fire to awe* diſagreers in all matters of *faith*, and conſequently no matter of *faith*, where there is no *fire to awe?* By this it appears that that exception of his Lordſhip's againſt your unity in matters of faith, is far from frivolous; and to get quit of it, you are fain to make a diſtribution, of which onely one *ſpecies* belongs to the *Genus*, which being put into form betrays it ſelf preſently: It muſt be thus; of matters of *faith*, ſome are required of us *ſub pœnâ ignis*, ſome are not. Can you ſtand to it, that this ſhall hold? are there any things *de fide*, which a man may ſafely disbelieve? if not, all the reſt you ſay in that Section is nothing to the purpoſe. But then you add, that all the differences are in matters not of *faith*; to which the anſwer will be very obvious (if I troubled you with no other) that ours are ſo too, and then you have little matter of triumph over us in that excellence. *Section 2.* B. C.

But if you pleaſe, I ſhall be a little more large with you in this point; and, firſt I beſeech you to conſider, that it is you that bring this Argument againſt us, taken from Diſſentions amongſt us, and not we againſt you (though we might with as good reaſon) and therefore that it lies on you to prove it a concluding Argument, and to us 'tis abundantly ſufficient, if we be but able to retort it, for then 'twill be an Argument *ad homines*, though in it ſelf it be no Argument. *Section 3.* D.

This being premiſed, I pray obſerve, in the ſecond place, the no-force of this Argument againſt us, unleſs it may alſo appear that our departing from you, is the cauſe of theſe Diſſentions. For if they be but onely conſequent to it accidentally, this ought not in all reaſon to be laid to our charge, any farther than thus, that this accidental conſequent, is a probable argument of one of theſe two things, either that you have better rules for the reſtraining of ſuch Diſſentions than we, or elſe that you are more carefull in executing the rules you have; and if either of theſe be ſaid by you, I ſhall then tell you, 1. That it ſeems this Argument concludes but probably, though the propoſition were granted, and I believe I could urge as probably on the other ſide, and conclude the excellency of our Reformation from that old ſaying of *Clemens* (by way of Anſwer to your Objection, both of *Jews* and *Heathens* againſt *Chriſtianity*, taken from the Diſſentions of *Chriſtians* in the *Primitive Church* τέτο ἡ αἰτία, ὅτι πασὶ τοῖς καλοῖς μάχη ἐστὶ καὶ ζῆλος, *The cauſe of them is, becauſe all things, that are excellent, are ſubject to the envy of Men and Devils*, and from thence, to the ſowing of ſeeds of Diſſentions amongſt them; agreeably to that of our Saviour, that as ſoon *as the wheat was in the ground, the envious ſowed his tares.* *Section 4.*

But then ſecondly, for the preventing of ſuch Diſſentions, I ſhall add, that though we have not pretence of *infallibility*, and threats of *fire* to reſtrain men from them, yet we have other rules more agreeable to *ancient Church-practice*, than either of theſe; and though the *weapons of our warfare are not carnal* in your ſenſe of εἰς ὄλεθρον σαρκὸς, *to the taking away of life*, yet are they, if they were executed, *mighty to bring down* or ſhut out *Hereſies*. For, if you know it not, I can tell you, that *Excommunication* (that ſovereign receipt of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, the moſt perfect deſign of charity, to ſave and recover that which is loſt, to ſhame men to reformation) and upon contempt of that, that ſecular rougher hand interpoſing, the Writ *de Excommunicato capiendo*, and the Statute *of Abjuration* are very ſtrong reſtraints; and if they have not been ſo diligently executed as they ought to be, though I hope you will pardon this fault, yet he that will not, muſt charge it onely on the Perſons of our *Magiſtrates*, and not on our *Religion*, or the ſtate of our Reformation. And then let me add, that even theſe Laws, and this execution of them, or the like, whether among you or us, can extend no farther than to outward reſtraints, and that onely of thoſe that will be ſo terrified, or to *puniſhment* of them that will not; but not to *preventing of Hereſies* in the inward riſe or growth, or ſometimes in the breaking out, whenſoever ambition of being Leader of a Sect, *&c.* are more prevailing than fear of puniſhments, which caſes muſt be lookt for in every Church. *Section 5.*

To which purpoſe you may pleaſe to reflect upon your ſelves, and tell me, whether there were not good ſtore of Hereticks before the times of the Reformation; If not, I am ſure *Irenæus*, and *Epiphanius*, and Saint *Auguſtine*, and *Philaſtrius* have abuſed us in their *Catalogues*; and I beſeech you, but to remember the ridiculous Hereſies of *Galatia* (which Saint *Jerome* mentions on occaſion of *Gal.* 3. 1. in reſpect of which he conceives the *Apoſtle* calls them *ſuch fools*, and thinks they were *bewitcht*) particularly thoſe of the ἀσελγεῖς, that would have *Cheeſe* mixt with the *Bread* in the *Sacrament*, which with two others of the like ſtamp, there mentioned, came from *Ancyra* the Metropolis of *Galatia*. And yet I believe, you would not think the Argument of much force, if it ſhould (from your example againſt us) be made uſe of by us either againſt thoſe Apoſtolical Churches, or againſt the Roman Church ever ſince, that ſo many Hereſies are gone out of it; and yet that would be as reaſonable in us, as in you it is to charge all the Hereſies which have been in the World ſince *Luther*, upon the Reformation. *Section 6.* E.

For, let me ask you, is the fault that you object to us in this matter, that Hereticks are gone out from us? That which we have ſaid, will ſatisfy you that that is no argument, that we are not a true Church, for if it be, it will be of force againſt the Catholick Orthodox Church in all Ages. Or is it, that they that thus diſſent from us, are ſuffered to continue among us? if that be it, then firſt there are alſo Diſſenters among you, continuing with you. Secondly, our Laws and Canons are for the caſting them out, if their diſſentings be heretical, and that is all that you can pretend of theſe, and if we have been more indulgent than you would have us, that is but an errour of tenderneſs firſt, and then, that onely the fault of Perſons. *Section 7.*

Having ſaid thus much (which I conceive full ground of ſatisfaction to what you have or can ſay in this matter) I might now add, that if you look no farther than the Church of *England* even in theſe (which I ſuppoſe you will count the) worſt times of it, you cannot find any greater or more dangerous Hereſies avowed by any conſiderable Party, than are owned by ſome of the Jeſuits among you. *Section 8.*

Section 9. I ſhall firſt mention that popular doctrine (you know what I mean) of *Bellarmine*, reſumed and confirmed not long before his death, with his moſt adviſed care in his *Recognitions*. Secondly, the doctrine and practice of *reſiſting* and *depoſing lawfull Magiſtrates* under colour of *Religion* (that I ſet it no higher, even to *killing of Kings.*) Thirdly, the oppoſing the Order of *Biſhops*, as expreſly contrary to the ſole power enſtated by *Chriſt* on Saint *Peter*. And alſo fourthly, the affirming it lawfull that *evil* may be done, ſo it be in order to a *publick good*; and that I trouble you with no more (and yet give you reaſon to think that it is in my power) I beſeech you to believe that I have read *Watſon's Quodlibets*, (and I could without much difficulty make a parallel betwixt theſe whom you ſo much charge, and thoſe whom you defend, your hateſt Enemies, and your deareſt Friends, that Book being ſo richly able to furniſh me with hints) and that I have ſurveyed the Writings betwixt the *Seculars* and the *Regulars* (with the late controverſie among you, about the *Biſhop of Calcedon*'s being appointed *Ordinary* in this *Kingdom*, produced) and in them the difference about the neceſſity of *Confirmation*, and the [*non*] (even now mentioned) in the *Canon* of the *Council*, as alſo the *Symbolum Jeſuiticum*, *&c.* and if we have any greater diviſions among us yet, than theſe, I beſeech you to let me know it from you (for I believe 'twill be no eaſie diſcovery) and I ſhall promiſe to doe and pray my utmoſt, that they may be avoided.

Section 10. This being thus ſet betwixt us, I ſhall not need to deſcend to a particular ſurvey of the truth of what you ſay, that theſe differences among you are in matters not *de fide*; though in that there would be a large field to amplify in alſo.

Section 11. To his Lordſhip's argument, [That *the Church ought to have reſolved theſe queſtions, if they deſired conformity with the ancient Church*] you anſwer, that *neither of theſe Doctrines hinder conformity with the Ancients in any thing wherein conformity is required*; and confirm that, by an implicit aſſertion, which you will never be able to prove, *viz.* that the *Fathers* did not deliver doctrines (as well as reaſons) directly contrary to the *Dominicans*; Whereas 'tis clear they did, *viz.* to that, that *phyſical predeterminations* can conſiſt with freedom of will. Which even now you thought good (not to deny, but) to excuſe by a *dilemma*, that if this oppoſition were not diſcovered to the *Dominicans*, it would doe no hurt, if it were, it would be relinquiſht. It ſeems by this, that if they are diſcovered, and not relinquiſht, the danger would then be great; and ſo, that if they knew this *conformity*, this *conformity* would be requiſite alſo, and ſo is requiſite in it ſelf, though by the excuſe of blameleſs *ignorance*, it be capable of mercy.

Section 12. To the forty ſecond Section you anſwer by granting again, and thus you ſay alſo Maſter *Chillingworth* is anſwered, and truly ſo any man will be content to be anſwered; I would all his Lordſhip's Treatiſe had been ſo anſwered, it had been more eaſe to your ſelf, and advantage to ſomebody elſe.

To the 43. Section, Chap. 25.

We do not formally infer, that becauſe our rule breeds unity, therefore all diſſenting Parties ought to yield to that; but that diſſenting Parties have no rule on which it is fit, or ſafe to rely; and again, that in place of it, we ought to ſeek out one which cauſes unity, becauſe no rule can be good without that quality. Nevertheleſs it follows alſo, ours is the true rule, becauſe, de facto, *none but ours either doth it, or is apt to doe it, and one ſuch rule there muſt be, we are ſure. Ours then is not therefore to be accepted, becauſe it breeds unity, but becauſe it alone doth breed it. As for* Nilus, *he is a pratling Greek, and beſides that in his ſeveral ſayings he overthrows himſelf, and confirms our Doctrines; in this point no heed is to be taken to what he ſaith.*

Chap. 25. *Anſwer to the twenty fifth Chapter.*

Section 1. In this Chapter you *diſclaim* an Aſſertion by *affirming* it; diſclaim it in theſe words, [That you *do not infer, becauſe your rule breeds Unity, therefore all diſſenting Parties ought to yield to it*] and affirm it in theſe [That *diſſenting Parties have no rule, that they ought to ſeek out one that cauſes Unity, that yours is the true rule, and none but yours:*] your meaning is, it ſeems, that you do infer it, but you doe it not *formally*; and ſure it matters little for *formality*, when the thing is ſo granted by you.

Section 2. For that you put in the word [*onely*] it matters little; becauſe any other company that ſhould deny that *infallibility*, and uſurp it themſelves, would ſoon get the *monopoly* of it alſo, eſpecially from any that differed from them in any particular. As for *Nilus*, 'tis far cheaper and eaſier to call him *pratling Greek*, than to confute his ſaying, which yet, if you pleaſe to mark his words in this place, is no more than you ſay in the very undertaking to anſwer this Treatiſe, that your Church muſt by all be lookt on as *infallible*.

To the 44, 45, 46, 47 Sections, Chap. 26.

In theſe four Sections *the Enquirer buſily endeavours to perſuade that errours might ſecretly creep into the Church by degrees, as a Child waxes bigger, and as the index of a Clock moves about. Be it ſo as the Enquirer ſaith; yet nevertheleſs, might all ſuch creeping errours, if there were any, be eſpied, at leaſt, when they had once got in, if not while they were ſtealing thither. Thus the growth of a Child is ſeen plainly, though not the growing, and the hand, or ſhadow of a Dial is ſeen at what hour it is, though the ſlow pace thither was not perceptible; and men may give a judgment whether it go falſe or true. Why then could not errours be eſpied as eaſily after they were once ſtoln in, though by never ſo ſmall degrees, they made their approaches thither? Thus were the errours of* Arius, Pelagius, Wicliff, Socinus, *and others, preſently diſcovered, notwithſtanding all their Authours counterfeiting and ſly manner of divulging them; even as tares, which were ſown while men ſlept: as ſoon as grown up were ſeen and noted. What then ſhould hinder all other pretended errours of the Church from being ſeen and regiſtred, although crept in never ſo inſenſibly?*

What matter is it that ſundry Books are loſt? Are they more loſt for thoſe errours, than for others? or were theſe more inviſible than all the reſt? It is ſtrange with what improbable conjectures this Enquirer deludes himſelf.

He tells us afterwards of another ſly way of breaking in, that is to ſay, under old names and titles, altering the ſignification, but not the words. But I would know how the errours of the Church could by this art be concealed, more than the errours of Calvin, *who ſought with old appellations to palliate his new Doctrines.*

But,

But, in concluſion, his principal device is, that if no precedent oppoſition were a note of the being taught from the beginning, that then the doctrine of the Chiliaſts would paſs for right and Apoſtolical, becauſe, as he affirmeth, it was not contradicted till two hundred years after the coming in. But my anſwer is, it is more than any man can prove, that it was contradicted no ſooner: nay, it is more than probable, that it was contradicted in the time of Saint Juſtin, *as we have ſhewed before, and alſo highly probable, that it was oppoſed and rejected in the time of* Dionyſius *the Areopagite, as alſo hath been noted before.*

Beſides, it is no way neceſſary that every caſual or innocent opinion ſhould be forthwith contradicted, or noted as an errour againſt faith; and of this ſort was the errour of the Chiliaſts during the time it was held but as an opinion, without cenſuring or condemning others, to which height, as ſoon as it arrived, it was cried down preſently and rejected.

The 48. *Section contains but a recapitulation of what was before propounded, and therefore requires no new anſwer to it.*

The laſt Section contains nothing that deſerves not commendation, or is unworthy of the Authour, but is rather to be extolled and imitated by all that make enquiries after truth, and his reſolves there be ſuch, that if they be truly and ſincerely put in execution by any, no man can have reaſon to be offended with him in this world, nor is it likely that God will be diſpleaſed with him in the next. But whether the Enquirer was not very unhappy in his ſearches after truth, or no, I leave it by the ſearcher of all hearts to be determined.

Chap. 26. *Anſwer to the twenty ſixth Chapter.*

To your anſwer to the *undiſcernableneſs of errours, that though they are not ſeen at the time, they may be ſeen after.* I reply, that I confeſs it poſſible they may be ſeen after, and that ſome are ſo, very ſoon after, but yet ſure not all *preſently after*, at leaſt not *publickly* and *vulgarly* ſeen; As they are ſeen, ſo they may be made known to the world, ſome a long time after others; and this is ſufficient to ſhew, that the *Authours* of the *errours* may poſſibly not be ſeen and diſcovered at all, though the errour in proceſs of time chance to be ſo, which will be moſt evidently true, if it be farther conſidered (what his *Lordſhip* affirmed) that *errours came in by degrees*, and not at once. *Section* 1. A.

To your queſtion what it *matters that ſundry books are loſt?* I anſwer, that thus much it matters, that from thence it follows *infallibly*, that 'tis poſſible there might be oppoſition againſt any doctrine, though in the writings we have, there be none mentioned; and as you diſprove not that, ſo his *Lordſhip* deſires not to have more acknowledged. *Section* 2. B.

Your next anſwer by retortion againſt *Calvin*, will be of no force, unleſs *Calvin* undertook to be *infallible*. *Section* 3.

For the matter about the *Chiliaſts* as you refer to your anſwer before, ſo do I to my reply; onely from your *favour* or indulgence to that *opinion*, during the time that it was held but as an opinion, *without cenſuring or condemning others*; but then withdrawing that *favour* when it arrived to that height; I am very glad and joyfull to join iſſue with you, and charitably to ſuppoſe (though I affirm it not) that till you took upon you to condemn and cenſure others, any opinion you held, merely as an opinion, might doe you no irreparable hurt; but now that you proceed to that inſolent unmercifull height, what mercy can you expect from your own principles, by which yet we that *cenſure* not, *condemn* not, are confident to hope for ſome *kindneſs* from *you*, though not from other men. *Section* 4. C.

To the forty eighth *Section* I ſhall take your example likewiſe; and to the laſt, commend your ingenuity for commending that, that deſerved it ſo much; and onely demand, with what conſcience you could think him very unhappy in thoſe ſearches, which you confeſs to be ſo happy in propoſing; for ſure if unhappineſs ſignify the ill ſucceſs of his ſearches, there can be (according to your *Principles*) no fear that they ſhould by God be permitted to be unhappy; or if it ſignify any fault in them, you cannot without *uncharitableneſs*, and judging of hearts, pronounce him guilty of it. *Section* 5. D.

The Concluſion.

The general reſult of all that which hath been debated hitherto betwixt the Enquirer and me, is, in effect, no other but that, Firſt, the Catholick Churches infallibility is a ſovereign preſervative againſt errour; and againſt all diſſention or diſ-union in believing, unto all thoſe who do acknowledge it, and yield ſubmiſſion thereunto. Secondly, that each new verity defin'd by that Church is to them a new path to Heaven, though on the other ſide, to all ſuch other as refuſe to be directed by her, it may prove juſt as the Enquirer is pleaſed to expreſs himſelf, a new path to walk in towards the Devil, or one ſtep more unto damnation. And in this he was in the right, and ſpoke truer than he was aware. Now it is well known that all we Catholicks are guided by that ſame infallibility; and again, that on the contrary all Anti-catholicks do reſiſt it, and what will follow out of this, is no hard matter to collect. Moreover this ſame infallibility, a quality ſo unpleaſing to the Enquirer, cannot, as he ſurmiſes, make us ſure, if we be in errour, never to mend, for we all do offer freely that if either he, or any of his ſide be ſure to diſprove ſoundly and clearly the infallibility, we will be as ſure to mend and forthwith to relinquiſh it; by which expected act of theirs we ſhall be reduced unto ſuch good terms, in which all Anti-catholicks continually are, that is to ſay, to believe at random, reel wildly up and down unconſtantly, and fall at variance amongſt our ſelves, as they do; and then I hope the Enquirer will be contented with us.

But the want on their behalf of ſuch an efficacious proof as this, hath been the true reaſon why we have not hitherto thought of any alteration, or coming towards them. Certainly it is much better to be perſuaded though falſely, of an infallibility, than to be ſure to have none, as you now are, but to be wrangling perpetually, falling out and fighting amongſt your ſelves; whereas, before you were, whenas our Religion prevailed, this inconvenience happened not. So that, in fine, all the goodly fruits you have reaped from your impugning Church and Councils, and in bringing in inſtead thereof a new invention of your own, is but the making of your ſelves and your Country miſerable, which daily, by dear experience we find. And ſo much for the Enquirer's unadviſed impugnation of the infallibility of the Catholick Church.

Chap. 27. Anſwer to the Concluſion.

Section 1. In your Concluſion which recapitulates the ſumme of theſe debates betwixt his Lordſhip and you, your firſt reſult is acknowledged perfectly, upon ſuppoſition that your Church were *infallible*; but then whether it be or no, that is the queſtion ſtill, and its being taken by you for a *Principle*, when 'tis ſo far from being ſuppoſed one, is the clear ground of the *Irreconcileableneſs* betwixt You and Us. For, upon
A. ſuppoſition that we were your Proſelytes in all manner of doubts beſides, yet your requiring us to believe you not onely in the right, but *infallible*, equally obligeth us to believe all that your *Church* can poſſibly ever *affirm*, as what you do already; and then we muſt have a ſtrong faith indeed, to be able to bear ſuch a burthen. Whereas, if you could but be brought to think it poſſible, you might be deceived, we
B. could then find place in you for *Scripture* and *Reaſon* to make impreſſion: but till then, you have that terrible prejudice againſt them, whenſoever they are produced againſt you (and whenſoever they are urged for you, they are to little purpoſe, onely to confirm you in the belief of that which you are already *infallibly* perſwaded to be *infallible*) that they are but temptations and ſhafts of Satan, which, the ſtronger
C. they come, and the more irreſiſtibly, the more is your faith obliged to reſiſt them all; and to that, this one fortification is ſufficient, that you know that whoſoever doubts of your infallibility, is not fit to be heeded in any thing elſe; *Reaſon* muſt ceaſe to be reaſon, *Scripture* to be Scripture, when it appears on that Argument.

Section 2. And that ſure is the reaſon that this Treatiſe of his Lordſhip's, which conſiſts not of more Paragraphs, than convincing *Reaſons*, againſt your *Infallibility*, is ſo eaſily rejected, or forgotten by you, that now you cannot acknowledge ever to have heard any ſuch on that Theme. And then I ſhall not attempt to hope to have ſo much, either *Logick* or *Rhetorick*, as to make that impreſſion on you.

Section 3. Onely let me deſire you to conſider the ground of your laſt period but one, that certainly it is better to be perſwaded, though falſely, of an *Infallibility*, than to be ſure to have none.

Section 4. Where firſt you muſt, if you ſpeak intelligibly, intimate that your *errour* is better (not onely than another *errour*, but) than *truth*; for the *Infallibility* you ſuppoſe to be an *errour*, when you ſo ſpeak, but the no-*infallibility* you do not ſuppoſe to be no-*truth*.

Section 5. But then ſecondly, I am ſo far from this opinion of yours, that I conceive it hard to imagine any *errour*, that could doe ſo much harm, as this of the pretended *Infallibility*, ſuppoſing it, as now you do, to be an *errour*; for that which brings a certain poſſibility (if no more) of all errours after it, and leaves no one falſity out of the *Creed*, that 'tis poſſible for all temptations to perſuade your *Church*; is certainly a *complicated errour*, and may well be called *Legion*, for nothing elſe can be ſo numerous as this; I'm ſure, not the believing you *fallible*, though you were not ſo; For, that would be but *one errour*, and no other neceſſarily conſequent to it, it being very poſſible for him that hath that opinion of you, to think every thing elſe that you think, to think you actually in the truth, although it be poſſible you may be in the
D. wrong. Not to mention the great injury that that *Infallibility*, if it did belong to you, would in one reſpect be apt to doe you, I mean to deprive your *Church* of all reward for any truths you preach, there being no matter of *reward* where there is no *poſſibility* of doing otherwiſe, nor capacity of a *crown*, where, for want of a *poſſibility* of being overcome, there is alſo an impoſſibility of obtaining *victory*.

Section 6. Thus have I given you an impartial account, how much, or rather how little, your Papers have wrought upon my underſtanding; and truly as the end of my writing any thing, was, that I might ſatisfy your judgment, ſo the main end of my enlarging to ſo many particulars, and, (as you may ſee by the expreſſions of my then-preſent-intentions at the end of the firſt *Chapter*) to a length which I had reſolved againſt, by examining almoſt every period in your ſeven ſheets, was to ſatisfy your deſire, ſignified *in*
E. *putting your Papers into ſo many hands*, that, to tell you true, after I had read them over, and declined the having any thing to doe with them once, they within few days after found another way to come to my hands again; ſo that it had not been civility toward you, to have put you to any more trouble, or farther to have tempted you to think your ſelf victorious. To fortify you the better againſt that *temptation*, I have been perhaps more plain and punctual ſometimes, than would otherwiſe have been neceſſary; and if when you have read it over, you find any ſuch *plainneſs* to have been without cauſe, upon your ſignification of your ſenſe of any ſuch my offence, I will promiſe to ask your pardon; mean while I ſhall not trouble you with any farther thoughts of continuing this Controverſie, (*peace* and *unity* and *amity* of pens and hearts being much a more *lovely* thing) but deſire that if any thing in your Paper (as far as it preſſes his *Lordſhip*) be in your opinion unſatisfied, it may in few words) without ſuch a large trouble as
F. this, be mentioned by you, and then friendly debated betwixt us at any time of meeting; of which whenſoever by the means that this came to my hands, you ſhall ſignify to me your pleaſure, I ſhall not fail to ſerve you, being indeed reſolved never to be thus injurious to my Reader again in civility to any man.

From my Study,
Sept. 23. 1645.

AN

A N

Appendix, or Anſwer,

To what was returned by the

APOLOGIST.

TO this *Reply* of mine, what was by the *Apologiſt* returned in the Margent of my Paper, ſhall be now diſtinctly ſet down, as the *Preface* promiſed, with a direction (by ſome Letter of the Alphabet) to that part of any Chapter of the Diſcourſe, to which each of his *Annotations* were applied, and affixed. And for *Anſwer* to them I ſhall not need enlarging.

In the *Introduction*, at the letter [*A*] this Annotation was ſet in the Margent. [*I know of neither Scoffs nor Triumphs.*]

Anſw. That there are ſuch, the Reader will give credit to his own eyes, if he review the latter part of your firſt Chapter, as alſo the cloſe of the eighth, and of the fifteenth Chapter; And that you ought to *know* them, *i. e.* acknowledge and reform them, as being contrary, the former to that *Charity*, the latter to that *Meekneſs*, which our *Saviour* left in charge with thoſe that would be called by his *name*, I hope you will diſcern, and confeſs with me.

Chap. 2. B. the Annotation is [*I do not treat here what is done by ſome, but what in propriety of ſpeech ought to have been done.*]

To this I anſwer, firſt, That it being true (as this Reply confeſſes) that ſome *Romaniſts* uſed that ſtyle of *Catholick Roman Church*, (though this *Apologiſt* did not) This is fully ſufficient to juſtify his *Lordſhip*'s title, becauſe he was not bound to foreſee that this *Apologiſt* would reform the ſtyle of others; And ſecondly, though it be not *propriety of ſpeech*, yet was that no argument neither, becauſe his *Lordſhip* that holds that *Church fallible* in great matters, might conceive it poſſible for them to be ſo in matter of *propriety of ſpeech*, nay was confident that ſo they were, being not able to disbelieve his eyes and ears, that of this they were guilty, as *improper* as it is. But then thirdly, the matter is yet more clear againſt the *Apologiſt*, for though his *Lordſhip*'s title did not *preſage*, yet I which had read that Anſwer, could ſee that he himſelf ſaid that the *Church Catholick* was the *Roman*, and the *Roman* the *Catholick*, and that is the thing which I affirm'd from his own words in that place to which that *Annotation* is prefixt. And therefore for him to ſay, that in *propriety of ſpeech this ought not to be done*] as it is an accuſation of himſelf, who was guilty of that *impropriety*, ſo is it not a confutation of me, who onely ſaid he was ſo.

Ib. C. [*We ſpeak here according to the rules of formal predication, not for reprehenſion of the Enquirer, but for rectifying the manner of ſpeaking, and ſtating the Queſtion rightly.*]

Anſw. 'Tis not imaginable how this note could advantage the Writers cauſe. In the very place to which this note is affixt, I am a-proving by rules of *formal predication*, that, by what is ſaid by the *Romaniſts*, and particularly by your ſelf, it is apparent, that you affirm the *Roman Church to be infallible*, though not *quatenus Roman*; this concluſion you deny not to follow from thoſe *rules*, but ſay, [*you ſpeak according to thoſe rules.*] And truly I have as yet no neceſſity to deny that you doe ſo, nor ſhall I, untill having affirm'd the *Roman Church* to be the *Catholick*, you proceed to deny the *Roman* to be *infallible*, though the *Catholick* be. This you do not yet diſtinctly deny, (though the whole controverſie about the title of his Lordſhip's book, ſhews that you are not very willing to ſtand to the affirmative.) When you doe ſo, I ſhall make bold to put you in mind of thoſe rules, and in the mean, onely to take notice of your own confeſſion, that what you ſaid, was *not for reprehenſion of the Enquirer*: which I muſt affirm to be a retractation of your former writing, which pretended to prove that in truth it *was not ſo, as in the Enquirer's title it is called.* This was then ſurely a *reprehenſion* of the *Enquirer*; and if now you ſay you meant not to reprehend him, this is to ſay you did not mean to doe what you did, which being a ſtyle of humility, I ſhall never reproach or find fault with in you; but yet tell you, that what you call in the next words of your Annotation, your [*rectifying the manner of ſpeaking, and ſtating the Queſtion aright*] is in my *Anſwer* proved to be contrary to your own *manner of ſpeaking*; and a clear *miſ-ſtating*. To which proofs as here

you reply nothing, (nor is it imaginable how you ſhould, the matter being ſo evident, *viz.* that they that affirm the *Roman Church*, to be the *Catholick*, and the *Catholick* to be *infallible*, muſt needs affirm the *Roman* to be *infallible*) ſo do you in effect confeſs that you had nothing to reply to the remainder of that whole Chapter, which as it is the longeſt in the Book, ſo by vindicating the fitneſs of his Lordſhip's title, and ſtating of the Queſtion againſt your exceptions, doth lay very uſefull grounds for the voiding your pretenſions to *infallibility*: For if it be cleared by my firſt Chapter (as I conceive it is, and your Annotations do not deny it to be) that the Queſtion is of the *infallibility of the Roman Church*, then we that deny the *Roman* to be the *Catholick*, muſt never be charged of denying the *Catholick* to be *infallible*, nor be liable to the arguments that are brought againſt us upon that head, (which without queſtion are the beſt you have) though we deny it never ſo confidently of the *Roman*.

Ib. D. *Surely the meaning is very obvious.*]

Anſw. If it be, I am ſure the words do not clearly expreſs it; for how ſhould the editor of his Lordſhip's Tract (to whom the former part of that period belongs, in theſe words [*though no notice hath been taken of any anſwer given already*]) *take notice* of *giving licence for any other anſwer? Give* notice *he* might, but that in my judgment is not to *take*; and *take* notice *you* might, but that I conceive would not cohere with the antecedents; and any third way of rendring, I confeſs I imagin not; and therefore ſtill if the *meaning* be *obvious*, it muſt be met with ſomewhere elſe, than in the ſound, and contexture of the words; but this σφάλμα ſhall not be imputed to you, it was onely an officiouſneſs in me then, to ſhew you it was ſuch.

Ib. E. *Theſe are bitter ſcoffs, and no way grounded upon my words.*

Anſw. That the phraſe [*ſad news*] was grounded on your words there recited by me, I muſt ſtill affirm; for they are moſt evidently a form of complaining, and that is all I meant by [*ſad news:*] yet if to you it ſeem to be a *ſcoff*, or *bitter*, and both thoſe in the plural, (more *ſcoffs* than one in that ſingle expreſſion) though my conſcience doth not accuſe me of any ſuch intention, yet I will fall at your judgment, and beſeech you to pardon me for it; and to make you reparations, promiſe to endeavour to offend no more againſt you, or any other Adverſary, by any kind of *bitterneſs*; and for once, be you pleaſed to imitate my reſolution, and remember, that when another man ſpake it, [*ſad news*] was a *bitter ſcoff*, and then perhaps your *reprehenſion* of me may work a double *cure*, and heal you alſo of ſome *exceſſes*.

Chap. 2. *Anſwer to Chap.* 2. A *I do not beg the Queſtion, but deny what the Enquirer aſſumed as true and granted, namely, that our proofs of the Church are no other nor better than thoſe by which you impugn it: which aſſumpt of his we deny, and whether juſtly or no, muſt depend upon the trial and the examination of his proofs to follow after; and therefore this denial of mine is no* petitio principii, *but a right and Logical denial, which either the Enquirer or you were bound to diſprove, and not to tell us as you do that we are bound to prove againſt the Enquirer, who here chargeth us, and ſuſtaineth the Perſon of the Opponent, or one that argues againſt our Infallibility.*

I am the Defendent, and no Defendent can beg the queſtion, my diſcourſe is Apologetical as the Title tells you.

Anſw. I did not venture to tell you that you were guilty of a *petitio principii*, untill I had, as I conceived, made an *ocular demonſtration* to you that it was ſuch, which you may pleaſe to review in the place; or to ſave you that trouble, I ſhall tell you the ſum of it; you deny a propoſition, which in that place 'tis clear that his Lordſhip proves, and having not anſwered one word to his proofs (which is in effect to deny the *concluſion*) you then give a proof or reaſon of your denial [*for we affirm that our Churches infallibility is proved by reaſons which are real and true*, &c.] this reaſon of yours being as much denied by his Lordſhip, as your main concluſion againſt which he diſputes, ought in any reaſon to have been backt with ſome firm proof, and of that kind you give none but your own affirmation; and becauſe you do not, this I there call a *petitio principii*, agreeably both to *Ariſtotle*'s notion of that *Sophiſm*, and to the notation of the phraſe. For *principium*, or τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ, being acknowledged to ſignify the *queſtion*; for that, or any part of it, to be brought in to prove any thing, that in that diſputation is denied, is either αἰτεῖσθαι or λαμβάνειν, *to beg the queſtion, or take it for granted*, and in effect, to prove a thing by it ſelf, (which is the moſt irrational proceeding that can be.) If you are not yet convinced of this, I ſhall yet farther give you a proof of it from thoſe ancient Authours, which can beſt judge of this matter, the *Interpreters of* Ariſtotle; Take one for all, † *Magentinus*, in his definition of this *Sophiſm*: Ἐν ἀρχῇ αἰτεῖσθαί ἐστιν, ὅταν τὶ δείκνυῃ δι' ἑαυτοῦ, περαίνοντι δὲ ἄλλο δείκνυσθαι, *A begging of the queſtion is, when any thing is proved by it ſelf, which ought to be proved by ſomething elſe.* Or again, ὅταν τὸ αὐτὸ προκείμενον εἰς ἀπόδειξιν, πάλιν λαμβάνωμεν ὡς περαίνοντες εἰς κατασκευὴν ἑαυτοῦ, *when that which is propoſed to be proved, is uſed as a medium, to prove it ſelf.* Or again, ὅταν πάλιν λαμβάνωμεν περαίνοντες, δοκοῦσαν ἑτέρων εἶναι τοῖς προκειμένοις, ὅταν δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν, *when we uſe a medium which ſeems to differ from the queſtion* (or the thing to be proved) *but is all one with it. As if to prove, that pleaſure is good, I ſhould aſſume, that pleaſure is to be choſen; whereas,* ſaith he, τὸ αἱρετὸν, καὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν ταὐτὰ εἶναι, *that which is good, and that which is to be choſen, are all one:* and therefore unleſs that be farther proved, that pleaſure is to be *choſen*, there is nothing done toward the proving it to be *good*. That this is your very manner of proceeding, I need not farther prove, having done it ſo newly by laying your whole proceſs before you; I ſhall onely add the note of that *Scholiaſt*, that Γένος τοῦ ἐν ἀρχῇ αἰτεῖσθαι ἐστὶ τὸ μὴ ἀποδεικνύναι, *The not demonſtrating of what we undertake, is the genus of this begging the queſtion*; or *begging the queſtion is a ſpecial ſpecies of not demonſtrating*; and unleſs you will diſcern firſt, and then labour to repair this infirmity in your diſcourſes, all your mentions of the *Philoſopher in his Analyticks*, will not perſuade us that you are likely to *demonſtrate*.

† Ἐξήγ. εἰς τὰ ςοφιςικ. ἀναλύτ. βιβ. α. fol. 28.

Thus

Thus much I had briefly ſaid to you before, but now have been forced to lay down more largely; and let me tell you, that when I had not onely *affirmed*, but *proved* you guilty of this *Sophiſm*, you ought either by denying my premiſſes, or by ſome other way to have anſwered my proof.

And inſtead of ſo doing, to ſay onely [*you are not guilty*] is a *denying my concluſion*, and *petitio principii* again. And from this you cannot be cleared by what you add [that *you deny what the Enquirer aſſumed as true and granted*;] For firſt, I ſay you were to have *anſwered* or *denied* my *premiſſes*, and you onely aſſay to prove your own *concluſion*: Secondly, your way or *medium* of proving that, is not concluding neither; For the thing aſſumed (by his Lordſhip) being this, [That *the means brought to prove your Infallibility, were fallible means, and ſo granted by you*] his Lordſhip did not aſſume this as granted or true in it ſelf immediately or without proof, but proceeded to prove it to be true and granted by you, and that by this *medium*, becauſe with you nothing was conceived *infallible*, but the *Church*: That concluſion then (being not ſet down as a premiſe or principle of probation, but as a *concluſion* proved by that *medium*) you again profeſs to deny, (remember I ſay you deny the *concluſion*) and then ſure we want no *trial* to diſcover the juſtneſs of ſo doing; and whereas you ſay his *proofs follow after*, I anſwer, that ſome other proofs follow after, but one ſufficient proof is brought in that place; and the denying the concluſion without anſwering of that one proof, is it which brought all this charge and inconvenience upon you; and therefore you now ſee I do not require of you (as you ſay I do) to *prove againſt the Enquirer*, but onely to anſwer his proofs; But if inſtead of doing ſo, you will take upon you to prove the concluſion which the *Enquirer* hath diſproved, and doe that onely by a bare ſaying ſomewhat which you know he denies, this is a *petitio principii* ſtill. And your ſecond Argument that it is not, taken from your being *Defender*, or *Anſwerer*, or *Apologiſt*, will no more quit you from that charge; for though an Anſwerer as long as he doth no more but either deny the *major* or *minor*, or anſwer to either of them by *diſtinguiſhing*, *limiting*, &c. cannot be guilty of that fault, yet if he deny none but the *concluſion*, he doth in effect, and *interpretativè beg* the *queſtion*; and if inſtead of denying of, or anſwering to the premiſſes, he go about to prove the queſtion in hand, or any part of it, he doth by ſo doing, take the place of an Opponent upon him. Now becauſe 'tis poſſible for an *Anſwerer* to doe one of theſe, though he ought to doe neither, it follows, that by either of thoſe ways the *Anſwerer* may *beg the queſtion*; and both thoſe are your caſe at this time, as hath, I conceive, already been manifeſted, and therefore I muſt be excuſed, if I ſtill conceive my concluſion is regular, the *Apologiſt* is *guilty of that Sophiſm.*

Chap. 5. *Anſwer to Chap.* 5. A. *An Anſwerer is not bound to prove but to defend; This Arguer and the Replyer, which is your ſelf, are bound to prove.*

Anſw. He that keeps himſelf ſtrictly to the *Reſpondent*'s task, *i. e.* either to *deny*, or *limit*, or *diſtinguiſh* of either of the premiſſes in the Objection, is not, I confeſs, bound to *prove*, becauſe he is not ſuppoſed to affirm any thing; his *repelling* the Enemies weapons, or *avoiding* of them, is enough to defend himſelf. And if this were your caſe, I ſhould be unjuſt to require any proofs from you. But you muſt be a very great deſpiſer of my Papers, if you did not take notice in that place, that I was forced to be plain with you, and tell you that you had not anſwered (either by *denying* or *diſtinguiſhing*, &c.) any one word to his *Lordſhip* in your whole fifth Chapter, but fell into other diſcourſes of your own, which courſe as it is not the part of an Anſwerer ſtrictly taken, ſo if it be permitted him at all, it muſt oblige him to give proof for all ſuch aſſertions as he ſhall bring in thus caſually, or elſe never to expect, or require to be heeded by his Adverſary.

And of ſuch aſſertions as theſe, (which were caſual and extrinſecal to your diſcourſe, and by me conceived falſe) it was, that I required proof from you, and you are ſtill my Debtour for it.

Chap. 6. *Anſwer to Chap.* 6. A. *If we affirm our principles be certain, contrary to the Enquirer's ſurmiſe, you, if you can, are to prove they are not, or elſe leave off contending.*

Anſw. Certainly this is very ſtrange uſage, when that which you call the *Enquirer's ſurmiſe*, is a concluſion induced by the *Enquirer* by many ſtrong proofs. This you know is there evidenced by me, and if I had been miſtaken, you ſhould have ſaid ſo.

This being ſuppoſed, I muſt tell you, that it is far from being ſufficient for you, to *affirm your principles to be certain*; for when the Enquirer hath propoſed many Arguments to prove they are not *certain*, and among the reſt this convincing one, [That *your Church* (which is your *infallible*) *is offered to be proved by ſuch marks, as the ignorant cannot ſeek it by*, and the *learned*, *though* never ſo honeſt, *may chance not to find it by*] for you ſtill to affirm they are *certain*, and to add no more, is but to *deny the concluſion*; and againſt ſuch an one 'tis to little purpoſe for me to bring farther proofs, when thoſe that are already brought are ſo dealt with; and truly unleſs you pleaſe to give over this courſe of *denying concluſions*, and *not conſidering premiſſes*, I will ſoon obey your adviſe, and reſolve to *leave off contending*.

Ibid. B. *Our Authours have proved all that we in defending do affirm, and if the Enquirer had impugned their proofs, we then would have tried to defend; wherefore that which we affirm and declare, doth not reſt upon a bare affirmation, although I prove them not in this place, as being here a mere Defendant, and not an Arguer.*

Anſw. This Annotation being upon the ſame occaſion, and in ſubſtance the ſame with the former, is already anſwered. Onely I ſhall add, that if you affirm ought which your Authours in other Books bring proof for, this will not excuſe you from a neceſſity of anſwering his Lordſhip's arguments againſt that *concluſion* of your Authours; or if it doe, you muſt not paſs for a *Defendant*. His part it is, to ward the Adverſaries blows; and if he make a thruſt himſelf, he then turns *Offendent* or *Arguer*, and when he doth ſo, he muſt take care his weapon have ſome edge (I mean, his affirmations ſome *proofs* annext) or elſe they will wound no body. As for the *Enquirer*, *i. e.* his *Lordſhip*, it was not his preſent task to defcend

cend to an enumeration and impugning of all your Authour's *arguments* (though yet thoſe which he could think of as your chief, he hath inſiſted on; and were he alive, he would from your dealing here, have little encouragement to ſeek out for others) his intention was to frame *arguments* againſt your *concluſion*, and if you had denied or anſwered them, you needed not to have troubled your ſelf to affirm any thing; or if out of deſign, or *ex abundanti*, you will, you muſt be content to be call'd upon to prove it; For call your ſelf what you pleaſe, you muſt be an *Arguer* when you ſo affirm.

Ibid. C. *Yes ſure by conſequence it is.*

Anſw. I am forced to ask your pardon, if I know not certainly to what part of my diſcourſe this Annotation belongs, whether to the end of one period, or the beginning of the other. Yet it falls out luckily, that whichſoever it is, it is again the *denying the concluſion* (which you are very ſubject to) for the end of the former period is the mention of a *concluſion* deduced from *grounds* immediately before ſpecified. And the beginning of the ſecond period is a *negation* of mine, with proof immediately following it, and before I come to the proof, [*For though*, &c.] you preſently interpoſe your [*Yes ſure by conſequence it is*] but will not conſider me ſo much, as after my example, to give the leaſt proof for what you ſay, or take notice of that proof of mine.

Chap. 7. *Anſwer to Chap.* 7. A. *I make no diſtinction here, but ſuppoſe it made and alſo manifeſt.*

Anſw. I onely ſaid you had *given a diſtinction* (not *made* it) and that ſuppoſed it *made* alſo; and I then conteined my ſelf from taking any exceptions to it; onely I told you, the applying of it to that place, would have *afforded ſome game, if I had been ſo ſportingly diſpoſed.* And to that, I pray conſider how pertinent your Annotation hath proved. I will not be provoked to add more.

Ibid. B. *Your part was to have confuted what I ſay, and not ſo often, and to no purpoſe repeat this* petitio principii.

Anſw. If it be a ſufficient confutation of any *Sophiſter*, to find out, and tell him of his *ſophiſm* (which *ipſo facto* is worth nothing when 'tis diſcovered, as the Title of *Ariſtotle*'s Book of *Elenchs* ſuppoſes, ἔλεγξις being defined by *Varinus*, φανέρωσις τοῦ κεκρυμμένου, *a diſcovery of that which was hid*; and 'tis manifeſt by comparing 1 *Cor.* 14. 24. with *v.* 25. and *Eph.* 5. 13.) then have I obeyed you in confuting what you ſay, though I take not your advice for the way of it. And indeed, if it ſhould be in any Dueller's power to preſcribe to his Adverſary (when he is in his danger) that he ſhall not wound him this *way*, but ſome other, or if it were regular for you to forbid me to tell you of a *petitio principii*, (when you are clearly guilty of it, and when to evidence that againſt you, is not onely the ſhorteſt, but moſt *logical*, moſt expedite, and moſt clear way of *redargution*) your Adverſary might be weary of playing out the prize, though he were ſure to conquer in it. I ſhewed you that an *Anſwerer* might ſo carry the matter, as to be guilty of *petitio principii*, and 'twas but *paſſion* in you to check or tell me, *'twas to no purpoſe*, that I ſaid you were ſo.

Chap. 8. *Anſwer to Chap.* 8. A. *We have done it, and doe it continually when occaſion requires.*

Anſw. I beſeech you reade over thoſe lines of mine to which your Annotation is affixt, and ſpeak your conſcience, whether you think 'twas fitly noted: If you can be ſo partial to your own creature, I will not contend with you; but onely tell you, that as I conceive it impertinent, ſo I ſee apparently, that 'tis contrary to that other ſpeech of yours, which within three lines I there recited from you. For if you doe it continually (*i. e.* prove the *Roman Church to be the true by its agreement with Scripture*, &c.) as here your Annotation ſaith you do, how could you ſay his *Lordſhip* was miſtaken in ſuppoſing you did ſo? I wiſh you had firſt read out to the end of the period, and then I ſuppoſe you would have fitted your *Annotation* to it the better.

Ibid. B. *I do not diſclaim Scripture, though I do not hold it to be the firſt or formoſt proof either of the Church or of Chriſtian Religion, and would know how you your ſelf would convert an Infidel or Atheiſt by Scripture, beginning with that proof.*

Anſw. You muſt again remember (what my laſt Anſwer mentions) that in that place when his *Lordſhip* had ſuppoſed you to prove the *Roman Church to be the true Church by its agreement with Scriptures and Antiquity*, which is in effect by *holding the truth*, you plainly tell him he is *miſtaken* in you. On this ground I muſt conclude (and think it proved by that confeſſion) that you do diſclaim Scripture, as far as I ſaid you did, *i. e.* not to all purpoſes, but to that of which the diſcourſe was, *viz. to prove your Church to be the true Church.* And 'tis not enough to ſay that you do *not hold it to be the firſt or formoſt proof*, &c. For if it be uſed by you as any proof at all, that will alſo be a very probable means, (beſides that it makes it evident, that his Lordſhip was not miſtaken in ſuppoſing it ſo) to bring you into the circle which you were ſo carefull to avoid. You ſee I am clear from your Animadverſion, and ſo have no occaſion to enter into that new controverſie, whether *the Scripture be the formoſt proof either of the Church, or of the Chriſtian Religion*, (though ſure it may be one, without being the other; it may be the *formoſt proof* of evidencing which is the *true Church*, to them that are ſuppoſed Believers (and none elſe will be fit for that enquiry) yet not be the *firſt means* to prove *Chriſtian Religion* to Unbelievers:) And yet I ſhall not be overcoy, nor make much ſcruple to tell you my opinion of this alſo, that I would not begin with an Infidel, with that proof to either purpoſe, as ſuppoſing he did believe it, or that it would of its own accord attract his belief *infallibly*; but for Chriſtianity it ſelf, I ſhould firſt labour to win ſomewhat upon his affections by converſe, and by ſhewing him the excellency of the *Chriſtian* Precepts, (and the power of them in my life)

life) bring him to think my diſcourſe worth heeding; then when I had gotten that advantage, I would relate the *rem geſtam* of Chriſtianity, where all the acts, and miracles, and paſſages of *Chriſt*'s life, would come in; then, if he doubted of the truth of it, tell him the authority, by which it comes down to us in a continued, undiſturbed, undenied *tradition*, from thoſe that were αὐτόπται τῦ λόγυ, *oculate Witneſſes of* Chriſt, *and the whole matter*; and to as good an advantage as I could, compound the ſeveral *motives* of *Faith* together, which if you pleaſe you may view at leiſure in *Grotius de verit. Chr. Rel.* and when by theſe means I had converted him, I ſhould then by Scripture and Antiquity, (which would now be of ſome authority with him) and not by *miracles*, attempt to manifeſt to him which were the *true Church*. To which end it may be worth your remembring, that your *Apoſtle of the Indies*, *Xaverius*, thought fit for their uſe to compile a double *Goſpel*, one of *Chriſt*, another of Saint *Peter*, by the authority of one of them to teach them *Chriſtianity*, of the other, the *ſupremacy* and *infallibility* of Saint *Peter's chair*. But I ſhall not give my ſelf liberty to enlarge on this.

Ibid. C. *I deliver the method, and how it may be, I alſo affirm or declare that it is, I was not in this place to prove, but to defend againſt the Enquirer's arguments, and no other, and therefore thoſe two quarrels needed not.*

Anſw. The deſign of moſt of your *Notes* is to ſave your ſelf from the neceſſity of *proving* any thing that you *affirm*, whereas it might be but an act of a little *ſupererogating charity*, if you would ſometimes prove your aſſertions, even when by ſtrict law you were not bound to it. But, Sir, I will not require your *alms*, but onely your *juſtice*, and though that will not oblige you to *prove*, when you onely *defend*, *i. e.* when you onely *deny* the premiſſes of his *Lordſhip*'s arguments, *&c.* or when you are ſtrictly an Anſwerer; yet when inſtead of that, you confront any *affirmation* of yours to his *Lordſhip's concluſion* (as here you do, and in all places when we charge *petitio principii* upon you) I muſt then be pardoned to put you in mind of your duty (which is that of *Arguers* then, and not of *Reſpondents*) either to prove what you ſo ſay, or not to think you have convinced any man. They that cannot anſwer one argument produced againſt them, may yet think fit to make uſe of ſome argument for them, hoping that may prove as convincing on their ſides, as that againſt them: and ſo by divertiſement put off the heat of the impreſſion; and this you have been proved to be often guilty of, and 'twill ſatisfy no man to ſay, that you neither *are*, *nor* (becauſe Defendant) *can be guilty of ſo doing*.

Ibid. D. *Sure he hath not, for* Turnbull *hath vindicated himſelf.*

Anſw. If every Reply were a *Vindication*, then you may have affirmed truth, and then theſe few marginal notes of yours (ſuch as they are) would be your *Vindication* alſo; and then I ſuppoſe you will give your free conſent that they be *printed*. But the task would be too long to diſprove what you have now ſaid, (for it would require the examination of all thoſe writings betwixt the two Combatants, and when that were done, you would think perhaps, that *Turnbull* were *vindicated*, and I that he were not) I ſhall onely tell you that you had been ſo concluded in a *circle* infallibly, if you had aſſerted that method, which his *Lordſhip* there diſproves; which is enough to vindicate his *Lordſhip* againſt thoſe that do aſſert that method, (as ſure ſome *Romaniſts* do) and againſt them he there argues, and not againſt you, or any in that place, which renounce that method.

Ibid. E. *If our Church be the true Church, it muſt be proved firſtly, as Chriſtianity is firſt proved; that is to ſay, by motives of credibility, and ſupernatural oſtenſions, or acts not of natural and ordinary, but ſupernatural and extraordinary providence; and he that will not prove Chriſtianity by this way, will not prove it at all. After this done, Scriptures and Fathers do come, but not before, and this way is not new, but the way of the Ancients.*

Anſw. I have here no neceſſity of re-examining of the means of proving *Chriſtianity* to an Infidel; it will ſuffice to remember, that thoſe means which are neceſſary to that, may be unneceſſary to prove, which is the *true Church*, becauſe now to him that is converted (as he that will judge betwixt *true* and *heretical*, is ſuppoſed to be) other means may ſufficiently ſupply the place; ſuch are *Scripture* and *Antiquity*, which to an *Heathen* are of no authority, but to a *Chriſtian*, or *ſuppoſitâ fide*, are; and being ſo, (as I conceive, you will not think fit to deny) may well be made the umpire betwixt us, who are, I hope, allowed to be *Chriſtians* ſtill, by the conſent of parties, or if we are not, our pretenſions to *miracles*, will hardly gain any credit with them that have that prejudice againſt us.

Mean while I muſt remember you, that *motives of credibility*, as you call them, are but weak premiſſes to induce a concluſion of ſuch weight, as the choice of religion is. I will tell you what I ſhould have ſaid inſtead of it. *Motives of exceſſive probability*, of the ſame, or greater force than thoſe, on which I ground and build the moſt conſiderable actions of my life, and which (as * formerly I told you) if I will diſbelieve, I have as good reaſon to miſtruſt the wholeſomeneſs of every diſh of meat I taſte on, (which 'tis phyſically poſſible may poiſon me, but yet none but *Hypocondriacks* think it will, or phanſie it ſo ſtrongly, as to abſtein) the ſecurity of any title of eſtate I purchaſe or poſſeſs, the truth of any matter of fact in the moſt acknowledged hiſtory or tradition among men, that I daily talk of. * Anſwer to C. 14.

All which though they produce not (nor are *apta nata* to doe ſo) a *ſcience* or *infallible* certainty, *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, yet doe they (or are very ſufficient to doe ſo) a *Faith*, or fiducial aſſent, *cui non ſubeſt dubium*; of which I doubt no more, than of the demonſtrated problem before me; a *certainty of adherence*, of which the believer is as fully poſſeſt, and from it receives as ſtrong motives to doe any thing proportionable to that belief, as if the *certitude of evidence* were allowed him. And this, I conceive, is a degree prettily advanced above *motives of credibility*; for ſuch is every the loweſt probability, nay almoſt poſſibility, and non-repugnance; whatſoever is poſſible to be, being (in it ſelf, and in caſe the oppoſite

ballance be not otherwiſe weighed down) *credible, i. e.* poſſible to be believed alſo. But this by the way, and *ex abundanti*.

Chap. 9. Anſwer to Chap. 9. A. *Why cannot the ſimple know this* (viz. that the *Greek Church doth not pretend from Saint* Peter) *as ſurely as they know the whole Chriſtian Church pretends from* Chriſt, *and from no other?*

Anſw. Sir, you are a little too haſty in your Annotation; for if you had but read on to the next lines, you had received the anſwer to your queſtion, ſo far as my diſcourſe is concerned in it, *viz.* a ſpecifying of divers ways, by which 'tis poſſible the *Greek Church* might (and one, whereby one part of it doth) pretend ſucceſſion to Saint *Peter*. And then, that which ſo manifeſtly may be, and is, will not I hope be ſo eaſie for ignorant men to know ſurely that it is not, or ſo ſurely as that the *Chriſtian Church* pretends from *Chriſt*, and from no other. Which yet if it have any difficulty in it not intelligible to ſome *ignorant* men, I take no pleaſure in frighting any with an apprehenſion that God will ever damn thoſe *ignorants* for not being ſure of what is ſo difficult, ſo their lives be *believing* and *Chriſtian*, and agreeable to what they do *know* of *Chriſt*.

Chap. 10. Anſwer to Chap. 10. A. *No ſure, not againſt the ordinary neceſſity.*

Anſw. The thing I ſay in that place is, that his *Lordſhip's* argument might be (I ſhall add, is) of force againſt the neceſſity of a guide, (meaning thereby an *infallible* one, for ſuch onely is to our purpoſe) and that that will ſerve his *Lordſhip's* turn, and deſtroy you, I there farther prove by a full explication of the whole matter. And therefore you muſt give me favour to leave out your epithet of [*Ordinary*] which you would have me interpoſe, when my diſcourſe in order to its end, hath no need of it. And if you tell me, you put it in in your anſwer to his *Lordſhip*, and that therefore I have not vindicated his *Lordſhip* from that anſwer, unleſs I take it in alſo; I muſt then confeſs to you, that I did not ſo underſtand your words, [*all that is nothing againſt the ordinary proviſion and neceſſity of a guide*] that the word [*ordinary*] was ἀπὸ κοινοῦ to be repeated to the word [*neceſſity*] but onely that it belonged to [*proviſion.*] And now that I know your pleaſure, I ſhall more clearly return my anſwer, that his *Lordſhip* ſuppoſes ſome men (and I confeſs my ſelf to be one of them) to believe, that to all who follow their reaſon in the interpretation of Scripture, and ſearch for tradition (*i. e.* the conſtant interpretation of the *Catholick Church* concerning any difficulty) God will either give his grace of aſſiſtence to find the truth, or his pardon if they miſs it. To which purpoſe you may pleaſe to compare *Juſtin. Mart. queſt. 4. ad Orthod.* and, to omit many more, *Facundus Hermian. in def. 3. capit. ad Juſt. l. 11. p. 491. & p. 496. & l. 12. p. 513.*

Now to them that ſo believe, the argument which you fetch from God's providence, to conclude an infallible guide, will not, ſaith his *Lordſhip*, be ſufficient to prove it; becauſe he ſtill will be able to ſay, that where imperfection is accepted, *means* of *perfection* are not *neceſſary*; If God will pardon *weakneſſes*, he need not give ſuch a meaſure of *ſtrength*, as excludes all *weakneſſes*; if *ſincerity*, though with ſome mixture of ſin, will ſerve turn here *in viâ*, we need not expect from God that *integrity* of *faculties*, which either was beſtowed in Paradiſe, or will be in Heaven, to give us an unſinning innocence. And if you will ſtill interpoſe, that this is nothing againſt the *ordinary neceſſity, becauſe theſe are caſes extraordinary*: I anſwer, that this is a great miſtake; For under the *Goſpel* or *Evangelical* State (under which all men have been, ſince the promiſe of *Chriſt* upon *Adam's* fall) there is no *ordinary neceſſity* of never *miſſing* or *miſtaking*; our natural ſtate being an eſtate of *weakneſs*, is advanced by *Chriſt* into ſuch a condition, not wherein all *weakneſs* is excluded, but wherein *ſincerity* with mixtures of ſlips and errours ſhall be accepted, and this as *infallibly* as *innocence* had been rewarded under the *firſt Covenant* made with *Adam* in the firſt ſtate. To the *firſt Covenant*, which is *ſtricti juris*, ſuch pardon for ſlips might be *extraordinary*; but to this *ſecond* (whereof ἐπιείκεια or gentleneſs, is as much a part, as ἀκριβοδίκαιον, or ſtrict juſtice, was before) this pardon for invincible infirmities is as *ordinary*, as obligation to puniſhment for every ſlip, had been before, this being a prime ingredient in that Covenant, and not *extraordinarii*, but *ordinarii juris*, that under it ſuch ſlips ſhall not be remembred. In like manner as in this Kingdom, *Chancery*, though it be oppoſed to *common law*, (in one ſenſe, as that ſignifies *ſtrict law*) yet it is a part of our *common law*, as that ſignifies the *municipal law*, or total body of Laws by which this Kingdom is ruled; *Equity* (though perhaps it came in later, and to repair defects or exceſſes in the *ſtrict law*) being now as much every Subjects right, and Writs out of that Court as legally required and granted, and the whole proceſs in Chancery, as clearly *ſec. jura & conſuetudines Angliæ*, and ſo, as much *ordinary*, or *ſecundum ordinem*, as any thing that paſſes in the *common-pleas*. And ſo much for your nice interpoſition of the word [*ordinary*] to your pretended *neceſſity* of a *guide*; where yet I might farther tell you, that *infallibility* is not eſſential to, or inſeparable from a *guide*; and therefore though the *guide* were granted to be *ordinarily* neceſſary to the finding out of truth, yet this would not come home to *infallibility*. The antecedent I could make good at large, if it were now ſeaſonable.

Ibid. B. *They* (i. e. *miſſes and miſtakings*) *are called extraordinary, becauſe happening accidently beſides the proviſion of the law, and not becauſe they happen ſeldom.*

Anſw. That *miſſes* and *miſtakings*, infirmities and ignorances, do happen *beſides the proviſion* of the ſecond, or the *Evangelical Covenant*, is a miſtake, as was intimated then (within few lines after thoſe, whereon your Annotation was faſtened) and now at large proved in my laſt anſwer to your former Annotation, and I ſhall not need repeat it, but onely tell you there is a *law of faith* (as well as of *works*) and that in that law there is proviſion for *errours*, as well as *ſins*, and that I hope belongs to all *Chriſtians*, *for we are not under the law, but under grace.*

Ibid. C.

Ibid. C. *And why ſo?*

Anſw. I had before given you the reaſon, *viz.* becauſe your diſcourſe hath tended to infer the one, and not the other.

Chap. 14. *Anſwer to Chap.* 14. A. *No man can bind another under pain of Anathema to believe as he defines, unleſs his definition be certain.*

Anſw. There was here very little occaſion for this note. For the buſineſs of *Anathema's*, I had ſufficiently reſtrained; Firſt, by limiting them onely to *excommunications*, as an act of *Eccleſiaſtical* diſcipline upon the refractary; and therefore ſecondly, not for matter of ſimple believing or disbelieving; but thirdly, for matter of diſobedience to our lawfull Superiours; and that diſobedience, again, not in refuſing to ſubmit our underſtandings, but our wills, and our conſequent actions: and fourthly, all this with ſtubbornneſs and perverſeneſs, after the uſing of all milder courſes. And with theſe and the like limitations there will be no more difficulty to ſay, an *Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrate* may *excommunicate* a diſobedient refractary perverſe Gain-ſayer, without undertaking to be infallible, than to ſay a Civil Magiſtrate may puniſh a Malefactour, without being *inerrable*. And therefore when you talk of *binding to believe under pein of Anathema*; there is ſome miſtake in that, or if there were not, yet *Truth* (if it were on grounds of Scripture believed to be ſo) would be as ſufficient a foundation of ſo doing, as the *infallibility* of the Judge. For not onely every *truth* is in it ſelf as *certain*, as that which is *infallible*, (every matter of *fact* that is ſo, is as certainly true, as any demonſtration in *Euclid*, and he that ſpeaks it, ſpeaks as *certainly true*, as if he did *demonſtrate*, yet is not in other things *infallible* for all that) but he that believes it with a full aſſent, hath as little *doubt* of that truth, as if it were before his eyes; yet doth it not *fide cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, on any ſuppoſition of its *infallibility*; by which means (though he pretends not to *infallibility*, yet) having no degree of *doubt*, he hath that, on which he will confidently build any *action*, and even lay down his life for ſuch truths, if they be of weight, which if it be not ground enough to proceed on to an *eccleſiaſtical cenſure* againſt the *ſtubborn* and *perverſe*, you are very mercifully diſpoſed, and I will not provoke you out of it, but rather give you my ſuffrage, that no man be thus *cenſured* for matter of *opinion*, but upon that light which is clearly deducible from the *Scripture*, or *univerſal Tradition*; and then I ſhall confeſs my ſenſe, that to *anathematize* men for any matter of doctrine, of any lower alloy, is, though not *formally*, yet *interpretativè* a kind of pretending to *infallibility*, uſurping as much, as if men were *infallible*, which they that have the ſpirit but by *meaſure*, ſhould have ſo much *humility* in themſelves, and *charity* toward others, as not to be guilty of.

Ibid. B. *The ſword preſerves not inward unity, nor ſatisfies the mind.*

Anſw. I had no occaſion to ſay it did. I was ſpeaking (as your anſwer called me to it) of *diſcipline*, and *unity*, or ſuch *unity* as *diſcipline* produced, which is *outward unity*, as oppoſed to diviſion and *Schiſm*; and yet let me tell you, it were not unpoſſible to extend my ſpeech to *inward unity*, and *ſatisfying of the mind*. For ſuppoſe a particular *Church* to have ſufficient means to work in the hearts of her Sons this inward unity, *viz.* by ſetting up the authority of *Scripture*, as it is interpreted by the *Fathers*, and receiving with due reſpect and obedience all *Apoſtolical Traditions*; Theſe, if duly revered by all Sons and Subjects, would be able to keep all of one mind in all matters of *Faith* (and for lower points, ſome kind of *liberty* being allowed, would preſerve *Charity* as well) and then while that Church were in this happy temper, you may farther ſuppoſe the *ſword of violence* to come in, and diſturb all, wreſting out of her hands the uſe and exerciſe of thoſe means, and beating down the *authority*, and taking away the *reputation* of them. And then in the caſe thus ſet, you will ſurely grant, that the *rightfull ſword*, if it might be ſo proſperous as to vanquiſh the diſturber, and reſtore what was thus violently taken away, may prove no improbable means of preſerving even *inward unity* in this ſenſe; and if you mark it, we ſpake it not in any other. And yet once more, if we had, we might have been juſtified perhaps in our ſaying. For *Hereſie* being a piece of carnality in the Apoſtles judgment, 'tis poſſible that the outward *ſmart*, that comes from the exerciſe of the *power of the ſword*, *i. e.* from temporal puniſhments, may cure that diſeaſe, and perſuade them, who inſtead of pleaſure from their *hereſie*, reap nothing but pain and ſorrow, to make better proviſion for their own *fleſh* and *bloud*, and think of hearing that reaſon, to which other honeſt mens ears are open, and then that may produce inward unity alſo, and theſe mens minds may be ſufficiently ſatisfied with that truth coming thus to them *tempore congruo, at a fit ſeaſon of working*, which at another time had been rejected. You ſee how little reaſon you had for that annotation.

Chap. 15. *Anſwer to Chap.* 15. A. Chillingworth *ſaith it in terms, and him alſo I deſired to anſwer.*

Anſw. Can you think this fair dealing? His *Lordſhip*, I made appear from his words, ſaid it not. And you cannot ſay he did. But *Chillingworth* ſay you *did ſay it*. What is that to his *Lordſhip*, or to me who undertake onely to vindicate his *Lordſhip*, and had not that rich harveſt of leaſure to think fit to be retained any more in other mens cauſes on ſuch joyleſs terms as theſe? in which, rather than I would adventure to be engaged, I ſhould be content to be thought to have no degree of kindneſs to him, eſpecially hearing that you had three great volumes prepared againſt Maſter *Chillingworth*: But then I pray what is the meaning of [*him alſo I deſired to anſwer?*] Can you think fit to impoſe a thing on his *Lordſhip*, which was ſaid onely by Maſter *Chillingworth*, and when you were diſproved, think you had ſtill confuted Maſter *Chillingworth alſo*, when you had onely falſified, not confuted his *Lordſhip?* Sure, Sir, this is not fair.

Ibid. B. *I know very well this was objected by both of them, and this I desired to answer, whether it were in their books or no.*

Answ. Here is more of the same strein. But I did conceive by your title, that you had confuted his *Lordship*'s Tract that was published, not any unwritten discourses, which we have no way of knowing, whether they past or no, I am sure were not undertaken by me to be vindicated. I never resolved to justify all that you could say either of them said, and I might be forced to be uncivil with you, if I should enter any such debate with you.

Ibid. C. *Neither* Arius, Nestorius, *nor others could peep out for saying any thing against the doctrine received. How then could this* Dionysius *have escaped, if he had adventured any thing against all the Orthodox?*

Answ. You are very much given, instead of answering *Reasons*, to deny *Conclusions*, and if that were backt with *Reason*, 'twere yet very improper for a Respondent, which you told us was your office at this time. But then secondly, in this matter you know, that neither I, nor his *Lordship* have said that *all the Orthodox* were for the *Millennium*. And yet thirdly, if they had, yet the denying the *Millennium* being a more tolerable opinion than those other of *Arius*, and *Nestorius*, *Dionysius*'s opposition of the *Chiliasts* might pass more unresisted, than *Arius*, or *Nestorius* could do.

Ibid. D. Photius *tells us there were Answers given, though he recites them not, and* Schottus *in his Notes hath resolved them.*

Answ. I will not take the pains to see or examine whether *Photius* say there were Answers. If he recites them not, I shall not be much moved with such blank Papers. The truth is, this hath been the way to satisfy the hardest Arguments that ever were brought, and confuting whole Books at once, by having it given out, that they are confuted, or that answers are made to them, when what those answers are, is not so much as intimated; this is a very cheap way of confutations; As for *Schottus*'s Solutions, if he have any, they prevail little with us; I am sure they will not conclude that *Photius* foresaw, or would have counted them of any moment to alter his opinion, which was the onely thing I there had occasion to take notice of.

Ibid. E. *Though* Philoponus *cite but one Epistle, yet elsewhere he numbers him among the famous Doctours,* Basil, Gregory, *&c. thereby insinuating he had left works as they had, and not one single Epistle to* Policarpus. *This is but a conjecture, but such both we and all must use in matters of fact, and when we are to walk through dark passages of Antiquity.*

Answ. Sir, you cited three places out of *Philoponus*, to prove that *Dionysius Areopagita* wrote those works now extant bearing his name: This testimony I told you, would be nothing to your purpose, unless it testified (if not all those Books, yet) of some one wherein he wrote against the *Chiliasts*. But this I shewed you was not done, because those places mention nothing of his, but an *Epistle* of *Polycarpus*, and in that I advertized you there was nothing against the *Chiliasts*. This it seems you cannot deny, but being willing to say something, say that *elsewhere* Philoponus *numbers him amongst the famous Doctours*, &c. I have not now leasure to reade over all *Philoponus*, for that [*elsewhere*] though I have reason to think, that you that before cited the Chapters in *Philoponus* so punctually, would have had the same charity to me again, if it had suted with your interests) considering how little can be concluded from what you now cite out of him. *Dionys.* was *numbred among the famous Doctours*, Basil, Gregory, *&c.* doth it follow thence, that all the works now extant under his name were his, or particularly that, wherein he opposes the *Chiliasts*? Nay, would not a man rather conclude from that pretended testimony of *Philoponus*, that the Authour under the name of *Dionysius Areopagita* was some Writer about Saint *Basil*'s or Saint *Gregory*'s time, with whom he is there consorted, and that is somewhat later than *Dionysius* in the Scripture. Nay, if *Philoponus* really meant him, would he not rather have given him the title of an *Apostolical* Person, than of a *famous* Doctour, such as Saint *Basil*, &c. As for the insinuation which you mention from this of *Philoponus*, if it did conclude as you would have it, that he *left Works as they* did, and not onely one single *Epistle*, yet sure 'twill not so much as once insinuate that they were the Works, that we have under his name; much less that peculiarly, which opposes the *Chiliasts*; least of all, that 'twas the *Apostolical Dionysius* that really wrote all these. But you confess *these but a conjecture*, and therefore sure 'twill be a very weak prop to hold up *infallibility*, especially when the conjecture, if it should be supposed true, would tell us that which we had not before been told from you, that the *Chiliasts* doctrine was taught, (and so capable of being confuted) so early as the *Apostles* times, for with them this *Dionysius* lived.

You *conclude that such conjectures as this, you and all must use in matters of fact*, &c. To which I answer, that 'tis possible you may be forced to it, on supposition that you think your self obliged to vindicate your *Churches Infallibility*, for 'tis very possible, there may be no better, than such conjectures to sustein it. But believe me, Sir, I will never maintain cause, as long as *God* keeps me in my right wits, which hath no better conjectures, than these to sustein it. And for *matters of fact* so long ago, they are of all things in the World the unfitteſt to be believed upon such *conjectures*. Because nothing but an authentick expres witnes can be ground of *faith* for such. There is no matter of fact done yesterday, but may if we will go by conjectures (I am sure as good and as probable as yours here) be related 10000 ways, for whatsoever may be, some bold Affirmer may conjecture was, and the more ancient, and more dark the passage was, the more liberty there will be for such Conjecturers, because the less possibility to confute any of them.

Ibid. F.

Ibid. F. Salvian *doth not refuse to condemn the Arian hereſie, but ſome of the Gothick Arians for it, as men not guilty of the malice of it.*

Anſw. If you look again, you will find that both his *Lordſhip*, and I, ſay that *Salvian* refuſed to condemn the *Arian Heretick*s (not *hereſie*) and this it ſeems, you confeſs with the reſtraint of [*Gothick Arians*] and this will ſerve our turns perfectly, and ſo we ſhall not quarrel about that, but hope from your own confeſſion, that he that is not willing to condemn all Proteſtants, may eſcape as well as *Salvian* even in your cenſure.

Chap. 16. *Anſwer to Chap.* 16. A. *The Council of* Conſtance *doth not teach this* [*viz.* that no faith is to be kept with Hereticks] *neither our Doctours hold it,* as Molanus, Becanus, Tannerus, Layman, Coeffecteau, Coquæus, *and others do ſhew us.*

Anſw. To *teach* is an equivocal word, and may ſignify to define by way of *poſition* or *doctrine* in *univerſum*; In this ſenſe I ſaid it not, nor do now mean it of that *Synod*, that they made any ſuch *determination*, that it ſhould be unlawfull to *keep faith with Heretick*s, or lawfull for any man in any caſe not to keep it. But then to *teach* may ſignify alſo, to *teach* by *example*, and to lay grounds of doctrine for the juſtifying of ſuch example. And thus the *Council of Conſtance* did *teach* it; The *Emperour* had given ſafe conduct to *John Hus*, &c. and the *Synod* declared, that that ſafe conduct ſhould be no prejudice to any Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction, and that *non obſtante* any ſuch conceſſion, any competent Eccleſiaſtical Judge might enquire, and proceed againſt any ſuch Perſons, and puniſh them as much as juſtice ſhould perſuade, if they would not retract their errours. And this coſt thoſe poor men their lives, whoſe preſumption on the *Emperour's* ſafe conduct, made them venture themſelves in that ſnare, never ſuſpecting, that ſuch a diſtinction as that could have proved ſo fatal to them. That you may not hereafter ſay I charge you unjuſtly, I ſhall ſet you down the very words in the Council in *Binius*, *Seſſ.* 19.

Præſens ſancta Synodus ex quovis ſalvo conductu per Imperatorem, Reges, & alios ſæculi principes, hæreticis vel de hæreſi diffamatis, putantes eoſdem ſic à ſuis erroribus revocare, quocunque vinculo ſe aſtrinxerint, conceſſo, nullum fidei Catholicæ vel juriſdictioni Eccleſiaſticæ præjudicium generari vel impedimentum præſtari poſſe ſeu debere declarat, quo minus dicto ſalvo conductu non obſtante, liceat judici competenti & Eccleſiaſtico de ejuſmodi perſonarum erroribus inquirere, & aliàs contra eos debitè procedere, eoſdemque puhire, quantum juſtitia ſuadebit, ſi ſuos errores revocare pertinaciter recuſaverint, etiamſi de ſalvo conductu confiſi ad locum venerint judicii, aliàs non venturi: nec ſic promittentem, cum fecerit quod in ipſo eſt, ex hoc in aliquo remanſiſſe obligatum. I ſhall not trouble you with the *Engliſh*, but onely ask, what this differs from teaching that *faith is not to be kept* (*i. e.* not neceſſarily, but in ſome caſe may be broken) *with Hereticks?* They that ſhall after ſafe conduct given, proceed to judgment (be it *Eccleſiaſtical*) againſt any man, and condemning him for *hereſie*, deliver him up to that ſecular hand to puniſh him with death, who had given him the ſafe conduct, and tell him, that he, having done what in him lies, remains not obliged by his promiſe, but may and muſt put him to death, who came to that judicature, onely on confidence of that his promiſe and ſafe conduct; have ſure proceeded upon other notions of juſtice, than thoſe with which my education hath embued me, and I muſt profeſs to appeal from their judgments, as in my Reply to that citation of them, I was bold to doe; and whatever your friends *Molanus*, &c. have thought fit to ſay for the ſaving the reputation of that *Council*, the matter is too groſs to be palliated, and I ſhall not trouble my ſelf or you to examine their excuſes.

Ibid. B. *Hereſie is puniſhed not for the accidental grievouſneſs of it, but for the eſſential.*

Anſw. This is again a *denying the concluſion*, (and not ſo much as endeavouring to prove the contrary) for this was the thing in this place clearly proved by the citation of thoſe Laws, that all Hereticks (*viz. Arians* and *Macedonians* by name) were not to be ſo puniſht, when onely *Eutychians* were; the former of theſe acknowledged by you as much Hereticks in reſpect of the *eſſential* grievouſneſs of their doctrine, as the latter, From whence it follows, that either there was great partiality, or elſe the difference aroſe from the *accidentals*. And truly, Sir, your ſaying in general that it is not ſo, will little perſuade any, when here is ſuch evidence in the particular, that it is.

Ibid. C. *The title of defence is the Argument.*

Anſw. There is not in that place any one word of this *title of defence*, or of any other argument; And that was all I affirmed. If you pleaſe to ſurvey the place, that will judge it betwixt us.

Ibid. D. *This is a hard cenſure, and hardly to be proved.*

Anſw. I confeſs 'tis hard in ſome ſenſe, *i. e.* to them that ſuffer under you for being *Hereticks* (as you call thoſe that depart from your deformations) and for being *invaders* (which all may at pleaſure be called, that are not able to reſiſt.) As for the cenſure, it is but that for which the grounds are gathered from your own words. Which 'till you diſprove, 'tis but your bare ſaying that 'tis an hard cenſure; or when it is proved, it matters little what difficulty there was in doing it.

Ibid. E. *Theſe were not ſettled violences, but tumultuous, and outrages not for Religion, but for other quarrels occaſioned by Religions.*

Anſw. The paſſage to which this Annotation was affixt, was about the *pictures of Papal approbation of Maſſacres*, to be ſeen at *Rome*. Which if they were, as you now ſay, *tumultuous* and *outrages*, then it ſeems

there is *Papal approbation* for ſuch; and then, either that or you are *fallible*. But ſince you ſee it neceſſary to add another limitation, that the *Maſſacres* ſo approved were not for *Religion*, I would fain perſuade my ſelf that you diſclaim *Maſſacres for Religion* (the lawfulneſs of which you were ſo long defending.) And if you be now in that good mood of mercy, I ſhall not go about to confute or provoke you out of it, but rather pray that God confirm you and all your friends in it for a longer ſpace, than your charitable not damning us did laſt in the former part of the Chapter.

Ibid. F. *Thoſe of* Queen Mary's *days had ſpoiled and ſtript the Catholicks of all they had, and therefore no marvail they did ſeek to puniſh them ſeverely, and to ſuppreſs them as men would do wild Boars broken into a Park or Garden.*

Anſw. He that ſhould compare this Annotation with the Text, would wonder how it came in, ſo without all temptation or occaſion. I was there a challenging him to name one, that ſince *Queen Mary*'s days was in this Kingdom put to death for *Religion*. And to the mention of *Queen Mary*, the Annotation is affixed. But I ſhall excuſe the impertinence; that very hint might well put him in mind of that ſea of bloud in *Queen Mary*'s days. Which if it were by way of puniſhment for ſpoiling and ſtripping *Catholicks*, and not for *Religion*; I beſeech you produce one ſuch bill of indictment brought in againſt the ſufferers. Our *ſtories* have told us otherwiſe; If you have any authentick Records in your *Archives*, I pray make us partakers of the truth; In the mean, I fear a Proteſtant Son of a *Romaniſt* Father, may, when opportunity ſerves, paſs for ſuch a *wild boar* and *a ſpoiler*.

Ibid. G. *My ſenſe is, that Religion may not be planted by arms, but being once planted and in quiet poſſeſſion, it may. And this I ſuppoſe no learned man will deny.*

Anſw. I may believe you, that this is now your ſenſe; but that it is the ſenſe of thoſe words of yours, which I was then confuting, I ſhall be confident to deny, not onely becauſe the words bear no ſuch ſenſe, but becauſe you did there your ſelf interpret them thus, that the thing which you diſclaimed the deſigning by *arms*, was onely the juſtifying the right and truth of Religion by them. Which I then conceived to ſignify, that your ſwords do onely force men to be of your minds, do not give them reaſons why they ſhould. Yet if after all this, you tell me in earneſt, that this was not your meaning, I ſhall cry you mercy for the miſtake, but not now enter into a diſpute with you of that new queſtion now propoſed by you, [*Whether Religion* (that muſt ſignify your doctrines as they are diſtinguiſht from, or oppoſed to ours, or elſe 'twill not be pertinent to our purpoſe) *being planted and in quiet poſſeſſion, may*] becauſe I cannot imagine what verb that ſyllable [may] is the mood of. [Plant] it cannot be, for that which is in poſſeſſion, is already planted: But what it ſhould be, I muſt not divine for you. Onely at an adventure I ſhall make a plain ſtate: If your doctrines were in quiet poſſeſſion here, and you ſhould know of any man that taught the contrary to them, muſt your ſword be drawn againſt him, or no? I beſeech you anſwer out of the ſenſe of your brethren, that we may know what to expect from you. For my own part, I ſhall make no ſcruple to tell you, that though the *defender of the faith* have the power of the *ſword* given him by God to that end, to govern in *godlineſs* and *quiet*, and may therefore draw it effectually againſt any that raiſe ſedition to bring in ſome other Religion againſt that which is by law eſtabliſht, or that vent doctrines that are in themſelves *ſeditious*, yet ought he not, onely in caſe of any ſingle doctrine or difference in Religion (where none of the civil intereſts are concerned, no violent aſſault made, or feared from the Diſſenters) to unſheath his ſlaughtering ſword againſt any ſuch Diſſenter, provided always that that doctrine be not blaſphemous. (And they that conſenting to this truth, will yet tyrannize over mens ſouls *in ordine ad temporalia*, as you and ſome others have done over mens *bodies and eſtates in ordine ad ſpiritualia*, ſhall never be excuſed by me.) And of this opinion I conceive there might be vouched as learned, and as primitive-tempered *Chriſtians*, as any that are more zealouſly, and ſo more bloudily minded.

Ibid. H. *Aſperſions be eaſily caſt, but ſhould not be admitted, when there are ſtrong preſumptions to the contrary, without evident proof; The Catholicks were known good Patriots under our former Kings, and under this our moſt gracious Prince we have good teſtimony, greater than which cannot be given.*

Anſw. The caſe is not here of aſperſions, but of matters of *fact*, or attempts of *Prieſts*, whereby *Queen Elizabeth* was known to have been in danger. On which provocation the Laws forbidding all ſuch to come into the Kingdom, made it ſuch a legal *preſumption*, that if they did, they ſhould incur that ſuſpicion, and ſentence of the Law. And ſo every man knowing what meaſure to expect from the Laws, were farther to be preſumed either traiterous or mad, if on thoſe terms he would adventure on ſuch a forbidden journey. As for evident proof, which you require, it belongs little to this matter, becauſe the very being in the Kingdom, was a demonſtration of contemning the Law, and an evidence that they were the men that were under that legal preſumption; which is far more than *a proofleſs aſperſion, with evidence to the contrary*. As for the fidelity of your Patriots under our former Kings, when they were of their opinions, I ſhall not queſtion it; neither in like manner your behaviour to our preſent *Sovereign*, but onely tell you, that the *Queen Elizabeth Laws* might be juſt for all that; (which was all we had now in hand) and for the execution of them in latter times, I before gave you an account.

Ibid. I. *We do profeſs, our beſt reaſon hath brought us to our Religion, not our paſſion, and we have as much reaſon to be believed as any others can.*

Anſw. 'Tis poſſible you may not; for if mens actions give in any teſtimony againſt their words, there will not be ſo much reaſon to believe ſuch, as when there is a concordance of them; But if upon ſerious

thrift

ſhrift you are able to profeſs this ſincerity, I ſhall be ſo charitable to believe you, and allow you any hope of mercy for your *errours*, which you can wiſh; but yet tell you, that by making this profeſſion in the plural number, you do ſomewhat prejudge it; no man being ſo privy to the hearts of his fellow profeſſours, as to be a fit voucher for them, every man muſt *ſtand* or *fall* to his own *Maſter*.

Ibid. K. *I was to anſwer and not to prove, and therefore might in right deny what the Enquirer falſely ſuppoſes without proof. It is the Reſpondent's right to affirm the very point in queſtion, or to deny it, without caring whether it be granted or no, ſo he himſelf be ready to defend it; and ſo he that can exact this as his own, ſhall not need to beg any thing, and if he do, he cannot beg more than what he hath, and what he affirms or denies already. For example, I deny againſt* Copernicus *that the earth moves, or I affirm that it is quiet, and I ſtand to maintain my ſaying. Certainly this is no begging, but yet to ſay that it is ſo, may be a begging, or if I ſhould ſay it ſtood ſtill, becauſe it doth not move, were a frivolous ſpeech, but yet for all that no begging of the queſtion.*

Anſw. This vindication of your beloved *petitio principii*, (that ſtands you in ſuch ſtead, and returns ſo frequently upon you) I have already examined, and diſcovered the miſtakings of it; and muſt now tell you again, that when the queſtion is by the Opponent proved by any *medium*, it muſt never be lawfull for the Reſpondent to deny it again any farther than by denying the proof on which it was inferred; for this would be the denying the concluſion, and *petitio principii* again. The Reſpondent in this caſe cannot *exact the queſtion as his own*, nor any otherwiſe defend it, than by repelling the weapons brought againſt him. As for your great *ſimile* of denying the *motion of the earth*, and your ſtanding to maintain your ſaying; if you doe this by any other means, than by denying or anſwering the proofs produced againſt you, this is not the Reſpondent's part, but will, when you have done what you can, appear to be that vulgar *Sophiſm*. It being certain, that when a thing is queſtioned betwixt two, the affirming without proof, is *begging* it; and it being not the *Reſpondent*'s part to prove (for if he do, he becomes *Opponent*) it follows neceſſarily, that the Reſpondent that in time of diſputation affirms, muſt either ceaſe to be *Reſpondent*, or elſe *beg the queſtion*.

Chap. 18. *Anſwer to Chap.* 18. A. *We are to conſider here, not what is conceived, but what is to be conceived. Now what is to be conceived I have ſhewed, namely, that the Church underſtands better than he doth, for right reaſon will tell him this.*

Anſw. This is the very thing which is diſproved in that place, and then the bare repeating it over again, will be but a mean kind of vindication. Be pleaſed to look over the place again, and if you will ſtill think that there was any place for this Annotation, I ſhall be ſorry I have been thus troubleſome to you.

Ibid. B. *I have ſhewed the reaſon why.*

Anſw. When an argument is framed on a double *ſuppoſition*; without diſputing the truth of either, 'tis not to be allowed the *Reſpondent* to anſwer, by denying the truth of either of the things *ſuppoſed*, for they are *ſuppoſed* in that diſpute, but not *diſputed* of. As for example, if the queſtion were, [*Whether ſuppoſing* Adam *were not faln, and* Chriſt *were come, the coming of* Chriſt *would be for the ſin of* Adam.] Do you think 'twould be tolerable for the Reſpondent to avoid ſome argument brought againſt him, by ſaying that it was abſolutely falſe to ſay that *Adam* was not faln, whereas 'twas true that *Chriſt* was come? This would certainly be ſo groſs and impoſſible to be juſtified, that I ſhould ſuſpect any man's fidelity, that ſhould tell me, he had rendred a ſatisfying reaſon why this ſhould be. And this is your caſe at this time.

Ibid. C. *Whether ſhe be infallible or no, ſhe is like to be wiſer than any private man. And this point cannot be in controverſie with a wiſe man, and therefore here is no* petitio principii.

Anſw. This is a rare way of replying, when a diſcourſe hath been proved guilty of a *petitio principii*, to ſay 'tis impoſſible it ſhould, and when a thing is denied, to ſay it cannot be in controverſie.

But, Sir, I ſhall yield you, the *Church* may be wiſer than any private man, yet not conceive it to follow (unleſs ſhe be alſo *infallible*) that when a private man and the Church differ, ſhe muſt always be in the right. He that is much wiſer than another, may yet in ſome particular be miſtaken, when that other is in the right, yea, and may be adviſed and reformed in ſuch a particular, by one that is not ſo wiſe as he. This you may apply to the matter in hand, not ſo far as to prefer the authority of any one man before the Church in general, but onely ſo, as not to pronounce it *infallible*. I might tell you farther, that a member of the *Church* of *England* aſſenting fully to the doctrine of that *Church*, and ſo diſcharging the duty of a private man in preferring the judgment of the *Church* (whereof he is a member) before his own judgment, may yet doubt of ſome things affirmed by the *Church* of *Rome*, and not make the compariſon between a private man's judgment, and the judgment of the *Church*, but onely betwixt one particular *Church* and another. But after all this, I might have ſpared any, or all theſe Anſwers, and do now onely deſire you to look back upon the place, and you will ſoon ſee that no ground is to be found there of your Annotation.

Ibid. D. *If you have no evidence (that 'tis God's pleaſure* that your *Church* ſhould be infallible) *nor can have, you ſay true, but this latter is denied.*

Anſw. 'Tis eaſy to deny concluſions ſtill. But if you will either anſwer the arguments, which have proved there is none, or produce any ſuch *evidence* that it is *infallible*, you ſhall be victorious indeed.

Ibid. E.

Ibid. E. *This argument which the Enquirer impugns, is an argument of his own making, and none of ours, yet for all that, the argument is not like a Ballad as good backward as forward, as Maſter* Chillingworth, *putting it a little differently from the Enquirer, would have it.*

Anſw. If you had pleaſed to diſclaim and not defend this argument at the firſt, you might have ſaved us ſome pains; and if you will yet promiſe me, that no man ſhall out of Maſter *Knot*'s Book make uſe of this argument any more, I will be very well content that argument ſhall be no longer inſiſted on; yet muſt tell you my opinion from my own expreſs knowledge, that they which read that Book before 'twas confuted by Maſter *Chillingworth*, did verily believe that that argument to prove an *infallible* Judge, taken from the topick of *God's goodneſs*, was Maſter *Knot*'s maſter-piece, and the foundation on which the main weight of his ſtructure was ſupported.

Chap. 19. *Anſwer to Chap.* 19. A. *In a Reſpondent there can be no ſuch thing as* petitio principii.

Anſw. We have ſhewed you that a *Reſpondent* may ſo ill behave himſelf, that there may. As for example, when a man hath uſed arguments to prove that you have been guilty of *begging the queſtion*, For you to deſpiſe and not take notice of the arguments, and to ſay onely that there can be no ſuch thing, is the very thing called *petitio principii.*

Ibid. B. *But we again deny it is* [petitio principii] *and the contrary ought to be proved.*

Anſw. It is clearly proved in the place; and not to conſider the proofs, but to deny the *concluſion* is another guilt of that *ſophiſm.*

Ch. 20. *Anſwer to Ch.* 20. A. *If the Enquirer's meaning be as you put it, it makes nothing at all againſt us, nor needs any Anſwer. But* Chillingworth *goes farther, and ſays that many of the ſimpler ſort amongſt us believe Truth upon no better grounds, than others believe Falſhood, and yet our ſimpler ſort believe Truths, upon all the motives that yours do, and ſomewhat more.*

Anſw. That that is his *Lordſhip*'s meaning is plain, *viz. That he that denies your infallibility, and yet uſes his beſt reaſon to ſeek if it be true, will be in as ſafe a condition, as he that believes it, and ſearches not.* And if this be nothing againſt you, I ſhall hope this quarrel is nearer an end than ever I had thought to ſee it. And then ſure many of us ſhall be capable of that *charity*, which you beſtow upon your own, for I am confident what we doe, we doe upon *ſearch*, and *uſe of our beſt reaſon*; and yet that we deny your *infallibility*, you are ſufficiently aſſured.

Chap. 21. *Anſwer to Chap.* 21. A. *He might be ſecretly obſtinate, and yet both he and we conceive the contrary.*

Anſw. 'Tis true he might. But yet ſure you that believe he was not *obſtinate*, cannot believe that the *puniſhment of obſtinacy* ſhould belong to him, but muſt either think God *unjuſt*, or elſe believe him *ſafe* in the ſame degree, that you think him not *obſtinate.* And this is all I required from you.

Chap. 22. *Anſwer to Chap.* 22. A. *Every implicit aſſent muſt be reſolved laſtly into an explicit, or elſe there will be an infinite regreſſion, for every implicit preſuppoſes ſomething in which it is involved or implicit.*

Anſw. I beſeech you obſerve the nature of this Annotation of yours. You ſay in your Apology, that one implicit *Faith* doth not contain another. I proved that falſe by this inſtance, that *ſuppoſing I believed by an implicit Faith, that you were an honeſt man, this might contain in it an implicit belief, of every Propoſition by you aſſerted*; and farther, by putting his Lordſhip's affirmation by you denied into a down-right *Syllogiſm*: you after your wont, anſwer no proofs, but prove againſt the concluſion. And truly your proof is a ſtrange one; every *implicit aſſent muſt be reſolved laſtly into an explicit*: Ergo, *One implicit faith* doth not contain another. As if you ſhould ſay, Every *ſubordinate* cauſe muſt be reſolved laſtly into a *firſt cauſe*; *Ergo*, One *ſubordinate cauſe* doth not contain another; the *Genealogy* of *Abraham* muſt at laſt be reduced to *God*, therefore *Abraham*'s Grandfather was not Father to *Abraham*'s Father: what ſound of reaſon is there in this arguing? The antecedent is the onely thing which you go about to prove, and the conſequence that which we deny, and therefore I ſhall need ſay no more to this Annotation.

Chap. 24. *Anſwer to Chap.* 24. A. *We mean the fire of this World, and that fire we are ſure is not in all Countries appointed to burn ſuch as do diſſent from us.*

Anſw. What? not to burn ſuch as diſſent in matters of *faith*? Is there any matter of *faith* which is not required *ſub pœna ignis?* (I mean alſo with you, the *fire of this world*) If there be, ſpeak out. But you have by your next Annotation in effect confeſt there is not, and ſo by that confuted this, for ſo you add,

Ibid. B. *I make no ſuch diſtinction.*

Anſw. i. e. No ſuch diſtinction, that of matters of *faith* ſome are required *ſub periculo ignis*, ſome not; which is in effect, that in reſpect of that penalty, all matters of *faith* are of the ſame nature. Which is abſolutely contrary to that former, unleſs in that your meaning were, that *fire* was not in all Countries appointed to burn Diſſenters from you, *i. e.* not in thoſe Countries, where you had not the power. And that will be but a ſlender obligation from you, if it be acknowledged.

Ibid. C.

Ibid. C. *If you could make that appear we were ſatisfied.*

Anſw. It is made appear as much, as your like Aſſertion of your ſelves, *i. e.* by our affirming it. But if you will have patience to reade on in that place, you ſhall ſee the point ſtated, and as much of it proved, as we have need to aſſert in this matter.

Ibid. D. *In ſome places we do* (make uſe of the Argument from Mutual Diſſentions) *but in this it is brought againſt us.*

Anſw. This is clearly falſe, for in the 40. Sect. his *Lordſhip* there mentions it as an Argument of yours, and in that place becomes Reſpondent, gives an Anſwer to that Argument, and that is the ground of the preſent debate.

Ibid. E. *Our Criterion or rule of Faith keeps off diſſentions when it is followed, yours does not. Lutherans and Calviniſts follow the ſame rule, and yet diſſent and condemn one another, ours do not ſo, but remit the differences to be decided to one and the ſame judge both exteriour, and interiour.*

Anſw. I was a-proving by the ancient *Catalogues of Hereticks*, that there were good ſtore of *Hereticks* in the world before the *reformation*, (from which it followes, that either your *infallible* Judge was not then in faſhion, or elſe that it is not ſuch a ſovereign means or antidote againſt *Hereticks*) you ſeem to diſtinguiſh, that your rule keeps off *diſſentions*, not always, but when it is followed; and prove that farther, becauſe you remit the differences to be decided to one and the ſame Judge. I might anſwer, that our rule, the word of God doth ſo too, at leaſt in matters of *faith*, and that any ſuch diſſention, at leaſt uncharitable cenſuring of Diſſenters, is abſolutely againſt that rule. But I conceive, that is not the thing that commends a rule as a means to prevent diſſentions, that they that follow it diſſent not, (for the rule if it be but one rule, what ever it is, will doe that) but that it is able and apt to keep men obedient, and to reſtrain them from exceſſes and not following of it. Now this is an excellence that theſe many Catalogues of *Hereſies* proved, that you had no right to pretend to; and if we have not ſo neither, we are but Partners in this piece of humane infelicity, to which, as long as we carry fleſh about us, it will be incident, for there *muſt be Hereſies among you.* As for your inſtance of the *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* diſſentions, and condemning one the other, I muſt tell you, that this little concerns the *Church* of *England*, which always diſclaimed the being called by the names, or owning the diſſentions of *Lutheran* and *Calviniſt*, and profeſſeth onely the maintaining of the *Primitive Catholick faith*, and to have no father on earth, to impute their faith to. I might add more even for thoſe *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts*, that if they did really follow (I ſay not onely profeſs, but follow) the ſame rule, they would certainly agree alſo.

Ibid. F. *I do not excuſe all* (the Jeſuits from the doctrine of reſiſting Magiſtrates under colour of Religion, killing Kings, oppoſing the Order of Biſhops &c.) *nor ought you to have accuſed all; For neither all the Jeſuits, nor near all be of that mind, but of the quite contrary.* Bellarmine, Valentia, Petavius, *and other Jeſuits have written for the Order of Biſhops againſt* Salmaſius *and others, but none at all have written againſt it. Neither was the controverſie between the Seculars about that point, as it is moſt evident.*

Anſw. I have already obeyed your commands; and indeed had no neceſſity to accuſe all of that Order in all places. It was ſufficient to prove the point in hand, (*diſſentions* among your ſelves) that any conſiderable number were of thoſe opinions, which are the worſt that are to be found among our *Sectaries.* And it ſeems, you cannot in your own heart excuſe all, as kind as you are to them. If others in a matter of ſuch moment are of a contrary mind, this is an argument not againſt, but for the truth of what is laid to you, diſſentions after all your *infallible* judgments. For the *Jeſuits* opinion of *Biſhops*, I appeal no farther than the diſputations in the Council of *Trent*, and the general pretenſions of that Order to an independency, and abſoluteneſs from any but their own ſuperiour, and the *Pope*; and this, though it allow *Biſhops* over other men, yet is ſufficiently contrary to the *Apoſtolick inſtitution*, and *practice*, of having all the *Churches* and *Presbyters* in them, ſubjected to them. You add, that the controverſie of the *Seculars* (I ſuppoſe you mean and *Regulars*) was not about that point, *i. e.* of *Epiſcopacy*: I did not ſay it was, any farther than thus, as the neceſſity of *Confirmation* is all one with the neceſſity of *Epiſcopacy*, (which truely to me ſeems to be very near it, and I am ſure the buſineſs was, whether the *Catholicks* in *England* ſhould have an *Ordinary* here reſident or no, and that *Ordinary* was a *Biſhop*; ſo that though it was not of *Epiſcopacy, in univerſum*, yet it came to a debate, whether the having *Biſhops* was neceſſary, or no) On which ſoever it is, it is enough to prove *diſſentions.*

C 26. *Anſw. to* C. 26. A. *At leaſt they might have been diſcerned, as well as other errours were, and the Authours of them alſo.*

Anſw. This note being reduced to intelligible ſenſe, will I conceive be, that the now *Romiſh* errours *might have been diſcerned*, &c. To which I anſwer, that though they might, yet Firſt, 'tis poſſible that they might not; Secondly, very poſſible that being favoured, if not brought in by thoſe in authority among them, they would not be branded or recorded for errours; and then, all that we their poſterity can ſee, may be onely, that the *tares* are ſown, but not punctually at what point of the night, or who the man was that ſowed them.

Ibid. B. *No more for theſe than for other errours.*

Anſw. His *Lordſhip* had occaſion onely to ſpeak of theſe, but will ſay the like of all others whoſe *original* is not diſcernible.

Ibid. C. *In all ages errours were cenſured and condemned.*

Anſw. All kind of errours were not thought to be of ſuch weight, as that ſuch heavy *cenſures* and *condemnations* which you lay on us, ſhould be faſtened on them. And therefore in caſe ours be not *errours*, or but *in materia non gravi*, in diſputable parts, (as if you pleaſe to deſcend to particulars, we will undertake to prove them) thoſe ſevere *cenſures* of yours, being more contrary to charity, may prove more dangerous to you, than we ſhall otherwiſe affirm your *opinions* to be.

Ibid. D. *I judge one of theſe two by the event, and the other by the ſemblance of his making a ſearch in manner as he ought.*

Anſw. This is a dark ſpeech which I do not clearly underſtand: if the meaning be, that you judge the ill *ſucceſs of his Lordſhip's ſearches by the event*, and the *fault* of them by the *ſemblance*, *&c.* I muſt then tell you, that the firſt is a very ill grounded judgment, for no event hath proved the illneſs of that ſucceſs, (unleſs like thoſe in the *Goſpel*, you count them the *greateſt Sinners on whom the Tower of* Siloah *fell*; or like him of late, that being willing to paſs his opinion on a learned man's choice of a ſide in the differences in the *Low Countries*, ſaid onely this, *Illud notum eſt, partes quas ſecutus non eſt, prævaluiſſe; ſi quis infelicitati hoc tribuat, ego prudentiam non probo minus felicem*; and *Busbequius* tells us ſomewhat like of the Turkes judgments of good and bad enterprizes) but rather on your own principles I have already proved, that they muſt be *good* in the *ſucceſs*, which were ſo happy in propoſing.

But then what you mean by the *ſemblance* of *his making a ſearch in manner as he ought*, by which you judge the *fault* in his *ſearches*; I muſt confeſs I do not at all underſtand, and therefore muſt be fain to confeſs my ſelf overcome and maſtered, though not by the reaſon, yet by the obſcurity of your writing; and if that be a victory, I wiſh you much good of it.

To the Concluſion. A. *I here contend no more, but that our Church may be infallible, notwithſtanding any thing the Enquirer hath objected. That ſhe is ſo, hath in due place been proved by others.*

Anſw. If you had performed the former, I mean ſatisfied all his *Lordſhip's arguments*, I ſhould not require at this time the latter from you, *i. e.* proving your *Church* to be *infallible*. I muſt then onely ask you in earneſt, whether you do believe that no one of his *Lordſhip's* arguments againſt your *Infallibility* (for any one will ſerve our turn) remains unanſwered by your *Apology*, and, then whether all that I have ſaid to vindicate his *Lordſhip*, be effectually anſwered in your marginal Notes, and whether you can juſtifie all them againſt this laſt *Reply*. If you are of this opinion in each, I am to crave your pardon for this ſo gainleſs trouble, but refer the matter to *God* and *impartial* men to judge between us.

Ibid. B. *If you would do it, we then would think it more than poſſible.*

Anſw. The meaning of this annotation, if it be ſenſe, muſt be this, that if we Proteſtants could or would find place in you for Scripture and Reaſon to make *impreſſion*, you Papiſts would then think it more than poſſible you might be deceived. Which if it be the meaning, I muſt then onely reply by prayer, that God would ſo ſoften your hearts, that they might be capable of that *impreſſion*. But if the words be indeed no ſenſe, but yet miſtaken for ſome other words, which would be ſenſe, then the likleſt thing that I can imagine, is, that you would have ſaid ſomewhat to this purpoſe. [*If you Proteſtants could by Scripture or Reaſon diſprove our Doctrines, we then would think it more than poſſible for us to be deceived*] Which though it were no huge Conceſſion, yet I ſhould be glad to have it from you, for then in effect your grounding of Faith on your *Infallibility* would be laid aſide, and then there would be no more truth in any individual Doctrine of your *Church*, than *Scripture* or *Reaſon* would infer, abſtracted from the *Authority* of your *Church*, which is all that at this time we demand from you.

And in that we are a little importunate (ſeeing we have you now in a ſeeming good humour:) Firſt, becauſe there is ſo much danger in inſiſting on that privilege of *Infallibility*, even in any particular, wherein men are in the right, becauſe he that really doth *ſtand*, yet may (and therefore ought to *take heed leſt he fall*;) but moſt eminently, when a man chances to be in the wrong. He that miſtakes firſt in a peice of Divinity, and after in a perſwaſion that he cannot *miſtake*, ſealeth up that errour, obſtructs all entrance, all approach, all poſſibility of *Reformation*, is fortified impregnable againſt all aſſaults either of reaſon, or even the ſpirit of truth; and by that one errour hath a kind of propriety in all other that can by the ſame hand be repreſented to him. Secondly, becauſe we cannot but obſerve the prudence of your *fellow-Champions*, Maſter *Knot* &c. now of late, who have choſen to vary the method from inſiſting on the ſeveral points of difference betwixt us, and them (proving themſelves to be the onely true *Church* from the particular truths profeſt by them, and by no others) to this other more commodious way of putting off all together by whole-ſale, of concluding the truth of all their aſſertions from the unerrableneſs of the Aſſerter, manifeſting that they are in the *right*, becauſe 'tis impoſſible they ſhould be in the *wrong*, uſing all skill to perſwade this one point, and then confident on good grounds, that no other can be reſiſted. Theſe two things put together, will advertiſe you, how ſeaſonable an admonition it is to you, that you will

will beſtow a little pains on your Brethren, to perſwade them they are *mortal* or *fallible*; and then again Reaſon and Scripture may find reception, and be agreed on the umpire betwixt us, and we ſhall promiſe ſincerely, that whatever that ſhall, *ſententiâ latâ*, award to you, we will moſt gladly yield, and never break with you, till you break from that umpirage.

Ibid. C. *The words are applicable againſt our belief of Chriſtianity, as well as againſt our belief of our Churches doctrine.*

Anſw. The words are applied by me onely againſt your *infallibility*, and if that be as *infallible* as *Chriſtianity* it ſelf, I beſeech you either ſhew as plain teſtimonies from the conſent of all Ages, that the *Church* of *Rome* is *infallible*, as there are for the *Canon* of the *Scripture*, or as plain places out of the *Scripture* for it, as we can for the ſeveral parts of *Chriſtianity*, and then I will give you leave ſo to apply the words; In the mean, you may ſpare your labour of *applying* my words, or elſe prove demonſtratively that they are ſo *applicable*.

Ibid. D. *A poſſibility perhaps of more errours, but a probability of fewer, for if ſhe were fallible, yet ſhe would not be fallible, as a private man; ſo that with theſe fewer errours we ſhould have quiet and unity, you with more errours ſhould have diſturbances and diſſentions.*

Anſw. In this place, whereto your Annotation was affixt, the diſcourſe was upon a ſuppoſition, that your *Infallibility* were an *errour*, (which I in that caſe affirm'd, would be the moſt *dangerous*, becauſe moſt *prolifical* complicated errour imaginable) and will you ſay that upon that *ſuppoſition*, there would be a *probability of fewer errours*? Will the thinking I cannot fall, make me ſtand the longer? is there no advantage to be made of *care*, and *caution*, and *fear*? or is there a diſadvantage in them? This is brave *fiduciary doctrine*; I muſt think *infallibly* I ſhall be ſaved, and that I cannot fall away, and the thinking that, will make it more probable that I ſhall be *ſaved*, and ſhall *not fall*. I confeſs I had thought that *humility* were a readier way both to truth and Heaven, than either of theſe *preſumptions*. What you mean by adding (by way of proof of that ſaying) that if your *Church* were *fallible*, ſhe would not be *fallible as a private man*, I confeſs I cannot gueſs. If ſhe would not, I conceive, this would be but little advantage on her ſide, for her *fallibility* would be a greater ſnare and ſcandal, and more apt to draw into errour thoſe that conceived her *infallible*, than any private man's *fallibility* would do. For that which you add of *quiet* and *unity*, if it were ſuppoſed to be joyn'd with fewer errours, I grant it would be an advantage; but at a time, when that *infallibility* was ſuppoſed to be one errour, and that prov'd moſt apt to produce a multitude; ſurely this ought not to have been ſuppoſed, any more, than that we ſhould have more errours ſtill, though 'twere not at the ſame time ſuppoſed that we have.

Ibid. E. *It was never put into more hands than two, but what thoſe hands might doe, I know not; and to thoſe on purpoſe to make trial what exceptions might be made againſt it, that ſo upon a review, I might know better what to alter in it, what to add, and what to take away.*

Anſw. I conceive one man hath two hands, and therefore 'tis poſſible you may mean, it was never communicated to above one man. If you do, 'tis certainly falſe; But if you mean two men by two hands, you acknowledge what I ſaid, for I ſaid no more. As for your affirmation that 'twas put into thoſe hands onely for *trial*, *&c*, This cannot be ſaid of one of them, for to him it was delivered by one of your friends, as an *unanſwerable piece*; but yet if it were, as you pretend, that you might know *better what to alter in it*; I am then glad I have given you occaſion to doe ſo, but muſt tell you, that now you have altered it, and delivered it from ſome infirmities, which appear'd to be in it, there be yet enough behind, to be reformed by any body elſe, and when that is done, there will remain ſomewhat elſe perhaps, but I am ſure no anſwer to my *Lord of Falkland*.

Ibid. F. *Sir, your noble courteſie is gratefully acknowledged, and I deſire with all due reſpects and ſervices to correſpond.*

Anſw. This I conceive to be a *civility*, and I ſhall never go about to confute that, or anſwer it, but by the return of the like, and my prayers alſo, that *the Lord give you a right judgment in all things.*

HERE *it ſeemes was once an end of thoſe annotations, and it had been for the readers eaſe and mine, that you had continued in that mind. But upon better thoughts, either that which had been here noted, was thought not quite ſufficient, or elſe,* ex abundanti, *this ſuperfœtation is beſtowed on us. The* cloſing ſheet *which I mentioned in the* Preface, *and promiſed to annex alſo. Which here in juſtice to the* Apologiſt, *I ſhall give you, though I conceive I had been as kind to him, if I had forgotten it.*

Section 1. THIS ſmall treatiſe Apologetical is no finiſht work, but onely a firſt draught or inchoation, and was ventured abroad to explore the judgments or cenſures of one or two intelligent Adverſaries, that ſo the Authour by his ſecond thoughts might be the better able to underſtand what was to be altered in it, what added, and what taken away, either as ſuperfluous or offenſive, and till that act was done, and withall an approbation and licence given by thoſe to whom it belonged, neither the work, nor any line of it is to be acknowledged, or vouched by the Authour.

Section 2. The drift is not to prove the Church which we call Catholique, and the Enquirer calls Roman, to be infallible, but to defend it againſt the Enquirer's arguments; for he Sect. 28. undertakes to give reaſons why the Church of Rome is fallible. So that our drift is to make it good that this ſame Church may ſtill be infallible, notwithſtanding any thing that he hath ſaid unto the contrary.

Section 3. The pillars that ſupport all his diſcourſe be 1. Sect. videl. that with us both Reaſon, Scripture, and Antiquity, be fallible; his proof of this aſſertion is a ſuppoſed maxime of ours, namely, that nothing is infallible but the Church. The aſſertion is firſt denyed, and afterward the proof, and againſt theſe denialls no reply can be made, becauſe we know beſt our own inward acts and judgments, and no man is able to tell us what we think, but we muſt tell them.

Section 4. Theſe three pillars of fallibility being broken and relinquiſht as deſperate, you are pleaſed to come with new ones in their places.

Section 5. Reaſon, ſay you, cannot prove the infallibility of your Church, becauſe it is not an evident verity; Scripture cannot, becauſe not certainly expounded to that probation; Fathers do not, becauſe it was not a doctrine held in their time.

Section 6. It ſeems then, that the cauſe why none of theſe three can prove our Churches infallibility, is not any want of infallibility in them, as the Enquirer contended it was, but ſome other different; ſuch, namely, as you here aſſign; and ſo the Enquirer's argument is at an end, even at the very beginning of it, and my task is done, yet, in my reſpects, to you, I will go on farther.

Section 7. To your firſt, I anſwer, that though reaſon cannot it ſelf alone prove our Churches infallibility, yet, as you acutely note, Sect. 3. reaſon can aſſure us, by ſhewing us ſome words of prophecy, or revelation from God, with ſufficient evidence that it is a revelation, and thus reaſon can prove a verity be it never ſo inevident. After this manner it is that we ſay reaſon proves our Church, againſt which proof the inevidence of it, as we ſee, can be no impediment.

Section 8. To your ſecond, I anſwer, by denying that ſcripture hath not been ſo certainly expounded to that purpoſe, for we ſay it

Section 9. hath been ſhewed by our authours at large, as for example, by Bellarmine, Valentia, Petavius, Veron and others.

1. L. 5. c. 20. l. 3. c. 4. 2. L. 2. adverſ. Creſcon c. 33. item ep. 118. item l. de unitate Eccleſ. c. 22. 3. l. 4. c. 30. 4. L. 12.

To your 3. I anſwer, firſt, that 1. Irenæus, 2. Auguſtinus, 3. Lactantius, and 4. Facundus Hermanenſis do abſolutely teach the Church to be infallible. Secondly, I deny that the Fathers teach not the Roman Church to be the true Church, and contrary to your tenet, I affirm that they hold that Church to be the true Chriſtian Church, as the forenamed authours have declared out of them, as alſo Card. Perone and Coeffeteau have excellently ſhewed. Alſo I my ſelf have endeavoured it elſewhere out of the ſeveral Teſtimonies of Antiquity not to be in this place repeated.

Section 10. The buſineſs touching the motives of Faith which I, with Irenæus, called Oſtenſions, their place, uſe and efficacy needs onely explanation, and ought to be admitted by every Chriſtian, and therefore begging your patience, I will tarry longer upon it.

Section 11. We do not go about to prove our Church to be the true, therefore becauſe ſhe holdeth with the truth, but becauſe we conceive we have good ſolid reaſons to perſwade us that ſhe hath the truth. Theſe reaſons have been often rendred by our Authours, to whom if the Enquirer had replyed, we alſo had endeavoured to defend them. Concordance with the Scriptures and Fathers we do marſhall amongſt them, not in the firſt place indeed in order of Doctrine, but yet in the firſt in order of dignity. Neither do we aim to prove our Church by the gallantry of Demonſtration, or any other way than Chriſtianity, ſooner, or later, is to be perſwaded unto Infidels; for we are now dealing, not about a parcel, but the whole frame of Chriſtianity, from the top to the foundation, and the laying of the firſt ſtone; which firſt ſtone we hold to be thoſe acts of God which Pſal. 104. 27. are called verba ſignorum, and fitly may be termed ſigna realia, that is to ſay, ſigns and oſtenſions, which be the acts of Gods omnipotence and ſovereign Government, and, by a moral certainty and rational way are ſhewed for humane inſtitution and inſtruction. This ſort of ſigns is, by order of nature, to have the precedence before all artificial ſigns, or vocal expreſſions of the divine will, and therefore as Raymund Sebund obſerveth liber factorum is to be peruſed before liber dictorum; by theſe ſigns, as, by the apparentiæ, or φαινόμενα, in Aſtronomy, we are to get the firſt notions of theſe celeſtial revolutions, or reſolutions of faith; and though theſe be ſure, yet are they not demonſtrative becauſe no way intrinſecal, neither to the revelations which they aſſure, nor to the objects revealed, which are aſſured by the revelations, as being no cauſes, nor effects of either, nor ſigns inherent of thoſe objects.

Section 12. Seeing then, the true Catholick Religion is but the true Chriſtianity, they both of them are to be learned by the ſame Apparences, or Oſtenſions, more or leſs expreſly underſtood. Now, while we draw nearer unto theſe ſigns, and learn them more and more expreſly, amongſt other things we may diſcover as good characteriſms and ſignatures of revealed truth, the Concordance of our Faith with holy Writ and venerable Antiquity, which two ſigns, without the preceding could have little force to perſwade belief. For, ſay I were to convert an Indian, I would not ſeek to doe it by telling him firſt of all of theſe two Concordances mentioned which 'tis like would move him but a little, for, though I could ſhew him the Bible was ancient and Godly, and the Fathers wiſe, yet this would not be enough to perſwade him, and therefore I ſhould hold it fit, Firſt to repreſent to him ſome other motives, as namely, Prophetical predictions authorized by event, miracles and miraculous operations and effects, creditably recorded from age to age, both in the Evangeliſts and other ſequent Hiſtories, of whoſe faith a man rationally cannot doubt, at leaſt in the ſum of them, or the chief bulk. I ſpeak not here of fabulous Narrations, or ſuſpected Hiſtories, but Authours of credit and eſteem; Secondly, the excellency of our Faith it ſelf, and manner of propagation of it. Thirdly, the perfection of life and heroick actions of ſuch as do profeſs it, and all this after a manner not interrupted, but continued from age to age, and conveyed down to us by the prime Eccleſiaſtical ſucceſſion, not of Perſons onely, but of Paſtours in the chief ſeat, and other inferiour, prized ſo highly by Irenæus, and held a moſt ſure note of truth, and a way to confound all that do gainſay it. Laſtly, a conſonance with Reaſon, Scripture, and Antiquity. Theſe and ſuch like be our φαινόμενα, theſe our oſtenſions; theſe be the received notices and ſignatures of revealed truth; by theſe God invites us and induces us to believe; and by theſe, engages his own veracity to warrant the act of our aſſent, it being repugnant to the high perfection of his truth, to lay upon man a rational obligation, and then deſert him, and to permit that the publique acts of his providence ſhould be a ſnare, not a direction, not an introduction to truth, but a ſeduction from it. Though therefore theſe motives make our faith but credible in an eminent and a high degree, yet the veracity of God is at hand to ſupply, ſeal and confirm all, and with the authority thereof, to make the aſſurance abſolute. This method of reſolving and reducing faith, was

eſt pleniſſima hæc oſtenno unam & eandem vivificatricem fidem, &c. Irenæus l. 3. c. 3.

ſignified

ſignified by Irenæus, *when as he ſaid,* Poſt tot Oſtenſiones factas non oportet adhuc quærere apud alios veritatem quam facile eſt ab Eccleſia ſumere. *This way deſigned by Saint* Auguſtin, *this is conformable to the Analytique principles delivered by* Ariſtotle *in his* Organon; *this is the beaten path of all Divines, and no new invention or exotique ſtuff.* Iren. l. 3. c. 4. Auguſtin. ad Honoratum Manichæum.

This method we are ready to maintain as ſtrong and ſolid, not permitting the believer to ſit down with a ſlender Socinian certainty liable to deceit, nor enclosing him in any maze, circle, or ſemicricle not enforcing him into endleſs and wearisome regreſſes, neither precluding evidence, nor deſtroying liberty, but by theſe motives fortified with the divine veracity, leading him aſſuredly to the Church, and by the Church to the entire and determinate Canon of holy Scripture; and ſo at length by both theſe joyned together, to the full diſcovery and diſtinct knowledge of the doctrines of our faith, after the manner following.

Theſe motives or oſtenſions being once conſidered, we are forthwith to obſerve to what body of Chriſtian profeſſours they belong, and in what line of ſucceſſion of Eccleſiaſtical Magiſtrates they deſcend unto us, and in the paſſages of antiquity, diligently to note which ſhip it is which in the Chriſtian fleet was counted the Prætorian, *or Admiral, with which all the reſt were to joyn company, and by the ſeparation from which, we are to judge which veſſels be fugitives, or pyratical, and which not; which aſſembly of Chriſtians legitimate and approved, and by this aſſociation to be diſtinguiſhed from the broken and diſperſed troops of Anti-Catholiques, and by the ſame the army of the living God in the Church militant, diſcerned from the ſtragling companies of divided and diſagreeing Sectaries, how numerous ſoever they may ſeem, when ſummed up all into one inconſiſtant body, or confuſed rout. This way and method we hold, which if it do not ſatisfie any, let them ſet us down a better, and not leave us without any; but let them take heed, that while with the Enquirer, we receive and admit the fallibility of the Church of* Rome, *or of any other determinate Church, and of one denomination, we fall not, with Maſter* Chillingworth, *to the infallibility of the Chriſtian faith, and ſo preſently to Infidelity. It is eaſie to impugn the Organon of faith, or Doctrinal principles, but not eaſie to compoſe it, eaſie to pull down, but not to build. The Enquirer's judgment uttered to me, was, that* Baron, *when he writ againſt us, was luſty and ſtrong, but when he ſpake any thing for himſelf; he was weak and languiſhing; and I believe this is the Enquirer's own caſe, and that he was able to ſay more againſt an infallibility than for it. In the one he hath ſhewed his ſtrength, in the other not.* Section 13.

Now a word or two about laws, and I have done. In which point I obſerve it as an uncontroverted doctrine, that unjuſt laws, properly ſpeaking, are not laws; firſt becauſe Lex *is the* dictamen rectæ rationis practicæ in eo qui poteſtatem habet; *but an unjuſt law, is neither* dictamen rectæ rationis practicæ, *nor* poteſtatem habentis, *for no man is preſcribed to doe wrong by reaſon, nor hath God the chief Legiſlatour given power to make them.* Durandus *concurres* in terminis in Opuſculo de legibus, *ſaying,* Injuſtæ leges magis ſunt violentiæ quam leges, nam ſecundum quod dicit Auguſtinus, l. de libero arbitrio, Lex eſſe non videtur quæ juſta non fuerit. Et tales non obligant quantum ad Deum. *So* Durandus. *To him* Suarius *ſubſcribeth,* l. 3. de legib. c. 19. n. 11. Lex injuſta non eſt lex, præſertim quando ex parte materiæ eſt injuſta, quia rem iniquam præcipit; tum enim ad acceptandum eam non obligat, verum etiam, neque ſi ſit acceptata. *And preſently after, giving a reaſon hereof, he addeth,* Quia excedit poteſtatem legiſlatoris. Section 14.

Secondly, ſo much veneration is due to laws, though never ſo unjuſt, that they are nevertheleſs in conſcience to be obeyed, unleſs they ſhould be publickly and knownly found contrary to a greater authority than that was by which they were enacted; that is to ſay, to the law of God, or Nature, Therefore they are not to be judged or cenſured by any private man.

Thirdly, being diſcovered to be unjuſt, they derogate nothing at all from the authority of the reſt, no more than the unjuſt laws of ſome Emperours did from the body of the law Imperial. For though all of them were made by the ſame Authours, yet not by the ſame authority; becauſe for the making of one ſort, there was good authority derived from God; but, for the making of the other, there was none at all, but ſuch as could not make it.

Fourthly, in caſe of ſuch laws, no man is to take arms, or make reſiſtence, but contrariwiſe, to ſuffer with humble patience, remitting the righting of his cauſe onely to God, per quem Reges regnant & legum conditores juſta decernunt. *And thus, Sir, I reſt your humble ſervant.*

The holy Scripture hath a threefold influence into faith. 1. *Diſpoſitive, as one of the motives, or inducements.* 2. *Negative, as a property,* ſine qua non. 3. *Poſitive, as a foundation or principle. The* 1. *as an ancient and godly book. The* 2. *as a rule, without concordance to which, faith could not be acknowledged; for every doctrine muſt be conſonant to its rule, whether that rule be true, or falſe, certain, or uncertain. The* 3. *as a ſetled principle, and a book known to be Canonical.* Section 15.

TO all this I ſhall anſwer as briefly as I can.

Firſt, to the 1. *Sect.* That for the matter of fact which concerns this treatiſe, I have already averred thoſe truths, that will not permit any reaſonable man to believe that this was ſo indeed, [*a firſt draugh: &c.*] for it was confeſt by him, *Chap.* 1. to be a ſecond draught. Secondly, it was not ſent out *onely to explore, &c.* for it was, * ſaith he, delivered but to two adverſaries, and to one of them (as I ſaid before) it was delivered as *unanſwerable.* Thirdly, if there were any ſuch deſign of *exploring* and *mending, &c.* I muſt conceive that that work is now done; for when it was ſent home to me again with theſe notes, many places which I had charged, were altered or taken away, and for *additions,* ſure ſuch were the marginal notes, and this appendage. Fourthly, For the *licence* I can ſay nothing, (but that I conceive it might as eaſily be gotten, as to what you have already made publick, if you had a mind to it) nor indeed force you to acknowledge or vouch any line of this book, but onely tell you, that thoſe words in your firſt Chapter of complaint, [*That there was no notice given of licence for it to be publiſhed, and have the advantage to be diſperſed abroad in many copies*] and that [*for want of the Printers help it ſhall lie concealed, and in much reſtraint, yea and be in danger to periſh*] ſeemed to me to ſignifie your willingneſs then to make it publick; and if you have ſince retracted that deſign, I hope ſo weak an anſwer, as ſome of your friends boaſt this to be, did not diſcourage you. I ſhall rather think it was modeſty, or elſe deſign, that you choſe rather to have diſclaimed, than commended your own, and thought it would appear more glorious for you to * In Conclus.

have it extorted from you, or (if it ſhould prove leſs ſplendid) yet more tolerable, to have been raviſht from you than proſtituted.

To the ſecond *Sect.* I anſwer, that you had ſaid that before in *annot.* to the *concl.* A. And the anſwer there belongs to this *Sect.* and if you had made good what you ſay was your drift, you ſhould be pronounced conquerour.

To the third *Sect.* You have taken a good courſe to defend *infallibility*, by ſetting up for it your ſelf, and affirming that *no reply can be made* to you in that matter, becauſe it depends onely upon your judgment, which none can know but whom you tell it; But, good Sir, your Authours do tell us, that there is nothing *infallible* but the *Church*, and when they have done ſo, we may know your *outward* acts, for ſuch are your writings, though your *inward* we pretend not to pry into.

To *Sect.* 4. I anſwer, that one argument of his *Lordſhip*'s, taken from your affirmed *fallibility* of *Reaſon*, *Scripture*, and *Antiquity*, is moſt prodigiouſly by you call'd *three pillars*. And how *Sampſon-like* you have broken them down, the Reader muſt judge; if you are ſo confident, I have here expreſt my ſelf your ſervant, by helping you to a publick tryal.

To *Sect.* 5. I acknowledge that from your own confeſſion I make thoſe three arguments, that neither *Reaſon*, *Scripture*, nor *Antiquity*, can *infallibly* prove your Church to be infallible. And

To *Sect.* 6. I ſay that the want of *infallibility* in thoſe three mentioned *Sect.* 6. and by you confeſt, is ſufficient to prove his *Lordſhip*'s concluſion that they cannot *infallibly* prove your *infallibility*, and this is the ſame that was meant by his *Lordſhip*, though more explicated by me, and brought home againſt you by way of retortion, and Argument *ad hominem*, upon your own confeſſion. And ſo your ὅπνικιον was ſung much too early, and you muſt to your task again, if you will make an end of it.

To *Sect.* 7. I anſwer, that if you had ſhewed the revelation, on which reaſon infers your infallibility, your ſection had ſtood good, but the total want of that, is your main impediment.

To *Sect.* 8. Be you alſo pleaſed to produce your conſent of *Antiquity* certainly expounding *Scripture* to infer your *infallibility*; and that ſhall be yielded you alſo, but I conceive thoſe writers of yours have not done it, and whenſoever you pleaſe, I ſhall be ready to examine their teſtimonies with you.

To *Sect.* 9. I anſwer, That we have allowed a ſenſe, wherein the *Church univerſal* may be ſtyled *infallible*, and that to ſave my ſelf the pains of examining your teſtimonies (though ſome without examining I know to be ill cited) I ſhall grant it in that ſenſe to be ſo; But then to your ſecond propoſition, (be it either [*I deny that they teach not*] or [*I affirm that it holds*] it matters little) *that the Roman Church is the true Church*, I anſwer. That if there be emphaſis in the particle [*the*] in the predicate, ſo that it ſignifie the [*Catholick*] *Church* in the former propoſition, 'tis then abſolutely falſe, that the Fathers ſay any ſuch thing. And you are prudent to cite none to that ridiculous purpoſe. But if you mean, that the *Roman Church* is a *true Church*, (ſo you do not mean that all it ſaith is true) as we grant that, ſo we challenge you to prove, that ever the *ancient Church* thought any ſuch *particular Church* of one denomination to be *infallible*; When you pleaſe to produce your teſtimonies, you ſhall receive anſwer to them.

To *Sect.* 10. Concerning the motives of *Faith*, You might have ſpared that pains, it being not at all concluded by you here or before, that that *infallibility* is built on the ſame grounds with *Chriſtianity*.

To *Sect.* 11. If you had never ſuch ſolid reaſons to perſwade you; that your *Church* had the truth (as I ſhould not need to deny, were it not for your denying the *cup* to the *Laity*, againſt Scripture, and your keeping the *Scripture* in an *unknown tongue*, and ſome other ſuch defects *in faciendis*, but rather charge you that you have more than the truth, *viz.* many errours mixt with the truth) this would prove but a very weak probation, that your *Church* is [the *true Church*] in the excluſive notion, *i. e.* that no other is the *Church*, but that: for *having the truth*, doth not ſignifie a *Monopoly*, or incloſure of it, or that no body elſe can have it, And if by [the *true Church*] you mean no more, but a true part, you know we do not queſtion it, nor affirm that your errours though many, have turn'd you *in non Eccleſiam*, *into a no-Church*. As for your Concordance with the Fathers which you ſay you have, I anſwer, that in thoſe things wherein you and we conſent, we ſhall not be unwilling to grant it to you (but yet muſt remember you, that you would not allow that to be a proof of your being *infallible*) but in thoſe other which we call errours in you, we challenge you to produce an *univerſal Concordance*. You go on; that you prove your *Church* by no other way than *Chriſtianity* is perſwaded unto *Infidels*. I hope your meaning is, that you prove your *Church* to be a *true Church*, and that ſhall be granted you without your proof: but that it is the *onely true* one, or the *infallible* one, I hope you have not *miracles* for that, (if you have, you have trifled away a great deal of time in not telling of them) nor *revelation* from Heaven, nor univerſal *tradition* to aſſure you, (what you affirm ſo confidently) that the *Infallibility of your Church is the whole frame of Chriſtianity*. And therefore what you learnedly add about the *verba ſignorum*, or *ſigna realia*, *ſigns* and *oſtenſions*, *&c.* by which you go about to prove *Chriſtianity*, I muſt profeſs to edifie me but little in point of the *infallibility* of your *Church*, becauſe that is ſo diſtant a thing from it.

To *Sect.* 12. Your affirmation, that the true *Catholick Religion* is the true *Chriſtianity*, (if that be the onely thing you aim at) ſhall be willingly granted you; all the queſtion will be, whether all your doctrines, *that of denying the cup to the Laity*, *&c.* be that *Catholick Religion*. And ſure to him that queſtions that, all the *characteriſms*, &c. all your *Prophetical predictions* will give but little ſatisfaction, and no more will the *excellency of Faith*, *perfection of heroick actions of Profeſſours*, nor the *conveyance from age to age*, by the *Prime Eccleſiaſtical ſucceſſion of Paſtours in the See of Rome*, becauſe that of the *ſub unica ſpecie*, *&c.* which we quarrell at in you, might as well be pretended to have teſtimonies out of the preſent Articles of our *Church*, as out of theſe. If there be any of theſe evidences, or moreover of *Reaſon*, *Scripture*, *Antiquity*, on your ſide, for ſuch controverted particulars, I beſeech you let them be produced, or elſe you may be *Chriſtians*, but yet corrupt in theſe particulars, your being a true Church will not pronounce you *infallible*, your *Church of Rome Primitive* may have the truth, and your *Modern Rome* be filled with errours. And therefore you may ſpare the pains of proving (what we have no occaſion at this time to deny) that God engages *his veracity to make good thoſe things*, *for which he gives us ſuch rational means of proof to induce our aſſent*, For what ever elſe is, your *infallibility*, or your other errours, for which we charge you, are none of

theſe

theſe things. And if you mark it, that which (according to your diſcourſe) gives us ſuch aſſurance of the truth of *Chriſtianity*, is the *oſtenſions*, *miracles*, publick acts of *God's providence*, not the *infallibility* naturally inherent either in your *Church*, or in any particular ſociety of men, nor the promiſe of God that any ſuch ſociety ſhall be *infallible*, and *viſible* to all, that it is that *infallible*. As for that which you covertly caſt into the heap of the motives of *Faith* [*that 'twas continued from age to age in the ſucceſſion of Paſtours in the chief ſeat*] that is no more a ground of the truth of *Chriſtianity*, than its *ſucceſſion* in all other ſeats, as I conceive you have your ſelf let fall alſo. The truth is, the Preaching the Goſpel over all the world, and the reception in ſo great a part of it, is an argument of the truth of *Chriſtianity* (among many others) becauſe it is the fulfilling of a Prophecy of their *ſounds going out into all Lands*; But this is far from concluding the peculiar privilege of *infallibility* of thoſe, who are under the *Roman ſubjection*. By which 'tis clear, that what you cite out of *Irenæus*, and Saint *Aug.* comes home no better to your point of *infallibility*, than *Ariſtotle's Analytick principles*, which in the ſame place (and elſewhere) you cite alſo. And therefore if all you ſay in that long Section were yielded, (concerning the motives to *Chriſtianity*, and your way by *bringing to the Church*, &c.) yet would you be as far to ſeek as ever, concerning your pretended *infallibility*.

To your 13. *Sect.* which is nearer indeed to your purpoſe, I anſwer, that being by your means brought to *Chriſtianity*, there is no need that I ſhould find out any particular body of profeſſors (or *Church* of one *denomination*) to which thoſe motives to *Chriſtianity* ſhould ſo belong, as to belong to no other but that; This ſure I may better ſay without proof, than you have affirmed the contrary; For do you think it reaſonable, that *Chriſtianity* being planted all over the world, each man that is converted to it, muſt find out the *Roman Biſhop*, and thoſe that are in *ſubjection* to him, or not be accounted *a Chriſtian*? If he be born at *Jeruſalem*, or converted there, will it not ſerve his turn to communicate with that Church, which hath given him *Baptiſm*? Was there any thing in his *Creed* could ſend him thither, till the *holy Chatholick Roman Church* was (by mockery I conceive) put in thither? As for the line of *ſucceſſion* of *Eccleſiaſtical* Magiſtrates, you muſt know, that is to be found in other *Chriſtian Churches*, as well as in *Rome*, and the *Scriptures* and *Apoſtolical* verities deſcend down to us in them alſo. And what if in ſome paſſages of *Antiquity*, the *See of Rome* ſhould be found to be the *Prætorian* or *Admiral*, in your ſtyle, *i. e.* the prime or principal See, would this prove her *infallible*? the *Prætorian* may ſpring a leak, as well as any other, and in caſe it ſhould, I do not conceive, that all other Ships of that fleet, were bound to doe ſo too, or elſe be counted *fugitive*, becauſe they are unwilling to run that unhappy fate of ſin, or errour in her. Sure if the *Prætorian* ſhould caſually, or wilfully ſplit upon a Rock, you would not cenſure all others for *Pyratical*, that did not ſo too. The reaſons are viſible, why that See of *Rome* had the *Primacy* at ſome time (and at other times other Sees put in their plea for it, and if they obtained not, yet was that an argument that it was never judged a matter of Faith, becauſe the Pretenders were not condemned for *Hereticks*, even when it went not with them) *viz.* From the *Imperial Seat* being placed in that City, with which the *Eccleſiaſtical* πρεσβεια, πρωτεια, might proportionably go along, juſt as your *Prætorian* is that ſhip, where the *Admiral* reſides, or which peculiarly belongs to him. But what is that to *infallibility*? That honour which comes by ſympathy with the Civil State, is not like to be ſuch a charm, or amulet, ſo to elevate above humane condition, that it muſt preſently ſet up for *perfection*. Let your Church have all its due and cuſtomary reſpects, but do not ſo link *inerrableneſs* with *Principality*, unleſs you can bring ſome ground from Scripture, for the union; and becauſe in all your *Apology*, *Annotations*, and *Appendage* you do not ſo much as name any ſuch, I ſhall conceive you are too wiſe to claim by [*Tu es Petrus*] or any other ſo unconcluding an argument. Believe me, your preſcription for ſome kind of *Principality* from the poſſeſſion of it continued to that See ſo many years, is a better plea than any other, and againſt that I am not now a-diſputing, but onely add, that greatneſs ſecular is no marke of *infallibility*. As for your rule of judging by the *Aſſociation with Rome*, which Aſſembly of Chriſtians is legitimate, which not, that that is an *infallible* way of judging, is not at all proved by your magnificent *ſimile*. For firſt, the *fleet* may be broken aſunder by ſome tempeſt, and ſo without any fault of any ſhip, be divided from the *Prætorian*. 2. The *Prætorian* may quarrell with all, or any of the reſt, and by threats or bullets drive them from her, and then if the cauſe be not juſt, if it be, for example, upon no other crime, but that the other ſhips judge it neceſſary to caſt out ſome veſſels or trumpery which they are reſolved to be either uſeleſs, or perhaps dangerous to the veſſell and all the Paſſengers, or again becauſe the reſt of the ſhips are reſolved to obey the commiſſion that ſent out the whole Fleet, when the *Prætorian* was reſolved to diſobey it, in this and the like caſes, 'tis clear, that the *Prætorian* is the onely *Schiſmatick*; Or if it be juſt, yet the ſhip though confeſt guilty of that other crime, or crimes, which made that ſeverity of the *Prætorian* juſt, will yet not be guilty of a new crime of *ſeparation*: the reaſon is clear, becauſe ſhe is forced to that, driven away, and now ever ſince lies under it unwillingly, 'tis her infelicity, not her crime; her puniſhment, not her fault. Or if there be a fault in that, *viz.* That ſhe doth not humbly *confeſs the fault*, and deſire to be reconciled, yet ſure it will not be infinitely true, that that is a fault, when either ſhe was guilty before of no fault, but a pretended one, for which that puniſhment was inflicted (to which purpoſe the *Chancellour of Paris* will adviſe you) or when the condition of her being received again is ſuch, as cannot with any honeſty be entertained, be it the undertaking any Treaſonable act againſt the *King*, whoſe Admiral he is, which denominates that *Prætorian*, and who is ſupreme Maſter of the whole *fleet*, or be it, but ſwearing any thing to be true which is falſe, or ſubſcribing to the belief, or practice of what we believe neither true nor practicable. And that this is the ſtate of our *Church* in its ſeparation from yours, I ſhall undertake to make good, whenſoever you will yield the point of *Infallibility*, or exchange it for the queſtion of *Schiſm*. You ſee I am not much edified by your way, and becauſe you are not ſo importunate, that I ſhould, but are modeſtly content that if I am not ſatisfied with it, I ſhould ſet you down a better, I ſhall humbly crave leave to doe it in very few words. The far better way, more *Chriſtian*, becauſe more *humble* and more *charitable*, (and beyond all, probably the moſt *peacefull* too) Is, to make the *Scripture*, as 'tis interpreted by the *ancient Fathers*, the ground of our belief for all the *ſubſtantial*, *i.e.* plain parts of *Faith*; to define as few of this nature, as the *Primitive Chriſtians* may be diſcerned to have done, to command and require obedience, and aſſent to theſe, from all our Inferiours under our authority, and to proceed to *Eccleſiaſtical*

cleſiaſtical admonitions, in caſe of errour, to cenſure, in caſe of *contumacy*, but to *bloud*, never purely for *Religion*; nor too often for Religion *in ordine ad temporalia*; To tolerate with meekneſs, thoſe that are contrary minded, in all things that are not either of the number of theſe few, very few *neceſſario credenda*, or that have not a neceſſary connexion and immediate influence on practice, and good life; This, as it is far from either pretending to *infallibility*, or letting looſe the reins to licentiouſneſs, ſo is it the happieſt, moſt laſting, durable temper of a *Church*, moſt agreeable to all thoſe ends that Chriſt hath made moſt eſtimable to us in his *Goſpel*, and ſo will be far from that fear of yours, of betraying us to a deſerting of the *Chriſtian faith*, or falling to *Infidelity*; univerſal peace and charity and humility, being above all things moſt contrary to that. And ſo you ſee, 'tis not ſo unpracticable a difficulty to compoſe an *Organon* of *Faith* ſo far, as to *preſerve* it among *Chriſtians*; And for the planting it among Infidels, that is not *hujus conſiderationis*, nor do I much believe I ſhall have much reaſon to differ from any learned *Romaniſt* on that Subject, on condition he would agree with me in this. As for your judgment upon his *Lordſhip, that he was able to ſay more againſt an infallibility than for it, and that in the one he hath ſhewed his ſtrength, in the other not*, I eaſily believe, and muſt think my ſelf bound to confeſs, becauſe I have ſeen a Book of his *againſt infallibility*, but never any for it. If this muſt be thought a fault in him, I muſt be content to lie under your ſevereſt cenſure for the ſame crime alſo, and *ſic habes confitentes reos*, patiently expecting what you will pronounce againſt us.

Sect. 14. You are reſolved it ſeems to have a word or two about *Laws*, upon what temptation, or provocation from the precedent diſcourſes, at leaſt from the main buſineſs in hand, I cannot readily ſatisfie my Reader. The moſt I can gueſs is, that in our meeting we fell into ſome diſcourſe and difference about the nature of *unjuſt Laws*, whether they might be ſaid to be *Laws*, or no. And perchance your charity led you now out of your rode to inform me in this matter; if 'twere onely ſo, I muſt acknowledge it an obligation, and ſhall thank you for that, though I chance to diſſent from you.

And that matter I perceive will be ſoon ſtated: Thus: That Laws, if (conſidered in reſpect of the matter of them) they be found to command me to doe ought, which by any ſuperiour law, 'tis unlawfull for me to doe, they are then unjuſt laws, be the *Legiſlatour* never ſo lawfully my *Magiſtrate*; and in this caſe 'tis true, that God hath not given him *power* to make them; meaning thereby ſuch a power, that he may make them without being *unjuſt*; but yet another power he hath given him, to wit, ſuch an one, as that, if he exerciſe it thus againſt God the Doners will, yet it ſhall not be lawfull for any man, or ſociety of men on earth, to call him to account, and puniſh him, to reſiſt violently, or reduce him *in ordinem*; Onely God that hath given him *poteſtatem in genere* (which is *libera ad utroſque actus*, power to make good or evil laws, but withall reſtrained by a command from the law of *nature*, and *God*, and limited by that law onely to the lawfull exerciſe of it, or making the *good laws*) is to receive an account of the *Talent* given him to trade with as his *Steward*, and to enquire whether he hath uſed it well or no. Thus much, unleſs I am miſtaken your diſcourſe gives me reaſon to think granted by you. And from thence I muſt conclude, that any ſuch *abuſe* of *power* in the *Law-giver*, though it be in him aberration from the rule in reſpect of God, yet ſtill is an act that hath ſome effect on the man which is born, or lives under that law, though not to oblige him to doe what is commanded him, yet to oblige him to non-reſiſtence, and ſuffering patiently, if the *Law-giver* be ſo wicked to tyrannize over him. Which obligation to *paſſive*, though not *active* Obedience, is the reſult of a Law, if not properly ſo called in your notion of it, yet very lawfully and intelligibly ſo called, as I have interpreted it; And for the *propriety* or *impropriety* of the word, I ſhall not much contend with you, ſo the ſubſtance be agreed on; and yet 'twere eaſie enough to repay you with the quotations of *School-men* and *Caſuiſts*, which make no ſcruple to uſe the word in my ſenſe, and to anſwer the places you have produced, and ſhew that 'twas onely in that ſenſe which we yield, that they did deny it. But enough of this.

For your 15 *Sect.* What it ſignifies, or whither it would, I cannot, I confeſs, divine; 'twas I conceive in you an exceſſive act of liberality, that you thought might be for your turn; and, though I know not how at this time I ſhall reap profit by it, yet I cannot but accept your good intentions. And ſo being extremely weary of a very thankleſs task, I bid you heartily farewell.

THE END.

TO THE
RIGHT HONORUABLE,
HENRY
L. Viſcount of Falkland,
MY HONOURABLE LORD.

My Lord,

NOT long before the death of that incomparable perſon, your Lordſhip's Mother, that great example of piety and humility, the Lady *Viſcounteſs of Falkland*, ſhe was pleaſed to commit to my hand that, which ſhe believed, next her Children, the deareſt pledge of her dead Lord; ſome excellent Monuments of his *Reaſon*, *Wit* and *Induſtry*, in the ſearch of that, which he would have as gladly found, as he hath rationally rejected, an *Infallible Judge* here on Earth in all our Controverſies in point of Religion, of which the labouring world ſeemeth at preſent to ſtand in ſo much need. I have conſidered often of that ſingular truſt and friendſhip, in making me the depoſitary of ſo rich a Jewel: And ſince ſhe, from whoſe hands I received it, is gone thither, where ſhe ſtands in no need of theſe diſcourſes, I know no perſon living that hath more right to it than your Lordſhip, or indeed to whom I would more willingly offer it. For though your Lordſhip be now out of my immediate charge and Tuition, yet as long as it ſhall pleaſe God to make me able to doe, or point at any thing that may, though never ſo little, help forward to perfect a good work in you, I ſhall never account my ſelf diſobliged. I muſt profeſs to all the World, that there is no Family now in being, to which I owe more true ſervice, than to your Lordſhip's: And ſhall to the utmoſt of my power, upon all occaſions make it good. Ihave nothing left me but a poor thank fullheart, which hath been my onely ſure Companion, when all elſe have forſaken me: That ſtill remains ἀσύλητον τι and κτῆμα εἰς ἀεί, being neither in the power of time nor

persons to spoil me of that, which like a good Conscience to my self, must to my friends be the best feast I can make them.

My Lord, my design is not by this to engage your Lordship in this *Polemical* discourse, nor my self neither, having neither ability nor leasure for a business of that concern, and by reason of my business of imployment, I had not been able to have presented it thus to your Lordship without the assistence of Judicious Friends, that honour the work for the Authour's sake, and the Authour for his own.

But, My Lord, I hope I shall have my end in it however, an end which no good man will envy me, namely, an occasion hereby to remind your Lordship of the Gallant Authour, your Noble Father, that by proposing Him to you as your constant Copy, you may do Him an honour beyond all his Friends: For while they *praise*, you may *imitate* him.

Indeed, it is one of the greatest comforts I have in this calamitous life, to remember, that I had the honour to be so near Him: And a reproach, which I cannot clear my self of, to have been at the same time so near, and so far off; so near in Conversation, and yet so far removed from him in those Excellencies, whereby he was the envy of this Age, and will be the wonder of the next.

His *Religion*, (for that I should begin with) was the more Eminent, because the more Early; at that age, when young Gallants think least on it: When they, young Candidates of Atheism, begin to dispute themselves out of a belief of a *Deity*, urging hard against that, which indeed is best for them that it should never be, *a Judgment to come*; then, I say, that *salvation* which these mention with a scoff or a Jeer, he began to *work out with fear and trembling*, and *effectually* to remember, that is, *to honour and serve* his *Creatour in the days of* his *youth*.

In the next place, I may not forget his vast *natural parts*: *Dixit ex tempore*, saith *Pliny* of *Isæus*, *sed tanquam diu scripserit*; and I may truely apply it to him, his Answers were quick and sudden, but such, as might very well seem to have been meditated. In short, his *abilities* were such, as though he needed no supplies of *industry*; yet his *industry* such, as though he had had no *parts* at all. How often have I heard him pity those Hawking and Hunting Gentlemen, who if unseasonable weather for their sports had betrayed them to keep at home, without a worse exercise within doors, could not have told how to have spent their time: And all because they were such strangers to such *good Companions*, with whom he was so familiar, such as neither cloy nor weary any, with whom they converse; such company as *Erasmus*, a person much esteemed by my Lord your Father, so much extolls in his 31. and 35. Epistle of his fourth Book: Not friends of the Cellar, or the Kitchin; τὰ ἄλλα δὲ προσκλητοὶ ἥδιον διαλέγονται, indeed their *own* friends rather than *his* who entertaineth them: But such, as being bidden, are ready; uninvited, intrude not; that bite no man's meat or reputation; silent, not spoken to; spoken to, speak as we please, what we please, how long and how much we please: Candidly communicating themselves to us without betraying our secrets committed to them; that still tell us somewhat that may delight us for its Antiquity, please us for its Novelty, or someway or other enrich our knowledge. While others studied the *Heraldry* of Horses, of Dogs, or at the best, their own: He, though not inferiour

feriour to his Neighbours in Deſcent, and Honour, knowing well how much more glorious it is to be the firſt than the laſt of a Noble Family, (Bloud without Vertue making Vice but more conſpicuous) was ſo far from relying upon that empty Title, that He ſeemed *Ipſe ſuos genuiſſe Parentes*, to have *begotten* his Anceſtours, and to have given them a more Illuſtrious life, than he received from them.

Though there were as much true worth cloſely treaſured up in him, as, well divided, had been able to have ſet up an hundred *Pretenders*; yet ſo much *Modeſty* withall, that the hearing of any thing was more pleaſing to him, than one tittle of his own praiſe.

This Vertue was indeed in a high degree in him, and ſhewed it ſelf upon all occaſions. If any thing, though never ſo little unhandſomely, had been ſpoken or done where he was, he was the greateſt ſufferer in the company, and much more out of countenance than he that made the offence. And ſurely he that was ſo tender of another man's *Civility*, may very juſtly be preſumed to have had a great regard to his own. And ſo he had indeed. For though his *Courage* were as great as his *Wit* and his *Learning*, (and that is expreſſion high enough) his *Valour* ſo undaunted and dreadleſs, as his great fall witneſt ἐν πολυφθόρῳ Διὸς ὄμβρῳ καὶ χαλαζαίνῃ φόνῳ, in that fatal *Haile* that made more Orphans than his Children: Yet to doe an ill or an uncivil thing, he was an arrant Coward: Though he was of *David*'s Stature, of his Courage too, μορφὰν βραχὺς, ψυχὰν δὲ ἄκραμπτος, and in this moſt like him, afraid of nothing but to offend. *Slain at Newbury*, Sept. 20. 1643.

But what needs any body plead for his *Civility* more than this preſent Diſcourſe, where he excells his *Antagoniſt* in that, as well as in reaſon, and ſhews that a *Gentleman* writ with a *Scholar*'s Pen.

Before I ſhut up all, my Lord, one Vertue there is yet to be mentioned, which of all that ever had relation to his Lordſhip, I may not, I muſt not ever forget, and that was his *Friendſhip*. That is a Vertue, which by the unintermitted affliction of my life, I have had more than ordinary occaſion to make uſe of. And that I muſt needs ſay was it, which made all his other Graces and Excellencies reliſh to me, He being the deareſt and the trueſt Friend, that through the whole courſe of my unhappy life I ever had the happineſs to meet with.

If it be a kind of pleaſure to reade diſcourſes of Friends and Friendſhip, What is it to enjoy ſuch a Friend in whom really was, that Excellency either Hiſtory can record, or almoſt Poetry feign?

Nothing ſo hard in *Lucian*'s *Toxaris*, that he durſt not doe; and nothing ſo handſome in all *Seneca*'s Laws of *Benefits*, that he knew not how to doe, and to out-doe for his Friend.

Let your Vertuous and dear Grandmother, my Lord, and all your Kindred yet alive, ſpeak to this: And your bleſſed Mother were ſhe now alive, would ſay, ſhe had the beſt of Friends before the beſt of Huſbands. This was it that made *Tew* ſo valued a Manſion to us: For as, when we went from *Oxford* thither, we found our ſelves never out of the Univerſity: So we thought our ſelves never abſent from our own beloved home. But I dare ſay no more of this, it being now a melancholy thing, I am ſure to me, to call back into my memory, happineſs never to be recalled, and to afflict my ſelf anew with the conſideration of what felicity I have out-lived.

Your

Your Lordſhip is now the onely ſurviving pledge of that admired Father, of whom when we his poor ſervants have ſaid all we can, the Character will be far too ſhort. It is in you, and onely you, my Lord, to ſet him out truly, and to reſemble him to the life; and that will be, by taking that Evangelical Counſel, *Tu autem fac ſimiliter: Doe like* him, live like him; and pardon me if I add one thing more, like him, Love

My Lord,

Your Lordſhip's moſt

humble and affectionately

devoted Servant,

TRIPLET.

THE

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

THE eminent abilities in the moſt noble Authour of the enſuing learned Diſcourſe, and learneder Reply, can ſcarcely be imagined unknown to any whom this language can reach: But if any ſuch there be, I ſhall deſire them to learn the perfections of that moſt excellent Perſon, rather from the Dedication, than this Preface; *the deſign of which, is onely to give the* Reader *ſome ſatisfaction concerning the nature of this Controverſie in it ſelf, and of theſe diſſertations in particular.*

The Romiſh *Doctrine of their own Infallibility, as it is the moſt general Controverſie between them, and all other Churches excluded by them from their Communion: So it is of ſuch a comprehenſive nature, that being once proved and clearly demonſtrated, it would without queſtion draw all other Churches ſo excluded, to a moſt humble ſubmiſſion and acknowledgement; nay, to an earneſt deſire of a ſudden Reconciliation upon any Terms whatſoever. For howſoever they pleaſe to ſpeak and write of our Heretical and obſtinate perſiſtance in manifeſt Errours, yet I hope they cannot ſeriouſly think we would be ſo irrational, as to contradict him whom we our ſelves think beyond a poſſibility of erring, and to diſpute perpetually with them, whom onely to hear were to be ſatisfied.*

But when they have propounded their Deciſions to be believed, and embraced by us, as Infallibly true, and that, becauſe they propound them, who in their own opinion are Infallible; if, notwithſtanding, ſome of thoſe Deciſions ſeem to us to be evidently falſe, becauſe clearly contradictory to that which they themſelves propound as infallibly true, that is the Word of God; ſurely we cannot be blamed, if we have deſired their Infallibility to be moſt clearly demonſtrated, at leaſt to a higher degree of evidence than we have of the contradiction of their Deciſions to the infallible Rule. Wherefore, The great Defenders of the Doctrine of the Church of England, *have with more than ordinary diligence endeavoured to view the grounds of this Controverſie, and have written by the advantage either of their learning accurately, or of their parts moſt ſtrongly, or of the cauſe it ſelf moſt convincingly, againſt that darling* Infallibility. *How clearly this Controverſie hath been managed, with what evidence of truth diſcuſſed, what ſucceſs ſo much of reaſon hath had, cannot more plainly appear than in this, that the very name of* Infallibility *before ſo much exalted, begins now to be very burthenſome, even to the maintainers of it: Inſomuch as one of their lateſt and ableſt Proſelytes,* Hugh Paulin de Creſſy, *lately Dean of* Laghlin, *&c. in* Ireland, *and Prebendary of* Windſor *in* England, *in his* Exomologeſis, *or faithfull Narration of the occaſion and motives of his Converſion, hath dealt very clearly with the World, and told us, that this* Infallibility is an unfortunate Word: *That* Mr. *Chillingworth* hath cumbated againſt it with too too great ſucceſs; *ſo great, that* he could wiſh the Word were forgotten, or at leaſt lay'd by. *That not onely Mr.* Chillingworth, *whom he ſtill worthily admires; but we the reſt of the poor* Proteſtants, have in very deed, very much to ſay for our ſelves, when we are preſſed unneceſſarily with it. *And therefore Mr.* Creſſy's *advice to all the* Romaniſts, *is this, that we* may never be invited to combat the authority of the Church under that notion. *Oh the ſtrength of Reaſon rightly managed! O the power of Truth clearly declared! that it ſhould force an eminent member of the Church of* Rome *(whoſe great Principle is non-retractation) to retract ſo neceſſary, ſo fundamental a Doctrine, to deſert all their Schools, and contradict all their Controvertiſts. But indeed not without very good cauſe: For he profeſſes withall,* that no ſuch word as Infallibility is to be found in any Council: Neither did ever the Church enlarge her Authority to ſo vaſt a wideneſs: But doth

doth rather deliver the victory into our hands when we urge her Decisions. *In all which Confessions, although he may seem onely to speak of the* Word, *yet that cannot be it which he is so weary of, because we except not against the word at all, but confess it rightly to signifie that which we impugn, neither do we ever bring any nominal Argument against it. But as when Cardinal* Bellarmine *sets down the Doctrine of the Church in their positive terms,* Summus Pontifex, cùm totam Ecclesiam docet, in his, quæ ad Fidem pertinent, nullo casu errare potest: *We conceive he hath sufficiently expressed the sense of the word* Infallibility, *so that,* Insallibilis est, & nullo casu errare potest, *are to us the same thing: It cannot therefore be the Word alone, but the whole importance and sense of that word* Infallibility, *which Mr.* Cressy *so earnestly desires all his Catholicks ever hereafter to forsake, because the former Church did never acknowledge it, and the present Church will never be able to maintain it. This is the great success which the Reason, Parts and Learning of the late Defenders of our Church have had in this main Architectonical Controversie.*

And yet though the Church never maintained it, though the Protestants have had such advantage against it, though Mr. Cressy *confessing both, hath wished all Catholicks to forsake it; yet will he not wholly forsake it himself, but undertakes most irrationally to answer for it. If the Church never asserted it, if the* Catholicks be not at all concerned in it, *to what end will Mr.* Cressy *the great mitigatour of the rigour, and defender of the latitude of the Churches Decisions, maintain it? If Mr.* Chillingworth *have had such good* success *against it, why will his old Friend Mr.* Cressy *endeavour to answer his arguments? especially, considering when he hath answered them all, he can onely from thence conclude that, Mr.* Chillingworth *was a very bad Disputant, who could bring no argument able to confute that, which in it self is not to be maintained.*

So unreasonable it is, and inconsistent with his Concessions, that he should give an answer at all; but the manner of his answer, which he gives is far more irrational. For deserting the Insallibility, *he answers onely the* Authority *of the Church, and so makes this* Authority *answer for that* Infallibility: *from whence these three manifest absurdities must necessarily follow.*

First, When he hath answered all Mr. Chillingworth's *arguments, in the same manner as he pretends to answer them, he must still acknowledge them unanswerable, as they were intended by him that made them. And no argument need to be thought good for any thing else, if he which made it, knew what he said, as Mr.* Chillingworth *certainly* did.

Secondly, He onely pretends to answer those arguments, as against the Authority *of the Church, simply considered without relation to such an* Infallibility, *which were never made against an authority so qualified. And therefore, whether the argument of his dear friend were to any purpose or no, his answer manifestly must be to none.*

Thirdly, If he intend to refute all opposition made to their Infallibility *by an assertion of their bare* Authority, *then must he assert that authority to be as great and convincing, which is fallible, as that which is infallible: that Guide to be as good, which may lead me out of my way, as that which connot: That Judge to be as fit to determine any doubt, who is capable of a mistake, as he which is not. And then I make no question, but some of his own Church, amongst the rest of their dislikes, will put him in mind of that handsome sentence of Cardinal* Bellarmine, Iniquissimum esset cogere Christianos, ut non appellent ab eo Judicio quod erroneum esse potuit.

I once thought to have replied to those answers, which he hath given to Mr. Chillingworth's *arguments: But his antecedent Concession hath made them so inconsiderable to me, that upon a second thought, I fear I should be as guilty in replying after my Objections, as he hath been in answering after his Confessions. Wherefore I shall conclude with an asseveration of mine own, which shall be therefore short because mine: That the Reply of this most excellent Person,* Sola operarum summa, præsertim in Græcis, incuria excepta, *is the most accurate Refutation of all, which can be said in this Controversie, that ever yet appeared; and if what hath already been delivered, have had such success upon so eminent an adversary, then may we very rationally expect at least the same effect upon all, who shall be so happy as to reade these Discourses.*

Which is the earnest desire of

I. Pearson.

[The *Discourse of Infallibility*, being before printed in this Volume is therefore here omitted.]

THE

AN ANSWER TO THE L. Faulkland's Diſcourſe OF INFALLIBILITY.

CHAP. I.

NATURE being not able to perfect the work of humane kind, which ſhe had begun, and burſting at thoſe throws and ſpringings, which her timely child gave, to ſee the light of eternal life, (whereof the diſtaſte of all things experienced in this world, and certain ſparklings ſowed in our ſoul, had given it a dim notice) expected from her merciſull Creatour, the aid (whereof how much greater the wonder was to be, and the neceſſity, now divers thouſand years, by lamentable experience was more dear, ſo much the readier was he) and it was to ſend from his eternal breaſt, his onely wiſedom to recount us wonders, and aver them under the ſeal of his immutable truth. He knew all ſecrets, and could not be touched with ſuſpicion of ignorance; he was all goodneſs, and free from all calumny of jealouſie or envy: who knew him, could not miſtruſt him; for beſide thoſe great Verdicts already expreſſed in his favour, his works gave aſſurance of his words, he fulfilling in deeds, whatſoever he perſwaded in words, and working to himſelf, what he wiſhed unto others. Lo here, the high, and ſage Maſter of our faith, whoſe Oracles we cannot miſ-doubt, ſo we be aſſured they are his; and who hath in vain ſpent ſo much ſweat, and pains, if after he paſſed from hence, he hath left no means to aſſure mankind, what it was he taught and practiſed, and for the teaching and practiſing of it, eſchewed not the ſtormy paſſage betwixt *Bethlehem* and Mount *Calvarie*: but as in *Bethlehem* he multiplied the three drops of his Circumciſion into the thouſands of innocent Brooks; ſo upon the Mount *Calvarie* he opened the great Source, which hath now through 16. Ages irrigated the world with an infinity of ſtreams of proportional examples of bloud and ſufferance. Now was his Legacy performed, and he from Mount *Olivet* triumphantly returned, from whence he was come, and the world left to be ſaved by faith, that is, by a conſtant perſwaſion of thoſe things which he had taught.

The Conditions of this Faith were three. Firſt, That it ſhould be a means fitting for humane kind, that is, for learned and unlearned, for young and old, for wiſe and fools, for Princes and peaſants, Rabbies and Idiots. Secondly, That it ſhould be a tenent, conſtant, undoubted, undiſputable, uncontrollable. Thirdly, That it ſhould be a rule of our life and actions, making but a paſſage of this preſent life, to the following, and teaching us to contemn the preſent and ſeen ſubſtance, in hope of an unſeen and abſent fortune. *Certes*, a hard task, and which needeth to be well grounded and founded by God himſelf. For who well conſidereth it, cannot doubt it, to be as great a miracle (to make the whole Maſs of mankind, to forſake what it ſeeth, and take to obſcure hopes or things, it does not ſo much apprehend what they are) as to force the ſtrongeſt works of nature, to hang the ſea in the air, to alter the courſe of Moon, and Stars, and whatſoever elſe is ſtrange and incredible in nature. Beſides that, to make a way of knowledge common, and indifferent to learned and unlearned, to make the ignorant underſtand what the learned cannot reach unto, and the learned die in defence of the truth he hath no other warrant for, than becauſe he hath learned it from an ignorant perſon, was the work of him alone who framed them both, and underſtood in what veins ſo different blouds do run.

But done it was to be, and how? Thoſe to whom during his life, he had moſt fully declared his mind, went, and told it to others, and all was done. We cannot deny the way to have been fitting, and expedient, ſo it be found efficacious and powerfull, to effect what the Authour intended. For if Faith muſt believe what Chriſt hath taught, what better inſtrument to breed faith, than who heard him ſpeak? If Faith muſt be common to learned and unlearned, what better means, than by hearing? From which

no unlearnedneſs can excuſe, nor learnedneſs be extempt. Every man may have from whom to hear and learn, if not wiſer than himſelf, yet one who may have properties to be a better witneſs. Children naturally believe what their parents tell them, unlearned men what Doctours teach them, abſent men, what thoſe who were preſent do report. All this goeth very well, ſo that this Expedient prove efficacious to the end intended.

Object. *But it hath the prejudice of humane fallibility, for who, for weakneſs that he doth not carry away what he hath heard, who, for vanity to ſeem to know more than his fellows, who, to make ſome traffic of it, or for ſome emulation to ſome other; but ſeldome it hapneth that a multitude can carry away a thing all in the ſame manner; and 1600 years are paſſed ſince, ſo that it is not credible, a Doctrine ſo delivered can perſevere incorrupted untill this day.*

Anſw. Yet if we look into the immediate progreſs and joints of the deſcent, we cannot find where it can miſs; for the doctrine being ſupernatural, and not delivered by man's skill or wit, the firſt and main principle of it can be no other, than to know what was delivered them by their Teachers, a thing not ſurpaſſing the underſtanding of any ſenſible wiſe man; ſo that put but twenty wiſe underſtanding men to agree, that the Preacher, to their certain knowledge, ſaid ſuch a thing, there remaineth no probable nor poſſible doubt, but that it was ſo.

Now then ſuppoſe, that one of thoſe (who having been taught by Chriſt's own mouth, had received by the confirmation of the Holy Ghoſt, that he could neither forget nor [illegible] this received doctrine) ſhould have preached over and over again the ſame doctrine, not long, nor hard to be carryed away, in all the Cities, Towns, and Boroughs of ſome great Country, ſo that whilſt he ſtayed there, they were throughly underſtanding and endoctrinated in that way. Now let him be gone, and after him all dead, who had heard him ſpeak; and then ſome queſtion ariſe concerning this doctrine (as we may ſay in the ſecond age) let us ſee whether errour can creep in or no, if the Chriſtians keep unto their hold. Their hold is what they were taught by Chriſt's Apoſtles. Let therefore the wiſeſt and beſt men of thoſe Cities and Towns meet together about the controverſie, and diſcuſs it out of this principle (what was delivered unto them as taught by the Apoſtles) will not there be a quick end of their diſpute? For every man can ſay, My father heard the Apoſtle ſpeak, he underſtood him to have ſaid this, ſo he himſelf believed, ſo he taught me, that this was that which the Apoſtle taught us. And when out of divers Cities and Towns, ſhall come a multitude of witneſſes, all agreeing in one point, how can it be doubted, but that this is Chriſt's doctrine, and that which his Apoſtle taught? And to diſagree, how is it poſſible? Since all their fathers heard the ſame things, and things not above their capacity, and often told them, and well apprehended by them when they were taught, and by conſequence could not tell their children otherwiſe than what they had heard and underſtood, in a matter of ſuch moment, and of which they apprehended no leſs, than that it concerned their own, and their childrens ſalvation, happineſs, or miſery for all eternity. And what here is moſt evidently certain, in the children of thoſe who heard the Apoſtles, may be derived with as much evidence again in the grand-children, and ſo in every age even to our preſent; for if in any age any queſtion begin, and it be reduced unto this principle; what did our forefathers teach us? neither can there be any pretended ignorance (for who can be ignorant of what was taught him when he was a child, and in what he was bred, as in the grounds and ſubſtance of his hopes, for all eternity? True it is, that if men leave this principle, and ſeek to judge the controverſie by learned diſcourſe, then may the Church be divided, one part following the authority of their Anceſtours; the other the ſubtile Arguments, and the great opinion they conceive, of the learning of their preſent Teachers: ſo that one ſide will claim ſucceſſion, and to have received it from hand to hand; the other the glory of great learning, and to have come by great induſtry to diſcover the errours of their forefathers. But it is evident, that if what the Apoſtles preached be the touchſtone of what is true, and what they preached, to be ſeen in what thoſe believe who have heard them, and they who received it from them that heard them; It is moſt evident, I ſay, that the one part, who ſeek for Chriſtian truth in learned diſcourſe, muſt needs forego the moſt certain and eaſie way, of attaining unto what they aim at: And likewiſe evident, that who keep themſelves duly and carefully unto the principle, cannot poſſibly in any continuance of time, ſwerve from the truth which Chriſt hath left unto his Church. So that the whole difficulty is reduced unto this, whether the Church for ſo many ages be perpetually preſerved in this principle, that what ſhe received from her forefathers, is that ſhe muſt believe, and deliver unto her poſterity; A thing ſo grafted in nature, which maketh us receive our being, our breeding, our learning, our goods, our eſtates, our arts, and all things we have, from our fathers, that it is a wonder of our mutability, that without forcible Engines we can be drawn from it.

CHAP. II.

NOW let us turn our diſcourſe, and as we have ſeen, that if our Saviour ordered his Apoſtles in the manner explicated, there was no way for his Church to ſwerve from his truth, but by ſwerving from the moſt plain, the moſt natural, and moſt evident, and concluding rule of his doctrine, and that but one, and moſt eaſie; ſo let us ſee whether from the preſent Church we can draw the like forcible train, which may lead us up to Chriſt, and his Apoſtles. Be therefore ſuppoſed or imagined, what no judicious man can deny to ſee with his eyes, if he hath never ſo little caſt them upon this preſent religion of Chriſtendom, to wit, that there is one Congregation or Church which layeth claim to Chriſt his doctrine, as upon this title, that ſhe hath received it from his Apoſtles without interruption, delivered ever from Father to Son, from Maſter to Scholar, from time to time, from hand to hand, even unto this day; and that ſhe does not admit any other doctrine for good and legitimate, which ſhe does not receive in this manner. Again, that whoſoever pretendeth Chriſt his truth againſt her, ſaith, that truth was, that once ſhe had the true way, but that by length of time ſhe is fallen into groſs errours which they will reform, not by any truth they have received from hand to hand, from thoſe who by both parts are acknowledged

knowledged to have received their leſſon from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, but by ſtudy and learned Arguments, either out of ancient Writers, or out of the ſecrets of nature and reaſon. This being ſuppoſed, either this principle hath remained unto her ſince the beginning, or ſhe took it up in ſome one age of the 16. ſhe hath endured; if ſhe took it up in ſome latter age, ſhe then thought ſhe had nothing in her what ſhe had not received from her forefathers in this ſort: And if ſhe thought ſo, ſhe knew it. For as it is impoſſible now, any country ſhould think it was generally taught ſuch a thing, if it were not ſo; ſo alſo was there the like neceſſity, and impoſſibility to be otherwiſe, if all men were not run mad. Therefore clear it is, ſhe took it not up firſt then, but was in former poſſeſſion, and ſo clear it is, that ſhe could not have it now, if ſhe had it not from the very beginning. Now if ſhe had it, and hath conſerved it from the beginning, no new opinion could take root in her, unleſs it came unto her under this Maxime, as received from hand to hand; and to ſay, that any opinion which was not truly received from hand to hand, ſhould by ſuch a community be accepted, as received from hand to hand, is to make it believe, what it ſeeth clearly to be falſe, to lie unto its own ſoul, againſt its own ſoul, and the ſoul of its poſterity. Let us add to this, that the multitude of this Church is ſo diſperſed through ſo many Countries and languages, of ſo divers governments, that it is totally impoſſible they ſhould agree together, or meet upon a falſe determination, to affirm with one conſent a falſity for truth, no intereſt being able to be common unto them all to produce ſuch an effect. Wherefore as an underſtanding man cannot chuſe but laugh at the ſelf-weening *Hampſhire* Clown, who thought in his heart there was no ſuch Country as *France*, and that all that was told of it, were but Travellers tales, becauſe himſelf being upon the Sea ſhore, had ſeen nothing but water beyond *England*; ſo I think no wiſe man will accompt him leſs than phrentick, that underſtandeth ſo little in humane ways, as to think whole Nations by deſign, or by hazard, can agree together to profeſs, and proteſt a thing, which they know of their own knowledge to be a mere lie, and a well known falſhood to themſelves, and all their neighbours

CHAP. III.

THE force of the declared link of ſucceſſion, is ſo manifeſt to a capable underſtanding, that being compared with any objection made againſt it, it will of it ſelf maintain its evidence, and bear down the greateſt oppoſitors and oppoſition, if the underſtanding be left unto it ſelf, and not wreſted by the prejudice of a ſome ways intereſſed will. Nevertheleſs, there is a deeper root, which greatly ſtrengthens and reduces into action, the former efficacity of the tradition. And this is, that Chriſtian doctrine is not a ſpeculative knowledge, inſtituted for delight of man to entertain his underſtanding, and hath no farther end than the delectation which ariſeth out of contemplation; but it is an art of living, a rule of attaining unto eternal bliſs, a practical doctrine whoſe end is to inform our action, that our life and actions ſquared by her directions, may lead us to that great good, the which God Almighty eſteemed ſo highly of, that he thought it reaſon enough for him to ſhade his Divinity under the miſery of man, to make us partakers of ſo great a bliſs. Hence it followeth, that no errour can fall, even in a point which ſeemeth wholly ſpeculative in Chriſtian faith, but ſoon it breedeth a practical effect, or rather defection in Chriſtian behaviour. What could ſeem more ſpeculative, than whether the ſecond, or third Perſons of the Trinity were truly or participately God? Yet no ſooner was an errour broached in theſe queſtions, but there followed a great alteration in Chriſtian action; in their Baptiſms, in their manner of Prayer, in the motives of Love and Charity toward Almighty God, the very ground-work and foundation of all Chriſtian life. Whether man hath free-will or no, ſeemeth a queſtion, belonging to the nature of man, fit for a curious Philoſopher; but upon the preaching of the negative part, preſently followed an unknown Libertinage, men yielding themſelves over to all concupiſcence, ſince they were perſwaded they had no power to reſiſt. Free-will being denyed. I need not inſtance in prayer to Saints, worſhiping Images, prayer for the dead, and the like; which is evident, could not be changed without an apparent change in Chriſtian Churches. So that a doctrine contrary to faith, is like a diſeaſe, which although the cauſe be internal, yet cannot the effects and ſymptoms be kept from the outward parts, and view of the world. The conſequence which this note draweth, is, that it is not poſſible, that any material point of Chriſtian faith can be changed, as it were by obreption, whilſt men are a-ſleep, but it muſt needs raiſe a great ſcandal and tumult in the Chriſtian Common-weal. For ſuppoſe the Apoſtles had taught the world, it were Idolatry to pray to Saints, or uſe reverence towards their Pictures: How can we imagine this honour brought in, without a vehement conflict and tumult, in a people which did ſo greatly abhor Idolatry, as the Apoſtles Diſciples did? I might make the like inſtance in other points, if the whole Hiſtory of the Church did not conſiſt of the invaſions made by Hereticks, and the great and moſt violent waving of the Church to and fro upon thoſe occaſions. We remember in a manner as yet, how change came into *Germany*, *France*, *Scotland*, and our own Country: Let thoſe be a ſign to us, what we may think can be the creeping in of falſe doctrine; ſpecially, that there is no point of doctrine, contrary to the Catholick Church, rooted in any Chriſtian Nation, that the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory does not mention the times and combats by which it entered, and tore the Church in peices.

Let it therefore remain for moſt evidently conſtant, that into the Chriſtian Church can come no errour, but it muſt be ſeen and noted, and raiſe ſcandal and oppoſition to ſhew it ſelf (as truly it is) contrary to the nature of Piety and Religion. And when it does come, it cannot draw after it any others, than ſuch as firſt deſert the root of Faith, and Anchor of Salvation, that is to be judged by what their forefathers taught them, and affirmed to have received from their Anceſtours, as the Faith which Chriſt and his Apoſtles delivered to the whole world of their time, and to ſuch as ever claim and maintain the right of ſucceſſion, as a rule of what they believe. Yet may this alſo be worthy of conſideration, that as in our natural body, the principal parts are defended by Bones, Fleſh, Skins,

and such like defences, in such sort, that no outward Agent can come to offend them, before having annoyed some of these; so in the Catholick faith, there are in speculation those we call Theological conclusions, and other pious opinions; and in practice many Rites and Ceremonies, which stop the passage unto the main principal parts of Christian belief and action. And about these we see daily such great motions in the Catholick Church, that he must be very ignorant of the Spirit of God, which quickneth his Church, that can imagin any vital part of his faith can be wounded while it lies a-sleep, and is insensible of the harm befalleth it; for as in any Science a principle cannot be mistaken, but it must needs draw a great shoale of false consequence upon it, and lame the whole Science, so never so little an errour in faith can be admitted, but in other Tenets, and Ceremonies it must needs make a great change, and innovation.

CHAP. IV.

NOW let any discreet man consider, what farther evidence he can desire, or peradventure, what greater assurance nature can afford, and not be of an awkward wilfulness to ask, that which is not conformable to the laws of nature? Much like unto him, who being sate in a chair far from the chimney, could not think of applying himself to the fire, but was angry the fire and chimney were made so far from him. The Philosophers say, it is *indisciplinati ingenii* to expect in any Art or Science more exactness than the nature of it affordeth. As if a man would bind a Seaman, to go so far every day, whether wind and weather served or no: So in moral matters, and such as are subject to humane action, we must expect such assurance as humane actions bear. If for the government of your spiritual life, you have as much as for the managing of your natural and civil life, what can you expect more? Two or three witnesses, of men beyond exception, will cast a man out of, not onely his lands, but life and all. He that amongst Merchants will not adventure, when there is a hundred to one of gaining well, will be accompted a silly Factor. And amongst Souldiers, he that will fear danger where but one of a hundred is slain, shall not escape the stain of Cowardise. What then shall we expect in Religion, but to see a main advantage on the one side, we may cast our selves on? and for the rest, remember we are men, creatures subject to chance and mutability, and thank God he hath given us that assurance in a supernatural way, which we are content withall, in our natural and civil ventures and possessions, which nevertheless God knoweth we often love better, and would less hazard than the unknown good of the life to come. Yet peradventure, God hath provided better for his Church than for Nature, since he loved her more, and in his own Person did more for her. Let us therefore examine the assurance he hath left her particularly. It was found in the second Chapter, upon this principle, that so great a multitude of men as cleave to this ground (to have received their faith by tradition) could not conspire by lying, to deceive their posterity. And if I be not deceived, this principle being granted, the conclusion (that this present Church is the true) followeth in as severe a way of discourse, as in *Aristotle's* Organ is taught, and exemplified in *Mathematical* Writers; whose use and art it is to put the like suppositions, whence to enduce something out against their principle. As in the said Chapter you are bidden, to put what year, or age, such an errour entred, and it is evidently true, that if it be true, then that year or age conspired to tell a lie to deceive their posterity. And as for the strength of their principle it self (although no moral man can be so absurd as to doubt of it) yet may we consider, that the understanding being the part, which maketh man to be a man, and truth being the perfection of our understanding, and true speech the effect, natural to true knowledge, or understanding: It is clear, that to speak truth is as natural a fruit of man's nature, as Pears of a Pear tree, Grapes of a Vine, Hony of the Bee: and that it can be no less grafted in nature, for men to speak truly, than it is in any other natural cause, to yield the fruit, for whose sake nature bred the cause. Wherefore as the constancy of the effect sheweth, that it holdeth upon eternal principles, that no one species of perfect creatures can perish, although we are not so skilfull of nature, as handsomly to weave the demonstration; so cannot it be doubted, but that if one had all the principles of man's nature well digested, he might demonstratively deduce the impossibility of [that such multitudes of men should conspire to a lie] the variety of particulars ever holding their being, from a constancy and uniformity in the universal. Add to this, the notoriousness of the lie, such as he is rarely found, that is so wicked as to venture upon; besides the greatness of the subject, and of the danger ensuing upon himself, and his deerest pledges. The ground therefore assumed, is a demonstrative principle, and peradventure in a higher degree than most physical principles be: For who knoweth not the nature of the soul, to be the highest thing Physicks can reach unto? Who knoweth not, that immaterial things are less subject to mutability, than those which are grounded in matter? Then as more noble, and as more immaterial, it hath greater exemption from mutability, than any other natural cause whatsoever. One addition more, may chance to clear the whole business more fully. Nothing more clear than that, no natural cause faileth of his effect, without there be some impediment from a stronger. Now the impediments which hinder a man from speaking truth, experience teacheth us, to be no other than hopes and fears. The same experience giveth us to know, that it is a rare thing, that hopes and fears should comprehend so great multitudes, as are in the union of the Catholick Church, specially during an age, which is the least time necessary for the effect we speak of, that what peradventure might at one time be ill admitted, should not be rejected at another. But if there were; can any man be so mad as to think, it could be a secret hope or fear, which should not break out amongst the posterity, and be known, that what was done was not true, but counterfeited upon fear or interest, which if it were, a whole ages counterfeiting would not be sufficient to make the posterity believe, they had received such a point of doctrine by tradition. Wherefore I do not see, how this principle of tradition, and the doctrine received by it, can be accompted of less certainty, than any Physical demonstration whatsoever; or Faith upon this ground not as sure as any natural cause, as the course of the Sun

Sun and Moon, as the flowing and ebbing of the Sea, as the Summer and Winter, Sowing and Harveſt, and whatſoever we undoubtedly preſume upon the like nature, and kind.

The principle which is taken in the following Chapter, is of no leſs force (if not of far better) to who rightly underſtandeth the nature of God his works, whoſe courſe it is, deeplier to root and ſtrengthen thoſe things which he would have moſt to flouriſh, or whereof he hath moſt care. Now Chriſtians well know, that God Almighty hath made mankind for his elect, as the world which is about us, for mankind. And therefore he hath rooted thoſe things which more immediately belong to the Elect (as is his Church, his Faith, and Holy Spirit in it) more ſtrongly than the principles either of man's nature, or of the world which was made for it: himſelf aſſuring us of it, when he told us, *One tittle ſhould not miſs of the holy Writ, though Heaven and Earth ſhould be diſſolved.* And ſo ſeeing the latter principle, relyed upon the not failing of God's Holy Spirit to his Church, which ſhould ever watch upon their actions, that nothing ſhould creep into Chriſtian life, which preſently the zeal of his faithfull ſhould not ſtartle at: I think it needleſs to ſeek to farther *qualifie* the ſtrength of that part, which receiveth it from the quality of ſo good a workman as was the Holy Ghoſt.

CHAP. V.

I Doubt not but whoſoever ſhall have received ſatisfaction in the diſcourſe paſſed, will alſo have received in that point we ſeek after; that is, in being aſſured both that Chriſt hath left a Director in the world, and where to find him, there being left no doubt, but it is his holy Church upon earth. Nor can there be any queſtion, which is this Church, ſithence there is but one that doth and can lay claim, to have received from hand to hand his holy doctrine in writings and hearts. Others may cry loud, they have found it, but they muſt firſt confeſs it was loſt: and ſo if they have, it was not received by hands, I mean, as far as it diſagreeth with Catholick doctrine; ſo that where there is not ſo much as claim, there can be no diſpute. And that this Church is a lawfull directreſs, that is, hath the conditions requiſite, I think can no ways be doubted. Let us conſider in her, preſence, or viſibility, authority, power. As for the firſt, her multitude and ſucceſſion, makes the Church that ſhe is ever acceſſible, ever known. The *Arians* ſeemed to chaſe her out of the world in their flouriſh, but the perſecution moved againſt her, made her even then well known and admired. In our own Countrey we have ſeen no Biſhop, no form of Church for many years; yet never ſo, but that the courſe of juſtice did proclaim her through *England*, and who was curious, could never want means to come to know her confeſſion of faith what it is, and upon what it is grounded. Whereſoever ſhe is, if in peace, her Majeſty and Ceremonies in all her actions, make her ſpectable and admired. If in war, ſhe never wanteth Champions to maintain her, and the very heat of her adverſaries, makes her known to ſuch as are deſirous to underſtand the truth of a matter ſo important, as is the eternal welfare of our ſoul.

For *Authority*: her very claim of antiquity and ſucceſſion (to have been that Church which received her beginning from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and never forewent it, but hath ever maintained it) giveth a great reverence unto her amongſt thoſe, who believe her; and amongſt thoſe, who with indifferency and love of truth, ſeek to inform themſelves, a great prejudice above others: For it draweth a greater likelihood of truth, than others have. And if it be true, it carrieth an infinite authority with it, of Biſhops, Doctours, Martyrs, Saints, miracles, learning, wiſedom, venerable antiquity, and the like: that if a prudent man ſhould ſit with himſelf and conſider, that if he were to chuſe what kind of one he would have it, to carry away the hearts of men towards the admiration and love of God Almighty, he could find nothing wanting in this, that could be maintained with the fluxibility of nature. For to ſay, he would have no wicked men in it, were to ſay, he would have it made of Angels and not of Men.

There remaineth *Power*: the which no man can doubt but Chriſt hath given it moſt ample, who conſidereth his words ſo often repeated to his Apoſtles. But (abſtracting from that) who doth not ſee, that the Church hath the nature and proportion of ones Country, unto every one? As in a man's Country, he hath Father and Mother, Brothers, Siſters, Kinſfolks, Allyes, Neighbours, and Countrymen which anciently were called *Cives*, or *Concives*, and of theſe are made his Country; ſo in the Church findeth he in way of ſpiritual inſtruction and education, all theſe degrees nearer and farther off, untill he come unto that farthermoſt, of being all united under the univerſal Government of Chriſt his Vicar: And as he in his Countrey findeth bearing, breeding, ſettling in eſtates and fortunes, and laſtly protection and ſecurity; ſo likewiſe in the way of Chriſtianity doth he find this more fully in the Church: ſo that if it be true, that a man oweth more unto his Maſter than unto his Father, becauſe *bene eſſe* is better than *eſſe*; certainly man alſo (as far as Church and Country can be ſeparated) muſt owe more to the Church than to his very Country; wherefore likewiſe the power which the Church hath to command and inſtruct, is greater than the power of the temporal Country, and community, whereof he is part. Again, this Church can ſatisfie learned and unlearned. For in matters above the reach of reaſon, whoſe ſource and ſpring is from what Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught, what learned man, that underſtands the nature of ſcience and method, can refuſe in his inmoſt ſoul to bow to that which is teſtified by ſo great a multitude, to have come from Chriſt? And what unlearned man can require more for his faith, than to be taught by a Miſtreſs of ſo many prerogatives and advantages above all others? Or how can he think to be quieted in conſcience, if he be not content to fare as ſhe doth, who hath this prerogative evident, that none is ſo likely by thouſands of degrees?

CHAP. VI.

THE stemme and body of our position thus raised, will of it self shoot out the branches of divers Questions, or rather the solution thereof.

And first, *How it hapned that divers Hereticks have pretended tradition (the* Millenarians, Carpocratians, Gnosticks, *and divers others) yet they with their traditions have been rejected, and the holy Church left onely in claim of tradition.*

For if we look into, what Catholick tradition is, and what the said Hereticks pretended, under the name of Tradition, the question will remain voided. For the Catholick Church calleth Tradition, that doctrine which was publickly preached in the Churches, ordred and planted in the manners and customs of the Church. The Hereticks called Tradition a kind of secret doctrine, either gathered out of private conversation with the Apostles, or rather they pretended that the Apostles, besides what they publickly taught the world, had another private or mystical way proper to Scholars, more endeared than the rest, which came not to publick view, but was in huggermugger delivered from those secret Disciples unto others, and so unto them; where it is easily seen, what difference there is betwixt this Catholick Tradition and this pretended. For (the force and energy of tradition residing in the multitudes of hearers, and being planted in the perpetual action, and life of Christians, so that it must have such a publicity that it cannot be unknown amongst them.) Those the Hereticks pretend, both manifestly want the life and being of traditions, and by the very great report of them lose all authority and name. For, suppose some private doctrine of an Apostle to some Disciple, should be published and recorded by that Disciple, and some others, this might well be a truth, but would never obtain the force of a Catholick position, that is, such as it should be damnation to reject, because the descent from the Apostles is not notorious, and fitting to sway the body of the whole Church.

The Second Question may be, *How it cometh to pass, that something which at first bindeth not the Churches belief, afterward cometh to bind it? For if it were ever a Tradition, it must ever be publick, and bind the Church: And if once it were not, it appeareth not how ever it could come to be; for if this age, (for example) hath it not, how can it deliver it over to the next age that followeth?*

But if we consider, that the scope of Christian doctrine being great, and the Apostles preaching in so great variety of Countries, it might happen some point in one Country to have been less understood, or peradventure not preached at all, which in another was often preached, and well both understood and retained; we may easily free our selves from these brambles. For the Spirit of Tradition residing in this, that the testimony of that, *the Apostles delivered this Doctrine*, be *exceptione majus*, and beyond all danger of deceit; It is not necessary to the efficaciousness of Tradition, that the whole universal Church be witness to such a truth, but so great a part as could be a Warrant against mistaking and deceit; so that if all the Churches of *Asia*, or *Greece*, or *Aphrique*, or *Egypt*, should constantly affirm such a Doctrine to have been delivered unto them by the Apostles, it were enough to make a Doctrine *exceptione majorem*: Whence it insueth, that if in a meeting of the Universal Church it were found that such a part had such a Tradition, concerning some matter, whereof the rest either had no knowledge or no certainty, such a Doctrine would pass into a necessary bond in the whole Church, which before was either unknown or doubted of in some part thereof. A likely example thereof might be in the canonical books, the which being written some to one Church, and some to another, by little and little were spread from those Churches unto others, and so some sooner, some later, received into the constant belief of the Catholick world.

The Third Question may be, *How (Christian religion consisting of so many points) it is possible to be kept incorrupted by tradition, the which depending on memory, and our memory being so fraile, and subject to variation, it seemeth, cannot without manifest miracle, conserve so great diversity of points unchanged, for so many ages?*

But if we consider, that Faith is a Science, and Science a thing whose parts are so connexed, that if one be false, all must needs be false, we shall easily see, that contrarily, the multitude of divers points is a conservation the one to the other. For, if one be certain, it of it self is able to bring us to the right in another, whereof we doubt. And as in a man's body, if he wanteth one member, or the operation of it, he must needs find the want of it in another: And as a Common-wealth that is well ordained, cannot miss any office or part, without the redounding of the defect upon the whole, or some other part; so a Christian, being an essence instituted by God, as specially as any natural creature, hath not the parts of his faith and action by accident and chance knitted together, but all parts by a natural order, and will of the Maker, ordred for the conservation of the most inward essence, which is the charity we owe to God, and our Neighbour. Wherefore Christian life and action consisteth but upon one main tradition, whose parts be those particulars, which men specifie either in matter of Belief or Action: So that this connexion of its parts amongst themselves, added to the Spirit of God, ever conserving zeal in the heart of his Church, with those helps also of nature (wherewith we see wonders in this kind done) will shew this conservation to be so far from impossibility, that it will appear a most con-natural and fitting thing. Let us but consider, in constant nations, their language, their habits, their manners of sacrificing, eating, generally living; how long it doth continue amongst them. See that forelorn nation of *Jews*, how constantly it maintaineth the Scripture? how obstinately their errours? The *Arabians* of the desart, from *Ismael* his time unto this day, living in families, wandring about the desart. Where Christians labour to convert Idolaters, they find the main and onely argument for their errours, that they received them from their forefathers, and will not quit them. The King of *Socotora*, thinking to please the *Portugals* by reducing a nation, that had the name of Christians, to true Christianity, he found them obstinately protest unto him, that they would sooner lose their lives, than part with their religion their Ancestours had left them. The *Maronites*, a small handfull of people, amongst *Turks* and *Hereticks*,

to

to this day have maintained their religion in *Syria.* And certainly thouſands of examples of this kind may be collected in all Nations and Countries, eſpecially, if they be either rude, and ſuch as mingle not with others, or ſuch as be wiſe, and out of wiſedom ſeek to maintain their ancient belief. And Catholicks are of both natures: For they have ſtrict commands not to come to the Ceremonies and Rites of other religions, and in their own, they have all means imaginable to affect them to it, and conſerve a reverence and zeal towards it.

CHAP. VII.

TO come at length to the principal aim of this Treatiſe, that is, to give an anſwer to him that demandeth a guide at my hands. I remit him to the moderate preſent Church of *Rome*, that is, Her, who is in an externe ſenſible communion with the externe ſenſible Clergy of *Rome*, and the externe ſenſible Head and Paſtour of the Church. If he ask me now, how he ſhall know her? (I ſuppoſe he meaneth, how he ſhould know her to be the true) I muſt contreinterrogate him, who he is? that is, in whoſe name he ſpeaketh? Is he an ignorant man? Is he unlearned? yet of good underſtanding in the world? Is he a Scholar? and what Scholar? A Grammarian, whoſe underſtanding hath no other help than of languages? Is he a Philoſopher? Is he a Divine? (I mean an Academical one, for a true Divine is to teach, not to ask this queſtion:) Is he a Stateſman? For he who can think one anſwer, can or ought to be made to all theſe; may likewiſe expect, that a round bowle may ſtop a ſquare hole, or one cauſe produce all effects, and hang lead at his heels to fly withall. Yet I deny not, but all theſe muſt have the ſame guide, though they are to be aſſured of that, in divers ſorts and manners. If therefore the ignorant man ſpeaketh, I will ſhew him in the Church of God an excellency in decency, Majeſty of Ceremonies above all other Sects and Religions, whereby dull capacities are ſweetly enſnared, to believe the truth they hear, from whom they ſee to have the outward Signs of vertue and devotion. If the unlearned ask; I ſhew him the claim of Antiquity, the multitude, the advantages of ſanctity and learning, the juſtifiableneſs of the cauſe, how the world was once in this accord, and thoſe who oppoſed, when they firſt parted, firſt began the Schiſm; how the points of difference be ſuch as on the Catholick ſide help devotion, and on the contrary diminiſh the ſame, and ſuch like ſenſible differences, which will clearly ſhew a main advantage on the Catholick ſide, which is the proportional motive to his underſtanding.

To the Grammarian I will give two *Memorandums:* Firſt, that ſeeing Catholicks were firſt in poſſeſſion both of the Scriptures and the interpretations, the adverſe part is bound to bring ſuch places as can receive no probable Expoſition by the Catholicks. It is not ſufficient that their Expoſitions ſeem good or better; that is, more conformable unto the Text; but they muſt be evincent, to which no ſo ſound anſwer, even with ſome impropriety, can be given. For who knoweth not, that is converſant in Criticks, how many obſcure, and difficult places occur in moſt plain Authours? and the Scripture, of all Books (the greater part of the men who wrote them, ſpecially the new Teſtament, being not eloquent, and writing not in their native tongue) for the moſt part are ſubject to many Improprieties.

The other *Memorandum* is, That to prove a Catholick point by Scripture, it is ſufficient that the place brought, do bear the Explication the Catholick beareth, and if it be more probable by the very letter, it is an evincent place. The reaſon is, Becauſe the Queſtion being about a Chriſtian Law, the Axiome of the Juriſts taketh place, that *Conſuetudo optima interpres Legis.* So that if it be manifeſt, that Chriſtian practice (which was before the controverſie) be for the one ſenſe, and the words be tolerable, no force of Grammar can prevail to equalize this advantage. The Grammarian therefore who will obſerve theſe rules, I turn him looſe to the Scriptures, and Fathers, to ſeek in them what is the faith of Chriſt, and properties of his Church to know her by.

Of the Philoſopher I exact to go like a Philoſopher, and to ſearch out the ſpecifical differences of every Sect, and when he hath found them, (*if any one but the Catholick hath any rule of Faith and good life*; which I remit to him to enquire.) But at leaſt, when he hath found the Catholicks to be this claim of Tradition before declared, then, if this do not bring him as demonſtratively, as he knoweth any concluſion in Philoſophy, and Mathematicks, to the notice that this is the onely true Church of Chriſt, for my part I ſhall quit him before God and man.

The Divine, if he hath truly underſtood the principle of his Faith in the nature of a Divine (I mean, *Trinity*, *Incarnation*, *Redemption*, *Euchariſt*, *Beatitude*, the *Creation* and *Diſſolution* of the World) and hath ſeen the exact conformity with the deepeſt principles of nature, with an unſpeakable wiſedom of the contriver: If he does not plainly confeſs, it was above the nature of man to frame the Catholick Religion, and ſeeth not, that onely that is conformable to nature and it ſelf; I ſay, he hath no ground ſufficient to be of it.

At laſt, the Stateſman who is truly informed of the Church (how far it is really of Chriſt's Inſtitution, and what either pious men have added, or peradventure, ambitious men encroached,) If he does not find a government of ſo high and Exotick ſtrain, that neither man's wit would dare to have attempted it, neither man's power could poſſibly have effected it: If he findeth not eminent helps, and no diſadvantage to the temporal government; I ſhall think there wanteth one Star in the Heaven of the Church, to direct theſe Sages to *Bethlehem.* But if God Almighty hath in all ſorts and manners provided his Church, that ſhe may enlighten every man in his way, which goeth the way of a man; then let every man conſider, which is the fit way for himſelf, and what in other matters of that way he accompteth evidence. And, if there be no intereſt in his ſoul, to make him loath to believe, what in another matter of the like nature he would not ſtick at, or heavy to practiſe what he ſeeth clearly enough, I fear not his choice; but if God ſend him time and means to proſecute his ſearch any indifferent while, it is long ago known of what religion he is to be of.

After this followeth no order of Chapters, becauſe it is applied to the diſcourſe which was occaſion of it.

Although if what is already ſaid, be not ſatisfaction unto the writing, and the Authour thereof, (for whoſe ſake and contentment, all that hath been diſcourſed hitherto, hath been ſet down:) I confeſs, that I have not ability to give him ſatisfaction: yet leſt it ſhould be interpreted neglect, If I did not make an application of it unto the writing, I ſhall as briefly as I can, for avoiding tediouſneſs, run over the diſcourſe. And true it is, ſpeaking of the Church of *Rome*, as this day it is the true Church of God; I anſwer the doubter, ſhe neither hath, nor can have any errour, which he need to fear, and be ſhye of. The which two limitations I add, for avoiding queſtions, Impertinent to our diſcourſe. The firſt, for thoſe which are concerning the connexion of the See of *Rome* to the univerſal Church. The latter, to avoid ſuch queſtions as touch that point, whether the Church may erre, in any Philoſophical or other ſuch like matter? which queſtions are not ſo pertinent to our matter.

Neither do I remit the Queſtioner unto Scripture for his ſatisfaction, although I hold Scripture a very ſufficient means, to ſatisfie the man, who goeth to it with that preparation of underſtanding and will, which is meet and required. Howſoever this I may anſwer, for them who prove it out of Scripture, that becauſe they diſpute againſt them who admit of Scripture, and deny the authority of the Church; if they can convince it, they doe well; though they will not themſelves admit generally of a proof out of Scripture, as not able to prove every thing in *foro contentioſo*.

That they ſay, the Church is made infallible, that we may have ſome guide, I think it very rational. For nature hath given ever ſome ſtrong and uncontrollable principle in all natures to guide the reſt. The Common-wealth hath a Governour not queſtionable; our underſtanding hath ſome principles, which ſhe cannot judge, but by them judgeth of all other verities. If there ſhould not be ſome ſuch principle in the Church, it were the onely maimed thing God hath created; and maimed in its principal part, in the very head. And if there be ſuch a principle, the whole Church is infallible by that, as the whole man ſeeth by his eyes, toucheth by his hands. Neither can I deny, but that the Authour well excepteth, or aſſumeth, that there is no leſs neceſſity, the Church ſhould be known to be infallible, or which is this Church, than that there is one. For if I ſhould admit abſolutely, that it is neceſſary for every man to know the Church is Infallible, precedently to the knowledge of which is the true Church, I ſhould forget what I had before ſaid, that ſatisfaction is to be given to every one, according to his capacity. It is ſufficient for a Child to believe his Parents, for a Clown to believe his Preacher, about the Churches Infallibility. For Faith is given to mankind, to be a means to him of believing, and living like a Chriſtian: and ſo he hath this ſecond, it is not much matter in what terms he be with the firſt. The good women and Clowns in *Italy*, and *Spain*, trouble not themſelves to ſeek the grounds of their faith, but with a Chriſtian ſimplicity, ſeek to live according unto that their Preachers tell them; and without queſtion, by perſeverance, come to the happineſs, great Clerks by too much ſpeculation may fail of. Such therefore know no otherwiſe the Infallibility of the Church, than becauſe ſhe telleth it them, to whom they give credit, as innocently as any child to his Mother.

The Church therefore was made infallible, becauſe ſo it was fitting for her Maker, ſo it was fitting for her ſelf, ſo it was fit for that part of mankind, that had more refined wits; not becauſe it was neceſſary for every one which was to come to her, or live in her, whereof the greateſt part firſt cometh to her, drawn by ſome of the means before delivered, and believeth her about her infallibility.

Neither do I remit him to a general and conſtant tradition, as if himſelf ſhould climb up every age by learned Writers, and find it in every one. I take it to be impoſſible. Teſtimonies one may find in many ages, but ſuch as will demonſtrate and convince a full tradition, I much doubt. Neither do I find by experience, that who will draw a man by a rope or chain, giveth him the whole rope or chain into his hands, but onely one end of it, unto which if he cleave hard, he ſhall be drawn which way the rope is carried. Tradition is a long chain, every generation or delivery from father to ſon, being a link in it. I ſend him therefore no farther than to this preſent age, where he ſhall (beyond all doubtfulneſs) find that this doctrine was delivered unto this age, by the care of their Anceſtours. And if we ſeek upon what terms, we find, that upon a fixed opinion of damnation in failing; and ſo, that they had received it ſo from their forefathers upon the ſame terms, with opinion that it had continued ever ſince Chriſt his time by this means. And he who is able to look into the means, how this can remain conſtantly ſo many ages, may find it not onely the far ſecurer, but an evidently infallible ſucceſſion of doctrine, inviolable as long as there is a Church. And this doth not onely ſhew that there is one, but which ſhe is, and that there can be no other. For I ſuppoſe, no man will be ſo ſenſeleſs as to ſay, the Apoſtles preached one thing in one part, and the contrary in another: wherefore it will be agreed, that once the Church agreed in her faith. This ſuppoſed, let us ſet the time when one part changed, and will it not be evident, that the changing Church being challenged cannot plead, ſhe received it from her Anceſtours, becauſe it is manifeſtly falſe to both parties? Then muſt needs one onely Church remain with that claim. And although we did not know what the *Greek* Church doeth by her Hiſtory, yet the force of conſequence would tell us, they cannot doe this which the Weſtern Church doeth, becauſe the doing of one is incompatible with the doing of the ſame by the other.

As for the two places concerning the Popes and Councils infallibility, it is not to my purpoſe to meddle of them, becauſe on the one ſide, the way I have begun, there is no need of thoſe diſcourſes: and on the other, I ſhould engage my ſelf in quarrels betwixt Catholick and Catholick, obſcure the matter I have taken in hand, and profit nothing in my hearers more than to be judged, peradventure, to have more learning than wiſedom to govern it withall. Wherefore I ſhall omit thoſe Paragraphs, if I onely note concerning the tradition impoſed upon *Papias*, that the very narration of it, ſheweth that it is no tradition, in the ſenſe we ſpeak of tradition, but in the ſenſe ſome Hereticks have pretended tradition; as

it were a doctrine ſecretly delivered, and gathered out of private conference with the Apoſtles, and not their publick preaching delivered to the Churches, which is the way we exalt tradition in. The witneſſes alſo of ancient Fathers are no parts of tradition, but ſigns and marks where it hath paſſed, whereas the body of tradition is in the life and belief of the whole Church. For the Church (as I have ſaid) is an eſſence compoſed, as it were, of interne and externe parts; the interne being faith, the externe, the outward action, which muſt needs be conformable to the internal faith, nor can there be a material change in the action, but it muſt argue the internal change of faith, nor internal change in faith, but it muſt draw with it an Iliad of altered actions.

As for the place of *Fevardentius*, which alloweth many Fathers to have fallen into errours, I think it will not trouble him, who is acquainted with the courſe of the preſent Church, wherein divers, who be thought great Divines, fall into errours, for which their books ſometimes are hindred from the print, ſometimes recalled, or ſome leaves commanded to be paſted up. The reaſon is, the multiplicity of Catholick doctrine, which doth not oblige a man to the knowledge of every part, but to the prompt ſubjection to the inſtruction of the Church; wherefore many men may hold falſe doctrine inculpably, not knowing it to be ſuch, even now after the learned labours of ſo many, that have ſtrived to open and facilitate by method, what is true and what is falſe; much more in the Fathers times, when there was great want of ſo many compilers, as theſe latter ages have produced.

As for the two points, he ſaith, avert him from Catholick doctrine, I am miſtaken, if he be not miſtaken in both. The firſt is, that Catholick doctrine damnes all, who are not in the union of their Church. He thinketh the ſentence hard, yet, I think he will not deny me this, that if any Church does not ſay ſo, it cannot be the true Church: For call the Church what you will, the Congregation of the Elect, the Congregation of the Faithfull, the Congregation of Saints, or Juſt; call it, I ſay, or define it what you will, doth it not clearly follow, that whoſoever is out of that Church, cannot be ſaved; for he ſhall not be Elect, Juſt, Faithfull, &c. without which there is no ſalvation. How then can any Church maintain theſe two propoſitions? I am the true Church, and yet one may be ſaved, without being in me. But peradventure he is ſcandalized, that the Catholick Church requireth actual communion external with her, which he thinketh in ſome caſe may be wanting without detriment of Salvation. But how would he have the Church ſpeak, which ſpeaketh in common, but abſtracting from ſuch particular caſes, as may change wholly the nature of the queſtion. For example ſake; hath not the Church reaſon to ſay, he that denyeth the bleſſed Trinity is an Heretick? It hapneth one who hath converſed among the *Tritheites*, hearing them uſe the word Trinity for three Gods meaning to ſpeak againſt them, denyeth there is any Trinity; ſhall this man be comprehended in the foreſaid condemnation? Or was the ſentence ill pronounced? Neither, as I think. For both was it well done by the Church, to condemn denyers of the Trinity, becauſe *per ſe loquendo* (as the Philoſophers ſpeak) that is, according to the ordinary courſe, and nature of things, who denyeth a thing in words, denyeth it in heart; yet the man foreſpoken, did not ſo, and was not condemned in that ſentence. In like manner, when the Church condemneth all ſuch as are not in actual union, and communion with her, ſhe doeth well: becauſe according to the ordinary courſe, this doth not fall out, without either preſumption, and damnable pride, or elſe culpable, either ignorance, or fear, and love of private intereſt, before God and his Church. But it followeth not thence, that by accident no man may ſometime be excuſed. The words of our Saviour concerning Baptiſm and Euchariſt their neceſſity, are very preciſe, yet the Church doubteth not to excuſe thoſe who have it in *voto*.

But to proceed unto the point. The current of Catholick Doctours holdeth, that no man ſhall be damned for infidelity, but he who wilfully doth miſ-believe; and that to doe ſo, it is required that faith be ſufficiently propoſed unto him. And what is to be ſufficiently propoſed, is not determined amongſt them. There wanteth not Divines, that teach, that even *ignorantia affectata*, doth excuſe from Hereſie.

On the other ſide it is moſt certain, that no man is damned for not profeſſing, what he is not damned for not believing. Wherefore profeſſion being that which engrafteth a man exteriourly in the Church of God, according to the ordinary opinions of Catholicks; it followeth, that no man is condemned for not being of the Church, who is not for infidelity; for which it is a very uncertain caſe, who be damned and who not. So that the Catholick poſition is not ſo crude, as peradventure the Authour underſtood it to be, though the words be rough, and ought to be ſo, as being of what is according to the courſe of nature, not what chance and accidents may invent.

The other point was of putting Hereticks to death, which I think he underſtandeth to be done Vindicatively, not Medicinally. I mean, impoſed as a puniſhment, and not in way to prevent miſchief, or oppreſs it in the head. If the *Circumcellians* were the firſt, that is ancient enough for the juſtification of the fact, although for baniſhment (which alſo he ſeemeth to reprehend) we know the firſt that could ſuffer it, did ſuffer it. *Arius*, I mean, by the hand of *Conſtantine*, whom he praiſeth for a ſpeech he uttered, before he knew the conſequence of the danger, and ſeemeth to reprehend for his after and better wits. Saint *Auguſtine* juſtifieth ſuch proceedings againſt Hereticks. Saint *Gregory* adviſed the like againſt *Pagans*, (if I remember) and the Church laterly, hath rather increaſed than decreaſed in the practice of it. *Moſes*'s ſpeech, I believe is miſtaken, the force of it being, that the baniſhment of Biſhops ſhewed his faith, becauſe the baniſhed were Catholicks, which ſhewed *Lucius* to be none. But what can be ſaid, if the Church uſeth that for the prevention of a greater, and more dangerous evil, which all politick Eſtates uſe for the remedies of leſs, and leſs dangerous evils, and are commended for it? For if Faith be the way of Salvation, and Hereſie the bane of Faith; if Salvation be the greateſt good, then the danger of a Countries being over runn with Hereſie, is the greateſt of dangers, greater than the multiplying of Thieves, greater than the unſurety of the ways, greater than a Plague, or Invaſion. Why then doth not reaſon force us to uſe the means to prevent it, which the ſame reaſon and experience, teacheth us to be moſt efficacious in this and all other contagious and gangrening maladies of the Common-wealth. I hope reaſon it ſelf, and the zeal of the Authour to his own and Countries ſalvation, will ſupply my ſhortneſs in this point. For ſuppoſing a Church be aſſured

she is in the right, and that the doctrine preached by another, leadeth to damnation, I know not why *Caiaphas*'s words should not be prophetical in this case, and that truly it doth not *expedire*, that *unus moriatur pro populo, & non tota gens pereat.*

He urgeth afterwards against the unity of the Church, that it is none such as we brag of. And I confess we brag of it, and think we have reason too. And if it please him to look into the difference of our Country of *England*, and some Land of *Barbarians*, as *Brasile*, or such other, where they live without Law or Government, I think he will find, that our bragging is not without ground. For wherein is the difference betwixt a civil Government, and a barbarous Anarchy? Is it either, that in a civil Estate there be no quarrels, or amongst *Barbarians* there is no quiet? The former would prejudice our Courts and Justice, the latter is impossible, even in nature. What is then the goodness of Government, but that in a well govern'd Country, there is a means to end quarrels, and in an Anarchy there can be no assured peace? This therefore is that we brag of, that amongst us, if any controversie rise, there is a way to end it, which is not amongst them who part from us. And secondly, that there is no assured agreement amongst those who are parted from us; for although to day they agree, there is no bond, nor tye, why to morrow they may not disagree. These two things we brag of, and I think the Authour will not deny it. For he confesseth we all agree, in that the Church is an infallible Mistress. Then it is evident, that if in any controversie she interposeth her judgement, the controversie is ended. He likewise confesseth, that who part from us, have no such definitive authority amongst them, and that Scripture whereon they rely, hath not this vertue, to take up controversies clearly. Again, I do confess, most English men confess a Trinity, the Incarnation, and Passion of our Saviour; but if to morrow, any one or more of them, light upon some book of an *Arian*, *Trinitarian*, or other Sect, so wittily written, that he putteth probable solutions for the places of Scriptures, sheweth slight ways, how our well-meaning fore-fathers may have slipped into such an errour; what is there to retain these men, from disagreeing with the rest of their brethren, and betake themselves to the *Arians*? And when the heat is passed, light upon some Rabbi, who shall cunningly exaggerate the absurdities (as he shall term them) of the Trinity, Incarnation, Passion; say our Saviour did strange things in vertue of some constellation, and delivering these things so oratorically, that for a new heat these things shall seem more conformable, than his *Arianisme*; what then shall hinder this to become a *Jew*, and at last to prove himself so great a Clerk, as to write *De Tribus Impostoribus*? Take away the power of the Church (which every man doth, who taketh away the Infallibility) what can retain any man, why he should not yeild to that discourse, which seemeth faireſt, seeing nothing is certain? But peradventure, some may attribute power unto the Church without Infallibility; whom I would have consider, but what himself saith. For his Church, by the power it hath, must either say, I command you to believe me, or I command you to profess this, whether you believe me or no. The second I think, no enemy of equivocation will admit, as the former is as much, as if it should say, I know not whether I say true or no, yet you must think I say true. So that if I understand any thing, where there is no Infallibility, there is no Power, where no Power, no Unity, where no Unity, no Entity, no Church. Now for the controversies mentioned (besides that there is a means to terminate them) they be such, as bring no breach of the ancient life, and action of Christians, which all those Opinions do, which for the most part are reputed to make Hereticks; That some controversies amongst us are not resolved, is a thing necessary amongst humane affairs, where things must have a time to be born, to encrease, to fall; and the greater things are, the greater is their period. Wherefore I do not see, why this may hurt the Church, more than the Suits which hang in our Courts, prejudice the Government of the Land. Neither can any other Church assume Infallibility to it self; because it cannot lay hold of this principle, that it receiveth its doctrine by hands; and so must first profess the Church of Christ to be fallible, or else it cannot part from it.

The last point of the Authour's discourse, is, to shew how errours might have crept in. Wherein I shall have no opposition with him, for I do not think the question is, how they should creep in, but how they should be kept out? For the fluxibility of humane nature is so great, that it is no wonder if errours should have crept in, the ways being so many: but it is a great wonder of God, that none should have crept in. This nevertheless I may say, (if the Authour will confess, (as I think) he will not deny, but that it is disputable, whether any errour in sixteen ages hath crept in) this very thing is above nature. For if there were not an excellency beyond the nature of corruptible things, it would be undeniably evident, that not one or two, but hundreds of errours had quite changed the shape of the Church in so many years, tempests, divisions, want of commerce in the body of the Church. But this one maxime, that she receiveth her Faith by Tradition, and not from Doctours, hath ever kept her entire. And he that will shew the contrary, must shew how it could come to pass, that those who lived in such an age could say unto their children, this we received from our fore-fathers, as taught them by their forefathers, to have been received from Christ and his Apostles, from hand to hand; which if it could not be, the question is resolved, that no errour is in the Church of God, which holdeth her faith upon that tenure.

And truly, if the Authour desire to examine many Religions, let him look their main ground wherein they rely, and see whether that be good or no. And I think amongst Christians he shall find but two, Tradition, and Scripture. And the Catholick onely to rely upon Tradition, and all the rest upon Scripture. And also shall he see, that relying upon Scripture cannot draw to an unity, those who rely upon it; and that more than one cannot rely upon Tradition, which when I have considered, I have no farther to seek, for if I be a Christian, I must belong to one side. By falling on the one side, I see my fortune in thousands who have gone before me, to wit, that I shall be to seek all my life time, as I see they are, and how greatly they magnifie very weak peices. On the other side, I see every man who followeth it, as far as he followeth it, is at quiet; and therefore cannot chuse, but think there to be the stone to rest my head upon, against which *Jacob* his Ladder is reared unto Heaven.

The Authour hath through his whole discourse, inserted divers things, which seem particularly to the

the juſtification of himſelf, in the way of his ſearch. The which, as I think, on one ſide I ſhould be to blame to examine (for who am I, to judge the Servant of another man) ſo, becauſe I cannot think, but that they are inſerted for love of truth, and to hear what might be ſaid againſt them (craving pardon, if on preſumption of that, it is his will, I any way offend) I ſhall touch the matter, wholly abſtracting from the perſonal diſpoſition of any man. And to begin a far off, it is confeſſed amongſt Catholicks, that all ſin muſt be wilfull, and ſo, as far as any man's doubt in Religion is not by will, but by force and neceſſity, ſo far it is not culpable, but may be laudable before God and man. As was without doubt the anxious ſearch of Saint *Auguſtine* for the truth, which he relateth in his confeſſions, for who is aſſured of being out of the truth, muſt have time to ſeek it, and ſo long this doubt is rational, and laudable. That which muſt juſtifie this ſearch, is in common, that which juſtifieth all actions, that a man be ſure in the aim he aimeth at, and in the means he taketh, not to be governed by any paſſion, intereſt, or wilfulneſs, but that he ſincerely aimeth, and carefully purſueth in the ſearch of the truth it ſelf, for the love of it; and of thoſe goods which depend of the knowledge of it. This is a thing, in which a rational man can have no other judge than himſelf; for no man knoweth what is within a man, but the Spirit, or conſcience of man. But he himſelf muſt be a rigorous Judge unto himſelf, for it is very hard to know the truth: when I ſay rigorous, I mean exact, and fearfull of miſ-deeming; As holy *Job* was, who ſaid, *He was fearfull of all is actions.* Holy *David*, but amongſt all, Saint *Auguſtine* doth more ſweetly complain of the miſery of man, not knowing his own diſpoſitions, and yet he was then forty years of age, when paſſions and heats of youth, which make this diſcuſſion harder, are generally ſettled. Beſides this, he muſt have this care, that he ſeek what the nature of the ſubject can yield, and not as thoſe Phyſicians, who when they have promiſed no leſs than immortality, can at laſt onely reach to ſome conſervation of health, or youth in ſome ſmall degree: So I could wiſh the Authour, to well aſſure himſelf firſt, that there is poſſible, an Infallibility, before he be too earneſt, to be contented with nothing leſs. For what if humane nature ſhould not be capable of ſo great a good, would he therefore think fitting to live without any Religion, becauſe he could not get ſuch a one as himſelf deſired, though with more than a man's wiſh? Were it not rational to ſee, whether amongſt Religions, ſome one hath not ſuch notable advantages over the reſt, as in reaſon it might ſeem, humane nature might be contented withall? Let him caſt his accompts with the deareſt things he hath, his own, or friends lives, his eſtate, his hope of poſterity, and ſee upon what terms of advantage he is ready to venture all theſe, and then return to Religion, and ſee whether, if he do not venture his ſoul upon the like, it be truly reaſon, or ſome other not confeſſed motive, which withdraweth him. For my own part, as I doubt not of an Infallibility, ſo I doubt not, but ſetting that aſide, there be thoſe excellencies found on the Catholick party, which may force a man to prefer it, and venture all he hath upon it, before all other Religions, and Sects in the world: Why then may not one, who after long ſearching findeth no Infallibility, reſt himſelf on the like, ſuppoſing man's nature affordeth no better?

Another thing may make a man's ſearch faulty, and is carefully to be looked unto, I mean, that it is eaſie for a man to miſtake himſelf, by too much confidence in himſelf or others. He that will make a judgement in an Art he is not Maſter in, if he be deceived, is to impute it unto himſelf. The Phraſe commandeth us to believe every man in his Art; he who knoweth and underſtandeth himſelf, believeth not. Therefore when we ſee Maſters in an Art, we are not skill'd in, oppoſe us, we may believe we are in the wrong: which will breed this reſolution in the Authour of the diſcourſe, that if himſelf be not skilled all thoſe ways in which he purſueth his ſearch, he muſt find himſelf obliged to ſeek Maſters, who be both well skilled, and (the matter being ſubject to faction) alſo very honeſt and upright men, or elſe he doth not quit himſelf before God and man.

I cannot part without one note more, which is, that it is not all one to incur damnation for infidelity, and to be in ſtate of Salvation. For the man to whom infidelity is not imputed, may be in ſtate of damnation, for other faults; as thoſe were, who having known God by his works, did not glorifie him as they ought: nay, they may be damned through want of Faith, and yet not be condemned for incredulity. As for example ſake, if when they have ſinned, they know not what means to take to have them forgiven, though they be without fault in not believing, nevertheleſs dying without remiſſion of ſin, they are not in ſtate to come to life everlaſting. As the man, who ſhould venture into a Wood without a guide, although he did his beſt to have a guide, nothing leſs might fall out of his way, as well as he, who neglected the taking of one; ſo if God ſent his Son to ſhew us the way of Salvation, and that be but one; as well is he like not to be ſaved, who never heard of ſuch a way, as he that heard of it, and neglected it; for neither of the two goeth that way; and who goes not on the way, is not like to come to the end. I known, God is good and mercifull; but I know his works, as far as we know, are diſpenſed by the order of ſecond cauſes; and where we ſee no ſecond cauſes, we cannot preſume of the effects. God is good and mercifull I know, and feedeth the Birds of the air, and much more men; yet we ſee in dearths and hard winters, both men and Birds to periſh, do they what they could to get victuals. And how am I aſſured he will ſend Angels to illuminate ſuch men as doe their endeavours, that their ſouls may not periſh? But far more do I doubt, whether ever man, who had not the way of Chriſt, or even of thoſe, who walked in it, did ever doe his beſt (except ſome few, and very few, perhaps not two of Chriſt his greateſt favourites,) and was not ſo culpable, that his perdition would not have been imputed unto himſelf. God of his mercy put us in the ſcore of thoſe, of whom he ſaith, *He will take pity upon whom he pleaſeth, and compaſſion of them he pleaſeth.*

THE

Lord of Faulkland's

REPLY.

SIR,

I Receive your intention to inſtruct me, for a great obligation; but I ſhould have eſteemed it a greater, if you would have pleaſed to let me know to whom I owe the Favour, and ſhould pay my thanks; and if you had not tranſlated the command of ſecreſie from proper to metaphorical Almes.

I am alſo to thank you (for in this Age we are beholding to them who doe what is fit) for not mixing Gall with your Inke; ſince I have ever thought that there ſhould be a little bitterneſs in a Treatiſe of Controverſie, as in a Love-letter, and that the contrary way was both void of Chriſtian charity, and humane wiſedom, as ſerving onely πρὸς τὸ πτοεῖσθαι τὴν θήραν, *to fright away the game,* and make their Adverſary unwilling to receive inſtruction from him, from whom they have received Injuries; and making themſelves unable to diſcover Truth (which Saint *Auſtine* ſays is hard for him to find who is calm, but impoſſible for him that is angry:) raiſing beſides a great ſuſpicion of ignorance in him that uſeth it; ſince it is a very true Rule which we have received from *Hierocles*, μέγα συντελεῖ πρὸς πραότητα τὸ τῆς ὑπεροψίας θάρσος, *Confidence of knowledge conduceth much to meekneſs:* Now in this I intend to take you for my pattern, and the ſame Authour for my Counſellour; καὶ δυνάμενος ἀνατρέπειν τὰ ψεύδη, *and being able to overthrow what is falſe* (for ſo muſt I think I can, and ſuch I muſt take your reaſons to be, as long as they perſwade me not) μήτε σοφιστῶς μήτε ὑβριστικῶς τοῦτο πείσῃ, σὺν πραότητι τὴν ἀλήθειαν διώκων, καὶ μετ' ἐυμενῶν ἐλέγχων τὸ ψεῦδος ἀναιρέπων, ἃ συγχωρῶν ἔστως ἔχειν ὡς λέγεται ἀλλ' ἀοργήτως ἀκούων, *reſiſting Errours without Anger,* and *purſuing Truth with mildneſs.*

Syneſius.

Now this I muſt profeſs for my ſelf, that ſince I conſidered any thing in Religion, and knew that there were ſeveral of them in the world, I never avoided to hear (at leaſt) any man that was willing to perſwade me by reaſon, that any of them was the true, μήτε πάντας λόγους καταδεχόμενος, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τοὺ ψεύδεις, μήτε πάντας ὑποβάλλων, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τοὺ ἀληθεῖς. Nay rather I have laid wait to meet with ſuch of all ſorts, as were moſt likely to ſay moſt on their ſide (as S. *Chryſoſtome* ſays of *Abraham*, that he did σαγηνεύειν τοὺ ξένους, *lay nets for Gueſts*) and though almoſt all that undertake the ſearch of ſo important a Truth, doe it better provided with ſharpneſs of wit, and ſolidity of judgement, yet I verily believe that few doe it with that indifference and equality which is fit for a Judge, and with which I both began and continue it.

Yet (leſt there might ſome un-markt prejudice lye lurking in me, and leſt I might harbour ſome ſecret inclination to thoſe Tenets which I had firſt been taught) I have ever lean'd, and ſet my Byas to the other ſide, and have both more diſcourſed of matters of Religion with thoſe of the Church of *Rome* than with their Adverſaries, and read more of their writings; though none either ſo often or ſo carefully, as this which I am now anſwering, both becauſe it was intended for my Inſtruction and confutation; as alſo becauſe the beauty of the ſtyle and language, in which you have apparrelled your conceptions (although.

Ovid. Metamorph.

——*Non Hæc*
Auxilio tibi ſunt, Decor eſt quæſitus ab iſtis,

yet) ſhowes the Authour a conſiderable Perſon, and I may ſay of the ſplendour and outſide of what you have ſaid (for my opinion (that it wants ſolidity, and that the Logick of it is inferiour to the Rhetorick) is ſeen by my writing againſt it) what *Tacitus* ſays of *Vitellius* his Army, *Phaleræ torqueſque ſplendebant, & non Vitellio principe dignus exercitus*; for as he would have had that glorious Army been employed in the defence of a better and braver Prince, ſo I wiſh your eloquence had guilded the better cauſe; καὶ εἰθ' ὡς λωστοὺ τοιούτου ὢν φίλου ἡμῖν γένοιο. And (having learnt moreover from the Pagan Divinity of *Hierocles* (which in this is conformable to that of moſt Chriſtians) ἔοικε τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν σπουδαζόμενον ἐκτεινομένη χειρὶ πρὸς λῆψιν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, τότε παρὰ θεοῦ συντελούμενον χρηστὰ εἶναι, καὶ πηγὴ τῶν ἀγαθῶν. καὶ τὸ μὲ ἐκζητεῖν πυκνίναι τὰ ἀγαθὰ, τότε ἐκφαίνειν τὰ ζητούμενα ὀρθῶς, ἢ δὲ εὐχὴ ἱδρύειον εἶναι τοῦτο παρ' ἡμῖν ζητοῦσι, καὶ τὸ παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ δόσεως, *Xenophon Hiſt. 3.*

that all our ſearch is but the ſtretching forth of our hands, and that our finding proceeds from God's delivering

delivering the Truth unto us, and that prayer is the beſt means to joyn the latter to the former:) I have not onely with my utmoſt endeavours done my part; but alſo beſought God with my moſt earneſt fervency to doe his; and ſo ὡς εἶδος ἐπὶ ὕλῃ ἐυχὴν τῷ ἔργῳ συνάπτων, *joyning Prayer to ſearch, like form to Matter*, I doubt not but God who hath given me a will, to ſeek his Will, will alſo τὰ ἑαυτοῦ χωρηγεῖν ἀνέρματα: and if I have not the truth already, I ſhall be taught the truth by him, and by you as his Inſtrument, or ſhall be excuſed, if I find it not; aſſuring you that I was never more ready to part with my clothes when they were torn, than with my opinions when they were confuted, and appeared to me to be ſo. *Euſeb. Orat. de Laud. Conſt.*

To begin then with your Treatiſe, you can ſay nothing for Tradition, which I will not willingly allow, Scripture it ſelf being a *Traditum*, and by that way coming to our knowledge, (for I am confident that thoſe who would know it by the Spirit, run themſelves into the ſame Circle between Scripture and Spirit, out of which ſome of your ſide have but unſucceſsfully laboured to get out between Scripture and Church) but that this way which you propound ſhould be convenient to know what was Tradition at firſt, I can by no means agree. Which to conſider the better, I will comprehend all the ſtrength of what you have ſaid in a little room, and ſhut up your Oration into the compaſs of ſome 3. Syllogiſmes; thus you argue.

What company ſoever of Chriſtians alone pretend to teach nothing but what they have received from their Fathers, as received from theirs, as ſo come down from the Apoſtles, that company alone muſt hold the truth.

But that company of Chriſtians which are in communion with the Church of Rome *onely pretend this,*

Therefore they alone hold the truth, and the Church.

The *Major* you prove thus:

If ſuch a company of Chriſtians could teach falſhoods, then (ſince it is granted that what was at firſt delivered was true) *ſome age muſt either have erred in underſtanding their Anceſtours, or have joyned to deceive their poſterity.*

But neither of theſe are believeable,

Therefore neither is it believeable, that ſuch a company of Chriſtians ſhould teach falſhoods.

The *Minor* you prove thus; (I mean that they alone pretend it, for that they, I mean all they, pretend it, you take for granted.)

If it be incompatible with the Church of Romes doing it, that any elſe ſhould doe it, then ſhe does it alone.

But it is incompatible, (which is denyed, and not yet proved.)

Therefore ſhe doeth it alone.

The ſeveral parts of this Argument, I mean firſt to Anſwer; and ſecondly, Whatſoever lyes ſcatter'd in your diſcourſe any thing to this purpoſe, or any other unanſwer'd in the firſt part; and thirdly, I will reply to thoſe Anſwers which you have been pleaſed to make, to part of that Nothing which I writ, wiſhing that this laſt work might have been longer, I mean that by anſwering it all, and in order you had given me occaſion to have dwelt more upon my reply.

Now if I do not ſhew that all of the Church of *Rome* do not, nor cannot pretend this; that for two to pretend it, is not incompatible (as having been ſo heretofore) that thoſe who alone pretend this, may pretend it falſly; that ſome men, and in time all may miſtake their Anceſtours, and have a mind in ſome caſes to deceive their poſterity; and that it is not neceſſary for a whole age at once to joyn in doing it, though it be done; if, I ſay, I ſhew not this, then let me not bee believed; and if you can ſhew me that I have not ſhewed it, I will promiſe to believe you.

Firſt, That the Church of *Rome* doth not, nor cannot pretend, that all their doctrine was received by them from their fathers as come down from the Apoſtles, it appears, becauſe when queſtions have riſen about ſuch things, whereof there was before no ſpeech, yet if a Council have determined them, they are received with the ſame aſſent, as if they had come from the Apoſtles; and they profeſs now the ſame readineſs to receive always any ſuch definition, though about a queſtion now unknown; and it is likely, they have done what they profeſs they are ready to doe; at leaſt, they ſhew, that yours is not the ground upon which they build. And I pray ask your ſelf, whether thoſe that teach the common people, (who are the greateſt part of your Church) uſe to be askt about it by them, or uſe to tell them, that this they received from their Fathers, as deſcended from the Apoſtles, by a continual verbal Tradition. For ſuppoſe they told them, that [this Tradition tells us] yet they are not able to diſtinguiſh between ſuch as is but Eccleſiaſtical, and Apoſtolical, or whether this be known to them onely by deductions, or from ancient books, and no ſuch uncontinued line of teaching, and not rather perſwade them in general to believe it, what by Arguments drawn from Scripture, what from reaſon, what from Fathers, Councils, or Decretals? I am not certain what is their courſe, but I am ſure, the moſt ordinary amongſt the Ancients (whom they pretend to follow) was, that when they had told the people, that ſuch a propoſition was true, they added [neither is it I that ſay ſo, but the Apoſtle, the Prophet, or the Evangeliſt] and mentioned the place, where they thought ſuch a doctrine was included; ſeldom ſpeak of any verbal Tradition (leſs of ſuch a one, upon which you wholly rely) except urg'd to it, when that was impudently claim'd by ſome Heretick; and when they did (as the *Aſian* Biſhops about *Eaſter*, *Juſtin Martyr* about the age of Chriſt, Saint *Auſtine* about communicating Infants, *Papias* and *Irenæus* about the doctrine of the *Chiliaſts*) then (as *Lucian* tells us, that when that Jugler *Alexander* ſent to a City a Verſe to be ſet upon their doors, to keep away the Plague, thoſe houſes which uſed the remedy, were more viſited than thoſe that did not ſo) thoſe doctrines which the Fathers did grace by writing verbal Tradition in their foreheads, were not leſs (perhaps more) apt to be after disbelieved, than the other which were not in that kind taught.

Now if the Ignorant be not expreſly inſtructed, that upon this ground they are to think that true, which they are bid to believe (eſpecially where their religion is eaſily enough received, onely for being that of their Country) you muſt allow, that the greateſt part of your Church cannot,

nor does not pretend, to have received all they believe under that Notion; and to know they did, you must have spoken with them all, or have heard them all instructed; for what is in some places so taught, may be delivered upon other grounds in the very next Parishes.

From the Ignorant let us come to the learned, and see whether they do not both believe more, and require more to be believed, than hath had any such pedigree as you imagine. First then, the great, eloquent, and judicious Cardinal *Perron*, (whom I prefer so much before all those of his side that have been Authours, that [if a Pigmy may be allowed to measure Giants] I should think that the vast learning and industry of *Bellarmine*, and *Baronius*, might with most advantage to their party, and no disgrace to them, have been employ'd in seeking quotations for his large and monstrous understanding to have employ'd them) he, I say, tells us, (and not from himself, but from Saint *Austine*) that the Trinity, Pennance, Free-will, and the Church, were never exactly disputed of, before the *Arians*, the *Novatians*, the *Pelagians*, and the *Donatists*. Now (since without doubt the former ages disputed as well as they could, and so could not instruct their Proselytes, better than they confuted their Adversaries) I think it evident, that more hath since been concluded, than came from Tradition, and that the way you speak of, appeared not sufficient, either to Cardinal *Perron*, or Saint *Austine*. But because *Bellarmine* (being written in a more general language) is more generally (though, I think unjustly) esteemed than *Perron*, I will ask you a question of him, when he excuseth Pope *John* the 22*d.* for denying, that Saints enjoy the beatifical vision before the day of judgment (in which he was lead by a Troop of Fathers) because the Church had not then defined the contrary; did *Bellarmine* believe, that then Christians had received from their Fathers, as from the Apostles, a direct contrary Tradition to his doctrine? If he did, how could he think the Pope, either possibly to be ignorant of it, or excusable, if he stood against it? If not, then he thought our Age beholding to our Fathers, for finding out some truths, which had no such line to come down by; nay, which the Apostles either taught not, or but obscurely, and so as needs Arguments to deduce it out of their writings; at least, not so generally, but that a Pope, and many more chief Doctours of the Church, knew not they had done so, (although you often put us in mind, that *Tertullian* tells us, how in that Church which he governed, the Apostles poured out all their doctrines with their bloud) and in his time, Fathers taught not their children so: And this objection lies against you, as often as any of your side confess any of the Ancients (accompted Orthodox) to have delivered any doctrine, contrary to that of the now Church of *Rome*, which many of them often confess, and you your selves do not deny: for that they could not have done, if an uninterrupted verbal Tradition had been then the onely rule of true doctrine, and they had known it to be so (for then they had a way of information, which you must confess easie, since they might soon have known, whether generally, Christians had been taught the contrary, under such a Notion, and in such a degree, as you speak of) or the Church of *Rome* had not since, either deviated from the tradition of one part, or introduced on the other.

But because you know, that the claim of Tradition could not serve your Churches turn, if any other different from yours made the same; you therefore affirm, that none doth, and prove it, because two cannot doe it; and in this you must give me leave to say, that you imitate the Philosopher, who made Arguments against Motion, though one walked before him; for though we see that the *Greek* Church does it as much as the *Roman*, (though apt to be deceived in the doing it, by the same ways) yet you hope to perswade us beyond our eyes, by a reason, which indeed ends in an assertion: for, I pray, why may not two companies of Christians, both pretend to such a Tradition, (though opposing each other) as well as the *Asian* Churches and the *Roman* did long together, about the celebration of *Easter*? But not onely that it may be so, but that it is so, you may find by *Hieremy*, *Nilus*, and *Barlaam* (who profess to stand to the Scriptures, the ancient Tradition of their Fathers, and the seven first general Councils, and they can be disprov'd no way; but by the same you may be so too) over and above the confessions of your own men.

But suppose you did pretend, and alone pretend to such a Tradition, yet you might falsely do it: for I desire you to remember, that the Apostles delivered, as well Writings as verbal Doctrine; and whatsoever the first ages thought to be contained there, that they might as well deliver to their posterity, as taught them by the Apostles, as what they received by word of mouth; since we use to say, I learnt this of such a man, when we mean from his book; and though you strive to joyn verbal Tradition in commission with Scripture, yet sure none of you can desire to thrust Scripture out quite from being at least a part of the Rule. Now that they might erre in interpreting their writings (and an errour in the cheifest then, might easily cause a general one since) I think you will not deny, especially since to say, that they left by Tradition every place of Scripture interpreted, would be an evidently false assertion: for how could the Fathers then have written upon it such differently-expounding Comments?

Secondly, How shall it appear, that there were not once two contrary Traditions claimed by two Parts (as the *Asian* Church, and the *Roman*, whereof both, it seems, claim'd a direct verbal Tradition, because one pretended to have received theirs from Saint *John*, and the other, from Saint *Peter*, whereof there is no word in their works) and that the erring Part did not prevail? We know, out of the fifth of *Eusebius* History, that the fore-runners * of *Paulus Samosat.* laid claim to Tradition, and nam'd the very Pope, that had chang'd the doctrine at *Rome*; which claim (how impudently soever) yet shews, that men might joyn to deceive their Posterity, as pretending to a Tradition, when there was no such; for, if you say those were but few, I answer, both that you are not certain of their number, and since so many may joyn, I pray, what number is it cannot?

v. *Euseb.* l. 5. c. 28.

Thirdly, Since you must and do confess, [that some Doctrines, which were not once generally witnessed to have been delivered by the Apostles, are now Doctrines of Faith (as the Epistle to the *Hebrews* was rejected by the *Roman* Church in Saint *Hierom*'s time, though to her, ye use to say, that *Irenaeus* would have every Church agree, and though Saint *Hierom*, whom you would prove to have thought

thought *Damaſus* infallible, when it is known, that he thought *Liberius* a Heretick, received it for all that) becauſe you ſay, that theſe doctrines had ſo much Tradition as was *exceptione major*, beyond exception, (though the Church of *Rome* thought not ſo then;) doth not this reſt upon the Logick of thoſe Ages, to conclude what Teſtimony is ſo? which might eaſily deceive them, eſpecially ſince you confeſs alſo, that particular Traditions may be falſe (as you inſtance in the *Chiliaſts*) and yet the ſame reaſon, which perſwaded ſome to receive them, may perſwade more and more in ſeveral times (and ſo no age need to joyn, as you ſuppoſe) and ſo a falſe Tradition may grow a general one; as it ſeems that of the *Chiliaſts* (if it be one) did, ſo general, that *Juſtin Martyr* ſayes, in his time all Orthodox Chriſtians held it.

Beſides, in thoſe things which were believed very convenient, and which yet it was fear'd, that unleſs men thought them neceſſary, they would be backward to practiſe, in reſpect of the contrariety of them to their diſpoſitions, (as confeſſion) how eaſie was it for them to be after taught, under pain of more danger, than at firſt they were delivered with? as Phyſicians often tell their Patients, unleſs they take ſuch a Potion, from which they are very averſe, they muſt unavoidably die, though the not taking of it (even in their own opinions) would but make them leſs likely to recover. Some of great authority (moved by a good meaning) might thus deceive others; theſe, thus deceived, might deceive others; till being generally ſpread, other good men, being loath to oppoſe them for the ſame reaſon, for which others deſir'd to ſpread them, (as we ſaw *Eraſmus*, who believed your confeſſion not to have been inſtituted by the Apoſtles, yet would not reprehend them that ſaid ſo, thinking it an errour that would increaſe Piety) they be at laſt taken to have been commanded, by the Apoſtles, without contradiction.

Indeed all the ways, by which I ſhewed in that paper, which you vouchſafed to anſwer (which I deſire not to repeat, to avoid both your being wearied, and my own, ἐχθές γε μὲν ἴσην ἄνδρὶ ἀειζήλως εἰρημένα μυθολογεῖν,) that errours might come to be general; all thoſe are ways, by which the ſame errours might come to be thought to have proceeded from Tradition. Saint *Auſtin*, and *Tertullian*, agreeing in the ſenſe of the ſentence, which we read in the latter, * *Si legem nuſquam reperio, ſequitur ut Traditio conſuetudini morem hunc dederit, habiturum quandoque Apoſtoli authoritatem ex interpretatione rationis*; and it is the more ſtrange that *Tertullian* ſhould allow any cuſtom the authority of coming from the Apoſtles, ſince in the ſame place, he gives any man leave to begin a cuſtom, ſo it be good (which depends upon his reaſon, as the reception of it does upon theirs that follow him) and ſo make it a cuſtom, in theſe words. *Annon putas licere omni fideli concipere, & conſtituere, duntaxat, quod Deo congruat, quod diſciplinæ conducat, quod ſaluti proficiat, dicente Domino cur non & vobis ipſis quod juſtum eſt judicatis?* By which it ſeems, he was willing, more ſhould be believ'd than was firſt taught; and when that way had brought in any thing (for there is the ſame reaſon of opinion, as of actions) and made it common, then the former Rule ſerves to rivet it in, under the falſe Notion of coming from the Apoſtles, or having at leaſt equal authority; neither can you except againſt this, as ſaid by him when he was a *Montaniſt*, ſince your ſide uſeth to brag of this, and the like places, as making for them. * *De Corona.*

To explain my meaning the fuller, give me leave to conſider one queſtion, which ſhall be, the *Immaculate conception* of the Bleſſed Virgin: In the firſt ages it is a thing granted, that many Fathers believed her, not onely not free from Original ſin, but not even from Actual; after this ſecond queſtion came to be more conſidered, and this firſt to be defin'd; but yet thoſe of the Affirmative opinion, cannot but grant to thoſe of the Negative, that many Fathers ſided with them (or elſe they were impudent Quoters, who claim three hundred) nay, even in Saint *Thomas* his time, they confeſs, that the Negative opinion was the more common doctrine; and yet ſee I pray, how things are altered? We have now a Hiſtory of ſome Treaties, of two Kings of *Spain* with two Popes, by two Embaſſadours to perſwade them to define the Affirmitive. The Hiſtory is written by one *Wadding* an *Iriſh-man*, his Secretary; there I find, that the Biſhop of *Carthage*, (having Order from the Embaſſadour his Maſter, to deſire, to preſs, nay almoſt to tear a Definition from his Holineſs about it) tells him (and not falſly) that thoſe who hold the Negative are, *Inter Catholicos ſoli & pauci unius inſtituti viri, & unus & alter ab illis edocti*, but a few of one onely Order, and one or two of their Diſciples. His Maſter bids him urge for the contrary, The opinion and ſubſcription of ſo many Prelates Orders and Univerſities, the univerſal acclamation of the People, the weighty neceſſity of cutting off ſcandals; nay ſaith he, many Univerſities ſuffer none to take Degrees, without making a Vow for the Defence of the *Immaculate conception*; and for the Oppugners, *Conſtat eos ſentire aliter, quam univerſa docet Eccleſia*, they differ from the Doctrine of the Univerſal Church: If then an opinion for which nothing is to be ſaid out of Antiquity, and much againſt it, which was even lately, the leſs common opinion, could grow to be held by ſo great a multitude in ſo high a degree, in ſo ſhort a time, that the much greater part of the Church ſhould now preſs to have it defin'd, and that ſo earneſtly, that to remove the oppoſing Fathers out of the way, they make a confeſſion very advantageous to us Hereticks, that many things have been defin'd by their Church againſt many Fathers; you may eaſily ſee, that Opinions may grow very general, nay grow to claim Tradition in one Age, that were unknown in another; for that they claim and prove onely becauſe of the general reception in all Apoſtolical Churches, not of any ſuch uninterrupted teſtimony of Fathers to their Children, that ſo it hath been taught in all Ages.

Wadd. Pag. 271.

Wadding p. 124.

Page 97.

Page 90.

Page 400.

Page 57.

Page 127.

Page 275.

You may ſee then, that all your Church goes not upon your grounds; ſince if they did ſo, many of it that ſtand for the Affirmitive, muſt pretend to them, and if they do, then ſure the Pope muſt have confeſſed them to be witneſſes beyond exception, and would accordingly have defin'd; if they do not, then this certain way of yours, cannot keep falſe opinions out of a Church, which makes not that their Rule.

You may alſo ſee, that opinions firſt unknown, after but particular, may come not onely to be general, and to have Tradition claim'd for them, but even to be defin'd; ſince if a General Council ſhould

ſhould now meet about this point, it is plain (without God's immediate working to the contrary, of which you ſpeak not) which would be defined; nay, I am confident, that as it is obſerved of the *Romans* that they were twice as long in firſt conquering *Italy*, as (after) all the world; and as my Lord *Bacon* tells us of one who was wont to ſay, *That he had firſt with much pains gotten a little eſtate, and after with little a great one*; ſo it is a much more ſhort, and eaſie work, to bring this to a Definition, than it was before to bring it thus far on the way towards one.

Which if it were brought (it being already almoſt defined, and ready to topple into a Doctrine neceſſary to ſalvation, the contrary being forbidden to be either printed or publickly taught) then (if you forſake not your Religion) you muſt forſake the Principle, and joyn with *Turnbull*, who tells us, That the Churches ſupreme definition of matters of Faith, is the infallible word of God, and together with the ancient Revelation made to the Prophets and Apoſtles, makes up one Object, wich is to be held by the Catholick Faith: By which it is plain, he thinks more may be reveal'd (and then muſt be held) than was to the Apoſtles and (by conſequence) could be delivered by them, which is contrary to what you now ſay.

And indeed the current of Writers of your own ſide either knew not this opinion and Argument of yours, or conſideringly balk it; elſe they might ſave themſeves and their Readers the labour of writing, and reading ſuch infinite Quotations: for though they ſpeak often of *Tradition*, yet they think themſelves bound to prove it better than by the pretence of your preſent Church; they pretend to receive it from the Ancient Writers, (not, ſay they, that verbal Tradition hath in all Ages been taught to all men, to teach it their children, and that it never ſlept,) and you are the firſt whom I have met with, who build upon this; Indeed they know the *Greeks* have as much claim to ſuch a one (in truth to any) as they, and if they ſhould ſay with you, that it is incompatible for two to have it, the *Greeks* may as well argue upon thoſe grounds, that the *Romans* claim it not, becauſe they do, as the *Romans* can, that the *Greeks* lay no claim to it, becauſe their Church does. And indeed direct experience ſhews that this is not, nor hath always been the ground of Chriſtians; that it is not (even amongſt you) we ſee by thoſe multitudes who cry out to have a Doctrine defined; which is ſo far from having any Tradition, (much leſs your kind of one for it,) that they labour with little ſucceſs to ſhew that there is none againſt them, and make it plainly appear, that upon your grounds they build not, but prove out of Metaphorical places of Scripture, ſome at moſt but probable reaſons, and the Revelations of S. *Bridget*, which are contradicted by thoſe of S. *Katharine*, (ſo ill do your Saints agree in heaven, that me thinks, we may be forgiven, if we have ſome differences upon earth:) That this hath not been always the way, we ſee by the example of *Origen*, who having been eſteemed by all Chriſtians, as almoſt a Prophet, no man in his time diſcovering that he taught contrary to what their Fathers had taught them, was yet condemned many years after his deceaſe, and his followers counted Hereticks, by the name of *Origeniſta*, which had been impoſſible, if the following Ages had thought Tradition the onely fit Rule to judge by, and accompted nothing Tradition, but what they received from their Fathers in expreſs terms: But if the opinions of Doctours, counted the Gnomons and Canons of Truth (for to that purpoſe ſpeaks *Nazianzen* of *Athanaſius*, and Saint *Auſtin* of *Nazianzene*, and Pope *Pius* the fifth of Saint *Thomas*, calling his doctrine, the certaineſt rule of Chriſtian religion, a title deny'd to Scripture) the definitions of Councils, counted the higheſt Tribunals upon earth, aſſiſted by the power of Emperours, which might doe much, when almoſt all were under one (as may be ſeen by the multitude which followed *Conſtantine*, to Chriſtinaity, and *Julian* from it, and by *Conſtantius* (as is complain'd) ἐν ὀφθαλμῷ στρεβλῷ, *in the twinckling of an eye*, transforming an *Orthodox* world into an *Arian*) if theſe ways, I ſay, might make a Tenet general, though no Tradition had come down at all concerning it; and after, it pleaſe to claim by a Tenure, by which it came not in at firſt, encouraged by ſome Rule of ſome Fathers to that purpoſe (as ſome *Frenchmen* ſay of Cardinal *Richelieu*, that ſince he had that title, he claims to have come from better Anceſtours, than he aimed at, being an ordinary Perſon; and *Henry* the ſeventh, though he came to the Crown by his Wives right, yet would hold it by his own) and none after oppoſe that claim, ſome not doing it, becauſe they think the opinion true, and then care not though it be believ'd upon falſe inducements, ſome as being ignorant that ever it was leſs general (which before the late and happy reſurrection of learning, the beſt read Perſons of their time might often be) how deceiving a way is yours, to diſcover what all ages have thought, by what now a part of the preſent teacheth, upon what pretence ſoever? which when you have conſidered, and not onely, that what I have ſaid may be, but by ſeveral examples (whereof I will touch ſome) that ſo it is, and hath been, then I hope you will be ſo far from expecting that I ſhould be moved by your Arguments, that your ſelf will wonder that ever you were.

Wadding p. 334. *Vincent. Le.* *Wadd. Pag.* 282.

Firſt then, that the *Chiliaſts* are Hereticks, or your Church not *infallible*, which counts them ſo, is moſt certain, and moſt plain; and if you be in the right, and that ſhe teacheth nothing, but what ſhe hath received uninterruptedly down from the Apoſtles, then they muſt always have been eſteemed ſo by Chriſtians; whereas their doctrine is ſo far from having any Tradition againſt it, that if any opinion, whether controverted, or uncontroverted (except that Scripture which never was doubted) may without bluſhing pretend to have that for it, it muſt be this of theirs. My Reaſons are theſe:

The Fathers of the pureſt Ages (who were the Apoſtles Diſciples but once remov'd) did teach this, as receiv'd from them, who profeſſed to have receiv'd it from the Apoſtles, and who ſeem'd to them witneſſes beyond exception, that they had done ſo, they being better Judges what credit they deſerv'd, than after-comers could poſſibly be.

All other opinions, witneſſed by any other Ancients to have Tradition, may have been by them miſtaken to haye been ſo, out of Saint *Auſtin*'s and *Tertullian*'s rules: whereas for this, and for this alone, are delivered the very words, which Chriſt us'd when he taught it.

Of the moſt glorious and leaſt infirm building, which ever, in my opinion, was erected to the honour

honour of the Church of *Rome*, Cardinal *Perron* was the Architect (I mean his book againſt King *James*) and that relyes upon theſe two pillars, that whatſoever all the Fathers (he means, ſure, that are extant) witneſs to be Tradition, and the doctrine of the Church, that muſt be receiv'd for the doctrine of thoſe ages, and ſo reſted upon: If theſe rules be not concluding, then the whole book being built upon them, neceſſarily becomes as inconſiderable for what he intended it, as *Bevis* or *Tom Thumb*: If they be, then this doctrine, which is now heretical in your Churches belief, was the opinion of the Ancient Church. For if being taught by the Fathers of any Age, none contradicting it, be ſufficient, this all for above two Ages (and thoſe the firſt) teach, not any Father oppoſing it before *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* (250, years after Chriſt at leaſt) that we know, or Saint *Hierome*, or Saint *Auſtine* knew and quoted: wherein I note, beſides, that both theſe Fathers, either thought that no ſign of the opinion of the Church, or cared not though it were.

And if Fathers ſpeaking as witneſſes will ſerve, let *Papias* and *Irenæus* be heard, and believ'd, who tell us, it came to them from Chriſt by Verbal Tradition, and *Juſtine Martyr*, who witneſſeth that in his time all Orthodox Chriſtians held it, and joyns the oppoſers with them who denyed the Reſurrection, and eſteems them among the Chriſtians like the *Sadduces* among the *Jews*: which proves, that you have the ſame reaſon *expalleſcere audito. Eccleſiæ nomine*, to *grow pale* at the mention of the Ancient *Church*, (the neareſt to the Apoſtles) as we have to ſtart at that of two hundred years ago, and to be aſham'd of your *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*, as we of *Luther*: Thus that great *Atlas* of your Church hath helpt us to pull it down the ſame ways, by which he intended to ſupport it, and though he have beſt of any undergone the burthen of proving that to be infallible, which is falſe, yet he muſt have confeſt, that either theſe are not proofs, or they prove againſt himſelf. And this advantage we have, that unleſs you prove your own infallibility (which you will never be able to do) in what point ſoever you confute us, that falls like a Pinacle without carrying all after it; whereas if we diſprove any one of your Religion, we diſprove conſequently that infallibility, which is the foundation of it all: ſo that (like them who uſe poiſon'd weapons) whereſoever we wound, we kill, but we are like thoſe creatures, which muſt be killed all over, or elſe their other parts will remain alive. *Camp.*

Neither muſt you think that you have anſwer'd the *Chiliaſts*, by tying them to the *Carpocratians* and the *Gnoſticks*, (which is but like *Mezentius* his joyning *Mortua corpora vivis*, dead bodies to the living) ſince the opinions of the two latter, aſſoon as they were taught, made the teachers accounted Hereticks, and were oppos'd by almoſt all, whereas that of the firſt, found in above two ages, no reſiſtance by any one known and eſteemed Perſon, and the teachers of it were not onely parts, but principal ones of the Catholick Church, and ſuch as ever have been, and are reputed Saints; though, by I know not what ſubtilty, you diſpence with your ſelves for departing from what doctrine was received from them as come down from the Apoſtles, and yet threaten us with damnation if we will not believe more improbable Tenets to be Tradition upon leſs Certificate. For as *Ariſtotle* ſaith τὰ ὄντως μεγάλα ἃ μὲ ὠνοῦνται μέζω, ἃ δὲ πωλοῦσιν ἐλάττω, Wine meaſures to buy with, are great, and to ſell by, are ſmall; ſo when you are to put a doctrine to us, how ſmall a meaſure of Tradition would you have us take? one place of one Father, ſpeaking but as a Doctour, ſeems enough: but when you are to receive any from us, how large and mighty a meaſure will yet give you no ſatisfaction? Neither can I find out what it is by which you conclude, that their Tradition was gathered the Heretical way from private diſcourſe with the Apoſtles: *Irenæus* indeed tells us, that *Presbyteri meminerunt*, one of which *Papias* was; but not a word, that it was deliver'd in ſecret, or the auditours but few, nor that others had not heard other diſciples teaching the ſame doctrine; and me-thinks that if you had evinced what you deſire (as you ſeem to me not to do, unleſs to affirm be to prove) it would make more againſt you; ſure if from ſo ſmall a ground as the word of one onely diſciple, that he in private diſcourſe was taught this by the Apoſtles, a falſe doctrine could ſo generally be received by all the firſt Doctours of the Chriſtian Church; and that, ſo long after *Dionyſius Alexandrinus* had uſed his great Authority to deſtroy it, Saint *Hierome* was yet half afraid to write againſt it, as ſeeing how many Catholicks he ſhould enrage againſt himſelf by it, as he teſtifies in his proeme to the eighteenth Book of his Comment upon *Iſaiah*; what ſuſpicions muſt this raiſe in the minds of thoſe of your own party, leſt what they eſteemed Tradition, had at firſt no greater a beginning, and no firmer foundation, but onely better fortune; for why might not the ſame diſciple have cozen'd them from whom their belief is deſcended in twenty other things, as well as in this? and why not twenty others as well as he? eſpecially ſince you confeſs ſome of your doctrine not to have had Univerſal Tradition, but onely Tradition enough; which if thoſe Fathers did not think they had had, for this, they would never have receiv'd it, but have excepted againſt the Heretical way of their delivery, if they had known that to be a private one, and a private one to be ſuch; and if they were ſo deceived in this way, might not they, and more have been ſo too in other points, and in time all? *Ethicks.*

If you ſay (as it hath been ſaid to me by one whoſe judgment I value, as much as any one of your Party) that if this opinion had indeed had Tradition, it could never have been ſo totally extinguiſh'd. I anſwer, that I affirm not, that it had, but onely that if the rules of your part be good and valid, then it had; I am ſure it hath better colour to plead upon, than any of thoſe other doctrines, which you impoſe upon us: Beſides, although it had, yet when Doctours of great authority with the people, had won upon many, firſt not to think it Tradition, and then not true, and laſtly their courage encreaſing with their multitude, (for Saint *Hierome* durſt not call it) had made it accounted an Hereſie, it is not ſtrange that none ſhould riſe to oppoſe it; for by that time, burning was come in faſhion, which was a ready way to anſwer all objections, and end all controverſies; eſpecially Piety being grown more cold, and ſo, men leſs apt to ſuffer for opinions, and the times more ignorant, and ſo men leſs able to examine what had been believed before them. But you who affirm, that your Church receives nothing, but what hath come to her by Verbal Tradition down

from the Apoſtles, muſt not onely deſtroy the Arguments, which prove this to have had Tradition (which you, or any elſe will be never able to do) but muſt affirm, that the contrary hath ſuch; which yet their moſt ancient oppoſers never pretended to, but ſcoft at the opinion as ridiculous and ſavouring of *Judaiſm*, which as wiſe men, and as good Chriſtians, as they, before them believed to be Orthodox.

Let us next conſider that controverſie which more afflicted the Church, and for a longer time than any other, that between the *Arians* and their Adverſaries, and let us ſee, whether even againſt
Lib. Con. R. Jac. Pag. 633. thoſe there were any ſuch Tradition as you ſpeak of. Firſt then I pray mark what Cardinal *Perron* confeſſeth, that an *Arian* will be deſirous to have his cauſe tried by thoſe Authours we now have, which lived before the queſtion aroſe; for there, ſaith he, will be found, the Son is the inſtrument of his Father. The Father commanded the Son, when things were to be made, the Father and the Son are *aliud & aliud*, which who ſhould at this day ſay, now the language of the Church is better examin'd, would be accompted an *Arian*. Now though there be no reaſon for you to disbelieve ſo learned a Prelate in a matter of fact (eſpecially ſince ὅτι ὁ μάρτυς) yet if you pleaſe to reconſider thoſe Authours ſeriouſly, if you have not mark't it before (as Prejudication blinds extremely) you will then confeſs it; Sure then if Fathers in the firſt ages taught their Children, that ſo they had receiv'd from theirs, as the doctrine of the Apoſtles, how could the chief Pillars of Chriſtianity have been ignorant of it? or if they knew it, how would they ever have written ſo directly againſt their knowledge? For that anſwer which Saint *Hierome* gives (as Saint *Auſtine* to the *Pelagians*) that before *Arius* aroſe, the Eccleſiaſtical Writers ſpoke *minus caute*, with leſs circumſpection, though it brings ſome ſalve to the preſent objection, yet it is a weapon againſt Tradition in general; for if through want of care the beſt and wiſeſt men us'd to contradict Tradition, (as you muſt grant they did) then ſure much more likely, when they taught by word of mouth, when leſs care is always us'd, than in Books; and how then can any age be ſure, that by this reaſon (of *minus caute loquuti ſunt*) their Anceſtours have not miſtaken their Fathers, and miſlead their Poſterity? Look but into *Athanaſius*, and ſee but what he anſwers to what is brought againſt him out of *Dionyſius Alexandrinus*; truly in my opinion, when he ſtrives to make it Catholick Doctrine, he doeth it with no leſs pulling, and halling, than *Sancta Clara* uſeth to agree the articles of the Engliſh Church with the Tenets of the Roman. Conſider what eighty Biſhops, and thoſe Orthodox, decreed againſt *Paulus Samoſatenus*, and if you make it conſent with *Athanaſius* his Creed, I ſhall believe that you have diſcover'd a way how to reconcile both Parts of a Contradiction: This I ſay, not as intending by it to prove the *Arian* opinion to be true, but that the contrary Party inſiſted not upon your grounds, but drew their belief out of Scripture; for if there had been ſuch a common and conſtant Verbal Tradition, the chief Chriſtians would not through want of Caution have contradicted it, neither could *Conſtantine*, if it had been then as known a Part of the Chriſtian Religion, as Chriſt's Reſurrection, have ever ſo ſlightly eſteemed the Queſtion, when it firſt aroſe, neither would *Alexander* the Biſhop of *Alexandria* have remain'd any while in ſuſpence, as *Sozomen* ſaith he did, τὰ μὲν τοῦτος τὰ δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἐφρόνουν: but this being then a Queſtion newly ſtarted and ſpoken of before but by Accidents, and ſo peradventure *minus caute*, (for the ſame Authour ſays, that they did ἄχρι εἰς ζήτησιν τὰ παράτολμον ἀνεξέτασα) they were therefore fain to try it by Scripture, (eſteeming Written Tradition, as ſufficient a Rule, as Verbal) as you may ſee by *Conſtantine*'s own words at
Theodoret. the Council of *Nice*, εὐαγγελικαὶ βίβλοι καὶ ἀποστολικαὶ, καὶ περὶ παλαιῶν θεοπνεύστων τὰ διαπρέποντα σαφῶς ἡμᾶς, πῶς χρὴ περὶ τῆς θείας φρονεῖν, ἐκπαιδεύουσι, ἐκ περὶ ἀσυνέτων ἐν λόγων λαβόντες τὰς ζητουμένας τῆς λύσιν. *The Books of the Evangeliſts, and the Apoſtles, and the Oracles of the Ancient Prophets teach us clearly what we are to think of the Divinity.* Let us therefore out of theſe Divinity-inſpir'd diſcourſes, ſeek the ſolutions of our Queſtions, which being the Emperours Propoſition, and paſſing uncontradicted (which the Biſhops would not have ſuffer'd it to do, if they had known yours to be ſo much the beſt, and moſt certain way, and this ſo hazardous as you ſuppoſe) we have reaſon to believe that they, for want of your direction, made the Scripture their Rule, and ſought out for Truth by the ſame way, that we damnable Hereticks do, and by that condemn'd the *Arians*, as not having ſuch a Tradition as you ſpeak of, (or if they had, which is very unlikely) counting it ſo inſufficient, as that they were not to conclude by that. Neither did onely that ancient, (and not yours) Council, but even your own Modern ones ſhew, that they went upon other grounds; ſince to have had every Biſhop askt what he receiv'd from his Teachers, as receiv'd from theirs, as come down from the Apoſtles, would ſure have been the ſhorteſt way to find Truth; and if they had thought it the beſt too, it would have ſav'd the Friers at *Trent* many a long diſpute out of Scripture, Fathers and Reaſon, and the Biſhops many a weary Seſſion before any thing could be determined, or the Parties brought to agree. Beſides there is another reaſon (if I may be pardon'd a little inſiſting upon my digreſſion) which perſwades me that your own Councils define not upon your grounds, (that is) becauſe ſuppoſe a thouſand Catholick Biſhops meet and define any thing, yet we know it is not among you believ'd *de Fide*, without it be confirmed by the Pope; which ſhews plainly enough, that you think not, they went by ſuch a Tradition, ſince of that eighty, ſo many perſons from ſo many ſeveral Parts are witneſſes beyond exception, according to your own grounds, and that their Infallibility is not thought to depend upon an Impoſſibility; that (in the matter of Fact, what hath been taught under that Notion) they ſhould either deceive, or be deceiv'd, but upon an infallible aſſiſtance of the Holy Ghoſt, which may be wanting to any company, whereof the Pope is no part, or of whoſe decrees he is no confirmer.

Now to return to my proofs, that againſt the *Arians* there was no ſuch Tradition as you ſpeak of, (at leaſt, that was the ground upon which they were condemned) conſider, if you pleaſe, that in that Epiſtle which *Euſebius* of *Ceſarea* writ to ſome *Arians* after the Council of *Nice*, he ſaith, Firſt, that they aſſented to the word ὁμοούσιον, *Conſubſtantial*, becauſe alſo they knew τῶν παλαιῶν λογίων τινὰς καὶ ἐπιφανεῖς ἐπισκόπους, καὶ συγγραφεῖς, *ſome eloquent and illuſtrious Biſhops and Writers* had us'd the Term:

In

In which I note, that neither claim'd he any ſuch Verbal Tradition for this, as you ſpeak of; and of that ſort which he claim'd, he names onely τίνας ſome, as knowing too many had writ otherwiſe to give ſuch a Tradition leave to be general.

Secondly, He ſaith, they conſented to Anathematize the Contradictors, διὰ τὸ ἀπόῤῥητον ἀγράφοις χρῆσθαι φωναῖς, *to hinder men from uſing unwritten words*, by which he ſaith (and that truly) that all confuſion hath come upon the Church. And if it be askt, why the ſame reaſon made them not keep out the word ὁμοούσιος, I anſwer, That I believe (or elſe he is not conſtant to his own reaſon) that he meant onely thoſe words to be unwritten, which were in Scripture, neither themſelves, nor equivalently, whereas he took ὁμοούσιος to be in the Scripture in the latter ſenſe: And that by *written*, he meant in the *Scripture* onely, appears by what follows, that *no divinely-inſpired writing* (μηδεμίαν θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς) uſing the *Arians* Phraſe, it was neither fitting to ſay nor teach them: Neither can you ſay that *Euſebius* being himſelf a ſecret *Arian* prevaricated herein; for *Theodoret* makes this epiſtle an Argument againſt them, which he would not have done, if either it had ſeem'd to him to ſay any thing contrary to the Catholick doctrine, or not to have oppos'd the contrary by a Catholick way, at leaſt without giving his leader ſome Caution concerning it.

All which reaſons move me to think, that the generality of Chriſtians had not been always taught the contrary to *Arius*'s doctrine, but ſome one way, others the other, moſt neither, as having been onely ſpoken of upon occaſions; and therefore me thinks you had better either ſay with the Proteſtants, that the Truth was concluded (as *Conſtantine* ſaid it ſhould be) by Arguments from Scripture, or (as ſome of your own ſay of other points) that before the Council it lay in *Archivis Eccleſiæ*, in the Desks of the Church, than claim ſuch a Tradition for it, as appears it can never be defended that it had.

Let us conſider but two opinions more:

That Infants are not to receive the Euchariſt, is now both the doctine and practice of the *Roman* Church; but ſix hundred years the Church us'd it; Saint *Auſtine* accounted it neceſſary, at leaſt in ſome ſenſe of the word, if not abſolutely (which laſt is moſt likely, becauſe from the neceſſity of that which could not be receiv'd but by them who had received Baptiſm, he, and *Innocentius* a Pope, prove the neceſſity of Baptiſm) and an Apoſtolical Tradition. If therefore both theſe Ages had one by your Rule, how comes this difference between their opinions, the Sacrament being the ſame it was, and the Children the ſame they were?

This I may conſider, and ſee if the ſame way that this Doctrine hath been altered, whether any other might not have received change?

Next, that Saints are invocable, you muſt ſay, is Tradition taught from Father to Son, as deriv'd from the Apoſtles, if you will be conſtant to your own principle; now though I might diſprove this, firſt by the many Fathers that believed, the *juſt* not to be admitted to the Beatifical viſion before the day of judgement (for upon this, your ſide now grounds that) but to be kept in ſecret receptacles, and by the long time which paſt before this Doctrine was condemn'd: Secondly, by the beginning of it, which was particular Doctours Hypothetical prayers, with εἰ τῆς ἀξιώσεις, and ſuch conditional clauſes: And thirdly, by *Nicephorus Calliſtus* his Relation (who in this is a believable witneſs, becauſe he allows of your opinion) that prayers to the Virgin *Mary* were firſt brought into the publick Liturgy by one *Petrus Gnapheus* a Heretick, about five hundred years after Chriſt; yet I will rather chuſe to confute this, by the confeſſion of *Sancta Clara* out of *Horantius*, who to this objection, that *Sub Evangelio* (which muſt mean when the Goſpel was preacht) no ſuch precept is extant, not onely denies it not, but gives this reaſon for it, leſt the *Pagans* ſhould think themſelves brought again to the worſhipping of Men inſtead of Gods: If upon this, or any other reaſon, this were not then taught, then have not all your Doctrines ſuch a Pedigree as you ſuppoſe; but allow it were; yet, howſoever it follows, that ſome, at leaſt, of the learned of your Church have not been taught that they have, or conſequently that it is neceſſary they ſhould have: Though it ſeems to me little leſs than *Montaniſm* to believe that any ſince (as it were a *Paracket*) ſhould perfect the doctrine which then was delivered by the Apoſtles: Neither can you anſwer, that they ſpeak onely of ſuch a Precept, and of being extant, whereas they might teach it lawfull, without giving any Precept, and they might have given ſuch a Precept although not extant; for I ſhould readily reply, that the reaſon they give why there is none ſuch extant, ſhews, that they mean there was none at all, neither Precept, nor allowance, ſince the *Pagans* would have been ſcandaliz'd at its being accounted lawfull to worſhip men inſtead of Gods, although it were not commanded, and not a whit the leſs, whether that in after times were extant or not, which they could not foreſee.

Lib. 15. *C.* 28 *Pag.* 271.

The onely anſwer which I am able to invent in your behalf, is this, that though ſome of your particular doctrines have not ſuch a Tradition, yet there being a Tradition that the Churches definitions are infallible, whatſoever ſhe at any time defines, is then to be believed upon the ſtrength of ſuch a Tradition, and before did *latere in cauſis*, as Flowers do in Winter.

Yet to this I may reply by deſiring you to enter with me into ſome few conſiderations.

Firſt, if this were ſo, and that ſo much of Chriſtian Religion depends upon the definitions of the Church, and our Reception of them, upon knowing always which is ſhe, and that ſuch is her authority; can you perſwade your ſelf, that Chriſt ſending his Apoſtles and Diſciples to Preach the Goſpel, and after four of them writing his Goſpel, (which ſhews, if the Books be true to the title, that they writ all they preacht, at leaſt that was neceſſary; for elſe they were not Goſpels, but Parts of it) that they ſhould not rather leave out any thing elſe, how important ſoever, than not have imployed themſelves about teaching us, that the Churches Definitions are a Rule of our Faith, and inſtructing us in Markes ſo proper to her, that we might never need to doubt, whether it be ſhe that defines or no; and whether their not having done this, evince not in Reaſon that this your Doctrine is falſe?

Secondly, I pray conſider whether if there were any ſuch continu'd Tradition about the Defini-

tions of the Church, whether that muſt not alſo have taught, (or elſe have been to ſmall purpoſe) when it is that the Church hath defin'd: but yet that is a caſe not fully judged among you; For ſome hold, that the Church hath defin'd when a Council hath, although unapproved by the Pope, which is denyed by others.

Thirdly, Conſider whether (ſuppoſing as was before ſuppos'd) it muſt not alſo have taught certain *Notes* to know the Church by: but yet about thoſe you are not agreed, *Salmeron* putting *Miracles* among the falſe Signs of the Church, and *Bellarmine* and many more among the True ones. *Tom.* 13. *Pag.* 193.

Fourthly, Conſider whether the Church have an eternal ſpring of Doctrines within her, or but a finite number, and onely thoſe which the Apoſtles preacht: and I believe you will pitch upon the latter. Not then to ask how they came to know them, nor, if you anſwer by Tradition, to ask you again how come men then not to know (before a Definition) what it is they Preacht? for if the Biſhops (of which a Council is compounded) know it not now, how will they know it when they meet? I will deſire to know why the Church will not at once teach us all ſhe knows, and not keep us in doubts which ſhe may reſolve? and did the Apoſtles teach their Doctrines to be lockt up, or taught to us? And then having conſidered this, you will find, I believe, that the Church doe with Doctrines, as Fathers with Eſtates, never give their Children all, that they may ſtill have ſomething to keep them in awe with; becauſe if ſhe ſhould, ſhe could never have after pretended a Power to end any new emergent controverſie; keeping in ſecret what ſhe knows, any that ariſeth, ſhe may ſtill pretend is endable by her.

Fifthly, Conſider that it will appear but a ſhift, if you ſay that there is a Tradition that all the Churches Definitions be true, and ſo excuſe the particular Doctrines, for otherwiſe having none, and yet avoid giving us any Rules to know the Church by at all times, and anſwering thoſe Queſtions, which muſt be ended before we can know at any time when ſhe hath defin'd.

Now I confeſs if you had ſaid Tradition teacheth, that the particular Church of *Rome* is ſo the Admiral ſhip, that we may know any other if it be of God's Fleet, becauſe then it muſt follow her, that is, be ſubject to her decrees and theirs which joyn with her, this would have been plainly to let me know your mind, and we might quickly have examin'd, whether there were any Tradition for the Church in this ſenſe to be always obeyed when ſhe Teaches; and without you ſay this, you ſay nothing, and will never be able to give any ſuch Note of the Church, as the ignorant may without bluſhing pretend to know it by: Becauſe therefore I gueſs, that when not I, but your Adverſaries reaſons (for I am but one of the worſt tranſcribers of them) have driven you from your own Fort, you muſt retire to that of your friends, or like them which are drowning, you will rather catch at a Twigg, than ſink; I will conſider this Aſſertion, which I ſuppoſe you muſt lay hold of, ſo far forth as to ſhew it to be indeed but an Aſſertion. That there hath no ſuch Verbal Tradition (nor indeed any) come down, ſeems to me for theſe reaſons.

Saint *Cyprian* by oppoſing the Church of *Rome*, and that with many Biſhops, about the Rebaptization, ſhews ſufficiently, that he and they knew of no ſuch Tradition; and then in what Cave muſt it have lain hid, if the chief Doctour of that age was ignorant of it, and even his Adverſaries claim'd it not? And that he knew no ſuch, appears not onely by his Actions, but alſo by his words; for to them who claim'd Tradition for the particular point propos'd, (though none for the Authority of the Church propoſing) he anſwers, If it be contain'd in the Goſpels, Epiſtles, or Acts, let it be obſerved; at one blow cutting off not onely that (for ſure the authority of the Church of *Rome* is no way taught in the Scriptures) but all other unwritten Traditions, which Cardinal *Perron*, thought moſt skilfull in that kind of Fence, was not able to ward, but *Du Pleſſis* objecting it, receiv'd no other anſwer, than that the opinion of *Cyprian* was condemn'd, and that Tradition, although unwritten, maintain'd. Which anſwer though it be as far from befitting the Cardinal, as from anſwering the objection (ſince it is plain, that this opinion was once held by ſuch as were of chief eſtimation among the Orthodox, and conſequently the contrary was not then the general and neceſſary doctrine of Chriſtians; and the prevailing of the one ſince, proves not the other falſe, but rather unfortunate, or the ſpreaders faulty) yet I confeſs I excuſe him, for as I have learnt from *Ariſtotle*, that it is ridiculous to expect a Demonſtration where the matter will bear but a probability, ſo would it be in me to expect even a probable ſolution of an Argument, the evidence of which will ſuffer none at all.

Neither was he (I mean *Cyprian*) the firſt, that without blot of Hereſie oppos'd the Tradition of the Church of *Rome*; but that courage which he left to others after him, when they ſaw the Chriſtian World joyn in counting him a Saint, and a Martyr, whom the Biſhop of *Rome* had ſtyled a falſe Chriſt, and a falſe Apoſtle, the ſame had he received by ſeeing that the *Aſian* Biſhops had alſo rejected, and oppos'd her Tradition, and yet *Polycrates* ever had in great honour, and the reſt never branded with the crime of Hereſie; nay, even the more neighbouring Biſhops, and who joyn'd with the Pope in the time of celebrating *Eaſter* (as *Irenæus*) yet thought the difference not worth excommunication, and for want of skill in the Canon Law, tranſgreſt ſo far as to reprehend him for it, whereas if to that Church all elſe had been to conform themſelves, then *Irenæus* ought therefore to have thought the matter of weight enough, becauſe ſhe thought it ſo, who were to ſmall purpoſe made a Judge, if ſhe were not as well enabled to diſtinguiſh between ſlight and material, as between Falſe and True, though that it ſeems ſhe was not, for the Church of *Rome* never refus'd their Communion before, though ſhe knew them to hold the ſame opinion, and ſo (as plainly appears) counted that material in one Age, which ſhe had not ſo eſteemed in others, and therefore (in the degree at leaſt of holding what ſhe held) contradicted herſelf, and followed Traditions.

And as *Cyprian* imitated them, ſo did the *African* Biſhops him; for a Queſtion hapning between them and the Biſhops of *Rome* about *Appeals*, though they abſolutely oppos'd him, and (in vain I confeſs) deſired him that he would not bring into the Church *Typhum hujus Seculi*, the *ſwelling* pride *of this World*; and though he laboured infinitely in the buſineſs πάντα λίθον κινῶν, that he might bring

bring it to pass, yet he, and two of his successours were either so unready, or so unskil'd in the present *Roman* Doctrine, *that Feed my sheep*, and *Thou art Peter*, were either out of their knowledge, or out of their memory, and they alledged, not any power *jure divino*, but onely pretended to a Canon of the Council of *Nice*, which when the *Africans* found not in their copies, (for they would not believe the Church of *Rome* so far as to trust to hers, though now you generally think the Scripture it self to have its authority *quoad nos*, onely for her definitions) they sent to the *East* to enquire there, and finding their copies agreeing with theirs, they then more resolutely withstood the Pretence, which brought at that time nothing to the Popes, but repulse and shame.

And indeed, not to object, that it is not numbred among any of the ancient Heresies, that they differ'd from the particular *Roman* Church, nor is this Rule, of being sure at all times to joyn with her, ever given by those Fathers who set us ways and Antidotes how to secure our selves against Heresie, (which could not have been left undone, if they had known any such Tradition) nor to speak of the Canon of the Council of *Chalcedon*, which attributes the power of the Popes to the gift of their Fathers, and that again to *Romes* being the head City; setting all this aside, I will ask your self if it be not plain that those Fathers, who (upon the impudent pretence of some Hereticks) send men to several places to enquire after Tradition, either send them to all the Apostolical Churches, or (to save their labour) to that to which they were neerest, as esteeming them all of equal authority (though not jurisdiction) for I may say of *Rome*, and them, as *Tacitus* doth of *Cælius* and the other Commanders (*Mutato nomine*, the name onely chang'd) *Pares jure, Roma audendo potentior*, for what by watching all occasions to greaten herself, whereof Cardinal *D' Ossat* is my witness, what by abusing the respect all men had ever given her, in respect of the chief Apostles which founded her, of the Empire which was long seated in her, and of her ancient Bishops, whereof about thirty together were martyr'd there, what by interpreting what was given to her Authority, as given to her Power, and taking civilities and complements (of which no Court is now so full as the ancient Bishops were) made to Popes, for allegeance sworn to them, what by forging false decretal Epistles (which the Termed Authours of them would not forgive them for, if they knew it, if it were onely for the barbarous language) what by these, and such other ways, she is come at length to that pass that what *Avitus* a *Roman* General said to the *Ansibarians*, who gave him reasons why he ought not in justice to disturb their possessions, *Id Diis placitum, ut Arbitrium penes Romanos maneret, quid darent, quidve adimerent, neque alios Judices quam seipsos paterentur*, It is the will of Heaven, that it be left to the *Romans* what they will please to give or take away, and suffer not any Judges but themselves; appears now not so much a History of the Pride of the *Roman* Empire, as a Prophecy of the general doctrine of the *Roman* Church.

Pag. 208. *and* 687.

Tacitus.

Having ever marked Errour and Confidence to keep so much company, that I seldome find the first, but I mistrust the second, makes me loath to affirm any thing over dogmatically out of these objections, or say that they cannot be answered; Onely (because I must not offend against Truth, for fear of offending against Modesty) I will take leave to say, that if I could have answered them my self, I would not have put you to the trouble of doing it; which you might also have sav'd, if by letting me know your name, you would have enabled me to have found you out, and so in a short discourse have tryed whether I could have obtain'd that satisfaction from your words, which I must now expect from your Pen. But supposing I had none of these objections, yet two things besides would have kept me from assenting to what you say: The first is, that your men, when they ask us how we know Scripture to be Scripture, and this to be the sense of it, tell us withall, that unless we know it by some more infallible way than our own Reason (they mean their Church) it will not serve for a belief of those things which are to be believ'd by a divine Faith; Now this Argument of yours upon which you build all, (allowing that it appear'd good reason) yet at most it is but reason, and liable to the same exceptions, unless the same thing be a wall when you lean upon it, and a bulrush when we do. The second is, that all you say (for as yet you speak not of the Authority of the Particular Church of *Rome*, though you must at length come to it, though by that too, little is to be gotten) if it were granted, would but prove those who adhere now to the Church of *Rome* to be now in the right; but I asked for a guide, which might without new search serve me the next year, as well as this; For (for all that you have prov'd) she may leave the way you say she now pretends to walk in, and attempt to reform too, (which I wish were as probable as it is possible) or there may arise a schism between two parts of those Churches which now adhere to the *Roman*, and both may claim Tradition, (for what hath been, may be again) and how shall I know then which side to take, since both will seem equally good by the Touchstone which you appoint me to try with? And if I be then sent to try by Ancient Writers, it is certain, that (besides the fallibility of that way for the learned) this cannot be done at all by the ignorant, and it is probable that both Parties will fall into that absurdity, into which the Church of *Rome* daily runs, which is, that although the evidence which she claims by, cannot well be exactly read over in thirty years time, yet she requireth us under pain of Damnation to give our Verdicts for her by twenty years old.

THE

SECOND PART.

Object. *THE high and Sage Maſter of our Faith hath in vain ſpent ſo much ſweat, and pains, if after he paſſed from hence, he hath left no means to aſſure mankind, what it was he taught and practiſed.*

Reſp. I ſuppoſe this ſpeech is directed at me, who (as you conceive) take away all means, becauſe I have no Judge; but I would fain know of you, whether *Plato*, and *Ariſtotle* have not left us means to know what they taught, although they have not left us any living infallible Judge to deliver us their doctrine verbally, or to expound their works: Or if you intended your Accent upon the word *Aſſure*, and if you mean by that, ſome *infallible* knowledge, I deſire you (out of your own words) to conſider whether humane nature be capable of it. For my part ſuppoſing as I do, that his Faith is in a ſufficient degree, which brings forth obedience, I require not any motives more *aſſuring*, (except from them who claim that they cannot erre) than ſuch as any man unprepoſſeſt with paſſion or prejudice, will believe ſufficiently to obey; and ſuch in my opinion are mine: For though I know, you count any way without a guide but groping in the dark, yet if God had not given us ſo much light as we deſired, we muſt not therefore ſet up falſe lights, and becauſe we would be ſure to have a guide, make one our ſelves: but he ſeems to me, to have dealt with us in Religion not very un-analogically, to what he hath in the world, giving us two lights, Scripture and Univerſal Tradition, whereof one gives light to the other, and both to us: Univerſal Tradition is our Guide to Scripture (as whatſoever elſe that guided us to, we would receive, if there were any ſuch thing) and Scripture is our way to God; By Univerſal Tradition we know much better, that theſe Books were written by Chriſt's Diſciples (who are ſufficient witneſſes of what he taught) than the *Ariſtotelians* know that theſe were *Ariſtotle*'s works, or the *Academicks* knew *Plato*'s, ſince Chriſtians have both kept them with more care, and in the acceptance of them uſed more caution, as thinking them ſo much more important: In the Scriptures I conceive, that (according to that rule, which I am ſure I have either read in *Chryſoſtome*, or very often quoted out of him) *πάντα ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα, all that is neceſſary is clear*; or if any man that ſtrives to ſquare both his actions and opinions by that Rule, chance to fall into any errour (for which his underſtanding is onely in fault and not his will) it ſhall not hinder his riſing to heaven: Such an infallible way excludes, if not all uſe, at leaſt all neceſſity of an infallible guide, and is as good as a Judge to keep Unity in Charity (which is onely needfull) though not in opinions; and indeed ſince you muſt grant, that if any man miſ-interpret the Council of *Trent*, it ſhall not damn him, ſo he doubt not of its truth, deſire to diſcover what it meant, and be in a Propenſion of believing that, when he knows it; me thinks (as *Cyneas* told *Pirrhus*) you had as good doe that at firſt which you muſt doe at laſt, that is, ſay the ſame with us at firſt concerning Scripture, which after much trouble, you are forced to ſay concerning Councils, and in hard matters let the ſame implicite Faith in God ſerve, which ſerves in them, who can claim no authority but from, and under him: And (which is more than I affirm) that no man, but by his own being wicked, can come into any errour by falſe interpretation of Scripture, ſee I pray, what Saint *Auſtine* ſays in his forty ninth Sermon *de verbis Domini*, that God hath ſo hedg'd in all his own ſayings, that whoſoever would interpret any place of Scripture falſe, he that hath a circumciſed heart, by reading what is before and after, may find that ſenſe which the other would pervert.

Yet if you can ſhew me reaſon to believe that there is any ſtanding guide upon earth (and without reaſon, it were unreaſonable to hope to perſwade me to believe it) I will never be proud ſo much to my own coſt, as rather to venture looſing my way by chuſing it my ſelf, than be beholding to him for directing me in it.

Object. *Thoſe to whom during his life, he had moſt fully declared his mind, went and told it to others, and all was done; But this way hath the prejudice of humane Fallibility, for ſeldome it hapneth, that a multitude can carry away all in the ſame manner, and one thouſand ſix hundred years are paſſed ſince; yet if we look into the immediate joynts of the deſcent, we cannot find where it can miſs: for the doctrine being ſupernatural, and not delivered by any man's skill, or wit, the main principle of it can be no other, than to know what was delivered them by their Teachers: when therefore an Apoſtle had preached over and over again the ſame Doctrine, not long, nor hard to be carryed away, in all the Towns of a Countrey, and let him be gone, and all dead who heard him ſpeak, and ſome queſtions ariſe concerning his doctrine, let us ſee whether errour can creep in if Chriſtians keep to their hold, that is, what they were taught by Chriſt's Apoſtles. Let therefore the wiſeſt and beſt of thoſe Towns meet and diſcuſs the controverſie out of this principle, will not there be a quick end of their diſpute? For every man can ſay, Thus my Father heard the Apoſtle ſpeak; and what is here certain of the Children of thoſe who heard them, may with as much evidence be deriv'd again in the Grand-children, and ſo in every age.*

Thoſe

Thoſe writings, whoſe buſineſs is to prove, ſhould be like the houſes in the Low Countries, *Reſp.*
for as there they take ſuch care of their foundations, that what is under ground coſts them more than all above it, ſo in theſe, the greateſt labour ought to be in ſetling ſurely the Principles, becauſe ἑνὸς ἀτόπου δοθέντος, *one abſurdity granted*, how fertile errour is after, what a herd or ſwarm of ſtrange concluſions follow, not onely your ſelf have obſerv'd, but *Ariſtotle* alſo hath told all that have read him, and experience daily tells mankind; ſince therefore a ſmall miſtake encreaſeth as much, and as ſpeedily as a grain of muſtard-ſeed, I muſt the earneſtlier contradict this πρῶτον ψεῦδος, *this firſt errour* of yours, as being the Parent of ſo many more already, and being likely in time (if by being confuted it be not us'd as *Saturn* us'd his Father) to have yet a more large and numerous Iſſue.

Then, you leave one thing out of your Hiſtory of the Goſpel, which alone conſider'd, 1
would have much weaken'd what you ſay; For you ſpeak of the Apoſtles, but forget utterly their Writings, a miſ-interpretation of which, might ſoon ſpread an errour. And certainly out of them, if Chriſtians had been to receive no Inſtructions, but onely to remember what was taught them by word of mouth, both they would have ſav'd themſelves the labour of writing them, and *Traditors*, who deliver'd them to be burnt, would have been thought to have committed no greater fault, than if they had done the ſame to any ordinary writing: But if the firſt Chriſtians, and generally their ſucceſſours ſince, have ever carefully and aſſiduouſly ſtudied (what by comparing places, what by all other ways) to underſtand them, and thought themſelves bound to believe, and obey whatſoever they found, or thought they found there contain'd, and eſteem'd that they were taught by themſelves, what they learnt from their writings (as they muſt have thought it the ſame thing, unleſs the Apoſtles authority had vaniſht, by having their inſtructions put into paper, which were as if the King's verbal Commands bound us, but not his Proclamations.) Then here appears a gate at which errours might enter, which you (at leaſt I am ſure this part of your Treatiſe) did not conſider.

But even their verbal might either be miſ-interpreted, or knowingly miſ-alledged, even by thoſe 2
who are counted *Archi*-Catholicks; for, I pray, muſt not one of thoſe two have been done, or by *Socrat. lib.* 5
the Church of *Rome*, or by thoſe of *Aſia* (which example I would not ſo often ſpeak of, but that I hope δὶς κὴ τρὶς τὸ ἀληθὲς is as good an excuſe, as δὶς κὴ τρὶς τὸ κακὸν:) For ſince it is impoſſible, that Saint *John* and Saint *Peter*, both inſpir'd by the Holy Ghoſt, which is the Spirit of Truth, ſhould teach contradictory doctrines, whereof one muſt neceſſarily be falſe; what elſe can follow, but that one part (if not both) intended to deceive, or were themſelves deceiv'd in it (and what makes it impoſſible, that ſuch a miſtake by men of authority may not generally ſpread?) and after a plain example, your reaſon will be no more able to overthrow experience, than the earthen Pitcher, in the Fable, was to break the Braſen one; χύτρα κὴ πίτρα ἃ συμφωνεῖ.

One of the Arguments you make for the infallibility of the way which you propound, is, *That* 3
the Doctrine, which the Apoſtles taught, was neither long nor hard to be carryed away; Out of which methinks I can evidently deduce that the Church of *Rome* is not that, ſince both it appears how long that is, and ſince you tell us your ſelf, *That the cauſe of many errours among you, is the multiplicity of Catholick Doctrines, which doth not oblige a man to the knowledge of every Part, but to a prompt ſubjection to the Church.* Truly if there be no contradiction between theſe two Propoſitions, I will confeſs that I have hitherto miſtaken what the word ſignifies; unleſs you mean, that the Apoſtle by teaching ſubjection to the Church incluſively, taught all that ſhe teaches, and ſo what they delivered was ſhort, but what implicitly, much; If this were ſo, certainly the Apoſtles, when they included almoſt all their doctrine in the ſubjection enjoyn'd to the Church, taught ſome certain markes by which men might at all times know her, though you pretend to none but ſuch as the *Greek* Church as much claim (which is enough to ſcruple the ignorant) and rightly too, as the *Roman* (as Antiquity, Succeſſion, Miracles, *&c.*) excepting onely communion with the Pope, and ſplendour, whereof neither are proper markes of the true Church, that is, ſuch as can never be abſent from her, ſince the Hereſie of a Pope (which hath been, and is not by your own whole Church held impoſſible) may take away the one way, and a general Perſecution the other.

It appears alſo by what you ſpeak of the immediate joynts of the deſcent, that you ſuppoſe if 4
any errour come in, ſome one Age muſt joyn to teach it, which by no means follows, no more than one Age of them at *Rome* joyn'd to teach their Poſterity *Italian* inſtead of *Latine*; but ſome may have taught a Doctrine to be probable in one Age, more, then, in the ſecond, and all in the third, according to *Seneca*'s obſervation. The errour of few (eſpecially when Notable Perſons) begetting the errour of a multitude; and again the authority of a multitude deceiving Particular men, and ſo by degrees it may be thought from probable, True, from true, *fere de Fide*, from that, abſolutely a part of Faith, and conſequently, to have come from Tradition; whilſt the contrary opinion being firſt believ'd the more improbable, next falſe, from falſe, Temerary, from temerary, *Hæreſi proximum*, and from that, abſolutely Heretical, hath by almoſt inſenſible degrees met with a mighty change, and is arriv'd at Hell before it almoſt misdoubted it. And that theſe progreſs-Doctrines have travel'd, it is eaſie for any man to ſee who hath been but a little converſant in your own Books, and whoſoever denies it, may as well deny that there is any green in Summer, when there is hardly any thing elſe.

And for the Caſe you put, that the wiſeſt, and beſt of the Towns where Doctrines were deli- 5
vered ſhould have met, *&c.* I both ſuppoſe, that the controverſie of who were beſt and wiſeſt, would not it ſelf have been eaſily ended; but allowing that it might have been eaſily done, and would have been moſt uſefully done, yet it never was; and ſo ſuppoſe the way never ſo good, it was yet like a Medicine, which be it never ſo Sovereign, can never cure if it be never taken; Councils there have been call'd Ancient, becauſe leſs Modern, and general, becauſe leſs particular (for the firſt was not till more than three hundred years after Chriſt, nor to the largeſt, appears it, that ever

any

any were ſummon'd from beyond the bounds of the Ancient *Roman* Empire, though Chriſtianity were much farther extended: Some leſs meetings or *Conciliabula* there were indeed before, but none of theſe accounted infallible by your ſelves (though me-thinks they ſhould by your grounds) and indeed it would goe ill with your own infallibility if you ſhould, for of the two moſt notable, the one defended Rebaptization, and the other condemned *Samoſatenus*, and in doing ſo, taught as plain *Arianiſm*, (if we might know mens meaning by their words, which if we cannot, all arguing, eſpecially from what any Authours ſay, is ended) as even *Arius* himſelf was condemned for at *Nice*; If theſe intended to diſcuſs the Controverſie out of the Principle you ſpeak of, and yet miſs'd Tradition when they meant to have followed it, then ſo might your beſt and wiſeſt men have done too; if they did not intend it, then it ſeems it hath not been held needfull always by Catholicks to try Doctrines by that *Criterium*, which you now preſcribe.

Object. *Who can be ignorant what he was taught when he was a child, as the ground and ſubſtance of his hopes for all Eternity?*

Reſp. Truly the ordinary ſort more than moſt eaſily: For becauſe either their mind wanders, or their Teachers deſcend not to their capacities, they commonly goe away both from publick Sermons and private Catechiſms, as if they had receiv'd inſtruction in a language as ſtrange to them, as that wherein they ſay their prayers: Beſides, their own Fathers teach them little or nothing, becauſe that is as much as they have learnt themſelves, (eſpecially in ignorant places and times) their Ghoſtly Fathers teach them moſt, but that much more concerning life than opinions; ſo that though they were not ignorant of all they were taught, yet they are abſolute ſtrangers to the greateſt part of what your Church teaches; And if now no more of their Religion be delivered by Verbal Tradition, what was then, when many points, which are now often taught (though not conſtantly, and in all places, but upon occaſions) were not thought of in many years? Suppoſe that about the Queſtion of what makes a Prieſt, a convocation of men had met (I mean of ſuch who knew not what was taught in Books) before *Luther*'s time (and what I ſay would be true in ſomewhat a leſs degree of this more inſtructed Age) what account could they have given, what they had been taught when they were Children? Truly they could have ſaid, we know it to be the cuſtom for our Biſhops to make Prieſts, and ſome of us have heard, he onely is to make them; what is done and taught in other places, we know not: Very far would they have been from all agreeing that they were taught when they were Children (as part of the ground of their hopes for all Eternity) by their fathers, as receiv'd from theirs, as come down from the Apoſtles; that he is no Prieſt, to whom in expreſs terms Commiſſion is not given to offer for the living and the dead, which now being objected to the Clergy of *England*, perſwades me, that your Church teacheth more than generally men are taught when Children, or indeed at any time by any Verbal Tradition: For not onely the Ordinary ſort, but even your moſt learned men knew not what is Tradition, if that be ſtill your Rule of Faith; for they diſagree among themſelves, whether ſome things be of Faith or no: as for Example, Whether the Pope can erre in the Canonization of a Saint; for if all Queſtions were that way to be ended, and ſuch Traditions were evident, (as if they were ſuch as you ſpeak of, they muſt be) all your ſide muſt be ſoon reſolv'd both in this, and all other ſuch Queſtions; And if you ſay that indeed all Particular Doctrines are not taught by ſuch a Tradition, but that by ſo much as all are taught, they know their Judge and Directour concerning them, and ſo are taught them implicitely, I anſwer, that the Vulgar, although they are generally told that the Church is infallible, yet I doubt whether they be either taught that this Doctrine hath had any ſuch general and uninterrupted a delivery, or have heard much concerning thoſe means, by which ſhe her-ſelf is to be known, or thoſe Circumſtances, by which we are to know when ſhe expreſſeth her opinion: That the Pope is the Head of the Church, they know; but whether Tradition teach him to be ſo, of Divine, or humane Right, from God, of Councils, or tacite conſent, and what Power is included in that Headſhip, a *Mahumitan* is as much inſtructed as moſt of them; and even his headſhip is ordinarily prov'd to them but out of ſome place of Scripture, out of which they hear his Infallibility concluded too, without being told the different degree in which thoſe two Doctrines are to be held. Secondly for the learned, neither are they taught ſo well ſome of theſe things, but that they differ concerning them, and your ſelf fly wholly ſpeaking of them, leaving them to agree among themſelves, and (as Cardinal *Perron* ſays in one place, he will do us Proteſtants when we differ) ſuffering the *dead to bury the dead*; If then neither are you all agreed by what to know your Church, nor when ſhe hath defin'd, ſo that even what is of faith is undermined among you, I find cauſe to believe, that Tradition is no excellent Directour of you even in your grounds, no not to teach you to know that which ſhould teach you all the reſt; And if you were, yet at the ſame wicket, and by the ſame degrees, by which I have ſhewed that other errours both may, and have not onely entered into your Church, but aſcended alſo to high places there; this doctrine concerning your Directour might have done the ſame.

Wadd. Pag. 30.

His *Opuſc.*

True it is, that every little is generally and conſtantly taught in all ages to the people, and that which is ſeldom, is told them to have been ſo receiv'd from hand to hand by the Verbal Tradition you ſpeak of; and if they be at any time taught ſo, and remember it, yet they know not whether the next Curate teach the ſame, at leaſt, if under the ſame notion and degree of Neceſſity. Indeed it would not be ſo intricate a work (as now adays it is) to be a Chriſtian, if your way had been onely followed: but it is not this Tradition, but the writings of paſt Ages, which tranſmit to poſterity the opinions of the Doctours of paſt times, many of them being erroneous, and more unneceſſary; out of theſe works the learned learn, and teach again in their works, what the greater part (the unlearned) ſcarce ever hear of; out of theſe they ſettle the degrees your doctrines are to be held in, ſome as probable, ſome true, ſome almoſt neceſſary, ſome altogether; and teach concerning others, that ſome are falſe, ſome dangerous, ſome damnable; whereas the vulgar have ſeldom their meat ſo curiouſly joynted to them, but are told in general for the moſt part

(unleſs

(unleſs ſome publick oppoſition, or the other occaſion perſwade them at ſome time to deſcend to teach them more particularly) that this is ſo good, and this is not ſo: And indeed the degree in which the laſt Age held ſuch an opinion, is both moſt hard to know (not onely becauſe the ignorant are ſeldom taught by word of mouth, and the learned have ſeldom occaſion, without ſome oppoſition, to explain themſelves ſo far in their writings) but becauſe alſo as many, and as conſiderable Perſons not writing, as do write, we cannot know by the Authours, what the whole Age thought true (except the acceptation of that Doctrine were a condition of the Communion) and moſt neceſſary to be known, becauſe moſt of our controverſies with your Church are as much, if not more, about the neceſſity of her opinions, as about the truth of them: For we ſeeing plainly, that in the pureſt ages many of the chiefeſt Doctours have contradicted ſome of her Tenets, without ſuſpicion of Hereſie; are not able to conceive how a doctrine ſhould, from being indifferent in one age, become neceſſary in another, and the contrary, from onely falſe, Heretical,

——*As time makes Botches Pox,*
And plodding on will make a Calf and Oxe. Dr. D.

eſpecially if that way had always been walkt in, which you now ſpeak of.

No judicious man can deny to ſee with his eyes, (if he have caſt them never ſo little upon the preſent ſtate of Chriſtendom) that there is one Congregation of men which layeth claim to Chriſt his Doctrine, as upon this title, that ſhe hath received it from his Apoſtles without interruption, delivered from Father to Son untill this day, and admits not any doctrine for good and legitimate which he doth not receive in this manner. Object.

What the Judicious (of whom I am no member) can do, I know not; but I not onely can, but do deny it, you meaning by that Congregation, the Church of *Rome*; for by ſeeing, that not upon this, but other kind of claim certain Doctrines have arrived to the very brink of being defin'd, I have cauſe to think, that if they received none in upon other grounds, theſe would not be ſuffered to ſtand ſo near the door. And indeed there being between your ſelves ſuch differences, that *Eraſmus* tells us, that he who is a Heretick among the *Dominicans*, is Orthodox to the *Scotiſts*, ſure one ſide hath admitted of a Doctrine for Legitimate, which hath not been ſo received; and then me-thinks this being eaſily endable, which it is, by ſeeing which claims ſuch a delivery, (for if both do it, then two Parts may, which you deny; if neither do, then your whole Church goes by ſome other Rule) that which doth, upon that which you call the Catholick Grounds, me-thinks ſhould have obtained a definition from her, and the other, which reſiſts that Principle, upon which they ought onely to build, ſhould have been ſuddenly and abſolutely condemned. This will appear plainer, if we conſider the opinions of your Church by the Actions of her Head, in a notable and late Example. A great controverſie being riſen between the *Dominicans* and the *Jeſuits*, it was heard before Pope *Clement*; let us ſee then what courſe he took to find which Part held the Truth, ſince he was not likely (eſpecially in a time wherein, by being more oppoſed than uſually, he had reaſons to be conſequently more cautious) to chuſe a new way, by which truth was not wont to be found out by your ſide upon like occaſions; Did he ſend for the wiſeſt and beſt men from all, nay from adjoyning Parts, to enquire of them what they had been taught by their Fathers, to have been received by them uninterruptedly from the Apoſtles? did he examine with which of them the firſt and pureſt ages ſided? did he conſider which opinion would make us have the more excellent conceit of God, and work moſt towards the expelling of Vice? None of all theſe were his courſe, but he appointed both ſides, to prove which of them followed Saint *Auſtine*, and according to them, he intended to give ſentence, if the advice of Cardinal *Perron* had not prevailed to the contrary: But many days they ſpent in examining what he thought, who thought ſo variouſly concerning it, that he ſcarce knew himſelf which; whereas before him, all the Ancients that I could ever meet with, were with the *Jeſuits* with an Unanimous conſent, and by them (if they muſt be tryed by men as fallible as themſelves) it would have better agreed with their own Principles to have had both Parts judged. Reſp. Præfat. in Hilar.

After the Pope, let us hear Biſhop, and almoſt Cardinal *Fiſher*, who being one of your own Authours and Martyrs, cannot be thought to prevaricate againſt that Church, for whoſe defence he imployed not onely his Inke, but his Bloud.

His words are theſe,

There are many things of which was no enquiry in the Primitive Church, which yet upon doubts ariſing, are now become perſpicuous, by the diligence of after-times. And that you may ſee, that he ſpeaks of points of Faith, He addes,

No Orthodox man now doubts, whether there be a Purgatory, of which yet among the Ancients there is no mention, or exceeding rarely: It is not believed by the Greeks *to this day——Neither did the* Latines *conceive this Truth at once, but by little and little.* Pag. 496.

And for an *Epiphonema* he cloſeth it thus,

Conſidering that Purgatory was a good while unknown; after, partly by Revelations, partly by Scripture, came little by little to be believed by ſome, and ſo at laſt the belief of it was generally received by the Catholick Churches---Who can wonder concerning Indulgences, that in the Primitive Church there was no uſe of them? Indulgences therefore began, after men had trembled a while at the Torments of Purgatory. Pag. 497.

See, I pray, how will you two agree? You ſay, the Church of *Rome* receives, but what ſhe claims to be come down to her from the Apoſtles without interruption: He ſaith, ſome of her Doctrines were long unknown, and came in by Revelations and Scripture; you ſay, new Doctrines cannot come into a Church that holds this Principle: He ſaith, Doctrines have come in by little and little: So either ſhe held not always this Principle, or for all that, they might come in: To be ſhort, all, which he hath ſaid, ſeems to me, as if he had purpoſely intended to frame a Ram to batter down that fortification, which you have built about the *Roman* Church.

Now though he be of ſo great an Authority that he needs no backing, yet I will deſire you to look

look into *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, where he ſpeaks of Indulgences, and ſee if he mend the matter. He confeſſeth, that the uſe of them ſeems to be late received into the Church, yet would not have them contemned, becauſe many things are known to after-commers, of which thoſe ancient Writers were wholly ignorant. Amongſt whom there is rarely mention of *Tranſubſtantiation*, more rarely of the *Proceſſion* of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son, of Purgatory almoſt none; For though he ſpeaks after as if he meant, onely that the names of theſe were unmentioned, and not the things, yet it is plain, that if he brought them in to any purpoſe, it was to prove, that ſome Doctrines are after of neceſſity to be believed, which once were not, and Doctrines conſiſt in the Things, not in the Name.

Epiſt. Pag. 1164. I could next tell you of *Eraſmus* his ſaying, *Res deducta eſt ad Sophiſticas contentiones, & Articulorum Myriades proruperunt. Religion is come down to Sophiſtry, and a Myriad of Articles are broken out.* But knowing that his words will not find ſo much reſpect, (becauſe he himſelf finds leſs favour) as

Pag. 296. *1 Edit.* thoſe of others more allowed among you, let us mark theſe words of *Sancta Clara*, The Church, when it is ſaid to define any thing, ſhe reſts not upon any new Revelations, but upon the ancient, lying hid in writings and words of the Apoſtles; which he ſays not as his private opinion, but the conſtant belief of Doctours: By which it appears plainly, that there are at leaſt interpretations of what the Apoſtles taught, drawn forth by Reaſon not received by Tradition, which makes now a part of the preſent *Roman* Religion, a ſufficient Gap for Errours to enter at, when either miſtakings, or ends may become new opinions, and ſtyle them but interpretations of the old. *Salmeron* a Voluminous Jeſuite, one, neither by his order, nor his inclination an enemy at all to the *Roman* Church, being preſs'd by the

Tom. 13. *Pag.* 467. opinions of the Ancients, affirms, *Doctores quo juniores, eo perſpicaciores eſſe*, That the more modern Doctours are, the more perſpicacious, that *per incrementa Temporum nota facta ſunt Divina myſteria, quæ tamen antea multos latuerunt:* In proceſs of time Divine Myſteries have been made known, which before lay hid from many; That it is infirm arguing from Authority, and anſwers to the multitude of them, who in times paſt had oppoſed him with theſe words of *Exodus*, That the opinion of many is not to be followed, leading us out of the way, with ſome other very Anabaptiſtical anſwers, and very contrary to your Tenets, (for ſure it were a ſtrange Tradition, which had ſo many Orthodox Oppoſers) and nothing inferiour to that ſaying of *Zuinglius*, ſo much exaggerated, *Quid mihi cum Patribus, potius quam cum Matribus?*

The ſame Authour in the ſame place ſays, that Saint *Hierome* durſt not affirm the *Aſſumption*, but Saint *Auſtine* durſt; and by that means, the Church perſwaded by his reaſon believes it: Such a notable Tradition have all her opinions; for even this affirmation, which he confeſſeth, brought in this belief, is it ſelf not now believed to be Saint *Auſtine*'s, for I take it, he muſt mean his tract of the *Aſſumption*, counted not his, by your own Divinity-Criticks, the *Lovaine* Doctours, which have ſet it forth at *Cullen.*

And becauſe I am willing to ſpend no more time in the proof of ſo apparent a Truth, I will not urge *Poza*, who to perſwade the defining of an opinion, which hath a great current of the Ancients againſt it, (ſo far it is from having any Tradition for it) reckons many other opinions condemned by your Church, and defended by the Ancients; unleſs you will believe his impudent

In Elucidar. Deiparæ, Pag. 1113. Aſſertion, that they are all corrupted: and will paſs to the Concluſion of this, which ſhall have for a Corollary, the Confeſſion of a *Spaniſh* Arch-Biſhop, who is to be thought to ſpeak with more authority than his own, becauſe being employed to bring that to paſs, which was deſired by ſo great a Part of your Church, he can ſcarce be ſuppoſed not to have had the advice and conſent of many of them in what he ſays.

Wadd. Pag. 125. He then tells us, Firſt, every Age either brings forth, or opens her Truth: Things are done in their times, and ſeveral Doctrines are unlockt in ſeveral Ages.

Pag. 170. Secondly, To ſhew that though his opinion had no ſuch Tradition as you ſay your Church claims for all her Doctrines, yet it may and ought to be defined; he deſires to know who ever taught the *Aſſumption* of the Virgin, before Saint *Auſtine*'s and *Hierome*'s time, and by whom was that opinion deduc'd from the Apoſtles: Nay, he abſolutely affirms, that before *Nazianzene*, no man ever taught any thing of her delivery without pain, yet many thought the contrary.

Pag. 202. Thirdly and laſtly, For your abſolute confutation, he confeſſeth, that ye believe and hold in this Age many things for Myſteries of Faith, which in former Ages did waver under ſmall or no Probability, and many things are now defined for Articles of Faith, which have endured a hard repulſe amongſt the moſt and the weightieſt of the Ancient Doctours, and no light contradiction among the Ancient Fathers; and having reckoned up five Particulars,

The Validity of Hereticks Baptiſm,
The Beatifical Viſion before the day of Judgment,
The Spirituality of Angels,
The Souls being immediately created, and not ex traduce,
And, The Virgines being free from all actual Sin:

Pag. 203. He ſhuts it up thus, Many of theſe kinds of Opinions there are, which ſometimes declined to one Part, ſometimes to the other, and had contrary Favourers, according to ſeveral times, untill a diligent and long diſquiſition being premitted, the Truth was manifeſted either by Pope, or Provincial, or general Councils; nay, and ſays, that the diſquiſition is made by conferring of Places of Scripture, and Reaſon, which is the way which you miſlike.

Pag. 204. Theſe things conſidered, whoſoever ſhall after ſay, that your Church claims all her Doctrines to have come by a Verbal and conſtant Tradition to her from the Apoſtles, I will not ſay that he is very impudent, but I cannot think that a ſmall matter will put him out of countenance; for your part, I eſteem you ſo much, that I am confident you have not ſo little Noſe as not to find the contrary, nor ſo little Forehead as not to confeſs it, having received the *Affidavit* of ſuch a cloud of Witneſſes.

Object. *Whoſoever pretend Chriſt his Truth againſt her, ſaith, that true it is, ſhe had once the true way, but by length of time ſhe is fallen into groſs Errours, which they will reform, not by any Truth which they have received*

ceived from hand to hand from thoſe, who by both Parts are acknowledged to have received their leſſon from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, but by Arguments, either out of Ancient Writers, or the ſecrets of Reaſon.

This is no farther true, than as it concerns the Proteſtants, for the *Greek* Church will not ſuffer your propoſition to be general, but forbid the Banes. *Reſp.*

They pretend not to have made any Reformation, but to have kept ever ſince the Apoſtles, what from them was received: *Barlaam* ſays, they do σώας καὶ ὁλοκλήρους τὰς τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παραδόσεις φυλάττειν, *keep ſafe and whole the Traditions of the Catholick Church*; nay, he proves his to be the ſound Part, becauſe by them οὐδὲν οὐδέποτε τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας παραδόσεως νενόμισται σεμνότερον, *Nothing was ever more eſteemed than her Tradition:* And he objects it to your Church, that ſhe doth τὰς τῆς καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀθετεῖν, καὶ πάντας εἰς οὐδὲν θέμενοι ξενικά τινα, καὶ ἀλλόκοτα ἀνιτ σάγειν δόγματα, *diſanull the Tradition of the Catholick Church, and ſetting them at nought, bring in ſtrange and undenizon'd opinions:* And that *Greek*, who is joyned to *Nilus*, and *Barlaam* in *Salmaſius* his Edition diſputing againſt a Cardinal, chargeth you, that you do τῇ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ πατέρων παραδόσει φθαρτείρειν ζιζάνια, *ſow Tares among the Tradition of the Apoſtles and Fathers.* If when they make this claim they either ſay ſo, and think not ſo, or think ſo, and erre, then this proves, that though the *Roman* Church did make that claim which you ſay ſhe doth, yet ſhe too might either claim it againſt her Conſcience, or againſt Truth: For this claim of the laſt cannot be denyed, but by him, who will imitate that *Hamſhire* Clown, of whom you give me warning, and believe no more than he ſees himſelf; eſpecially ſince your own Authours, when they diſpute for Traditions, prove their authority from this profeſſion of the *Greeks*: but I cannot blame you to forget them, (if we would ſuffer you) ſince they cannot be remembred but by your Religions diſadvantage; For I verily believe, that if they had but one Addition which they want, (I mean Riches) not onely moſt of them who leave the Proteſtants, would ſooner go to them than to you, (unleſs they would take their Religion as we take Boates, for being the Next) but many among you, who (though they diſlike your pretended Infallibility, the Pope's uſurpations upon the rights of other Biſhops, his (not ancient) claim of power to deliver Souls out of Purgatory, *&c.* And yet are frighted from joyning with the Proteſtants, by want of Succeſſion, Vocation, and ſuch like Bull-beggers) would goe over to them (as I have heard, *Spalato* meant to doe) if theywere not kept, by an unwillingneſs to change the ſpiritual tyranny of the Pope, for the temporal of the *Turk*.

But (although there were no ſuch Churches, or they made no ſuch claim, yet having ſhew'd out of your own Authours, that ſome opinions have not been conſtantly delivered by Tradition, but have entered into the Church upon the grounds (which might at leaſt poſſibly deceive them) of Scripture, Reaſon and Revelation, and others knockt apace to be let in) I hope we may be excuſed for making a reveiw of all, and examining what doctrines have been brought in, if not by Scripture (which we think reaſonable) at leaſt by comparing what this age teacheth and requires, with what the firſt Ages did; to which we are encourag'd by your ſelves, who make agreement with Antiquity, the cheif mark of the Church, unleſs you mean your ſelves to be onely Judges, even of thoſe things by which you bid us to judge you: For our examinations by reaſon, I cannot tell why you miſlike it, ſince thoſe who truſt their own reaſon leaſt, truſt it yet to chuſe for them one whom they may truſt, againſt which, all Arguments drawn from her fallibility without queſtion lie. Your Religion is built upon your Church, her authority upon reaſons, which we think ſlight and fallacious, and your ſelves think but prudential and probable; ought we not then, nay muſt we not examine them by Reaſon, or receive them upon your word? And allowing them probable reaſon, yet I have ſtill cauſe to examine further, whether your ſuperſtructions be not more unreaſonable than your foundations are reaſonable, for then I cannot receive a more unprobable doctrine, than that is probable, which it is prov'd by: Yet (in reſpect of things appearing divers, at divers times) I do not like my own way ſo well, as to eſteem it abſolutely infallible, but though I keep it, becauſe I account it the beſt, yet I will promiſe to leave it, when you can ſhew me a better; which will be hard to doe, becauſe you cannot prove it to be better but by reaſon, againſt which proof (and conſequently, againſt whatſoever it proves) your own Objections remain; For to be perſwaded by reaſon, that to ſuch an authority I ought to ſubmit it, is ſtill to follow reaſon, and not to quit her. And by what elſe is it, that you examine what the Apoſtles taught, when you examine that by ancient Tradition, and ancient Tradition by a preſent Teſtimony? Yet when I ſpeak thus of finding the Truth by Reaſon, I intend not to exclude the Grace of God, which I doubt not (for as much as is neceſſary to Salvation) is ready to concur to our Inſtruction; as the Sun is to our ſight, if we by a wilfull winking chuſe not to make, not it, but our ſelves guilty of our blindneſs: Indeed if we *love darkneſs better than light*, and inſtead of eſteeming it, ſhut it out, it were but juſt in God, if we ſo continue long hardened, not to ſuffer it to ſee after, when we would, ſince ſo obſtinately we would not when we might, like to that that happened to thoſe Engliſhmen, of whom *Froiſſard* ſpeaks, who having long bound up an eye, and made a fooliſh vow, never to ſee with that till they could ſee their Miſtreſſes, when they returned, and unbound them, they ſaw nothing, but that they could not ſee.

Yet when I ſpeak of God's grace, I mean not, that it infuſeth a knowledge without reaſon, but works by it, as by its Miniſter, and diſpells thoſe Miſts or Paſſions, which do wrap up Truth from our Underſtandings. For if you ſpeak of its inſtructing any other way, though I confeſs it is poſſible (as God may give us a ſixth ſenſe) yet it is not ordinary, and ought not to be brought to diſpute, becauſe ſo we leave viſible Arguments to fly to inviſible, and your Adverſary, when he hath found your play, will be ſoon at the ſame lock, and I believe, in this ſenſe, infus'd Faith is but the ſame thing, otherwiſe apparell'd, which you have ſo often laught at in the *Puritans*, under the title of private Spirit.

This being ſuppoſed, either this Principle hath remain'd unto her ever ſince her beginning, or ſhe took it up in ſome one Age of the ſixteen; if ſhe took it up, ſhe then thought, ſhe had nothing in her, but what ſhe had receiv'd from her fore-fathers, and if ſhe thought ſo, ſhe knew it. Object.

Resp. This Principle is not yet taken up by her; and ſuppoſe it were, yet ſince ſome other opinions are confeſs'd to have been receiv'd by her, not from a conſtant Tradition, but Scripture, and Revelations, and not at once, but by little and little; this very Principle of receiving nothing but from Tradition, might it ſelf have been receiv'd not from Tradition: nor need it have been in any one Age of the ſixteen, but ſome might have taught it in one Age, more in another, and all at laſt: and this ſo far from being an impoſſibility, that it were no wonder.

Object. *Let us add, that the multitude of this Church is ſo diſperſed through ſo many Countries, and Languages, that it is impoſſible they ſhould agree togcther upon a falſe Determination, to affirm with one conſent a Falſity for Truth, no Intereſt being able to be common to them all, to produce ſuch an effect.*

Reſp. Although ſo many Countries could not ſo well agree upon it at once, yet ſome might ſo perſwade others, that in time and by degrees the diſeaſe may be grown epidemical: And truly, conſidering in every Country how few there are, who think of Religion at all, or of them again, who walk in it by the directions of their own eyes, even of them who take upon them to ſhew that way to others, but for the moſt part (which they did much more in more ignorant times, when *Scriptura ſacra cum vetuſtis authoribus frigebat*) are lead by ſome few, whom they reverence for their Piety and learning, ὧν λόγους ἀκινήτους ὑπολαμβάνουσι νόμους, *whoſe words are accounted laws*, and they again by a *Thomas*, or a *Scot*, or at beſt by *Auſtin*, or *Hierome*, and think it Tradition enough to have it from them (for elſe why think they to bear us down with the Authority of one or two Fathers, if they think that not ground enough to goe upon themſelves?) it ſeems little ſtranger to me, that whole Countries ſhould let in not ancient opinions, than that a few ſhould, ſince a few in all places have ever govern'd all the reſt; of this I will bring two very known examples out of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.

The firſt is of *Valens* the Emperour, who, being himſelf an *Arian*, and making peace with a Nation which was not ſo, and ſuppoſing that they would never have firm concord with him, to whom in Faith he was ſo oppoſite, was adviſed to perſwade their Biſhop to change his belief, for which end having employ'd both words and money, and effected it, the Biſhop, directly contrary to Saint *Peter*, being himſelf weakened, weakened his brethren, who yeilded to communicate with the *Arians* (which before they abhorr'd from) and to eſteem the Father greater than the Son. *Theodret lib. 4.*

The ſecond, is of that *Macedonian* Biſhop, who, being perſecuted by the Catholick Biſhop of the ſame place (who was then gone to *Conſtantinople* to fetch Souldiers, by whoſe aſſiſtance he might afflict the Hereticks the more) reſolved to turn Catholick, and perſwaded all his followers to joyn with him in that Act, and this in ſo ſhort a time, that when the other returned, he found him choſen Biſhop unanimouſly by both Parties, and himſelf (for his cruelty, not undeſervedly) excluded.

There is beſides another thing which helps to let in great errours, which is, that men naturally neglect ſmall things, and ſmall things in time naturally beget great; for which cauſe *Ariſtotle* ſhewing to us ſeveral cauſes of the Changes of Government, one of them is διὰ τὸ παρέμπιπτον, adding, that πολλάκις λανθάνει μεγάλη γιγνομένη μεταβάσις ὑπὸ νομίμων, ὅταν παρορῶνται μικρόν, *Often a great change comes ſtealingly in, when what is little is not conſidered.*

Yet beſides the general careleſneſs; The Authority of the Teachers, the Flexibility of the Taught, and the ſmalneſs of the Things themſelves at the beginning, even Intereſt it ſelf (which conſiſts of two Parts, Fears, and Hopes (is able to produce great effects: Of this me-thinks your ſelves may be witneſſes, who uſe to call ours, a *Parliamentary Religion*, as thinking, that the Will of the Prince, and both Houſes, onely made it to be receiv'd: Whereas in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeths* Reign, of many thouſand Livings which were in *England*, the Incumbents of not a hundred, choſe rather to loſe their Benefices for your opinions, than to keep them by ſubſcribing to ours; all who (for the greateſt Part) of neceſſity muſt be ſuppoſed for private intereſt, to have diſſembled their Religion, either then or immediately before.

Secondly, In the Third Book of *Evagrius* we find, that above five hundred Biſhops ſubſcribed againſt the Council of *Chalcedon*, which we have reaſon to think, moſt did unwillingly, (eſpecially, if the Infallibility of a general Council were ſo famous a Doctrine for Catholicks as now it is) becauſe we know it was upon *Baſiliſcus* his commands, and that a conſiderable Part of them (the Biſhops of *Aſia*) profeſs'd after, they were forc'd to it, though before they had been very angry in another Epiſtle with thoſe, who ſaid that they had done by force, rather than Free-will.

And over and above all this, we may ſee by *Eraſmus* his words, that many might not oppoſe a Doctrine brought in by great Power, in hope of a time to doe it in, when there might be more likelyhood of prevailing: for he ſaith in one place of his Epiſtles, that thoſe who reſiſt opinions, when there is no probable means of doing good by it, are like thoſe, who out of ſeaſon attempt to break Priſon, who gains nothing by it, but to have their Irons doubled upon them: And the ſame cauſe which he thinks ſhould move them to ſtay (outwardly) contentedly in Priſon, may have made many others not reſiſt, when they were firſt by violence and crowd carryed thither, who might fear leſt their oppoſal might not help their cauſe, but beget a definition againſt it. And there being thus many ſeveral motives which may work upon ſo many ſeveral kinds of men, it is no wonder, if an errour may ſoon over-run all men, or ſeem to do ſo.

Next, Whereas you ſpeak of ſeveral Countries, and Languages, I muſt deſire you to remember, that the Clergy of your Church are as it were all of one Language, (*Latine* either being, or being ſuppoſed to be, as much theirs, as that of their own People) and being under the Dominion of one, that is the Pope, which makes them as it were one Country, and from them the Laity receive all their opinions: Nay in ancient times almoſt all conſiderable men ſpoke the Language of the governing Nation, (as all of the better ſort of the *Iriſh* do *Engliſh*) and the greateſt part of Chriſtians were governed by one man, the Emperour, and ſo a new opinion may eaſily have been received generally, no ſuch bars being ſet up to hinder it, as you alledge.

Object. *Chriſtian Doctrine is not a ſpeculative knowledge inſtituted for delight, but it is an Art of living, a Rule of attaining to eternal bliſs; hence it followeth, that no errour can fall, even in a point which ſeemeth wholly ſpecula-*

ſpeculative in Chriſtian Faith, but ſoon it breedeth a Practical effect, or rather a defection in Chriſtian behaviour.

I wonder much to hear you ſay this, who certainly have a Religion conſiſting of many pionts, which are no way reduced into Practice: Eſpecially from the degrees in which they are held, (which I conceive introduced) could ariſe no change in Chriſtian behaviour; I confeſs that Chriſtian Religion being a Covenant between God and Man, by the entermiſe of Chriſt, we Chriſtians are properly concerned but in the knowledge of what are the Conditions and Reward propoſed and promiſed, what we are to obſerve, and what to hope for; and in ſo far-forth underſtanding the Nature and Attributes of the covenant-maker and bringer, as we may be made ſure, that whatſoever God hath promiſed or threatened, that indeed he hath: But though this principally concerns us, yet the neceſſity of believing the veracity of God, obligeth us moreover to give our Aſſents to any thing, how little ſoever it have to doe with practice (as Saint *Paul*'s having Parchments) if it be once made to appear to us either by Scripture, Reaſon, Tradition, or any way to have been ſaid by God either immediately, or mediately by Chriſt and his Apoſtles: And do not your ſelves count the *Greeks* Hereticks for denying the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Son, (though many Fathers deny it too) though, I pray, what hath that to doe with Practice or Chriſtian behaviour? and if you ſhould now change your opinion in this point, what outward change would it breed, except onely the blotting out of one clauſe in a Creed in your Liturgy, wherein it was not at firſt? And not ſo much outward change would there be, if you ſhould turn to believe *Enoch* and *Elias*, not to be ſtill alive, the contrary to which, *Bellarmine* ſays, all Catholicks hold now with a certain Faith: And many more are of this kind. *Reſp.* *Cap. 6 Lib. 3 de Romano Pontifice.*

Object.

Whether man have Free-will or no, ſeemeth a Queſtion belonging to ſome curious Philoſopher; but upon the Preaching of the Negative part, preſently followed an unknown Libertinage, men yielding themſelves over to all kind of Concupiſcence, ſince they were perſwaded they had no power to reſiſt, Free-will being taken away.

Reſp.

At this time it is not my own cauſe which I plead, Ἐνταῦθα ἂν ὑποπτ]ῶ· γίγνομαι, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμαυτῷ κατασκευάζων, ſince in this point I confeſs, I ſhould rather be a *Pelagian*, than a *Calviniſt*, ſince the firſt doth not wholly overthrow God's Grace, (for whatever we have by Nature, His grace gives us) but the ſecond wholly everthrows His Juſtice, beſides the direct contrariety of their Doctrine to Scripture, they ſaying in effect, that *the Kingdom of Heaven* is to take us *by violence*, whereas that teaches us, that we are to take it ſo: But yet give me leave to ſay thus much for them, that though it be true, that ill life follows very conſequently from that Principle, and thoſe who hold it, muſt be ill *Logicians*, if they be good men, yet it is plain, that very many of them live as good lives, as any who believe the contrary.

Beſides, this in my opinion concerns as nearly your *Dominicans*, as our *Calviniſts*, ſince they uſe *Free-will*, as *Tully* ſaith *Epicurus* did the gods, *verbis aſſerunt, re negant; aſſert it in words*, but *deny it in deed*: yet I think you will not ſay that they are the more licentious, for (by direct conſequence) denying Liberty; If therefore an opinion, which is ſo nearly tyed to action, produce no more effects, how much fewer would thoſe other ſo much more unconcerning Tenets bring forth?

I need not inſtance in Prayer to Saints, worſhipping Images, Prayer for the Dead, &c. which it is evident could not be changed without an apparent change in Chriſtian Churches.

Object.

Without change (which though it muſt be then apparent, yet need it not be ſo to us) I confeſs they could not come in, but with little oppoſition they might: the doubtfull eſtate of the dead after this life, before the day of *Judgment-audit*, being much better that they ſhould have our Prayers, though they want them not, than miſs of them if they want them, may not unlikely (and peradventure not unreaſonably) have brought in that Cuſtom without either giving ſcandal, or being received by Tradition; Though if it had, ye would have gotten little by it, for unleſs ſuch a Purgatory, out of which Indulgences may deliver, will follow out of it, the Pope will not care for the other, as being οὐδὲν πρὸς τὸ ἀλυσιτ, *nothing to profit*: And though he did eſtabliſh a Purgatory, yet it might be one after the Reſurrection, for ſuch a one, more than one Father ſpeaks of: But it need eſtabliſh none, (no not any third place, which is leſs) for the prayers might be firſt intended for the encreaſe of the happineſs of the Bleſſed, and relaxation of the torment of the Curſed, which latter effect, that the Prayers for the dead have, is ſaid by *Prudentius*, and confeſs'd to have been ſaid, both by him, and others, by your own *Heroe*, Cardinal *Perron*. *Reſp.* *Lib. con. Reg. Jac. Pag.* 892.

Of the worſhip of Images I ſhall ſpeak hereafter.

Praying to Saints may have come in upon conſequences drawn out of miſtaken places of Scriptures, or others, which inducing the opinion, that they enjoy'd the beatifical viſion before the day of judgment, ſome might conclude, that then they ſaw all in it, and at firſt pray to them but conditionally; till their number increaſed, and with it, the degree in which they held the opinion, till now to deny it, is accounted Hereſie, though I know no Father which juſtifies our invocating of them (although they ſpeak of their interceding for us) before *Nazianzene*, whoſe example alone being of ſo great authority might ſpread it much: though, I pray, remember, who (as ſays *Nicephorus Calliſtus*) it was that brought it firſt into the publick Liturgy.

It is not poſſible, that any material point of Chriſtian Faith can be changed, as it were, by obreption, whilſt men are on ſleep, but it muſt needs raiſe a great ſcandal, and tumult: For ſuppoſe the Apoſtles had taught the world, it were Idolatry to pray to Saints, or uſe reverence to their Pictures, how can we imagine this honour brought in but by a vehement conflict and tumult in a people, which did ſo greatly abhor Idolatry, as the Apoſtles and Diſciples did? *Object.*

Ἄμαι ἀπάτην δι δ' ἀπηρτύνετο σκάφας: I ſpoke chiefly, not of changing a point of Faith, but of creating one, not of contradicting a doctrine delivered from the Apoſtles, but of introducing one, of which they were wholly ſilent, either as theirs at firſt (as ye muſt ſay *Papias* did) or onely as True, till being rooted and ſpread, it be believed Apoſtolical upon *Tertullian*'s Argument, that elſe how could ſo many Churches, *errare in unam fidem, erre into the ſame belief*, which (becauſe leſs time had then been allowed errour to diſperſe it ſelf in) was then, though no concluding proof, yet a better than it was the next Age, and ſo ſtill grew the worſe for the wearing, till now it is worth juſt nothing. *Reſp.*

But as *Himerius* ſaith, ῥᾷστον ἀπολογῆσθαι περὶ ὧν ὁ φεύγει τις λέγει, I ſay, tis moſt eaſie to anſwer that which is not imputed, for I am ſo far from ſaying that the Apoſtles taught theſe two things to be Idolatry (ſince on my Conſcience they ſpake not of them directly at all) that I my ſelf will not ſay they are. For Prayer to Saints (ſet aſide your Idolatry-like Expreſſions, ſeeming to beg that of them, which you profeſs, you mean onely to have them beg for you) I ſuppoſe the Queſtion to be but this, whether they hear us or no (which Martyrs might poſſibly do, and yet no other, how holy and canoniz'd ſoever, becauſe many Fathers held that none elſe ſee God yet) If they do, I believe you may as well (or better, becauſe you are more ſure of their being in favour with God) deſire them to intercede for you, as you may deſire the Prayers of any living Friend; but if they do not, then I will not ſay in *Chryſoſtome*'s phraſe, πόσων ἂν ἄξια ταῦτα σκήπτων, what Thunderbolts doth it not deſerve, but how unreaſonable is it to caſt men out of the Church, and ſend them out of the world, for not aſſenting to an opinion, which you cannot prove.

For reverence to the Pictures of Saints, if you mean onely ſome outward civil reſpect, to teſtifie the great honour and love which you bear the Prototypes, It is, I believe, no more Idolatry, than keeping off our hats in the Preſence-Chamber to the Cloth of Eſtate.

Yet this I am ſo far from eſteeming neceſſary, that I think they had better never come in, than have occaſion'd ſo much un-chriſtian turmoile about ſo indifferent a thing. The firſt and pureſt Ages
Tertul. did well enough without theſe Pictures (we hear onely of a Parabolical one of Chriſt in a Chalice) after they came to be made, after to be ſet in Churches, after to be prayed before, nay, at laſt they are come to ſo great an exceſs, that not onely againſt Scripture, but all Antiquity, they are now come to picture God the Father himſelf: Upon a Pope's Letter to an Emperour, wherein he defends the picturing of Saints and Chriſt, and ſpeaks improbably of the Antiquity of their Pictures, and adds the reaſon why they pictured not God the Father, *Baronius* ſays in the Margent, Yet it hath after happened, that they pictured him as he hath appeared; a way which the Church of that
De fide & Symb. time could eaſily have found out, had they thought it lawfull, as it is plain Saint *Auſtine* did not, unleſs *Nefas eſt* be an Approbation: This alone may ſerve to ſhew that beliefs may come in, even contrary to that of former time (and yet we not know when they entered) unleſs you will oppoſe a ſuperficial reaſon, that a thing cannot be, to a plain example that it is, and force me to anſwer with *Barlaam*, νεκρὸν βλέπω, λέγεις μοι ὅτι ἀδύνατον ἀποθανεῖν, *You tell me, it is impoſſible for him to die, whoſe Corpſe I look upon.*

Object. *We remember in a manner as yet, how change came into* Germany, France, Scotland, *and our own Country, let theſe be a ſign to us, what we may think can be the creeping in of falſe doctrine.*

Reſp. This is but a continuance of the ſame Paralogiſm: For at this time, in theſe places, a ſetled Religion being contradicted, the caſe is very different from an Opinions prevailing in the minds of men, when they were yet white Paper, and not filled with any doctrine to the contrary, either becauſe though once the contrary had been taught, yet it had ſlept a good while, or becauſe nothing had before been ſpoken concerning it: We know, that nothing makes Noiſe but Oppoſition and Reſiſtance, and if that be not much, it will not laſt long, and the memory of it as little: Beſides, moſt of theſe points making for the power and wealth of the Clergy, you muſt not expect, that there ſhould have been as great an out-cry and hubbub when they were introduced at firſt, as when expelled after long prevailing, it being a work, both more ſhort, eaſie and ſecret to plant an Acorn, than to cut down or remove an Oak (χαλεπὸν γὰρ μεγάλην μεταφυτεύειν) although thoſe men which govern the reſt, were not in this caſe ſo much intereſſed.

Object. *There is no point of doctrine contrary to the Catholick Church rooted in any Chriſtian Nation, that the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory doth not mention the times and combats, by which it entered, and tore the Church in pieces.*

Reſp. The combats wherein it tore the Church, peradventure it doth, but of the times wherein many entred, they are altogether ſilent. All take notice of *Arius* his words, when by reaſon of *Alexander*'s hot oppoſition there grew diviſions; but of what the Orthodox-counted Authours (which we have) before the Council of *Nice*, ſaid (though ask *Perron*, and he will tell you, how like *Arianiſm* they look) no Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory makes any mention, becauſe they made no bounce like the other, and ſo in likelihood took no more notice of other opinions, which made none neither. And what is ſaid of this point, may be ſaid of *Eutychianiſm* (ſee the ſame place of *Perron*) for we know how *Dioſcorus* called upon the Fathers of the *Pelagians*, and others, whoſe opinions were certainly in the Church before them, who are now counted the Authours of them.

Nay, even of opinions rooted (as you call it) are not the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father onely, the communicating Infants, the admitting none to the Beatifical Viſion but Martyrs, and other ſuch, rooted in the *Greek* Church? or can you tell when they entered? at leaſt, was it not long before any combat concerning them? But ſuppoſe this were true, it is but accidentally ſo, for ſome of thoſe writings which deliver this to us, might as well have been loſt, as many others which were, ſo that no man can conclude that, of whatſoever, no beginning can be ſhewed in Eccleſiaſtical ſtory, that hath not been introduced, (eſpecially ſince I ſpeak not ſo much of opinions oppoſing the Ancient Tradition, as of Superfetations, not onely of points indeed Material, but of ſuch as in continuance of time, have grown to be thought ſo) for how can I tell, many of them having been loſt, but ſome of thoſe would have given me notice of it, if I now had them.

Object. *Let it therefore remain for evidently conſtant, that into the Chriſtian Church can come no Errours, but it muſt be ſeen and noted, and raiſe ſcandal and oppoſition.*

Reſp. Here, Sir, not onely Ἄιξ ἔπω τέτυκεν, ἕειφ' ὑπὸ δώγματα παίζει, you reſolve upon a Truth of a concluſion, before you have proved the Premiſſes; but even that is ſuch a one as follows not out of them, although they were granted: For how follows it, that becauſe all heretofore have been noted, therefore all at all times muſt be ſo; nay, that though at the coming in they found ſcandal and oppoſition, we neceſſarily (many centuries after) muſt know they did ſo (For the knowledge,

which

which we have of these things, is but *Reliquiæ Danaum*; what was overseen by the zeal and negligence, and how much we want of what we might have known, had the rest scap'd, no man can tell who pretends not to Revelation, and to the ability of knowing what was in Books, whereof he never saw any, and never heard of most: But though it follows not, such a thing hath been done, therefore it must ever be; yet it follows (in spite of the most severe exception) such a thing hath been done, therefore it may be; As for example, since *Valentinian* the Emperour bringing in, so contrary to Christian Religion, as you will confess *Polygamy* to be, and establishing it with a law which allowed it, and yet those who tell us both of his actions and his Edict, speaking no tittle of any opposition which was made to it, but he ever accounted a very good and pious Emperour, and his Son by his second wife (his first still living, and undivorced from him) being esteemed legitimate, and succeeding him in a part of his Empire; think you whether his authority could not have drawn the Principal men, (and inclusively the rest) to subscribe almost any opinion, who could keep them from opposing such an Act, or such a law? And if though this be now counted unlawfull, yet we find not, that either any Bishop advised him against it, or excommunicated him for it, or indeed any man disliked it: If any false opinion backt by great Power, have been not onely (like this) introduced, but spread and setled, how unlikely is it that we should now know what scandals it raised, supposing it raised any?

As in our Natural Body, the Principal parts are defended by bones, flesh, skins, and other defences, that no outward Agent can come to offend them, before having annoyed some of these; so in the Catholick Faith, there are in speculations, those which we call Theological Conclusions, and other pious opinions, and in practice; many rites and ceremonies, which stop the Passage unto the main Principal Parts of Christian belief, and Actions. Object.

Either these Theological conclusions, and pious opinions are derived from the same Tradition, or they are not; if they be, then sure they are equally matters of Faith, and so need some other course to defend them, and you must find *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes*: If they be not, but were onely deductions either of the first Ages Logick, (which was not always excellent) or of that of more Modern times, then may they so easily be false themselves, that I know not how they can serve to preserve the rest certainly from all corruption; indeed, to secure any Truth: But I believe many may be miscounted Hereticks, for onely opposing some of these, what through the over-caution, and too much ardour of some *Primum mobile*, and of the greater part lead by a few such, what through their being come (having been long) from pious opinions, to be matters of Faith, as in great Families Servants, who have waited long in meaner places, are rewarded with higher: Besides I verily believe, that many Doctrines, which you account necessary, have no such redoubts about them, or at least have not always had; and indeed you onely affirming it, by *Tully*'s Rule, (who was no small Master of Reason) *Sat erit verbo negare*, It will be enough for me barely to deny it. And for Rites and Ceremonies which you suppose guard your Doctrines, (many used among the Ancients being not now in use amongst you) either some Tenets, which those did guard, and they did hold, ye held not; or if you do still, at least they are now unguarded. Resp.

But still, I speaking most of the easiness, that false and new Doctrines, not contradicting the old, may be brought into the Church; what answer is it, to tell me, how the Principal parts of Christian Religion are sure guarded, since so they may be, and yet such other may be brought in? As Christ's Promises, and chief injunctions may be retained, and yet praying to Saints, and Purgatory, and such like, be superinduc'd.

Let any discreet man consider, what farther evidence he can desire, or peradventure what greater assurance Nature can afford. Object.

Sir, I wish you so well that I cannot but give you warning, that this saying of yours doth *Sapere Hæresin*, since it seems as if you disclaimed any absolute Infallibility, and pretend onely to grounds of most possibility, which the Protestants doing too, use yet to be accused for making nothing certain, and having no firm foundation to build any thing upon: But as you claim less, than by your own Rules you should, so you claim still more, than either you are able to prove, or we likely to grant. Resp.

The Philosophers say, it is indisciplinati ingenii, *to expect in any Science more exactness than the Nature of it affords.* Object.

I confess this to be true; but I desire you also to remember, that as it is absurd to expect as exact a proof in the Politicks, as in Geometry, so it is absurd to expect as high a degree of Assent to the first, as to the second: my objections, being intended against those, who will be infallibly believed to be infallible upon probable grounds, for they themselves give them no higher a Title, and indeed that it self, in my opinion, is more than they deserve. Resp.

What shall we expect then in Religion, to see a main advantage on the one Party we cast our selves upon. Object.

Truly such Advantage on your part I cannot see: Neither if I did, could I in reason joyn with you. A main advantage it is, to have more Truth than any other Society of Christians: but supposing you had so (which is but a supposition, for I verily believe, if the Question were but, who had most Title to so much, ye would appear to a dispassionate man, οὐδὲ τρίτου, οὐδὲ τετάρτου, *Neither third nor fourth*, according to the answer of the Ancient Oracle) yet you withall require, not onely that I should believe, you erre in nothing, but that you never can; and then I had rather remain in their communion, I say not, who themselves erred not, but whose conditions of Communion were less rigorous, and exacted not of me to profess they could not erre, when I believe they do. And if you answer, that it would necessarily follow, that if they had fewest errours, they must have none, because some Society of Christians must be always free from all this; I shall absolutely deny, and the more earnestly, because I know this is a trap, wherein many have been caught, who taking this for granted, have examined the Doctrines of the most known Churches of Protestants, and finding (as they thought, and peradventure truly) some errours in them, some Doctrines no way to be proved but upon Popish grounds, Resp.

and

and by that juſtifying thoſe, and ſome imputations impoſed upon their Adverſaries, wherein their Tenets, or the conſequences from them were miſtaken, they then by the Doggs Logick have run over, without ſmelling to the Church of *Rome*, as knowing no other Society but theſe, and being prepoſſeſt, that one of neceſſity muſt be free from all errour: Whereas for my part, as the ἐκλεκτικοὶ, thoſe who bound not themſelves to believe abſolutely the whole Doctrines of any Sect, but pickt out what they thought accorded with reaſon, out of them all, were a wiſe ſort of Philoſophers; ſo they ſeem to me reaſonable Divines, who ſpeak God's will as they did Truth, (for it is not to chuſe by reaſon, and Scripture or Tradition received by Reaſon, which makes a Heretick, but to chuſe an opinion which will make moſt either for the chuſer's Luſt, or Power and Fame, and then ſeeking ways how to entitle God to it) For ſince it would be a Miracle, if the Errours of the *Roman* Church, being long gathering, could have been all diſcovered in a Day; or if it had been poſſible for the firſt Reformers, (who having their eyes but newly open, it is not ſtrange if (like the man in the Goſpel) they ſaw at firſt men walking like Trees, and had but an imperfect apprehenſion of Truth, eſpecially being in *Tully*'s ſtate *Quem fugio habeo, Quem ſequar non habeo, I ſee whom to fly, but not whom to follow,*) not to have left ſome opinions untaxt, which yet were errours, nor to have expunged others, which yet were none; I cannot ſee why we may not in ſome points joyn with the one, and with others in other, and beſides find ſome Truths which ly ἐν μεσοτχμίῳ, well in the mid-way between the Parties, ἀφαιροῦντες ἑκατέραν τὴν ὑπερβολὴν, nay in ſome points differ wholly from both: Which Liberty, if it were generally allowed, and generally practiſed, if particular intereſts were trod wholly under foot, eſpecially by the greateſt, and if ſuch ſpirits as thoſe of *Caſſander* and *Melanctbon* were more common, no conſiderable things would in a ſhort time be left, but all would flow again in the ſame Chanel; whereas this opinion, that always one part erres not, is both prejudicial to Truth, and the beſt Unity, which is, that of Charity, for it perſwades them who have feweſt errours, to believe thoſe to be none, and to hate all oppoſers as Hereticks; and of this your Church is moſt guilty, which not onely affirms that there is ſuch a one, but that ſhe is it, and propheſies as much of her ſelf always for the future, as ſhe promiſeth for the preſent, and upon this ground (like him who having won nineteen games at Tables, threw the Dice in the fire for not winning him the twentieth) though we ſhould yield to her in all points but one, and that the leaſt conſiderable, ſhe would yet throw us into the fire as Hereticks, for diſſenting from her in that.

Object. *You are bidden to put what year, or age, ſuch an errour entered, and it is evidently true, that then that year, or age, the Church conſpired to tell a lie, and deceive their poſterity.*

Reſp. You would never be loved, if you were a Poſer, and uſed to ask ſuch hard queſtions; for either you muſt mean by [an opinion entering] when firſt any man profeſſed it, or when firſt by all in communion with your Church it was aſſented unto: If you mean the firſt, it is impoſſible to be anſwered; for if one ſhould ask, who taught firſt that Chriſt was not begotten by God, before he was conceived by the Virgin *Mary*, (through his power and the over-ſhadowing of the Holy Ghoſt) one who knew little of Antiquity, would anſwer *Socinus*, a more learned Perſon would ſay *Photinus*, another *Paulus Samoſatenus*, another might find before him, *Artemon*, and another yet before him, *Theodorus* σκυτεὺς, (with whom curious Logicians, and great Readers of *Euclid*, *Ariſtotle*, *Galen*, and *Theophraſtus* were joyned) and yet that he was the firſt, we have no certainty, for if a little of *Euſebius* had been loſt, *Theodorus*, and *Artemon* had not been now heard of, which may as well have happened to others before them, either by want of being take notice of by an Hiſtorian, or by the loſs of the Hiſtory, and not onely is this ſo in this, but in all other points.

If you mean the ſecond, (for ſo you muſt, by your Inference, though the words of the Queſtion will bear both ſenſes) it is as impoſſible for you to receive an anſwer. For how ſhall I know when by all it is granted? For ſuppoſe no Authour to have been loſt, and me to have read and remembred them all, yet (as in *England*, when the *Calviniſts* opinion prevailed moſt, as wiſe and learned men, as thoſe who writ, though differing in opinion from the Authours, yet oppoſed them not ſo publickly, but that many might believe the more general Tenet to be received by all) how ſhould I know that the opinions of the Authours of ſeveral Ages, did agree with that of all equally wiſe and learned in the ſame times? for if there be no greater certainty of the opinions of all of one Kingdom in our own Age, think what Infallibility can we have concerning an abſolute general conſent a thouſand years agoe. And of this, *France* may as well be an example as *England*, wherein many called *Caſſandrians*, diſſent from the publickly received Doctrines, though with ſo little ſtir, that our poſterity will not know that there now are ſuch; So that all which any man can anſwer to this Queſtion, is, that ſuch a one was the firſt that he knows of, who taught ſuch a Doctrine, and ſuch a time the firſt, wherein he knows not that any contradicted it, or that your Church defines it for a neceſſary opinion, and exacted aſſent to it, as a condition of their Communion; which anſwer will be nearer to Truth or Falſhood, according to the meaſure of the anſwerers learning; And indeed if you pleaſe to remember, that when learning roſe again, and the Reformation began, moſt *Manuſcripts* of conſiderable Books, had long layn unreguarded by the generality in Popiſh Libraries, and out of them onely had ſome few been Printed, you muſt confeſs, that it was in the power of your Church, what anſwer we ſhould be able to make to that Queſtion which you propoſe, which then it is no wonder if it were not anſwered, for your willingneſs to keep men in darkneſs concerning this, even in times of moſt light, is to be ſeen by your expurgatory Indexes: For there, though you profeſs to meddle with none but Modern Authours, (whereas it is plain you go as high as *Bertram*) yet both that will ſerve to deceive our poſterity concerning the general opinions of theſe times, and if your Church in former Ages uſed any courſe ſomewhat Analogical to this, upon thoſe Authours who then were modern too, (as likely enough they did, or you have cauſe to hope they did, for your more juſtification) then how can I know when any opinion entered, that is, either firſt was at all, or firſt by all taught: ſince in all times (how little mention ſoever be made of it) there may have been ſome Doctours of that opinion, though either no Authours, or although Authours, yet by this Stratageme may be kept from us.

Neither

Neither indeed can you anſwer this Queſtion your ſelf; for you know not in what Year, or Age, did either the giving the *Euchariſt* to Infants begin, or end, at leaſt Saint *Auſtine* knew not the firſt, who believed it an Apoſtolical Tradition: Neither was this a bare Cuſtome, but implyed an opinion of good which Children received, which the change ſhews plainly to have altered; and certainly either the firſt opinion was a Superſtition, or the latter a Sacrilege.

But howſoever, your Conſequence follows not, for though your Church conſpired, and deceived their Poſterity, yet it might not conſpire to deceive their Poſterity, but to inſtruct it, being themſelves deceived. And therefore when you reckon up the Motives which men have to ſpeak falſe, I wonder to ſee Hopes and Fears put in, and errour left out.

Object. *It is God's courſe deeplier to root and ſtrengthen thoſe things which he would have moſt flouriſh. Now Chriſtians know, that he made mankind for his Elect, the world for mankind, and therefore he hath rooted thoſe things, which more immediately belong to his Elect (as his Church, Faith, and Holy Spirit in it) than the principles either of man's nature or of the world, which was made for it, himſelf aſſuring us of it, when he told us,* That one tittle ſhould not periſh of the holy Writ, though Heaven and Earth ſhould be diſſolved; *and ſo ſeeing the latter principle relyeth upon the not failing of God to his Church, which ſhould ever watch upon their actions, that nothing ſhould creep into Chriſtian life, which preſently the zeal of the faithfull ſhould not ſtartle at; I think it needleſs, to ſeek further to qualifie the ſtrength of that part, which receiveth it from the quality of ſo good a workman as the Holy Ghoſt.*

Reſp. Ἀρχὴ παιδύσεως ἡ τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐπίσκεψις, I muſt therefore obſerve, that this word [Church] hath ſo many ſignifications even among your ſelves, that it ſeldom comes into the mouth of a *Roman* Arguer, but there comes withall, four Terms into his Syllogiſm; I could wiſh therefore, that you would ſtill ſet down your Definition of it, and put that (inſtead of the word *Church*) into what you ſay, leſt what your late *Grecian* Defender *Cariophilus* ſays of Hereticks, οἰεῖπορ ἡμῖν δεῖ περὶ τὰ τῶν χαλκιζόντων αἰνίγματα, ἴδιον δὲ μάλιστα τοῦτο συμπάντων τῶν αἱρετικῶν, πάντες ἀσαφείᾳ χαίρουσιν ὠμωνύμοις καὶ ἀμφιβόλοις, that *they delight in doubtfull expreſſions*, may ſeem more properly to belong to you: Certainly in ſome ſenſe the Elect are God's Church, and in that ſenſe, the Church belongs not to his Elect, but is it; neither indeed know I (define it as you pleaſe) how it doth, ſince you profeſs, that men may oppoſe any company of men, whomſoever you will call the Church, without being obſtinate, or conſequently by hereſie excluded from Heaven, and ſo may, for all that, be elected. Neither indeed know I, how God hath made mankind for his Elect: It is true, that having elected thoſe who ſhall perſevere in Faith and Obedience, and given man Free-will, which (joyned with Grace univerſally offered) might bring him to the condition, and in that to election, and by that to Heaven; God may be ſaid, to have made mankind for his elect, that is, to be his elect, if they ſhut not themſelves out of the way to be ſo; And all men (eſpecially Chriſtians) I believe have, and always ſhall have means enough to perform theſe condition, in ſuch a meaſure (all things conſidered; I mean, either natural defects, as in Ideots; never having heard of Chriſt, as in many Pagans; not having Chriſt's will ſufficiently propoſed, as in many Chriſtians, and whoſoever is not by ſome fault in his will hindred from aſſenting, to him it is not propoſed ſufficiently) as ſhall by God be from them required.

But this hinders not, but that all Chriſtians may ſee what they ſhould, if they ſtand not in their own light. or wilfully wink; and if they neglect Chriſt's Inſtructions or Commands, and make themſelves deaf againſt his voice, *charm he never ſo wiſely*, they then may fall from neceſſary Truths (much more from others) unto errour, as well as from good life into wickedneſs, from which, without queſtion, God's Spirit is as ready to keep men that will be kept, as from the other, and which is no leſs (if not more) part of the conditions required (for in that epitomy, which Chriſt hath given us of the day of judgment, men are onely mentioned to be puniſhed for want of Charity, and not miſinterpretations of doctrine) though I grieve to ſee ſo many of all parts (whereof I am too much one) live, as if God were ſo obliged to them for their Faith, that he were bound to wink upon their works, and not to be an Idolater, or not a Heretick, were enough not to be damned.

And certainly to ſay, *That one tittle of God's Word ſhall not paſs away*, is not to ſay, that God will keep here always a known company of men, to teach us all Divine Truths, which from them, becauſe of their authority, we may without more adoe accept (for unleſs you mean the Church in this ſenſe, it concerns not our differences) till you can prove that this word makes ſome ſuch promiſe. For this ſeems to me onely to ſhew the veracity of God's Word, without ſpeaking at all of any Churches continual obedience to it, or true interpretation of it, or the impoſſibility of her receiving the Traditions of men for the will of God.

Beſides in this Paragraph I obſerve three things.

The firſt, That you now draw your Arguments from the ſtedfaſt Truth of Holy Writ, whereas you neither quote out of it any thing to prove your main Aſſertion, and in that way, which you laid before to find out Truth by, you took no notice at all of Scripture, but would have all differences decided, by onely comparing what men had by verbal Tradition, like that *Dominican*, of whom *Eraſmus* tells us in his Epiſtles, that when in the Schools any man refuted his concluſion, by ſhewing it contrary to the words of Scripture, he would cry out, *Iſta eſt Argumentatio Lutherana, proteſtor me non reſponſurum*; *This is a Lutheran way of Arguing, I proteſt I will not anſwer to it.*

Secondly, You now bring the proof of your certainty, from God's Spirit never failing his Church (though you never define what is there meant by Church, nor do you bring any proof, or ever can, that God's Spirit will ſtay with any, unleſs they pleaſe it, or that this will not conſiſt with the leaſt errour in divine matters) whereas before you made it a Phyſical, or rather ſuperphyſical certainty, that Traditions muſt be delivered from Age to Age uncorrupted, and this, not becauſe of any other aſſiſtance, but *ex neceſſitate Rei.*

Thirdly, You ſeem to think, that aptneſs to ſtartle in the faithfull, will ſerve to ſecure them from all errours; Whereas I muſt profeſs my ſelf of opinion, that in ſome times, and ſome caſes, that may ſerve to induce it; for (it being truly ſaid, that there is as much folly beyond wiſedom, as on this ſide of it, and *Nazianzene* telling us truly, that διαιαρπίνουν τῇ σοφίᾳ οἱ πεζοὶ λόγοι ἀεὶ τὴν πίστιν, ἀεὶ

ἄντε ὑπερπίπτουσιν, *the mark is equally missed by over shooting, as by shooting short)* I doubt whether over much caution may not have made some doctrines, and their Abetters, condemned (espetially when they appeared somewhat new) some Truths rejected for fear, lest they did by consequence con-
Arist. Ethick. tradict some points of Faith, when indeed they did, ὥσπερ οἱ κύνες ταχὺ συνιᾶσι εἰ φίλῳ, εἰ μὴν λοιμόν, ὑλακτοῦσιν, as *Dogs* often *bark at a friend* for an enemy, upon the first noise he makes, *before having considered* which he is: This made the Ancients so earnest against the now-certainty of the *Antipodes*, this in after times, for the same opinion, cost a Bishop his Bishoprick; and truth in all probability, would have then been defined a heresie, if a general Council had been called about it. Since then this aptness to startle, hath inclined Orthodox Christians to condemn, not onely those who had affirmed in terms the contrary to Tradition, but even those, from whose opinions they thought it would result, and consequently to exact an Assent, not onely to direct Tradition, but also to whatsoever else seemed to them reasonable deductions from it; This seems to me a way by which Errours may have entered by shoals, the first Ages (I mean then, *Cùm* Augustinus *habebatur inexpugnabilis Dialecticus, quòd legisset Categorias* Aristotelis) not having been so carefull and subtile in their Logick, as these more learned times, both *Arminians* and *Calvinists*, *Dominicans* and *Jesuits*, *Papists* and *Protestants*, seeming to me to argue much more consequently to their own Principles, more close to their present business, and every way more rationally, than the ancient Doctours used to do, I mean those which I have seen: And I am confident, that if two or three Fathers should rise again unknown, and should return to their old Argument against the *Arians*, from *Cor meum eructavit verbum bonum*, both Parties would be so far from receiving them for Judges, that neither would accept of them for Advocates, nor trust their Cause to their arguing, who opposed their common enemy no better.

Now that this way of making Deductions out of Tradition, and those both very hasty, and false ones, is very ancient, appears even by an example in the end of the Gospel of *John*, for there out of Christ's words falsly interpreted, a conclusion was drawn and spread among the Brethren, that Saint *John* should not dye; and what they did out of these words of Christ, other in other times may have done out of other words of his, and their Collection pass for his Doctrine; which shews the great advantage which we have by God's Word being written, since if it had not, we could not always have gone to a new examination of the very words, which Christ or his Apostles taught, and consequently a consequence of them spread in the place of them, would have been more incurable than now it is. I will also desire you to look in the five hundred eighty fourth Page of the *Florentine Council*, set out by *Binius*, and there you will find, that the *Latines* confess, that they added the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son, to the Creed, because the contrary opinion seemed to them by consequence, contrary to a confessed Tradition of Christ's eternal Divinity, to which, yet it will
Con. Reg. Jac. Pag. 708. appear out of what Cardinal *Perron* hath excellently shown, (though upon another occasion) that it doth not contradict, but that this consequence was ill drawn; which may have been in other points too, and have brought in no small multitude of Errours since; neither was their *Logick* certain to conclude better, nor were they less apt to add to their Creeds accordingly, at any other times than they were at that.

Object. *I doubt not but whosoever shall have received satisfaction in the discourse past, will also have received in the point we seek after, that is, in being assured both that Christ hath left a Directour in the World, and where to find him, there being no doubt but it is his holy Church upon Earth: Nor can there be any doubt which is his Church, since there is but one that doth, and can lay claim to have received from hand to hand his holy Doctrine.*

Resp. That which makes you expect that your Reader should have received satisfaction by what you have said, is, that since Christ hath a great care of his Elect, he must consequently (most strongly of any thing) have rooted his Church. Now I having shewed, that by your own confession, men may be of his Elect, that are out of your Church, I seemed to my self to have likewise proved, that there is no necessity of any Churches being their Directour. I know you generally think this the more convenient way, to have left such a guide, that because otherwise *Dominus non fuisset Discretus*, or in
Arian. *Epictetus* his Phrase, θεὸς ἔκαμεν ἐπιμελεῖτο ἡμῶν ὃν δεῖ τρόπον, you conclude that he hath: but we (though indeed in such cases where our κοιναὶ ἔννοιαι the *common Notions* concerning God, teach us, that such a Thing were contrary to God's main Attributes to doe, some of us conclude upon that ground, that this he hath not done) in these cases which onely concern convenience, of which we have much less certainty, begin at the other end, and considering first what he hath done, conclude that to be sufficiently convenient; and so finding no infallible guide by him instituted, suppose it convenient that there should be none: Truly if convenience were the measure, and our Understandings the measurers, we should resolve that God hath made every Particular man, at least every Pious man Infallible, and so to need no outward guide, which yet it is plain that he hath not done. Though in my opinion, in some sense, he hath made every man (who pleaseth) Infallible, in respect of his Journeys end, though not of all Inns by the way, certain to find Heaven, though he may miss many Truths in Divine matters: For the belief which God requires, of being to be thought true of his word, and that man be ready to believe and obey what he says, as soon as it shall appear to him that he hath said it, and every man being able (according to his means) to examine what he hath said; It follows, unless God should damn a man for weakness of understanding, (which were as strange, as if he should damn him for a weak sight, or a feeble arm) that every man is Infallible in his way to Heaven, so he lay no blocks in it himself, (at least is undoubtedly secur'd of any danger of Hell) For if they neither desire to avoid the trouble of enquiry, through unwillingness to find that to be true, which is contrary to what he now thinks, and so to hazard either the affection of dear Friends, or the favour of great Friends, or the fear of some other humane Inconvenience, as want of present means, Improbability to get more, or of that disparagement so terrible to flesh and bloud, of descending to confess that they
Eras. Ep. have so long erred, (like *Frobenius, qui potuisset vivere, nisi puduisset agrotare, Who might have lived, but that he was ashamed* to confess himself *sick*) If, I say, none of these or the like things, either keep him

him from ſeeking what is God's will, or from daring to profeſs it when he hath found it, then ſuch an Errour having no reference to the will, which is the onely fountain of ſin, cannot by a juſt God be puniſhed as a ſin; and the proof of the neceſſity of an Infallible Directour drawn from God's care of his Church, for his Elects ſake, is eaſily avoided.

But ſay you, if there be a Directour, it muſt be the Church; and again, becauſe you know that all congregations of Chriſtians, pretend to that Title in ſome ſenſe (as even the worſt men call themſelves by better Names than they deſerve, as *Ariſtotle* ſaith, οἱ λησαὶ ἑαυτὰς προσεκαλοῦντο) and I may miſtake our enemies Camp for our friends, and ſerve againſt Chriſt, whilſt I think I fight under his Banner (though even then, I believe, I ſhould have a ſhare in that prayer of his, to whom none is denied, *Father forgive them, for they know not what they doe*) unleſs you gave me ſome certain marks to know the Church by; you therefore ſay, what you have before ſaid, that yours is it, becauſe that alone pretends to Tradition; to which I anſwer, what I before anſwered, that the *Greeks* ſerve me to diſprove the ſufficiency of this Mark, who profeſs, that they hold the conſtant Tradition, and that under that Notion, they have both received what you deny, and not received what you propoſe. *Rhetor.*

Let us conſider in her, Preſence or Viſibility, Authority, Power; As for the firſt, her multitude and ſucceſſion make the one, that ſhe is ever acceſſible, ever known. Object.

What you now ſay, is not to prove your Church a Directreſs, but having (as you think, and I think not) proved that already, you now mean to ſhew, that ſhe hath the Conditions requiſite in a Directreſs: But this I deny, for neither is her *Preſence* or *Viſibility*, (for all her *multitude* and *ſucceſſion*) ſuch as were in a Directreſs required: For ſhe (beſides that ſhe muſt bring notice and proofs with her, to prove that ſhe is inſtituted by God to direct men; and thoſe plain and evident, if ſhe require merely but our aſſent; but if ſhe require us to aſſent Infallibly, then thoſe Infallible, which yours cannot doe) muſt alſo be ſo viſible, as to be known to all men, if not as a Directreſs, at leaſt as a Company of men, which yours ſure was not to thoſe Nations, which were lately diſcovered by *Columbus*: But if you except and ſay, ſhe need onely be viſible to all Chriſtians, (though this exception need a proof) yet even this Condition your Church hath not always had; for I believe, to thoſe Chriſtians whom *Xaverius* found in the *Eaſt-Indies*, your Church had been as little viſible, as to thoſe *Pagans* whom *Columbus* diſcovered in the *Weſt*: Beſides, beyond the *Abiſſins*, how far Chriſtian Religion may be propagated, and yet your Church unknown, who can tell? Beſides, even to moſt of them (for any credible Teſtimony that appears) ſhe may not be very viſible. But above all, that reaſon being anſwered, upon which you conclude, that there is ſome Directour, and that ground being taken away upon which you build, that yours is that, me-thinks it will be unneceſſary to diſpute long upon the Conditions required to that, which hath no entity at all. *Reſp.*

For Authority, her very claim of Antiquity and Succeſſion, to have been that Church which received her beginning from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and never being all united under the univerſal government of her forewent it, giveth a great reverence to her among thoſe who believe her, and amongſt thoſe who with indifferency ſeek to inform themſelves, a great Prejudice above others. And if it be true, it carrieth an infinite Authority with it, of Biſhops, Doctours, Martyrs, Saints, Miracles, Learning, Wiſedom, Venerable Antiquity, and ſuch like. Object.

There is no Queſtion, but any Church, true or falſe, which claims to have ever kept the Apoſtles Doctrines uncorrupted, and is infallibly believed to have done ſo, muſt among thoſe Chriſtians who thus believe, have even equal Authority with the Apoſtles. But me-thinks, that this claim before proof, ſhould to others be any prejudice for her, (eſpecially to thoſe who have great Arguments againſt her) is unreaſonable; and if after conſideration it appears otherwiſe, ſhe hath then onely helpt to weaken her Teſtimony, and hath deſtroyed her Infallible Authority in any thing elſe. *Reſp.*

There remaineth Power, which no man can doubt but he hath given it moſt ample, who conſidereth his words ſo often repeated to his Apoſtles: But abſtracting from that, who doth not ſee that the Church hath the nature and proportion of ones Country to every one? As in a man's Country he hath Father and Mother, Brothers, Siſters, Kinsfolks and Allies, Neighbours and Country-men, (anciently called Cives *and* Concives) *and of theſe are made his Country; So in the Church finds he in way to ſpiritual Inſtruction, and Education, all theſe degrees nearer and further off, till he come unto that furthermoſt of Chriſt his Vicar: and as he in his Country finds Bearing, Breeding, Settling in Eſtates and Fortunes, and laſtly, Protection and Security; So likewiſe in the way of Chriſtianity, doth he find this much more fully in the Church: So that if it be true, that a man oweth more to his Maſter than to his Father,* Benè eſſe *is better than* eſſe; *certainly a man alſo (as far as Church and Country can be ſeparated) muſt owe more to the Church, than to his very Country; Wherefore the Power which the Church hath to Command and Inſtruct, is greater than the Power of the Temporal Community, of which he is part.* Object.

I wiſh you would have ſet down theſe words of Chriſt, ſo often repeated to his Apoſtles, in which *Power* to the Church (I mean ſuch a one as yours pretends) is undoubtedly given; For my part, truly I remember none; For I ſuppoſe not, that the Power given to the Apoſtles can reaſonably be claimed by any Society of men now, no not though you ſhould extend the Definition as largely as *Eraſmus*, (who ſays *Eccleſiam voco totius Populi Chriſtiani conſenſum, I call the Church the Conſent of the whole Chriſtian People*) unleſs that be meant too in all Ages, and ſo the Apoſtles would come in; They were ſo ſigned, and ſealed to (as I may ſay) from Heaven, by having moſt converſed with Chriſt, and been moſt beloved by him, and choſen eſpecially to teach the World his Will, that it is impoſſible any men could be indeed Chriſtians, and not receive their Doctrine, as that of Chriſt, without any other Proof; but there is no other Church that hath ſuch a Privilege; The Power of propoſing ſhe hath, and ſo have you, and without Queſtion, if you can convince any Chriſtian that what you ſaid, Chriſt ſaid firſt, he is bound both to believe and obey it; and again, let all Churches joyn in propoſal, yet till he be ſo convinced, (unleſs his own fault hinder it) it binds him not, neither is it ſufficiently propoſed, allowing it true, which it is not always neceſſary that it ſhould be, although ſo atteſted. For as a Natural Fool is not bound to obey any Doctrine or Precept, taught or impoſed by God himſelf, becauſe his underſtanding cannot diſcover it to be ſo: ſo in my opinion, whoſe underſtanding ſo- *Reſp.*

ever is not convinc'd of the ſame, (how plain ſoever to others the thing be) he is for as much as concerns this point, in the ſtate of a Natural Fool, and no more to be condemned.

Neither ſee I what you prove out of the Proportion between the Church, and every man's Country; for if any Church be intended by God to be ſo our Directour, that her propoſitions are to be received, becauſe they are hers, then indeed we owe her much more obedience than to our Country, which if it ſhould require of us to believe an opinion true, becauſe that hath defined it, I believe no man would obey, and he who ſhould preſs us to it, would be accounted ſo mad, that we ſhould ſend him, not to a Doctour of Divinity, but to a Doctour of Phyſick, to be confuted.

And that any Church is ſo intended, appears not at all by this propoſition, ſince the ſame is even amongſt the Church of the *Turks*, which is, *Eccleſia malignantium*, for there they find their Metaphorical Fathers, Mothers, Brothers, Siſters, Kinsfolks, Allies, Neighbours, (which all Hereticks do too among themſelves) all theſe degrees nearer and further off, till at laſt they come to that furthermoſt, of being united under the Univerſal Government of *Mahomet*'s Vicar, the *Mufty*. But to them you would ſay, that this proves not Truth, but at moſt Concord, and that is *Factio inter Malos*, which is
Saluſt. *Amicitia inter Bonos*; therefore the ſame we anſwer you, ſince Pyrats, and Thieves, have as ſtrict bonds among themſelves, as the honeſteſt perſons, and often greater conſpiracies, and συγκεχυμένως, to deſtroy theſe, than they make to defend themſelves. And whereas you ſay, that we owe more gratitude and obedience to the Church, than to our Country, I have told you, that this may be true without owing obedience to all ſhe teaches; But yet even this in ſome ſenſe is True; To the general Tradition of Chriſtians of the firſt Ages who lived with the Apoſtles, and could not in any likelihood but know their writings, I owe the knowledge of the Scripture, and to that, the knowledge of God's will, and to that, Heaven, if I conform carefully to it both my Life and my Belief; and to the Church in this ſenſe, I owe both as much gratitude as you pleaſe, and believe whatſoever this, as generally, witneſſeth to have received from the Apoſtles: But this concerning any preſent Church, doth as little concern your preſent purpoſe: For let us mean by the Church, that company of men which hath kept Tradition wholly uncorrupted, (and ſuppoſe there is ſuch a one) yet to know that ſhe hath done ſo, I muſt examine her Doctrine; and compare it either with Scripture, or the firſt Antiquity, and ſo rather receive her for it, than it for her: Beſides, that the whole Church teaches nothing, and if ſhe did, yet by the ſame ways from any ſingle learned Orthodox man, I may receive the ſame inſtruction, to whoſe commands nevertheleſs (except when he delivers God's) I owe no obedience.

Thus too, when the Orthodox company commands as they are Orthodox, that is ſomething of the will of God, then they are to be obeyed; and ſo am I; and ſo again, when the choſen Governours for that purpoſe, command indifferent Things; but if they exceed their Commiſſion in commanding, no man is longer bound to obey, no more than if a *Mayor* of a Town ſhould command the People to make his Hay, they were bound to obedience, ſince commanding more than his Magiſtracy authorizeth him, he in that caſe is no Magiſtrate.

Object. *This Church can ſatisfie both learned and unlearned. For in matters of Faith, above the reach of learning, whoſe ſpring is from what Chriſt and his Apoſtles taught, what learned man can refuſe in his inmoſt ſoul, to bow to that which is teſtified by ſo great a multitude to have come from Chriſt? and what unlearned man can require more for his faith, than to be taught by a Miſtreſs of ſo many prerogatives and advantages above all others?*

Reſp. The learned cannot reaſonably be ſatisfied with this (eſpecially ſo far forth as to believe it infallibly true,) Firſt, becauſe they ſee great multitudes have and do teſtifie contrary things. Secondly, becauſe
Tom. 13. Pag. 468. they muſt have obſerved with *Salmeron*, that a multitude of ſome opinion may proceed from ſome one Doctour, eſpecially, if he be Illuſtrious; and ſome again, taken with a pious and an humble fear, chuſe rather againſt their mind, to approve what hath come from others, than to bring forth any new thing out of their own underſtanding, leſt they may ſeem to bring ſomething unwonted into the Church. This they muſt needs ſee, may bring an undelivered opinion to be general, and then the generality may bring it to be thought to come from Tradition, according to *Tertullian*'s rule, *Quod apud multas Eccleſias unum invenitur, non eſt erratum ſed Traditum*, and that of Saint *Auſtine*, that of whatſoever no beginning is known, and yet is general, is to be believed to have its original from the Apoſtles. By this way (ſuppoſing that all your Church did witneſs, all their Doctrines to have had ſuch a lineal ſucceſſion, which they know to be falſe) they ſee, that opinions falſly and illogically deduc'd from true Traditions, may be equally believed to be ſuch themſelves, *Vincentius Lirinenſis* allowing the following Curch to give light to the former, which they might miſtake in doing, at leaſt, the certainty of her Illuſtrations cannot have their force from Tradition: By this way they ſee, that in time, ſuch Doctrines may come to have ſuch a general atteſtation, which had their firſt ſpring from Scripture miſ-interpreted, either by publick miſtakes, or by Councils miſlead, either by fear, errour or partiality; and what proceeded either from conſent, or definition, may ſeem to have been deduc'd from Tradition: In this they will be confirmed, by ſeeing plainly, that more is now required to be believed by the Church of *Rome*, than in all times hath been; that now among you contrary parties urge for, or expect a general Council to end queſtions, concerning which, neither ſide claims any continued verbal Tradition, and that the greateſt part are ready to receive ſuch a definition, in as high a degree, as any Tradition whatſoever; They will be alſo confirmed by your denying Infallibility to a Council, how general ſoever, unapproved by the Pope, by ſeeing, that if (as you ſay) no man can be ignorant what he was taught when he was a Child, as the ground and ſubſtance of his hopes for all eternity, and if in this, all your Religion were compriſed (or elſe to what purpoſe ſay you this) then no man bred in the Orthodox Church could err, or ever have erred in matter of Faith, without knowing that he had departed from the very Baſis of Chriſtianity; and for Inſtructions in theſe points, not onely all Authours, as Commenters upon Scripture, and the like, were wholly uſeleſs, but it were alſo a vain thing, to go for inſtruction even to Chriſt's Vicar, and Saint *Hierome* might have reſolved his own queſtion, about the ὑποστάσεις, every whit as well as *Damaſus*, or Saint *Peter* himſelf: And for the ſame reaſon, it were wholly impoſſible,

poſſible, that at the ſame time the Popes, and moſt notable, and moſt pious, and moſt learned Papiſts living, ſhould have juſtified and applauded *Eraſmus* for the ſame works (the one by his printed *Diplomas*, and the reſt by their Letters) for which, at the ſame inſtant, the greateſt part of the Monks counted and proclaimed him a more peſtilent Heretick than *Luther*, if they had all weighed Hereſie in the ſame balance, and more impoſſible if in yours; which the learned will yet leſs approve of, when they ſee how ſoon the worſe opinion, and leſſer authority may prevail, as how that of the Monks hath done againſt that of the Popes, and Biſhops, and that ſo much, that *Eraſmus* is now generally diſavowed as no Catholick, and given to us (whom we accept as a great preſent) that *Bellarmine* will allow him to be but half a Chriſtian, and Cardinal *Perron* (which I am ſorry for) gives a cenſure upon him, which would better have become the pen of a *Latomus*, a *Bedda*, a *Stunica*, or an *Egmundane*, than of ſo learned and judicious a Prelate.

Now for the Ignorant, I am ſure you will never be able to prove infallibly to them, that your Church hath any prerogatives above others; the ordinary way cannot be taken with them, becauſe they not underſtanding the Languages, in which the Fathers and Councils are written, cannot be preſs'd by what they cannot conſtrue; and your way as little, becauſe they are not more (though totally) ignorant of the Authours of paſt Ages, than they are of the ſtate, opinions and claims of the preſent time; ſo that I know not how you can attempt them, if they have but a moderate underſtanding to their no-knowledge.

The body of our Poſition ſhoots forth the branches of divers Queſtions, or rather the Solutions of them: And firſt, how it happened, that divers Hereticks pretended to Tradition, as the Chiliaſts, Gnoſticks, Carpocratians, *and divers others, yet they with their Traditions have been rejected, and the Church onely left in claim of Tradition; For if we look into what Catholick Tradition is; and what the Hereticks pretended, the queſtion will remain voided. For the Catholick Church calls Tradition, that Doctrine, which was publickly delivered, and the Hereticks called Tradition, a kind of ſecret Doctrine, either gathered out of private converſation with the Apoſtles, or rather pretended, that the Apoſtles, beſides what they publickly taught the world, had another myſtical way, proper to Scholars, more endeared, which came not to publick view, whereas the force and energy of a Tradition, reſiding in the multitude of hearers, and being planted in the perpetual life and actions of Chriſtians, it muſt have ſuch a publicity, that it cannot be unknown amongſt them.* Object.

Of the *Carpocratians* and *Gnoſticks*, I have ſpoke before, but ſure for the *Chiliaſts* this is onely ſaid and not proved: Howſoever this undeniably appears, that either *Papias* and *Irenæus* thought not this Tradition to have come ſuch a way as you ſpeak of, or elſe they thought it no heretical way, but ſuch a one, as was (at leaſt reaſonably) to be aſſented to; and both what was the way by which Traditions ought to come, and by which this came, they were more likely to know, than thoſe of following ages; which proves, that this Objection (as much as concerns them eſpecially) remains ſtill ſo ſtrong, that (in ſpite of *Fevardentius*) it will be better to anſwer it, *Scalpello quam Calamo, with a Pen-knife than with a Pen*, and no Confuter will ſerve for it, but an *Expurgatory Index*, no *non ſi tuus aſſoret Hector*, if Cardinal *Perron* were alive. Reſp.

I muſt by the way take notice of what you ſay here, that Tradition muſt have ſuch a Publicity as cannot be unknown among Chriſtians, and deſire you to agree this with what you ſay in the next *Paragraph*, that the Apoſtles may not have preached in ſome Countries ſome Doctrines, which we now are bound to receive as Traditions; for ſure thoſe Doctrines were then unknown among many Chriſtians; and if they had been neceſſary, ſure the Apoſtles would no where have forgot (with ſo good a Prompter as the Holy Ghoſt) to have taught them; If they were not then neceſſary, how have they grown to be ſo ſince? Beſides, I appeal to your Conſcience, whether it appear that the Doctrine of the Exchequer of Superabundant merits, of which the Pope is Lord Treaſurer, and by virtue of which he diſpenſeth his pardons to all the Souls in Purgatory, appear to have been known even to any of the beſt Chriſtians, and whether if it had been known to them as a Tradition, (being a Doctrine which neceſſitates at leaſt Wiſedom and Charity, a continual practice of ſuing for them, and of giving them) it were poſſible, that of what they knew, ſuch infinite Volumes of Authours ſhould make no mention.

Suppoſe ſome private Doctrine of an Apoſtle to ſome Diſciple ſhould be publiſhed, and recorded by that Diſciple, and ſome others, this might well be a Truth, but never obtain the force of a Catholick Poſition, that is, ſuch as it would be a damnation to reject, becauſe the deſcent from the Apoſtle is not notorious, and fit to ſway the body of the whole Church. Object.

I confeſs, that to have been no more generally delivered, will prove that the Apoſtles thought not ſuch a Doctrine neceſſary, elſe their Charity would not have ſuffered them to have ſo much concealed it; but yet to any ſuch Doctrine, it is impoſſible that any Chriſtian, who believes the teſtimony, that it came from the Apoſtles, ſhould deny his aſſent, becauſe it were to deny the Authority, upon which all the reſt is grounded; for the Church pretends to her Authority from them, and not they from her; and howſoever, ſuch a Doctrine (although not neceſſary) could not be damnable as you make this: Beſides, here will firſt ariſe a Queſtion not eaſie to be decided, how great a multitude of Witneſſes will ſerve to be notorious, and fit to ſway the body of the Church, eſpecially ſo many having not for a long while been thought fit even by Catholicks, though atteſting Doctrines ſince received by you all, and conſidering that multitude of your Church, which believe the immaculate Conception in as high a degree, as it is poſſible without excommunicating the deniers, who either walk not by that which you count the onely Catholick Rule, or elſe claim ſuch a Tradition, who yet are not thought fit to ſway the reſt. Reſp.

Secondly, I pray obſerve how eaſie it was for the two firſt Ages, at leaſt the chief of them, and all that are extant, to have given aſſent to Traditions ſo unſufficiently teſtified, or to have miſtaken Doctrines under that notion, (for ſo they did to this of the *Chiliaſts*) and then after, for it to ſpread till it were general, and laſt as long as men laſt, upon their authority; and when once it is ſo ſpread, how

ſhall we then diſcover how ſmall an Original it had, when peradventure the head and ſpring of it will be as hard to find, as that of *Nilus*, ſo that the greateſt part of what you receive, might poſſibly appear to be no certainer, nor better built, if we could digg to the foundation: Wherefore, ſince the delivery of a Tradition by ſubſequent Ages hath its validity onely from the authority of the firſt, me-thinks you ſhould either think that they received none but upon better grounds, or elſe think theſe grounds good.

Thirdly, I know not why you reſolve this opinion of the *Chiliaſts*, to have had onely ſuch a private Tradition; for though they name *John* the Diſciple, and mention certain Prieſts who heard it from him, yet they deny not a more general delivery of it, but peradventure leſt men might think that the general opinion (that it came from the Apoſtles) might ariſe from places of Scripture, (which fallacy, their teſtimony, when not ſo fully expreſſed, was ſtill in danger of, concerning any point, but that theſe books were written by theſe men) they therefore thought it fit to name to us their witneſſes, that it came from Chriſt's own mouth, and in what words: And if they had done ſo much on your ſide, for the differences between us, I believe you would now have few Proteſtant adverſaries left, for you would have converted the greater part, and by that, have been enabled to burn the ſmaller.

Object. *The ſecond Queſtion may be, How it cometh to paſs, that ſome things, which at firſt bind not the Churches belief, afterwards come to bind it? For if it were ever a Tradition, it ever muſt needs be publick, and ever bind the Church; and if once it were not, it appears not how ever it could come to be, for if this age for example have it not, how can it deliver it to the next that followeth? But if we conſider that the ſcope of Chriſtian Doctrine being great, and the Apoſtles preaching in ſo great varieties of Countries, it might happen ſome point in one Country might be leſs underſtood, or peradventure not preacht, which in another was often preacht, and well both underſtood and retained, we may eaſily free our ſelves from theſe brambles: For the Spirit of Tradition reſiding in this, that the teſtimony be* exceptione majus, *and beyond all danger of deceit; It is not neceſſary to the efficaciouſneſs of Tradition, that the whole univerſal Church ſhould be witneſs to ſuch a truth, but ſo great a part as could be a warrant againſt miſtaking; ſo that if all the Churches of* Aſia, Greece, *or* Africk, *or* Ægypt, *ſhould conſtantly affirm ſuch a Tradition to have been delivered them from the Apoſtles, it were enough to make a Doctrine* exceptione majorem: *Whence it enſueth, that if in a meeting of the univerſal Church it were found, that ſuch a part hath ſuch a Tradition concerning ſome matter, whereof the reſt had either no underſtanding, or no certainty, ſuch a Doctrine would paſs into a neceſſary bond of Faith in the whole Church.*

Reſp. Your ſword is ſo ſharp, and your ſhield ſo weak, that I can hardly believe they came out of the ſame forge; but when I obſerve how much you have a better right hand than a left, and that not onely you have raiſed an objection which you cannot lay, but your anſwer to it multiplies more, I cannot but compare you to him in *Lucian*, who travelling with a Magician that had no ſervant, and inſtead of one was daily wont to ſay to a Peſtle, Peſtle be thou a man, and it would be ſo, and when his occaſions were ſerved, would bid it return to be a Peſtle, and was obeyed, thought one time to imitate the Magician, he being abroad, and made indeed the Peſtle a man, and draw water, but could not make it return to the former ſtate, but it continued ſtill to draw, wherefore angry and afraid, he took up an ax and clove the Peſtle-man in two, whereupon ἐγένοντο τὼ μιᾷ ὑδροφόροι, inſtead of one water-drawer there leapt up two: For firſt I pray conſider, what could you have found more certain to deſtroy all, which you had before laboured to ſettle, about the Infallibility of your Tradition, than this diſtinction of *Exceptione Major*, ſince, if not a general one, but one which ſeemed ſuch, were required, how eaſie it was for falſe opinions to get in, under that colour, teſtified but by a few reputed honeſt men, and ſo received by, and tranſmitted from others of great and general authority? Secondly, how could you have found a better way to anſwer your own Objection againſt the *Chiliaſts* Tradition, for want of being ſufficiently publick, ſince if that had not ſeemed to them to have had this condition (I mean, if they had thought they ſhould for this cauſe have excepted againſt it) it had been impoſſible theſe Saints ſhould have received it, and concerning the publicity of it, and the number and authority of the deliverers, they muſt of neceſſity have been the beſt Judges who then lived, and who were the more conſiderable Doctours of the moſt conſiderable Ages: ſo that you muſt either confeſs, that a Tradition binds not, unleſs indeed general, or confeſs that this doth, ſuppoſing this not to have been general, which you cannot prove.

Philoſ.

Object. *A likely example of this may be drawn from the Canonical Books.*

Reſp. I deny it to be now neceſſary to Salvation, to admit of any Books for Canonical, which it was lawfull for Chriſtians in paſt ages to doubt of, and which had no general Tradition; and again, this anſwer helps againſt your ſelf: for it is plain by Saint *Hierome*'s Teſtimony, that the *Roman* Church received not the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, which the *Eaſtern* Churches received (whoſe Teſtimony, according to your grounds, ſhe then ſhould have believed to be beyond exception) and it is plain by *Perron*'s Teſtimony, that the *Eaſtern* Churches received not the *Maccabees*, when he ſays, the Church of *Rome* did. Now it is plain, that the Receivers pretended to Tradition, becauſe nothing elſe could make a Book thought Canonical, whereas other opinions might be brought in by a falſe Interpretation of Scriptures, and after being ſpread, might be thought to come from Tradition: So that according to your grounds and theſe Teſtimonies, not onely the *Weſtern* Church ought to have believed the *Eaſtern* about the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and the *Eaſtern* the *Weſtern* about the *Maccabees*, but alſo they ought to have required this aſſent from each other, which they not doing (as they would have done, if they had thought their Teſtimony ſo valid as you do) it follows, that you do differ from the Churches of the fifth and ſixth age, about what is *exceptione majus*, you thinking that to be ſo, which they thought not; and again, from all the extant Doctours of the two firſt ages, you thinking that not ſo, which they thought was; as alſo thoſe two times agreed about it, as little with each other, as you with them both.

Object. *The third Queſtion may be, How Chriſtian Religion (conſiſting of ſo many points) is poſſible to be kept uncorrupted by Tradition, which depending upon Memory, and our memory being ſo frail, it ſeemeth, cannot without*

manifeſt

manifeſt miracle conſerve ſo great a diverſity of points unchanged for ſo many ages. But if we conſider, that Faith is a Science, a thing, whoſe parts are ſo connexed, that if one be falſe, all muſt needs be falſe, we ſhall eaſily ſee, that contrarily, the multitude of divers points is a conſervation, the one to right the other, wherein we doubt.

As in *Judges*, when a battel was to be fought between the Children of *Iſrael* and the *Midianites*, the *Midianites* deſtroyed each other, and left nothing to doe for *Iſrael*, but onely to purſue them; ſo truly, your Objections work ſo ſtrongly upon your own Party, that I have nothing left me to preſs, and much to applaud: For, for this very reaſon, I believe, that all neceſſary points were given in writing, and onely the witneſſing, that theſe were the Apoſtles writings, was left to Tradition, which was both much leſs ſubject to errour (as being but one point, and that a matter of fact) and could no other way be done, becauſe no writing could have witneſſed for it ſelf ſo ſufficiently, that we ſhould have had reaſon to have believed it upon no other certificates; and to this your anſwer ſeems to me no way ſatisfactory; ſince, firſt, I deny *Faith* to be a *Science*, it being nothing but an aſſent to God's Revelations; neither are thoſe ſo connexed as you liberally affirm, and ſparingly prove; Nay, ſuppoſe they were, yet though errours would be the leſs likely to enter, yet when any one, by any means were got in, then this connexion would be a ready way to help it to let in all its fellows: Beſides thoſe opinions which may be ſuperinduc'd as Traditions, which ſuch a connexion could not hinder, if they were not contrary to the true ones; and of this ſort is chiefly our queſtion. *Reſp.*

That therefore you are no better able to wind your ſelf out of this inextricable Labyrinth, is no wonder to me, and no diſgrace to you, ſince a man may as well be a good Logician, though he cannot ſolve an inſolvable queſtion, as he may be exceedingly skilled in Phyſick, and yet not able to cure an incurable Diſeaſe; Beſides, that theſe Objections aroſe ſo at the firſt ſight, out of what was to be conſidered, that it was as impoſſible for to avoid them, as to anſwer them.

Let us conſider in conſtant Nations, their Language, their Habits, &c. how long they continue among them. Object.

Truly there is no Nation that I know, whoſe Language hath not, and doth not daily palpably ſuffer change. Conſider, that of theſe *Engliſh* hourly denizoning words of all kind of Languages, theſe of the *Spaniards*, *Italians* and *French*, almoſt made up out of Latin, and that of the ancient *Greeks*, unknown to thoſe of this Age, unleſs they learn it at School: Habits indeed ſome Nations alter leſs, but ſome daily, and none change not ſometimes: But this is little to the purpoſe, ſince thoſe Nations which have remained very conſtant in things, which no conſiderable cauſe appeared to them why they ſhould alter, may yet have received new opinions (eſpecially if not contradicting the old) taught them by ſuch, in whom they wholly relied, (as moſt go more hood-wink'd in theſe matters, than in thoſe which are indifferent, out of a Vicious humility) or proved by Arguments which perſwaded. For when the reaſons are probable (as they may be for a falſhood) the Perſons preſſing them, in themſelves of authority (as they may be and yet err) and the people to whom they are preſt, full of eſteem of their Teachers, then meet the three ways of working perſwaſion which *Ariſtotle* mentions, whereof αἱ μὲν ἐν τῷ ἤθει τῦ λέγοντος, αἱ δ' ἐν τῷ τὸν ἀκροατὴν διαθεῖναι πῶς, αἱ μὲν ἐν τῷ δεικνύναι ἢ φαίνεσθαι δεικνύναι· Eſpecially when beſides all theſe, the rewards of belief propoſed, are more than extraordinary, as alſo the danger of disbelief. Wherefore I count it by no means reaſonable, ἀκολουθεῖν τοῖς ἧττον πιθανοτέρων ἴχνεσι καθάπερ τὰ πρόβατα, *like ſheep* (without more examination) *to walk in the ſteps of thoſe, who have gone before us.* *Reſp.*

See that forlorn Nation of the Jews, *how conſtantly it maintaineth the Scripture, and how obſtinately their Errours.* Object.

Truly I thank you, Sir, for this example, ſince it puts me in mind of an Objection, which elſe I had utterly forgot: Many of thoſe errours which they hold, (as the *Cabala* and others) I pray, upon what other ground hold they them than this, that they have been taught, *Moſes* delivered them to their Fathers, as unwritten Traditions, and that under that Notion they have deſcended: Now may not they defend themſelves in them, by the very ſame Arguments which you uſe in this Treatiſe for the Church of *Rome?* May not they ſay that they have received them from their Fathers, who received them from theirs, who muſt either have joined in miſtaking their Anceſtours, or in intending to deceive their Poſterity, whereof neither is credible? May not they ſay, what is ſaid of theſe laſt Ages, may be ſaid upwards and upwards, till they come to that, wherein their Fathers received theſe Doctrines from *Moſes*, who was ἀξιόπιστος, as *worthy of credit* in the delivery of theſe, as in that of the ten Commandments, and their Fathers witneſſes beyond exception, that theſe Doctrines be delivered? May they not ask you *what year or age*, theſe errours entred among them, and ſay *it is evidently true*, that then their whole Church *conſpired to tell a lie?* May they not bid you beſides conſider *the Notoriouſneſs of the lie? ſuch as he is* very *rarely found*, who *is ſo wicked as to venture upon*; *beſides the greatneſs of the ſubject*, and the *danger enſuing* to *himſelf and his deareſt Pledges?* May they not add, that *the multitude* of their *Church is ſo diſperſed through ſo many Countries and Languages, that it is impoſſible they ſhould agree together upon a falſe determination, to affirm a falſhood for a truth, no Intereſt being able to be common to them all to produce ſuch an effect?* This they may ſay, and if they do, and retort your own words upon your ſelf, I know not, truly, what new ones you will find to anſwer them in, unleſs you change the whole courſe you now ſteer, and come about the ſame way which I now uſe to you, that is, ſhewing by what ways ſuch an opinion may have ſpread among them, although not at firſt received, and proving out of their own Authours, that this hath not been always held a Tradition among them, though now ſo accounted, which is ſometimes (as I remember) your own *Galatinus* his way, and the beſt that is: But if to that they ſhould again reply out of your own words (the Names onely changed) that if what *Moſes* delivered were certainly true, and what he delivered be to be ſeen in what they believed who heard him, and ſo till now, it is evident, that they who ſeek for truth in learned diſcourſes, muſt needs forego the moſt certain and eaſie way of attaining what they aim at: That *Jew*, who ſhould retort this, and much more of this kind upon you, and keep you to Tradition, and make their preſent Tradition (upon your grounds) the Judge of that, I am of opinion, would make you as ſilent, as if (according to the Proverb) *Reſp.*

you

you had ſeen a Wolf firſt, or were a *Pythagorical Freſhman*, and you would wiſh you had never put into an enemies hand ſuch a weapon againſt your ſelf, as this preſent diſcourſe: So that in *Anna Comnena*'s Phraſe ἐκατέρωθεν βόθεσν ὤρυξας, you have digged a ditch on either ſide of your ſelf: For either you muſt grant theſe Arguments not to be ſufficient for your Party, or you muſt allow them to be ſufficient for a *Jew*.

Object. *Whereſoever Chriſtians labour to convert Idolaters, they find the onely Argument for their errours that they received them from their forefathers: The King of* Socotora *thinking to pleaſe the* Portugals *by reducing a Nation that had the Names of Chriſtians to true Chriſtianity, he found them obſtinately proteſt to him, that they would ſooner looſe their lives, than part with the Religion their Anceſtours had left them.*

Reſp. This is no news to me who lived ſeven years in *Ireland*, where, this is all the reaſon the Vulgar either have or give for their Religion; and it is the leſs ſtrange, when I remember *Ariſtotle*'s *Ethicks*, where he tells us of one, who defended the beating of his Father, thus, ἐγὼ γὰρ ὅτε (ἔτυπτον) τὸν ἑαυτοῦ κἀκεῖνος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, becauſe it had been the lineal cuſtom of his Family to doe ſo. Yet for all this, that thoſe who earneſtly deſire to keep the Religion of their forefathers, and think they have done it, may yet be deceived, may appear to a Chriſtian by the example of the *Jews*, and to any *Romaniſt*, by the example of the *Grecians*.

To your example of the anſwer to the King of *Socotora*, I anſwer,

That either thoſe heterodox Chriſtians had been at firſt converted by Hereticks, or by Catholicks; If by Catholicks, (and your Church be that, and your grounds be hers) then it is plain, that men may grow into great errour, who hold faſt, as they think, upon Tradition, and may ſwerve from that Rule, whilſt they think they walk by it: If by Hereticks, then it ſeems Catholicks (as you call them) are not the onely Religion that have converted Nations, and that note of the Church which is ſo daily and ſo eagerly preſt, appears common to more than it: And ſo you may take which horn of my Dilemma you pleaſe.

Object. *To come at length to give an anſwer to him that demands a guide at my hands, I remit him to the modern Viſible Church of* Rome, *that is, her who is in an extern ſenſible communion with the extern ſenſible Clergy of* Rome, *and the extern ſenſible Head, and Paſtour of that Church. If he ask me, how he ſhall know her, I muſt counter-interrogate him, who he is? Is he an ignorant man? is he unlearned, yet of good underſtanding in the world? Is he a Scholar, and what Scholar? A Grammarian, whoſe underſtanding hath no other help than that of Languages? Is he a Philoſopher? Is he a Divine? (I mean an Academical one, for a true Divine is to teach not to ask this Queſtion) Is he a Stateſman? For he that can think, one anſwer can, or ought to be made to all theſe, may likewiſe expect, that one cauſe may produce all effects: Yet I deny not but all muſt have the ſame guide, though they are to be aſſured of that guide in divers manners.*

Reſp. I confeſs, Sir, you *come* to the Demander but *at length*; for till I had read further, I had not known that your Treatiſe was intended for an anſwer to mine, if I had not been told ſo when it was given me. For hitherto, as *Baaſh* a King of *Iſrael*, in the *Chronicles*, when he came againſt *Judah*, aſſail'd not their Cities, but built *Ramoth* againſt them, ſo you have not attempted to deſtroy what I had ſaid, but raiſed another conſideration, a City, a *Ramoth* of your own; againſt which I have brought ſuch battery, as ſeems to me ſufficient to demoliſh it.

Now for your directions to a guide, I anſwer, ſuppoſing that there is one, and that this you ſpeak of, be now it, (for you will not ſay ſhe always is) and not to quarrel with you for giving me an accidental and mutable guide, that being a thing which you ſuppoſe ſo neceſſary to be always known, I will join iſſue upon this with you, whether ſhe be to be known to be a guide by any Infallible Notes, for ſuch are required by reaſon, to beget ſuch an aſſent, as is required by you, all other being termed by your ſelves, not Faith, but Opinion. To your contra-interrogation therefore, *who* I am? that is, in whoſe Name I ſpeak, I anſwer and profeſs my ſelf one of the notably *ignorant*; but though I act my own part onely, when I ſpeak in his perſon, yet for once I will adventure to anſwer you, in the name of the ſeveral perſons you ſpeak of, and will ſhew, that none of them have ſufficient cauſe to receive the guide which you propoſe upon the reaſons which you alledge.

Object. *If the ignorant man ſpeaketh, I will ſhew him in the Church of God, decency, and Majeſty of ceremonies, above all other Sects and Religions, whereby dull capacities are ſweetly enſnared to believe the truth they hear, from thoſe whom they ſee to have the outward ſigns of Vertue and Devotion.*

Reſp. To this I anſwer, in the *ignorant man*'s perſon (that is, in my own) thus, I for my part, neither ſee what you ſay you *ſhew* me, (for in all *decency and Majeſty of ceremonies*, the King's Chapel ſeems to me to equal the Queen's, and our Cathedral Churches, much to ſurpaſs your Cock-lofts) and if I did, yet the *decency* of them would not prove your Church to be a good guide, ſo well as a good miſtreſs of ceremonies, and if by their *majeſty* you mean their Magnificence, then that would onely prove her rich, and not orthodox, ſince this is ſuch a note, that (her Doctrine remaining as true as it is) one perſecution would ſerve to deſtroy it, and with it, all that means which you allow the Ignorant to find his guide by; And whereas you ſay, that *dull capacities are* by this *ſweetly enſnared to believe the Truth*; I anſwer, that by the ſame means they may be as *ſweetly*, and as eaſily *enſnared* to believe falſhoods, unleſs you could ſhew that *Majeſty* and Truth are inſeparable Companions.

Object. *If the unlearned ask, I ſhew him the claim of Antiquity, the multitude, the advantages of Sanctity, and Learning, how the World was once of this accord, and thoſe who oppoſed, when they firſt parted, firſt began the contrary Sects; how the points of difference be ſuch, as on the Catholick ſide help devotion, and on the contrary ſide diminiſh the ſame; and ſuch like ſenſible differences, which will clearly ſhew an advantage on the Catholick ſide, which is the proportional motive to his underſtanding.*

Reſp. I ſee indeed you *claim Antiquity*, but do you think it reaſonable that I ſhould take your word? Our Divines (whom becauſe I know more, I have more cauſe to truſt than you, in a caſe of which I my ſelf can take no cognizance) abſolutely deny it, and to me you cannot diſprove them, unleſs I had at leaſt ſome learning to enable me to judge, who quotes that truly which now I cannot conſtrue: For *multitude*, I find not what that proves; it may work upon my fear rather than upon my aſſent; yet I am told,

told, that many more Christians disagree from your Church in this main Question of her being a guide, than she consists of; that the *Turks* are more than both, and the *Pagans* more than all three; so that if they relate the state of the world aright, *multitude* must rather seem an argument against truth than for it: And forasmuch as I can see my self, your Religion is the least in this Kingdom, and I know no other: For *the advantages of sanctity and learning*, to the first I answer, that since in a Country where the State is their adversary, and where for fear of scandal, and hope of gaining numbers to their Church, (to help both to the surety and ornament of it) by commending their Doctrine by their lives, in likelihood they are more vigilant against vice, than where they have no such thorns against their breasts to keep them awake, even here I can find no such advantage as you pretend, I have no cause to guess that I should find it where the incitement of emulation and such like, are absent, and the charms of greatness, wealth, power, and by consequence likelihood of impunity, are present: For the advantage of *learning*, I answer, that speaking to me with the fore-knowledge of my being unlearned, I wonder you should make use of such a motive, which (how true soever it were in it self) I am not capable of discerning to be so, any more than a blind man is likely to assent to an argument drawn from Colours, of which he could have no possible notion. Now whereas you say that *the world was once of this accord*, it is more than I know: we are told that whole Churches in the *East*, had long denied this, when *Luther* first left you; and howsoever, that it could not be brought in time by arts, propt by power, to accord in an errour, is more than you have proved. Whereas you say, that *those, who opposed* this, *when they first parted, first began the contrary Sect*: I answer, that our men pretend, that they began no new Doctrine, but onely scoured off the rust which time and worldly ends in some, and negligence in others, had suffered to grow on. Which Question again remains to be tried, (if you refuse Scripture, as your side useth to do) by a Jury of such who are for the most part untranslated, or those which are, by Parties, and whose language I cannot spell, nor consequently determine by their evidence. Now whereas you say, that the *points* in controversie on your *side help Devotion*, and on ours *diminish* it, I wish you had instanced which, and wherein, for I for the most part see nothing towards it, they being mere speculative opinions, and not reducible to life, as especially this whereof we most differ, which is, your Church's being a general guide: Those, which most may seem such, are either Confession, (which yet we deny onely to be necessary, not profitable, if well used, which is practised by some of us, and recommended to all, and which as you have tempered it, making contrition sufficient for his salvation, who hath till his hour of death lived in all sin, and making attrition with absolution, of the same force as contrition, and requiring to attrition, (as I am told you do) onely sorrow for sin, though arising from the fear of Hell, so some love of God being joyned to it, (which none can want but an Infidel) will not *help Devotion* much, but rather *diminish* it) or Monastick life, (which was grown into great excess and disorder, which yet many wise and modern Protestants think might as well have been reformed as the other parts of the Church, without total abolition, and so upon this is left no Question) or Fasting, (which if you think Protestants are against, I pray reade Bishop *Andrews* his Lent Sermons, and which if it be not so much used among us as it should, is not so much the fault of the Religion, as of the Men) and all these things considered, I find none of your motives to shew a main *advantage* on your side, and therefore I have yet no cause to leave my own: And if in some of these things you should seem to have more truth than we, yet that would not free you from having more errour in other points than this comes to, much less from having any at all, without the belief of which, I should not be received among you, though I were willing to come: And this lieth upon you to prove, and that not by probable, but by infallible arguments, if you require (as they say your side useth to do) an assent of that Nature.

To the Grammarian I will give two Memorandums; first, that seeing the Catholicks were first in possession both of the Scriptures, and the Interpretations; The adverse part is bound to bring such places as can receive no probable Exposition by the Catholicks. For who knoweth not, that is conversant in Criticks, how many obscure and difficult places occur in most plain Authours, and the Scripture of all Books (the greater part of the men that wrote them, especially the New Testament, being not eloquent, and writing not in their native Tongue) for the most part are subject to much impropriety: The other Memorandum is, that, to prove a Catholick point by Scripture, it is sufficient, that the place brought, bear the Exposition the Catholick giveth, and if it be the more probable by the very letter, it is an evincent place. The reason is, because the question being of a Christian law, the Axiome of the Jurists taketh place, that Consuetudo optima Interpres Legis, *so that if it be manifest, that Christian practice (which was before the Controversie) be for the one sense, and the words be tolerable, no force of Grammar can prevail to equalize this advantage: The Grammarian therefore, who will observe these Rules, I turn him loose to the Scriptures and Fathers, to seek there what is the Faith of Christ and properties of his Church to know her by.* Object.

To your first Memorandum, I answer, that you have grounded it wholly upon begging the question: for if those of your Religion had first been in possession of the Scriptures, then the Christians had been of it in the Apostles times, which if you could prove, you would need to prove no more, but all would easily follow: and then for your consequence, that is equally false, for though I confess, to make any Doctrine a point of Faith, it is required, that the place be as plain as you please, yet to the making it the more probable opinion (and consequently, excluding the contrary from being necessary) so much is not required. The greatest cause of the obscurity of those books, in which Criticks are conversant, is the negligence and ignorance of Transcribers, so that some Authours would scarce know their own books, if they were revived; whereas the great care of Christians about so dear a pledge, hath much, if not wholly hindred, the same cause from perverting, and so obscuring Scripture: At least, if it have not, it seems your Church is not so faithfull a Guardian of her deposit, as her dear friends (moved by partiality or ends) would make us believe: Besides, till now I ever thought, that Eloquence rather led men to speak improperly, than the want of it, since ignorant persons keep themselves within the bounds of what precisely they mean, whereas the eloquent wander into figures, which are so many, and have gotten such footing in language (whilst in the search of significancy propriety is lost) that those, who use them, are obliged to those who will please to understand, because all they say may bear two Resp.

ſenſes, the one proper, the other improper: And though it be true, that they have overflown, even into the language of the ignorant, yet it is as true, that both they are much leſs uſed among theſe, and that they had not hence their beginning, but from Eloquence: And though the Apoſtles write not in their native Tongues, yet they write in an inſpired language, ſo that they were not likely to commit, at leaſt, any ſuch ſolœciſms as ſhould deſtroy the end of the Inſpirer, which was, that they ſhould be underſtood by it.

To your ſecond Memorandum I anſwer, that ſince every man is free till ſomething binds him, you (who pretend, that we are bound to receive more Doctrine as neceſſary, than appears to us to be ſo) are in all reaſon to give us plainly evincent proof, that what you thus require, God requires too; for till then (to return you to another Axiome, for yours) *præſumitur pro libertate*; whereas we (the burthen of the Negative proof not lying upon us) if we bring probable Arguments, we doe it *ex abundanti*, and bring more than we need to bring; And whereas you ſtand upon *Cuſtome*'s having power in *Law* matters, I anſwer, that in all caſes, that is not of force; for we hold, that it muſt not prevail againſt a Statute, which ſhews, that they may be contradictory; and as *Nullum tempus occurrit Regi*, is thought to be a good civil topical Law, ſo me-thinks, *Nullum tempus occurrit veritati*, is a good publick divinity Law, your own Scripture too telling us, that Truth is ſtronger than the King; Beſides, where it is of force, it is in ſuch caſes as the law hath appointed that it ſhould be ſo, and if you can prove out of Chriſt's Law, that there it is ſo appointed to be in matters of Divinity, we ſhall willingly yield; but ſeeing that our law, which allows this force to cuſtome, ſets down alſo in how long time it is, before it become of force, and I have cauſe to think, that Chriſt would have been as carefull as our law, and have ſet down this too, if he had had any ſuch meaning, and if it were ſettled to be a cuſtome of ſuch a ſtanding (as by Saint *Auſtine* ſometimes is ſpoken of) as that in no time it be known that ever it was otherwiſe; in moſt of your affairs this would ſtead you a little, though one ſide have burnt the evidences of the other, to which in likelihood you owe it, if this ſtead you in any; of queſtions, whereof Scripture and Antiquity are wholly ſilent, or merely ſpeculative, and unreducible unto act (of which ſort are the greateſt between us) or not concerning the lawfulneſs, but the neceſſity of an Action, to the firſt kind no ancient cuſtome can belong, nor other to the others, than a cuſtome of Interpretation of ſome Text concerning it, not enough to conclude upon (beſides, that it is not that which you ſpeak of) ſince daily your men differ, and defend their differing from all that went before them, about more than many Texts, as *Cajetane*, *Salmeron* and *Maldonate* ſhall bear me witneſs, unleſs, like *Sampſon*, you may break thoſe Ropes by which others muſt be bound: And adding to all this, that our cuſtome may ſerve to ſhew the meaning of the law, when our ſelves were Authours of it, though not when God is, and that our general cuſtome arguing our united conſent (which onely gives force to our laws) may be as fit to bind, as a law in civil caſes, and yet not in divine, where the laws proceed from a higher fountain; that ſuch a rule may be good in civil reſolutions, which require but probable proofs, and yet not in divine ones, where (according to the grounds of your Party, which requires an undoubting aſſent to her Doctrines as infallible) infallible proofs are neceſſary, eſpecially this, like other Topical arguments, having onely force *cæteris paribus*; and again, good, where it is not ſo neceſſary, that the will of the Legiſlatour be followed, as that peace and quiet be preſerved, to which, all alterations, even to the better, are enemies, and yet not in theſe caſes, where we are to prefer the will of our Law-maker before any humane convenience; or good, if the cuſtome paſt unqueſtioned, when the Law was firſt promulgated, but not, if crept in after by negligence, or plainly appearing to have been brought in by power; all this perſwading me not to be ſo far ſwayed by your Rules as you would have me, I ſuppoſe you have ſmall hope, that not being ſo, I ſhould find either in Scripture, or the firſt Antiquity, either that *Faith* which your Church propoſeth, or theſe *properties* of Chriſt's *Church*, by which your Church proves, or rather ſtrives to prove, that ſhe it is: Give me leave beſides to ask you one Queſtion, and that is, What we ſhall conclude, when the Chriſtian practice of ſeveral places hath ever differed, as that of *Greece* from that of *Rome*, which it may alſo do in more places than we are acquainted with, the extent of Chriſtianity being unknown to us, as are the cuſtoms of ſome remote Chriſtian Countries which we know.

Object. *Of the Philoſopher, I exact to go like a Philoſopher, and to ſearch out the ſpecifical differences of every Sect, and when he hath found them (if any one but the Catholick hath any rule of faith and good life, which I remit to him to enquire) but at leaſt, when he hath found the Catholicks to be this claim of Tradition before declared, then if this do not bring him as demonſtratively as he knoweth any Concluſion in Philoſophy, and Mathematicks, to the notice that this is the onely true Church of Chriſt, for my part I ſhall quit him before God and Man.*

Reſp. I have examined the differences between all parts as you bid me, and find the Proteſtants to have a ſufficient *rule of Faith, and good life*, yea ſuch a one as by Maſter *Knotts* confeſſion, (*Quem honoris cauſa nomino*) is as perfect as a writing can be: And ſince a writing may contain all Doctrines, and onely cannot give teſtimony to it ſelf, nor be αὐτόπιστος, I have no reaſon to think it inferiour to that of their adverſaries: Your claim of Tradition I ſee plainly enough, and as plainly, that it is but a claim, many of your ſide overthrowing it, and others not of your own, pretending to it: Biſhop *Fiſher* confeſſeth, that Scripture and Miracles brought in the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, and that again the Doctrine of *Indulgences*.

Eraſmus, who though himſelf no Martyr, yet one who may paſs for a Confeſſour, having ſuffered, and long, by the Bigots of both Parties, and a dear Friend both to *Fiſher*, and his Collegue in Martyrdom, Sir *Thomas Moore*, (who were the *Deucalions* of learning in this our Country) makes yet a larger confeſſion: *Non obſcurum eſt, quot opiniones invectæ ſunt in orbem, per homines, ad ſuum Quæſtum callidos, confictorum Miraculorum præſidio.* Theſe reaſons alone (allowing for brevities ſake, that I had no more) would make me believe, not onely that what you ſay, concludes not geometrically, but perſwades not probably, and conſequently, you by your promiſe have *quitted* me, which without it I doubt not but God would have done.

The Divine, if he hath truly underſtood the Principles of Faith in the nature of a Divine, (I mean Trinity, Incarnation, Redemption, Euchariſt, Beatitude, the Creation and Diſſolution of the World,) and hath ſeen the exact conformity of the deepeſt Principles of Nature, with an unſpeakable wiſedom of the Contriver: If he doth not plainly confeſs it was above the nature of man to frame the Catholick Religion, and ſeeth not, that onely that is conformable to Nature, and it ſelf; I ſay, he hath no ground ſufficient to be of it. Object.

Suppoſing the greateſt part of what you ſay to be true, (for I ſee not how a bare conſideration even of theſe Doctrines will ſerve to prove them to come from God's Revelation) it might prove the Chriſtian Religion againſt *Pagans*, but for yours againſt *Proteſtants*, I can draw out of it no Argument; which if upon your explanation, it appears not to be through the default of the *Lymbeck* (which I expect) then the better I think of you, the worſe I ſhall think of your cauſe, which would have miniſtred to ſo ſharp an Inquirer, better proofs, but that the old *Axiome* hindered it of, *Nihil dat quod non habet*: Theſe *Principles of Faith* you ſpeak of, are agreed on by both Parts; ſo, out of their Truth, and the impoſſibility of their being forged, all the other points cannot be proved, which have upon them no neceſſary dependence: and that your Religion is conformable to the *deepeſt Principles of Nature*, I am ſo far from ſeeing, that I conceive your own opinion of *Tranſubſtantiation* contradicts them almoſt all: Neither ſee I any ſuch *unſpeakableneſs* in the *contriving*, but that ordinary underſtandings by ſeveral degrees, in a long tract of many ignorant negligent ages, egged on by ambition, cloak'd over by hypocriſie, aſſiſted by falſe miracles, and maintained by tyranny, might eaſily both induce and eſtabliſh them; ſo that though we have hitherto differed in our premiſſes, yet we meet in the Concluſion, which is, that I have *no ſufficient ground to be of* your Religion. Reſp.

The Stateſman, who is truly informed of the Church, how far is really of Chriſt's Inſtitution, and what either pious men have added, or peradventure ambitious men encroach'd, if he doth not find a government of ſo high and exotick ſtrain, that neither man's wit dare to have attempted it, neither man's power could poſſibly have effected it; If he find not eminent helps, and no diſadvantage to the temporal government, I ſhall think there wants one ſtar in the heaven of the Church, to direct theſe Sages to Bethlehem. Object.

I anſwer now in the perſon of a *Stateſman*, (a part which but for this occaſion, I am ſure never to have acted) Thus, Reſp.

I find ſo much policy in your Church, for moſt part really, and always in *voto*, aimed at, although miſs'd, that of no body of men did ever *Ariſtotle's* ſaying appear to me truer, παρ' ἐνίοις, ἡ πολιτείας ἕνεκεν ὄρος ἐστὶ νόμων, ἵνα δεσπόται ὦσι τῶν πέλας, *Among ſome men it is the end of the Laws of their Commonwealth, to be maſters of their neighbours*; but I find nothing in the government, that ſhould prove it to proceed from a divine fountain: An Eccleſiaſtical Monarchy you have, ſo have alſo the *Turks*; the Pope pretends to a power of ending all Controverſies, ſo doth alſo their *Mufty*; and ſince *man's wit attempted* that, and *man's power effected* it, why it might not doe the ſame in the Weſt, it did in the Eaſt, (having the aid of ſome Tinſel-reaſons, and ſome not wholly averſe places of Scripture) I cannot conceive: And what *help* is by your Church given to *temporal government*, I ſee not, unleſs giving the Pope power in temporals, even to depoſe Kings, be the *helps* you mean: I know that ſome of your ſide are not concerned in this, but it is grown ſo general, that though it be as yet no neceſſary part of your Religion, it is like to be ſhortly; And truly throughout I find ſome things which *pious men have added*, many, which *ambitious men* have *encroach'd*, (though of your Church I could not be informed in this, who hath not decided the Queſtion) but nothing that you alone hold, inſtituted by Chriſt; and ſo to your *Bethlehem*, for *want* of a *ſtar*, I am not likely to travel.

Let every man conſider which is the fit way for himſelf, and what in other matters of that way he accounteth evidence, and if there be no intereſt in his ſoul to make him loath to believe, what in another matter of the like nature he would not ſtick at, or heavy to practiſe what he ſeeth clearly enough; I fear not his choice; but if God ſend him time and means to proſecute his ſearch any indifferent while, it is long ago known of what Religion he is to be of. Object.

I ſee yet no cauſe to think, that your Religion is that which will be choſen, though we agree about the State, in which every Inquirer's ſoul ought to be, and in which thoſe of few are; I ſee all parents labour to fix opinions into their Children before they come to an age fit to judge of any greater doubts, than what may happen at ſpan-counter, or cherry-pit; and they again ſeldome labour to ſet right, what Education hath ſwayed: Neither are they wrought upon onely by prejudice, but ſome becauſe of gain, like *Demetrius*, ὅτι ἐκ ταύτης τῆς ἐργασίας ἡ εὐπορία ἡμῖν ἐστὶν, *becauſe by this craft they have their goods*; ſome becauſe of temporal honour, like the *Phariſees*, ἵνα μὴ ἀποσυνάγωγοι γένωνται, *leſt they be caſt out of the Synagogue, loving the praiſe of men more than the praiſe of God*; ſome for fear, like the High Prieſts, ἀφίσονται οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, καὶ ἀροῦσιν ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἔθνος, *The* Romans *will come and take away both our Place and Nation*; Some becauſe of the contradiction in the true Doctrine to their vain or wicked deſires, and ſo, as ſome Diſciples ſaid, though ſomewhat upon another occaſion, they account it, σκληρὸς λόγος, *a hard ſaying*, (which made *Epictetus* ſay, τοῦ μαλακὸς οὐ δεῖ περιτρέπεσθαι ῥᾳδίως, ὅταν δὲ τύχῃ ἀγωνίσῃ λαβεῖν,) indeed moſt Chriſtians, who oppoſe any of Chriſt's Commands, either for ſome of theſe reaſons, dare not enquire whether Chriſt hath commanded them, φοβοῦνται ἐρωτῆσαι περὶ τοῦ ῥήματος τούτου, or enquiring, find, but confeſs it not, like thoſe I ſpoke of before, who ὀλίγευται μὴ οὐκ ὁμολόγωσι· As *Epictetus* therefore ſaith, that we ſhould enquire of God, who is our guide, as Travellers do of them they meet, οὐκ ἔχοντες ὄρεξιν πρὸς τὴν δεξιὰν μᾶλλον φέρειν ἢ τὴν ἀριστερὰν, *having no deſire to turn rather to the right hand than to the left*; or again, as we enquire of our eyes concerning what is to be ſeen, ὃ παραναλίσκεις αὐτοῖς, ἵνα τοῦτο μᾶλλον ἡμῖν δηλώσωσιν· *not perſwading them to ſhew us* one thing *rather* than another; ſo ſay I, ought we to go to reaſon to find God's will, indifferent, which is Truth, or elſe we are likely very lazily to ſeek what we are unwilling to find; and a probable argument for what we deſire, will ſeem a Demonſtration, and a Demonſtration againſt it, ſcarce a probable Argument. This I inſiſt upon the more, becauſe I think we have more cauſe to put you in mind of this, than you us, being too little practiſed on both parts, but not moſt by yours, whereof the greateſt part commonly arrives not ſo far, as at the fault of not ſeeking as they ſhould, becauſe commonly they have not leave given them to ſeek at all: for beſides thoſe who neglect to ſeek

and may, no Bible being allowed by you to moſt, as no Smith was ſuffered by the *Philiſtines* in *Iſrael*, they fearing leſt the *Hebrews* ſhould make them ſwords and ſpears, and you leſt they ſhould make out of it, Arguments to perſwade them to revolt from you; It is no wonder if your Church, be like the Congregation in the *Acts*, ἐκκλησία συγκεχυμένη καὶ οἱ πλείους οὐκ ἤδεισαν τίνος ἕνεκεν συνεληλύθεισαν, *the moſt part know not why they are come together.* And truly if thus it were not, if all had liberty to ſeek Truth, and if all who ſought it, were indifferent in their ſeeking, and their judgments were abſolutely unbridled by their affections, and unſwayed by prejudice, I cannot perſwade my ſelf that ſo many could meet in thinking it fit to receive (for ſo they ſeem to me) ſuch impoſſible Doctrines upon ſuch improbable grounds, or to require a more than probable aſſent to but probable Doctrines, (allowing them to be ſuch) and ſhould not ſee, what is grounded upon them, (if not impoſſible) is at leaſt much more improbable, than the Motives are probable, which kind of Aſſent cannot be expected by God, who as he requires onely λατρείαν λογικὴν, a *reaſonable ſervice*, ſo alſo λογικὴν πίστιν, a *reaſonable faith.*

Here followeth the Third Part of this Diſcourſe, which is a Reply to ſuch Anſwers as you have been pleaſed to make to a little of that little, which I at firſt oppoſed.

Reſp. *SPeaking of the Church of* Rome, *as this day it is the true Church of God, I anſwer the doubter, ſhe neither hath, nor can have any errour which he need to fear, and be ſhie of.*

The which two limitations I add, for avoiding Queſtions impertinent unto our buſineſs.

The firſt, for thoſe which concern the connexion of the See of Rome *to the Univerſal.*

The latter, to avoid ſuch Queſtions as touch that point, whether the Church may err in any Philoſophical or other ſuch matter; which Queſtions are not ſo pertinent to our Matter.

Repl. Meaning by the *true Church* a company of men, which hold all (and no more) that Chriſt taught (for other interpretation, I believe, you will not give it) then there is no queſtion, but that not onely it hath no dangerous errour, but none at all; but that yours is ſuch, remains unproved, and I believe, *manet æternúmque manebit.* For upon examination, I doubt not, it will appear, that as I have read of a Cohort of *Perſians*, which they called σπεῖραν ἀθάνατον, the *Immortal Cohort*, which all died in one battel; ſo your infallible Church will be found to abound in errours, and to belie equally her title, being troubled her ſelf, with what ſhe undertakes to ſecure others from, like the Apothecary in *Lucian*, who undertaking to cure all men of the Cough, αὐτὸς μεταξὺ σπῶμαν καὶ βήσσης ἐφαίνετο, could himſelf ſcarce preſcribe his Medicine for coughing the while. Beſides, of what ſort ſoever the errour be, yet ſince the Condition of her Communion is, to profeſs a belief that ſhe hath none, ſuch a one as to them, who indeed believe ſo, would not be dangerous, yet to me, who cannot profeſs this but againſt my Conſcience, how ſlight a one ſoever, may be an occaſion of damnation: Again, as to me your anſwer appears falſe, ſo to thoſe of your own ſide it will appear heretical; to me it would give no ſatisfaction (though you had proved what you but affirm) becauſe I deſire to know an eternal, not a temporary Guide, whereas if in your Church there ſhould happen any Schiſm, your anſwer then would give me no means to reſolve my ſelf which part were the guide (that is, the true Church) without a new, and peradventure (by the way) an endleſs ſearch: To them it will give ſcandal, becauſe, firſt, you preſuppoſe that we muſt know the Church by the Doctrine, and the Doctrine by the Church; and ſecondly, you imply a poſſibility, that the Church of *Rome* is now but by accident (and may come not to be) the true Church, and ſo all their confidence built upon her, as the Directreſs of all Churches, and the eternal Admiral of God's Fleet, will appear to have a very fallible foundation: Beſides, in the cauſe of your Limitation, I find more reaſon to commend your Diſcretion, than your Ingenuity: for, for the firſt, if you had ſaid, that the Univerſal Church of Chriſt muſt always be connected to the particular one of *Rome*, which were to allow her Infallibility, you knew Antiquity to have ſaid much againſt you; and beſides, that this being not yet *de fide* among your ſelves (nor evident in it ſelf) could not ſerve for a foundation to the whole body of our faith; if you had abſolutely denied it, you knew, that you ſhould incur the diſpleaſure of the moſt prevailing part of your own men, and that then the main (and to the Ignorant, the onely viſible) ſign would be taken away. For the ſecond, if you had affirmed, that the Church could err in nothing, how ſlight ſoever, you would both have contradicted many of your own ſide, as *Stapleton* by name, and have aſſerted more than there were any colour of proof for, and would have wanted this diſtinction to retire to, if you were confuted in any particular; if you had reſtrained her Infallibility to things neceſſary, or weighty, or the like, then the queſtion would again have riſen, which are thoſe (for many errours, which we lay to her charge, concern not things indeed neceſſary, though ſhe add to the errour, that other, of thinking, that whatſoever ſhe holds, becomes neceſſary by her holding it) and then for all you have ſaid, the Doctrine of *Purgatory* might be falſe, and yet ſhe the Church, and that infallible, as far as by your Doctrine her Infallibility had need to be extended.

Reſp. *Neither do I remit the Queſtioner to Scripture for his ſatisfaction, although I hold Scripture a very ſufficient means to ſatisfie the man, who goeth to it with that preparation of underſtanding and will which is meet and required. Howſoever this I may anſwer for them who prove it out of Scripture, that becauſe they diſpute againſt them who admit of Scripture, and deny the authority of the Church, if they can convince it, they doe well, though they will not themſelves admit generally of a proof out of Scripture, as not able to prove every thing in* foro contentioſo.

Repl. If you hold Scripture to be ſo ſufficient a mean, I wonder, Sir, why you think not fit to remit me to it, unleſs you think, that you have ſeveral ſufficient ways to prove ſo evident a Truth by, or think me not to come with meet *preparation*: Indeed if that be (as among you it is counted) to come reſolved,

not

not to judge of what the *Roman* Church holds, by what the Scriptures ſay, but to believe, that they ſay whatſoever ſhe holds, then I confeſs, I come not with the Conditions required; but if it be to come deſirous to find the Truth, and to follow and profeſs it when I have found it, in ſpite of all temporal reſpects, which might either fright or allure me from ſo doing, then I ſuppoſe, that Charity (which *hopeth all things)* will encline you to believe, that I come as I ought to come, untill ſome evident reaſon perſwade you to the contrary: That the Scripture cannot prove every thing in *foro contentioſo* I believe, but all neceſſary Truths, I believe it can; for onely thoſe, which it can, are ſuch: I deny not, but that a contentious perſon may deny a thing to be proved, when his own Conſcience contradicts his words, but ſo he may Arguments drawn from any other ground as well as Scripture; ſo that if for that cauſe you refuſe to admit of proofs from thence, you might as well for the ſame, refuſe to admit of any by any other kind of Arguments: And certainly, if the Scriptures (I mean the plain places of it, cannot be a ſufficient ground for ſuch and ſuch a point, ſurely it cannot be a ſufficient ground to build a ground upon, as the Churches Infallibility, and therefore, though it ſeems you deſire ſo much that this be believed, that ſo it be, you care not upon what proof, yet a conſidering Proteſtant, who is not as hot to receive your Religion, as you are that he ſhould, may preſently ſay, when he is preſs'd by you with Scripture to this, Since this is a way of proof which your ſelves admit not of, an Argument from hence may bring me from my own Religion, but never to yours, becauſe it is a beam which that relies much upon, that by any other way, than the authority of the Church, no man can be ſufficiently ſure of the meaning of Scripture.

That they ſay, the Church is made infallible that we may have ſome guide, I think it very rational; for Nature hath given ever ſome ſtrong, and uncontrollable Principle in all Natures to guide the reſt. The Commonwealth hath a Governour not queſtionable, our Underſtanding hath Principles which ſhe cannot judge, but by them judgeth of all other verities. If there ſhould not be ſome Principle in the Church, it were the onely maimed thing God had created, and maimed in its Principal part, in the very head. And if there be ſuch a Principle, the whole Church is Infallible by that, as the whole man ſeeth by his eyes, toucheth by his hands. Reſp.

Chriſt is our unqueſtionable, and infallible Governour, and his Will the Principle by which we are guided, and the Scripture the place where this Will is contained, which if we endeavour to find there, we ſhall be excuſed, though we chance to miſs, and therefore want not your guide, (who either is not, or as hard to find as the way: and again, when he hath defined, the certain meaning of that definition, as hard to find as herſelf.) Neither is a company of men thus believing, *maimed in the head*, though having no other more uncontrollable Principle: If your guide were evident of her ſelf, as thoſe Principles are by which we judge all things elſe, then your Similitude would hold a little, whereas being neither knowable in her ſelf, nor provable by ought elſe, what you have ſaid, onely ſhews, what an ill match is made, when Wit is ſet againſt Truth. *Repl.*

It is ſufficient for a Child to believe his Parents, for a Clown to believe his Preacher, about the Churches Infallibility: For Faith is given to mankind, to be a means of believing, and living like a Chriſtian, and ſo he hath this ſecond, it is not much matter in what terms he be with the firſt. Reſp.

To what you ſay, I anſwer, that I confeſs that it is not poſſible that without particular Revelations, or Inſpirations, the ignorant, even of the Orthodox party, ſhould receive their Religion upon very ſtrong grounds, (which makes me wonder, that even from them you ſhould exact an aſſent of a higher nature, and a much greater certainty, than can be miniſtred to them by any arguments which they are capable of) yet if they believe what they receive, with an intention of obedience to God, and ſuppoſal that their opinions are his Revelations, and uſe thoſe means which they in their Conſcience think beſt to examine whether they be or no, (though it be, when they find themſelves unable to ſearch, by truſting others whom they count fitteſt to be truſted) I believe they are in a very ſaveable eſtate, though they be far from having of the Truth of their Tenets any Infallible certainty; and the ſame I think of thoſe which are in errour; for ſince you cannot deny, but that a Child, or a Clown, with the ſame aptneſs to follow God's will, may be taught by his Parents, or his Preacher, that what God forbids, he commands, that Chriſt's Vicar, is Antichriſt, or the Church, *Babylon*, and ſcarce teacheth any truth, though it could not teach the leaſt errour; why ſhould ſuch a one be damned for the misfortune of having had heretical Parents, or a deceiving Preacher? For no more, it ſeems, is required of ſuch, than to give his belief to thoſe; (And indeed the ſame reaſon extended, will excuſe him, who though learned, impartially aimeth at God's will and miſſeth it) for though you ſeem to inſinuate, by the cauſe you give of what you ſay, that ſo men believe and doe what they hear God command, he careth not upon what grounds, yet I, who know that God hath no other gain by our ſo doing, than that in it we ſacrifice to him our ſouls and affections, cannot believe, but that they ſhall be accepted, who give him that which he moſt cares for, and obey him formally, though they diſobey him materially, God more conſidering and valuing the Heart than the Head, the end than the actions, and the fountain than the ſtreams; And truly elſe he who through ſtupidity or impotence abſtained from any vice, or through negligence or prejudice miſs'd ſome errour, would be as well accepted of by God, as he that by a care of his ways and of obedience to him who ſhould rule them, did avoid the firſt, and by a ſtudious ſearch, the ſecond. *Repl.*

I cannot part from this Theme without one conſideration more, and that is, that if ſo Fallible a Directour as you ſpeak of, may be cauſe enough of aſſent to one Truth, why may they not be ſo to another, and why ſhall not the belief of our ignorants, upon their teſtimony, that the Scripture is the Word of God, be as well founded, as that of yours to the Infallibility of the Church upon the ſame? And yet it is daily objected to us, that this belief of ours is not ſurely enough founded, ſince not received from their Church, although the unlearned among us receive it from their Parents and Preachers, and the learned from Tradition; as from the firſt of thoſe your unlearned do, and from the ſecond of which, your unlearned pretend they do receive the authority, and infallibility of the Church it ſelf: Although we be ſo much more reaſonable than you, that we require them not to be ſo ſure upon it, as they are of what they know by ſenſe, but onely to give them ſo much credit, that they may give up their hearts to obedience.

Resp. *Neither do I remit him to a general and constant Tradition, as if himself should climb up every age by learned Writers, and find it in every one. I take it to be impossible. Testimonies one may find in many ages, but such as will demonstrate and convince a full Tradition I much doubt: Neither do I find by experience, that who will draw a man by a rope or chain, giveth him the whole rope or chain into his hands, but onely one end of it, unto which if he cleave hard, he shall be drawn which way the rope is carried. Tradition is a long chain, every generation or delivery from Father to Son being a link in it,* &c.

Repl. Of this opinion I was wholly before, First upon my own small observation (which also perswaded me, that no controverted opinions had so much colour for such a Tradition out of antiquity, as some which now are by both parts condemned) and after, by consideration of what hath been so temperately, learnedly and judiciously written by our Protestant *Perron*, *D' Aille*; But though I think that nothing is wholly provable by sufficient testimonies of the first ages, to have had Primary and general Tradition, (except the undoubted books of Scripture, or what is so plainly there, that it is not controverted between you and us) yet the Negative is easie to be proved, because any one known person dissenting, and yet then accounted a learned and pious Catholick, shews the Tradition not to have been general, and that the Church of this Age differs from that of those times, if it Anathematize now, for what then was either approved of, or at least thought not so horrid but it might be born with. And again, though we agree upon what will not serve to convince a full Tradition, yet we disagree about what will serve; for allowing there were any controverted opinions delivered, with equal Tradition to the Scripture (which I deny to have been, but would receive, if it so appeared) yet sure you begin at the wrong end, in the examination of what those are, which ought to be done, by considering the testimonies of the first ages, and not of the last; for in your own similitude of a rope, though to help me to climb by it, you put but one end into my hands, yet you must shew me, that the other end is somewhere fastned, or else, for ought I know, instead of getting up by it, I may onely get a fall, and this fastning appears not to me, till I be shewed some more certain connexion between the Opinions of this Age, and those of the Apostolick times, than yet you have done, or till you have answered those Arguments, by which, as I perswade my self, I have made it appear, that it cannot be done.

Resp. *As for the two places concerning the Pope's and Council's Infallibility, it is not to my purpose to meddle of them, because of one side, the way I have begun beareth no need of those discourses, and on the other, I should engage my self in Quarrels between Catholick and Catholick, obscure the matter I have taken in hand, and profit nothing in my hearers, more than to be judged, peradventure, to have more learning, than wisedom to govern it withall.*

Repl. With your favour, Sir, these places concern, not onely questions between your selves, but between you and us; for I thought you had all agreed (though I knew you had not always done so, and though it seems by your declining to speak about it, that you do not yet) that general Councils, confirmed by the Pope, are infallible, and the Doctrines defined by them, are to be believed *de fide*, which if you be not, then the Glew, which it is so bragged you have, to keep you still at Unity, is dissolved; and if you be, then you should both have answered upon what grounds you are so, and have destroyed my Objections against the possibility of certainly knowing when it is, that these (which used to be called the Church) have defined: finding therefore *Altum Silentium*, where there was so much cause of speaking, makes me believe, that the cause why you have not answered, is onely because you could not, and then you have a ready Apology, that *Nemo tenetur ad impossibilia*; which I believe the rather, because I know, that to so clear a judgment as yours, that place of Scripture, *When two or three are gathered together*, &c. which is so often press'd for the Infallibility of Councils, must appear to make as much for the Synod of *Dort*, as for the Council of *Trent*; and to so great a learning as yours, it cannot be unknown how few (if any) of the Ancients have asserted their Infallibility, and how many, both of the Ancients, and your Moderns, have denied it; I am confirmed in this belief too, because you, I know, would never have accepted that as a sufficient excuse from me, if I had avoided to answer an Argument so, because Protestants are not agreed upon the point, if you had thought it such, as that they ought to have been agreed upon it, and truly this is as great and considerable a question, as any among us.

Resp. *As for the place of* Fevardentius, *which alloweth many Fathers to have fallen into errours, I think it will not trouble him who is acquainted with the course of this present Church, wherein divers, who be thought great Divines, fall into errours, for which their Books are sometimes hindred from the print, sometimes recalled, or some leaves commanded to be pasted up; the reason is, the multiplicity of Catholick Doctrine which doth not oblige a man to the knowledge of every part, but to the prompt subjection to the instruction of the Church; wherefore many men may hold false Doctrine inculpably, not knowing it to be such, even now after the learned labours of so many that have strived to open and facilitate by Method, what is true, and what is false; much more in the Fathers times, when there was great want of so many Compilers as these latter Ages have produced.*

Repl. First, What *Fevardentius* confesseth, proves plainly that, for which I intended it, which was, the ridiculousness of proving their Doctrine to be true, by being conformable to that of the Fathers, and yet making themselves Judges of those Judges they appeal to, and confessing, that many of them erred in many points, which if they did, they might as well doe the same in those about which we differ, although they agreed with you, and dissented from us.

Secondly, What both he confesseth, and you confess with him, disproves that way of knowing Divine Truths which you propose, for neither the Doctours of the ancient Church (who were sure more likely to know what was then taken for Tradition, than any late Compilers) nor of the Modern, who had a mind to deliver truth, and trac'd and followed your way of finding it, could err in points of faith, if *Qui docet ut didicit, he that teacheth as he hath been taught*, must still be in the right; for publick Tradition, no learned man, at least, can be ignorant, not any man (say you) of what he was taught when a Child, as the substance of his hopes for all eternity, and so cannot in reason have his Books either forbidden or *pasted up*, for delivering any thing contrary to it.

Thirdly,

Secondly, Who are theſe Cenſors who forbid and *puſte up* Books? certainly not the Univerſal Church, nor yet the Repreſentative; the latter is not always in being, nor when it is, at leiſure to conſider and judge all Authours; and of the firſt theſe Authours are a part; if then they be fallible, (as they muſt be, if they be not the Church) why may not they err, and the Martyr-books ſpeak truth, which yet will eaſily by this means be kept from Poſterity, if thoſe in the Dictatory Office diſſent from it, as they will be ſure to do, if the opinion contradict never ſo little the power or greatneſs of the Pope, upon whoſe favour theſe Oecumenical Correctours muſt depend, or they not long remain in their places: and yet you expect that your adverſary ſhould produce ſucceſſion of their opinions in all ages, though nothing be let paſs but what a few pleaſe, and though when in time all of you are agreed (as you will ſoon be, or appear to be, if one ſide appear to be gag'd) then this conſent, though thus brought about, becomes the conſent of the Church, and a very notable Motive.

And ſince you ſay, that what all are bound to, is onely a prompt ſubjection to the Church, why leave you it ſo in doubt, what is the Church, as if men were tyed to be ſubject, but muſt not know to what; you ſay indeed, that the adherers to the Church of *Rome* are now the Church, but what they may be, you will not plainly declare; So that if a Schiſm among them ſhould happen, we are all as far to ſeek as if you had been wholly ſilent, for ſince the infallibility lies not in the particular Church of *Rome*, and conſequently the adhering to her is not ever a ſufficient note of the Church, (as you will not ſay) nor is it among your ſelves *de fide*, ſince the Univerſal Church (whatſoever ſhe be) can never define any thing, and of the authority of the definitions of the Repreſentative, and of what conſtitutes both her and her Decrees, you refuſe to ſpeak, what remains there, to which this prompt ſubjection is to be the onely everlaſting Note of the true Church, but onely the Truth whenſoever ſhe appears? Thus as the Prieſts of *Apollo* (therefore peradventure called *Loxias*) uſed to ſpread lies, and ſecure his reputation, the firſt by the antiquity, and the ſecond by the darkneſs of his Oracles, ſo doth your Religion gain upon many men, and ſecure her ſelf from many objections, by the manifold acceptions, and conſequently, difficulty of this term *Church*; For whatſoever is ſaid in Scripture concerning her being free from *all ſpot*, or *prevailing againſt the gates of Hell*, or their danger who reſiſt her, the firſt meant (as I believe, and the place denies not by any circumſtance) of the Church Triumphant, the ſecond of the Church of the Elect, and the third, of the Profeſſours of Chriſtianity in general, or at moſt of thoſe who are in all neceſſary points Orthodox among them; That they without ſufficient proof reſolve to be ſpoken of the Church in their ſenſe they have fancied; that is, ſome ever known body of Chriſtians which muſt be ſtill guide to the reſt, and then claim to be that, becauſe no other (all elſe being more ingenuous) claims it beſides themſelves; whereas, if (conſidering that ἀρχὴ παιδεύσεως ἡ περὶ ὀνομάτων ἐπίσκεψις, and the Oraculous truth of my great Lord *Bacon*'s obſervation, that unleſs men in the beginning of their diſputes agree about the meaning of their terms, they muſt end about words, where they ought to have begun) they had marked what other ſenſe theſe words were capable of, (for if it will here bear another, then this cannot hence be concluded but by leave) they would then ſoon have ſeen the weakneſs of their building, by the ſlightneſs of their foundation. Again, they prevail much by working upon mens aſſents, by the means of their modeſties, and preſs it to be an intolerable pride to oppoſe their opinions to the conſent of the Catholick Church; whereas, if it be weighed how ſmall a part of it they mean by that word, and yet of them how many follow blindly the decrees of one, and how ſoon thoſe prevail againſt that few, not backed by any power, who do not, it will then appear, that not onely other Churches, but even a *John* or a *Thomas* have as much reaſon to be lead by their own underſtandings, as by the opinions and decrees of an *Urbane* or a *Gregory*, upon which that conſent is ſo often founded; And as they make their advantage of this word in their offenſive wars, ſo do they in their defenſive, for when they are preſs'd unto the abſurdity of their Tenets, then (though indeed they be general) yet they pretend, that they are the opinions but of private, though many men, and not of the Church; and again, when any Fathers (who yet ſometimes they ſay are wholly theirs) are ſhewed to contradict ſome of their Doctrine ſo plainly, that none of thoſe ſubterfuges, which in one of their expurgatory Indexes, they confeſs they often uſe, will ſerve to palliate it; then they ſtrive to ſcape by anſwering, that the Church had not then defined it; whereas if it be examined, how far they conſent about what is the Church, and what are her Definitions (whereof they are not yet agreed, for ſome ſay, ſhe hath defined, what, others ſay, ſhe hath not) this onely will be certainly found, that it never can be certainly found, what are her opinions of any point, or when ſhe hath declared her ſelf: As (beſides many other Arguments, ſome preſs'd by my ſelf, and others, by other Pens more fit to treat of ſo weighty a matter:) appears by your refuſing to leave your *Latibula*; and declare plainly your opinion concerning it, which if you ſaw defenſible, and you were all agreed about it, you would quickly have done, and not incurred the reprehenſion of that Axiome, which teacheth, that *Doloſus verſatur in generalibus*, which makes me think, that if this were generally enough mark'd, you would no longer be able to dazle any man's eyes with the ſplendid title of Sons to the Catholick Church, as *Alexander* hoped to do thoſe of the *Barbarians*, with ſtyling himſelf Παῖς Διὸς, the Son of *Jupiter*, although indeed he was ſo much the more moderate than the ſecond, as never to deny, that any other could be Son to the ſame Father, whereas you will not allow, that any may have intereſt in your Mother beſide your ſelves.

To conclude this Paragraph, give me leave to ask one queſtion, and that is, how your ſaying, that Truth is more eaſie to find now than in the Fathers times, will agree, either with the way which you ſay, is the onely Catholick one to find Truth by (for ſure ſuch a Tradition was always equally eaſie to find, and if the firſt ages had erred in it, we muſt of neceſſity, following your advice, have followed their errour too) or with the ſaying of ſo many of your ſide, that if I ſhould reckon them up, I ſhould make a Catalogue of Authours, equal to thoſe of *Photius*, or *Geſner*, or *Poſſevine*, who all joyn, that Truth was moſt likely to be moſt certainly known that time, which was, in *Campian*'s words, *Chriſto proprior, ab hac lite remotior, nearer to Chriſt*, and conſequently to Tradition, and to which, for that cauſe, all think fit to appeal againſt us, or with that cuſtome of your Church, which ſuffers none to take

take Orders before they have vowed to interpret Scriptures according to the Fathers, which if men now-adays be more likely to find the Truth, than at that time they were (as they muſt be, if Truth in this age be more eaſie to be found, whether through greater abundance of Compilers, or what elſe ſoever) then this Vow is as much, as if they had vowed to leave the beſt way of Interpretation and teaching, to follow the worſt.

Reſp. *As for the two points, he ſaith, avert him from Catholick Doctrine, I am miſtaken, if he be not miſtaken in both. The firſt is, that the Catholicks do damn all who are not in the Union of their Church. He thinks the ſentence hard, yet I think he will not deny me this, that if any Church does not ſay ſo, it cannot be the true Church. For call the Church what you will; the Congregation of the Elect, the Congregation of the Faithfull, the Congregation of Saints, or Juſt; call it, I ſay, or define it what you will, doth it not clearly follow, that whoſoever is out of the Church cannot be ſaved, for he ſhall not be the Elect, Juſt, Faithfull,* &c. *without which there is no ſalvation. How then can any Church maintain theſe two Propoſitions, I am the true Church, and yet one may be ſaved without being in me?*

Repl. This is, by your favour, a mere Paralogiſme; for though thoſe who define the Church by qualities, which both Parts agree, to be the conditional Keys to the Kingdom of Heaven, muſt needs affirm, that none out of the Church can be ſaved, yet what is this to them, who mean by the Church, the Company of the Orthodox in all points, and by them your ſelves, out of which (allowing that there be ſuch a one, which I doubt of, and that to be yours) I ſhall believe, that ſome may be ſaved, till I ſee ſome more cauſe to think all errour in Religion always damnable, which it is plain, by what after you ſay, that you think not your ſelf, and the Church taken in this ſenſe, which is your ſenſe, may maintain both Propoſitions; or to ſhew you, how much, what you ſay, would make againſt your ſelf, thus I argue; The true Church muſt hold that none can be ſaved out of her; but your Church denies not, but that ſome out of her may be ſaved; therefore yours is not the Church: My *Major*, is included in your own ſaying, that thoſe two Propoſitions are not maintainable together: My *Minor*, though falſe, yet is alſo your confeſſion (where you ſay, that the Churches Propoſition is not ſo cruel as it ſeems, though the words be rough) and therefore ſo ought you to make my concluſion too: Beſides, thoſe who exclude all from Salvation, who are out of the Church in the other ſenſe, meaning by it the Elect, as they are not like them in the wrong, ſo they are not occaſion of much harm, like them, who ſtyling the Church, a company of men of ſuch a belief, and under ſuch a government, affirm an impoſſibility of being ſaved out of it; for they giving no viſible ſign of who is in the Church (for who can know the Elect, but the Electer) cauſe no want of Charity, nor frequency of War, and Perſecutions by it, as the others do, who having made firſt a viſible partition, leſt thoſe who are out of it, may draw others out too, they ſend them out of the world by way of prevention.

Reſp. *But peradventure he is ſcandalized, that the Catholick Church requireth actual Communion external with her, which he thinketh may in ſome caſe be wanting without detriment of Salvation. But how would he have the Church ſpeak, which ſpeaketh in common, but abſtracting from ſuch particular caſes as may change wholly the Nature of the Queſtion?*

Repl. I am ſcandalized, not becauſe you require to Salvation joining with you in Communion, but becauſe alſo you require joining with you in opinions; and if it were onely this, yet am not I any whit ſatisfied with what you ſay for it, for with the true Church, that is, the Company of true believers, in points any way material (or rather the trueſt) I conceive it not damnation ſometimes not to communicate: For if they have any never ſo ſlight errours, and which appear ſo to me, which yet they will force me to ſubſcribe to, if I communicate with them, my aſſent would be damnable; or if they require the ſame ſubſcription to ſome truths, which yet after my real indeavours in inquiry, appear errours to me, I doubt not but my refuſal is no way damnable: Neither can I abſolve your Church concerning this her ſaying, for your reaſon, becauſe ſhe ſpeaks in general, wholly abſtracting from particulars, which change the nature of the Queſtion; for why doth ſhe ſo, why doth ſhe not expreſs her exceptions, or at leaſt tell us, that the rule is not ſo general, but that it will bear ſome, and not make men (who know not that ſhe intends to reſtrain at all, what ſhe ſo abſolutely pronounceth, and who will find no cauſe to take your bare word for her intentions) many times, at leaſt to hate them as God's enemies, whom he loves as his friends, and believe them to fry in Hell, who ſhine in Heaven? Howſoever if ſhe uſe to expreſs her ſelf in rougher words than her meaning is, how apt may ſhe be to be miſtaken in ſeveral of her reſolutions; and conſequently, how eaſie is it for ſome age to have miſunderſtood the paſt, and deceive the following? Neither do I like your example, becauſe that is not to differ from the Church, but to miſtake her meaning; though even he, who ſhould deny that there were three Gods, if he thought that by the Trinity your Church ſo meant, muſt conſequently think her not infallible, and ſo by your grounds be conſequently a Heretick.

Reſp. *The current of Catholick Doctours, that no man ſhall be damned for infidelity, but he who doth wilfully misbelieve, and that to doe ſo, it is required that Faith be ſufficiently propoſed unto him, and what is to be ſufficiently propoſed, is not determined amongſt them. There wanteth not Divines who teach, that even* ignorantia affectata, *doth excuſe from Hereſie. On the other ſide it is moſt certain, that no man is damned for not profeſſing, what he is not damned for not believing. Wherefore, profeſſion being that which engrafteth a man exteriourly in the Church, according unto the ordinary opinions of the Catholicks, it followeth, that no man is condemned for not being of the Church, who is not for infidelity, for which it is a very uncertain caſe who be damned, and who be not.*

Repl. As the King of *Spain*, after long calling the *Hollanders* Rebels, at laſt for his own ſake deſcended to treat with them as free States; ſo thoſe of your Religion, when they hope to gain a Proſelyte, thunder out to him crudely, and without any of theſe Mollifications which you now uſe, that *extra Eccleſiam Romanam nulla eſt ſalus*, there is no ſalvation out of the Roman Church. And Maſter *Knot* peremptorily avers, that no Catholick of an entire fame ever taught, that a Proteſtant ſo dying could be ſaved; yet when they are preſs'd with the conſequences, they can (as it ſeems) vouchſafe to give us better words, and find μαλάγματα enough to ſoften this opinion, though ſuch as bring them more diſadvantage in other

conſide-

conſiderations, than help in this. For firſt, as before it ſeemed that you are not fully agreed either about the authority of the Councils, or what conſtitutes the Church, (by your avoiding to ſpeak concerning it) ſo now it ſeems, that neither are you reſolved of what conſtitutes an Heretick; and then what remains there for you to know, if what you account infallible, and what damnable, be yet both uncertain to you?

Secondly, Since you confeſs none to be a Heretick, but he to whom the truth is ſufficiently propoſed, and when that is, you are not reſolved; what a more than *Sythian* Barbarouſneſs is it, to make a coal of a Chriſtian, onely upon ſuſpicion of Hereſie? eſpecially ſince the *Pagans* themſelves had Chriſtian Charity enough to perſwade them, that it was much better that a guilty perſon ſhould eſcape, than an innocent be puniſhed: much more ſhould you rather ſuffer the tares to grow, than venture to pluck up the corn with it, and believe the beſt, when the truth lies hid in a place ſo hard to ſearch into, as is the heart of man, into which (as none entered the *Sanctum Sanctorum* but the High Prieſt) God onely can have admittance.

Reſp. *The other point was, of putting Hereticks to death, which I think he underſtandeth to be done vindicatively, not medicinally, I mean, impoſed as a puniſhment, and not in way to prevent miſchief, and oppreſs it in the head.*

Repl. I ſuppoſe it ſmall ſatisfaction to a poor man, carried to the ſtake for his Conſcience, to know by which member of a diſtinction he is put to death; and that this as little excuſeth you, as it ſatisfies them, I hope to ſhew before we have ended the conſideration of this preſent Paragraph.

Reſp. *If the* Circumcellians *were the firſt, that is ancient enough for the juſtification of the fact; although for Baniſhment, which alſo he ſeemeth to reprehend, we know the firſt that could ſuffer it, did ſuffer it,* Arius *I mean, by the hand of* Conſtantine, *whom he praiſeth for a ſpeech he uttered before he knew the conſequence of the danger, and ſeemeth to reprehend for his after and better wits.*

Repl. I wiſh to you what *Eraſmus* wiſh'd to *Auguſtinus Steuckius*, which is, that you were but equally *in probando diligens*, as you are *in aſſeverando fortis*: For how unlikely is it that we ſhould give you credit without proof, onely ἀποδεῖξιν φέρειν τὸ ἀρχαῖον, that the antiquity of a thing, which began ſo long after Chriſt's Apoſtles were all dead, is enough to prove it lawfull: Howſoever it would at moſt but prove it lawfull, to put ſuch Hereticks to death, as force men to doe ſo in their own defence; for ſuch were they: Beſides, I object not onely againſt this cuſtome, the not being ancient, (for I confeſs there might have been before a power to doe ſo too, though not uſed to the uttermoſt, though in likelihood what perſwaded you to uſe it, would have perſwaded them to the ſame, if they had thought they had it) but as being alſo condemned by *Hilary*, and *Athanaſius*, and other Orthodox: For though ſome puniſhment of a leſs degree were inflicted upon others too by their own ſide, (as you truly inſtance) when their power prevailed; yet *Conſtantine* ſays, not onely in an Edict for liberty of opinions, (which he, who was then Pope, never appeared to ſtomach, as his ſucceſſour, undoubtedly would now doe the like) μηδεὶς τὸν ἕτερον παρενοχλεῖτω, ἕκαστος ὅπερ ἡ ψυχὴ βούλεται τοῦτο καὶ πραττέτω, *let no man trouble another, but let every one doe as his own ſoul will:* but alſo gives this concluding reaſon againſt you for it, ἄλλο γὰρ ἑκὼν τὸν ὑπὲρ ἀθανασίας ἆθλον ἐκκοῖλως ἐπαναιρεῖσθαι, ἄλλο τὸ μετὰ ποινῆς ἐπαναγκάζειν· *For it is one thing willingly to take upon them this combat for immortality, and another to force them to it with puniſhment*; and ſo in whatſoever he did contrary to this in any caſe, wherein this reaſon held, his words condemn his action: And whereas you ſay, that when *Conſtantine* made ſo ſlight of the queſtion between *Arius* and *Alexander*, it was, becauſe he knew not the conſequence of the danger; I ſhall deſire to know of you whether you muſt not confeſs, that there is now no King of your Religion ſo ill inſtructed in it, (though none of them be never ſo learned, or curious as *Conſtantine* was) who, if any man in his Dominion ſhould ariſe, denying *Tranſubſtantiation*, would not preſently know the danger of the conſequence, and reſolve him for an Heretick, and to the ſtake inſtantly, and not ſpeak againſt his opinion onely as impertinent, and *de lana caprina*, and περὶ ὄνου σκιᾶς· And if this had been as reſolved a thing then among Chriſtians, to have come from Tradition, as Tranſubſtantiation is now amongſt Papiſts, he would neceſſarily as ſoon have diſcovered it too: Howſoever I believe his after-wits to have been his worſer wits, in puniſhing, though not in condemning of *Arius*, and to me it yet ſeems (for to be ſure, not to ſpeak Heretically, I will not ſpeak obſtinately) that to have laboured in ſtopping of diſputes on both parts, and tying them to Scripture Phraſes, and to ſpeak of God onely in the Word of God, had been at leaſt in reſpect of Unity, not a worſe way, than to have given an example to what after followed, I mean, the frequent explication (with *Anathema* to boot) of inexplicable myſteries; Neither would then ſo many queſtions have ſo long troubled the Church, which for their ſlightneſs were unworthy ever to exerciſe the Schools; But for that or any other mere errour, as it may be, for ought any one knows, unlawfull in any to puniſh at all, I by no means like not to put to death, for the ſame ſeems to me it ſelf ἁμαρτία ἁμαρτῶν πολὺ καὶ ὑπερβολήν, *a ſin above meaſure ſinfull*, though even the act of it proceeded from an opinion of doing God ſome ſervice, and that opinion from a mere errour too, then I conceive but a material no formal ſin for the ſame cauſe, and ſo, neither this material Murtherer, nor that material Heretick, be guilty before God, who onely can diſtinguiſh, and to whom it is fit to be left. Howſoever the long doubt of ſome, and oppoſal of other Orthodox to this courſe, and that ariſing not from their Policy or Compaſſion, but their Conſcience, not as thinking it unprofitable or unfit, but unlawfull, ſhews, that there was then no Tradition that the Apoſtles taught it to be lawfull ſo to uſe Hereticks, upon which onely, all the Infallibility, which you claim for any belief or cuſtome of your Church, is founded.

Reſp. *Saint* Auſtine *juſtifieth ſuch proceedings againſt Hereticks.*

Repl. Truly for putting them to death (unleſs when they firſt aſſaulted, which makes a wide difference, for then it was not done as to Hereticks, but as to *Aſſaſſines*, from whom Nature teaches us to defend our ſelves, and conſequently to re-offend them whenſoever Religion bars it not, experience ſhewing us the danger of merely defending, to be near to that too, of not doing it at all) I know not that ever he did, nor do I believe it: That ſome degree of puniſhment ſhould be inflicted upon them, I confeſs he at laſt conſented, but chiefly to force them to come and ſee what the Church did, (whoſe actions the Hereticks impudently belied; as if they ſet pictures upon the altar, and did what you both doe and de-

fend, and they did not, *i. e.* denied it.) Howſoever we have Saint *Auſtine* againſt Saint *Auſtine*, and not onely his authority, but his reaſons, more valid by much than that, when he ſaith, that ſuch oppreſſions would make them think themſelves *vi victos, non veritate convictos, overcome by force, not convicted by truth*, and conſequently diſlikes it, *ne fictos Catholicos habeamus, quos apertos Hæreticos novimus*, leſt they become from *open Hereticks*, but *feigned Catholicks*: Reaſons, which (though theſe be not all we have) in my opinion it was as impoſſible for him reaſonably to anſwer when he was living, as it would be now for him to do it when he was dead. Beſides, as he uſeth theſe ſtrong arguments againſt it, ſo he is himſelf a ſtrong example againſt it; for the Church had loſt this her ſo notable Champion, if they then had been as ſevere to the *Manichees* as you are to us.

Reſp. *Saint* Gregory *uſeth the like againſt* Pagans, *(if I remember) and the Church laterly hath rather encreaſed, than decreaſed in the practice of it.*

Repl. I believe your memory deceives you in this, which you have cauſe to hope it doth, for elſe the Church of *Rome* differs from that of Saint *Gregory*'s times, it being now with her a judged caſe, that Infidels may not be compelled to the Faith, as I am told is ſhewed by *Valentia*, Saint *Thomas*, *Hartado*, and others, the Church having no power over thoſe who are out of it, and therefore they pleaſe to ſay, that (like them who among the *Romans* were onely *Cives ad onera*, liable to the taxes of Citizens, without Intereſt in their Privileges) Baptiſm hath made us of the Church enough to be liable to her Puniſhments, though not to be benefited by her Communion: Though indeed the ſame cauſe why you would have Hereticks put to death, for fear of harming others with their opinions, me-thinks ſhould extend to their puniſhment too, unleſs you believe us to be as bad as Malefactours, and not them, or that their opinions are ſo irrational as not likely to ſpread, and ours ſo reaſonable, that againſt them the ſword is the beſt ſhield, and therefore (as *Brennus* did his) you put that into the ſcales for want of weight, it being of giving Reaſons as the Poet ſaith it is of giving Requitals, *Iraſci quam donare vilius conſtat.*

Another reaſon which perſwades me that you are miſtaken in what you ſay of *Gregory*, (as this miſtake facilitates my belief, that you are ſo about *Auſtine*'s too) is that *Bede* tells, that ſome *Romaniſts*, having converted the King of *Kent*, that King did not yet force any to become Chriſtians, for (ſaith he) he had learned of theſe his Maſters, that the ſervice of Chriſt (WHICH REASON EXTENDS FARTHER THAN TO PAGANS) muſt be voluntary, and not forced; Now if theſe received what they taught from *Gregory*, as you often tell us) then either he did not as you often ſay, or thought that unlawfull which himſelf did; And howſoever this Cuſtome hath *encreaſed* ſince, is very unconſiderable; for unleſs it have its authority explicitely or implicitely from the Apoſtles, it can give none ſince, and unleſs it be proved to be well done at firſt, no continuance can give this, or any other action more juſtification than at firſt it had.

Reſp. Moſes *ſpeech I believe is miſtaken, the force of it being, that the baniſhment of Biſhops ſhewed his faith, becauſe the baniſhed were Catholicks, which ſhewed* Lucius *to be none.*

Repl. If *Moſes* had meant as you would have him, he ſhould not have ſaid, onely τῶν ἐπισκόπων, but τῶν ἐπισκόπων τῶν καθολικῶν, not indefinitely the baniſhing of Biſhops, but the baniſhing of Orthodox Biſhops; the leaving therefore of that out, wherein, according to you, the whole ſenſe of his Argument lay, ſeems to me plainly enough to ſhew, that he meant what they and you deny: eſpecially he adding (as you may ſee in *Sozomen*) their being puniſh'd by labour, as well as puniſhment, and then ſaying, ἃ πανταχῶς ὄντων ἀλλότρια χριστοῦ, καὶ τῶν ὀρθῶς περὶ θεοῦ δοξαζόντων, *which things are wholly abhorring from Chriſt, and all right Believers concerning God*, and in *Socrates*, δοῦλον γὰρ κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, *for God's ſervant ought not to fight*, for ſo he counted to puniſh.

Reſp. *But what can be ſaid, if the Church uſeth that for the prevention of a greater and more dangerous evil, which all politick Eſtates uſe for the remedies of leſs, and leſs dangerous evils, and are commended for it? For if Faith be the way to Salvation, and Hereſie be the bane of Faith; if Salvation the greateſt good, then the danger of a Country's being over-run with Hereſie, is the greateſt of dangers, greater than the multiplicity of Thieves, greater than the unſurety of the ways, greater than a Plague, or Invaſion; why then doth not reaſon force us to uſe means to prevent it, which the ſame reaſon and experience teacheth us to be moſt efficacious in this, and all other contagious and gangrening maladies of the Commonwealth. I hope reaſon it ſelf, and the zeal of the Authour to his own, and Country's Salvation, will ſupply my ſhortneſs in this point; for ſuppoſing a Church be aſſured ſhe is in the right, and that the doctrine preached by another, leadeth to damnation; I know not why* Caiaphas *his words ſhould not be prophetical in this caſe, and that truly it doth* expedire, *that* Unus moriatur pro populo, & non tota gens pereat.

Repl. I wiſh heartily you were as good a Caterer as a Cook, I mean, that you brought as good reaſons, as you dreſs artificially what you bring; For I find there is in your words a very notable δεινωσις, able to ſteal a man into your opinion, before he hath ask'd himſelf why; but if he ſtay to do ſo, then all your excellent embroidery will not keep him from diſcerning many bracks in your ſtuff: To prove which, I will bring many reaſons (beſides what I have taught already) by which it ſhall, I hope, appear, why thoſe, whom you call Hereticks, ſhould not be put to death, although Malefactours may, although even the lawfulneſs of that (ſince other puniſhments, which would not ſhorten their time of repentance, might peradventure ſerve to repreſs them) is not abſolutely certain.

Firſt, Malefactours plainly offend againſt their Conſciences; at leaſt think not themſelves bound by them to commit their villanies (neither pretend they otherwiſe) which they, whom you call Hereticks, either *bona fide* follow, or do for ought at leaſt you can know.

Secondly, What are Malefices, muſt be known before Malefactours, and Hereſies before Hereticks; now of the firſt, Mankind agrees, but of the ſecond but you onely, a ſmall part of Chriſtians, and yet you differ too about the ways of knowing them, and conſequently, whether ſome things be Hereſies or no (as for example, whether the Oath of Allegiance contain any) wherein ſince ſome of you are deceived, me-thinks it ſhould incline you to think it not impoſſible for you all to do ſo, in what you all agree to be ſuch.

Thirdly,

Thirdly, Malefactours are not, or ſhould not be puniſhed for ſuch, without a plain knowledge that ſuch they are; but although there were an impoſſibility of miſtaking what is Hereſie, yet there is no poſſibility of knowing who are Hereticks, the form of which is obſtinacy, a ſecret, and (to man) an undiſcoverable quality, whom he onely ſhould puniſh who onely knows.

Fourthly, Malefactours are certain to hurt others, whereas neither are Hereticks ſure to perſwade any, and if they do, yet they may hurt none, ſince who receives their belief *bona fide*, and through mere errour, is unharmed by it.

Fifthly, Whom they do harm, it muſt be through their own fault, and by their own conſent, whereas without either, the Malefactours are cauſe of much miſchief, even to the moſt guiltleſs.

Sixthly, Malefactours paſſing wholly unpuniſh'd, peradventure not put to death, would bring a certain deſtruction to the State, which temporal Magiſtrates are appointed to watch over, which yet in ſpeculative opinions is not concerned.

Seventhly, The puniſhment even by death, of Malefactours, brings not any temptation of ſinning upon them; the ſame to others is in all probability a cauſe to keep many from a careſull ſearch of God's Truth, (leſt they might find the puniſhable belief to be the true one) and from profeſſing it, when they think they have found it; both which are ſins of the firſt magnitude.

Eighthly, This courſe with Malefactours was not, for ought appears, ever thought unlawfull in the pureſt times of Chriſtianity, and was then in uſe; whereas towards errours in belief, it was diſallowed of them by the chief, and long before death was at all inflicted upon them, though they underſtood as well the danger of Hereſie, and were as careſull to preſerve their flocks from all danger by all lawfull ways, as any ſince.

Ninthly, It no way redounds to Chriſt's Glory, that Malefactours be unpuniſh'd, but it makes much for it, that his Army appears to conſiſt of Voluntiers, and not of Preſs'd men, that his Truth ſhould prevail by no humane force, but onely by the power of the firſt teacher, and the light of the Doctrine, which for us unbidden ſo to aſſiſt, is to think the Ark muſt fall, if we hold not forth our hands to hold it up, and takes from it the honour of ſubſiſting by the way, by which it took root, when (to borrow Saint *Chryſoſtome*'s words) οἱ ἀσθενεῖς ὑπὸ ἰσχυρῶν οὐκ ἐγένοντο, καὶ οἱ δώδεκα τῆς οἰκουμένης, *The weak were too hard for the ſtrong, and twelve for the World*, and that γυμνοὶ πρὸς ἐνόπλους ἀγωνίζοντο, They being *naked*, and their adverſaries *armed*.

Tenthly, That death is the moſt effectual way to ſuppreſs Malefactours, you ſay reaſon and experience ſhews, and it is generally agreed of; but in this caſe it ſeems even to your beſt men the worſt courſe, as appears by *Iburranes*'s reſolution concerning the *Hyperephanians*, by the 267 Page of grave and judicious Cardinal *D' Oſſat* his Letters, by the Epiſtle of Cardinal *Richelieu* to his King before a Book of Controverſie, and by *Eraſmus* his Teſtimony, who tells us, that a *Carmelite* having then this power in his hands, *Ubicunque ſævitiam exercuit* Carmelita, *ibi diceres fuiſſe factum Hereſeon ſementum*, whereſoever he exerciſed his cruelty, he ſeemed to have ſowed Hereſie. All which reaſons make me believe, that there is much difference between the ſtriving to deſtroy theſe two ſorts of men; and if there were not, yet for fore-touched reaſons, and others which I will touch at, I ſhould as ſoon think it unlawfull to put Malefactours to death, as lawfully to kill Hereticks. For indeed ſince ἄχμιον μίσει ὁ φονεὺς τοῦ θάνατος, it diſadvantageth what you would aid; to ſeem to believe, that truth, without other aſſiſtance, would not ſooner root out falſhood, than that it, that the Orthodox are not more likely to cure the ſeduced, than to be infected by them; and that there is no way to end the Hereſies, but by ending the Hereticks: And thus you run into three inconveniences;

Firſt, You put reaſonable ſcruples into conſidering mens minds, leſt as a *Greek* Oratour ſaith againſt *Ulyſſes* for ſtriking *Therſites*, τὸ μηδὲν ἔχειν ἐλέγχειν ὁμολογία τὸ πλήξαι, *It was a ſign he could not confute him, that he ſtruck him*; ſo, that it be want of arguments, which makes you fall to blows, and cauſe them to ſuſpect, that if you were not (peradventure for ſome better reaſons than appear to them) diffident of your cauſe, you would give your adverſaries leave to ſpeak as loud as them pleaſed, and not ſeek ſo ſuſpiciouſly to ſtop their mouths, whilſt they diſpute with you at as much odds, and upon terms of as much diſadvantage, as Saint *Paul* did with the *Grecian Jews*, συνεζήτει πρὸς τοὺς ἑλληνιστὰς, οἱ δὲ ἐπεχείρουν αὐτὸν ἀνελεῖν, *he diſputed againſt* them, *but they went about to ſlay him.*

Secondly, It deſtroys thoſe plauſible Arguments ſo often uſed, of Unity, and Tradition, and Multitude; for, firſt Uniformity may be induced by power, but *Unity* and Impunity can never be parted; all other agreement being but as a thief and a robbed perſon agreed, the one to take his purſe, and the other to give it again. Again, *Tradition* it lames as much, for how can any man tell, but that two parts claiming contrary Traditions, or one part claiming it upon falſe grounds, and the other denying it, the truth may not by this force have been over-born, when we receive not what men would have delivered Poſterity, but what Power would ſuffer them. Again, how ſhall we know but that the greater part of your *multitude* believes not as they profeſs; no man knowing his Neighbour to be of his mind; when it is ſo probable, that many may not think as they ſpeak, when it is not lawfull for all to ſpeak as they think.

Thirdly, By this way you are cauſes, that you ſuffer often where you have not the State on your ſide, as much as you inflict when you have; for though you will ſay that none ſhould puniſh but the Church, yet every divided company of Chriſtians, thinking themſelves to be that, (that is to be the orthodox) will uſe your own cuſtome to your harm, and you will be ſhot like the Eagle in *Æſope*, οἰκείοις πτεροῖς, with your *own feathers*; and ſo Truth whereſoever ſhe be (if all follow this way) will by force by many parties be oppoſed, and but by one propagated and defended; ſo that not onely in conſideration of Chriſtianity, but even of Policy, I miſlike this courſe, as being always wicked, and often hurtfull, and more often uneffectual: And for my part, I deſire ſo much that good be done for evil, that (though you be moſt fit of any to be ſo uſed, who uſe us ſo, where your power extends, and whoſe cruelty will extend with your acquiſition, if you make any, and you hold your ſelves, that *impendens periculum* is cauſe enough for a war) yet I heartily wiſh all laws againſt you repealed, and truſt, that diſarmed Truth

would ſerve to expell Falſhood, whereas now they being in force againſt you, give you the honour of a perſecution, and not being executed, give you the fear of one: It is truly ſaid, *Militia Chriſtiana eſt Hæreſes expellere*, but it needs this limitation, *ſed armis Chriſtianis*, that *Chriſtian warfare* employ onely *Chriſtian arms*, which are, good arguments, and good life; elſe if they uſe ſuch a courſe, as is more properly κατ' το δίκαιον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ πεπιθόων, and go to force that part of man, which is liable to no power but that of perſwaſion, (which if it do not beget a true and pious aſſent, in likelihood it will a damnable diſſimulation, and which, if Chriſt had meant for a prop for his Doctrine, he would as ſoon have at firſt made it a part of the foundation, and have charged his Apoſtles not to ſhake the duſt off their feet, but to draw their ſwords out of the ſcabbard at thoſe, who rejected what they taught) then it often (though ſometimes by reaſon of the different diſpoſitions which reign at ſeveral times among men, and may happen otherwiſe) miſſeth of the intended end, and works not often ſo much as upon mens Tongues, and never upon their Heads and Hearts: A great example of which happened not long ſince; *Calvin* with all his works ſince the time they were written, having ſcarce made ſo many Proteſtants in *France*, as I have credibly heard it reported, as the Maſſacre made in a Night, which act though I impute not to all thoſe of your Religion, for many of them I know did, and do miſlike it, yet it both had its fountain from the Pope's Legate, (and conſequently in all likelihood from the Pope, who gave God publick thanks for it) as one of his ſucceſſours confeſs'd to Cardinal *D' Oſſat*, Page 432, and it may be juſtified as well as any judicial proceeding, upon that reaſon which you give, why Hereſie may be ſtopped with the ſword, leſt they who are wrought upon by it, may work upon others.

To conclude, I ſhould be better contented with this courſe, if the opinions were infallibly errours, and infallibly damnable, and this were always an effectual way, (and no other could be found more mercifull) to ſtop their ſpreading; but ſince you have no infallible way of knowing the Church to be infallible in her definitions, and conſequently, that the contrary opinions are falſe; ſince you know not infallibly which is ſhe, (for you pretend but prudential Motives) ſince your knowledge, having defined, is likewiſe fallible, as depending upon many uncertain circumſtances; ſince not onely the matter of Hereſie is thus uncertain, but the form too, for you confeſs you doubt whether *Ignorantia affectata* be it or no; and ſince though the form were certain, yet in whom, it is by no means plain, but rather impoſſible to be known, (as who is obſtinate, and conſequently to whom it is damnable) ſince this courſe often gives growth, and ſtrength to that, from which it would take even Being and Subſiſtance: I cannot but think you have cauſe to change your proceedings, leſt not onely you expell not, but leſt you encreaſe Hereſie; and again, leſt you oppoſe it not, but miſtake the Truth for it, and applaud your ſelf for cutting off a Gangren'd member, when you deſtroy a ſound one, and inſtead of ending a Heretick make a Martyr; and again leſt (allowing this to be the Truth) yet you put to death innocent perſons inſtead of guilty; eſpecially ſince if the opinions were damnable in whomſoever they were, yet ſome better way might be found, (as cloſe impriſonment or the like) to keep them from harming with them, rather than (as you do by putting them to death, when elſe they might live to be converted) to damn them certainly, leſt they may poſſibly damn ſome others; Again for Proteſtants, who joyn with me in believing that there is no way to know the true Church, but by true Doctrine, nor to know that, but by the Scripture, (for Univerſal Tradition ſeems to us to deliver nothing but what is ſo plainly contained there, that it is agreed upon) in them I believe it muſt be intollerable Pride, and raſhneſs, (and the ſame in Papiſts concerning thoſe places out of which they would prove the Churches infallibility) to conclude, this ſeems to me the ſenſe of this place of Scripture, therefore this infallibly it is, and no man can deny it, who either gainſays not his Conſcience, or hath it not miſlead by ſome ſinfull paſſion or affection, and therefore the deniers muſt be damned, and therefore leſt they damn others, we will ſend them through one fire to another. And this, though it be an equal fault in both Proteſtants and Papiſts to ſay and doe, yet it is more Illogical in the former, as contradicting at firſt ſight all their Principles, and deſtroying the whole Platform upon which the Reformation was built.

Reſp. *He urgeth afterwards againſt the Unity of the Church, that it is none ſuch as we brag of, And I confeſs we brag of it, and think we have Reaſon. And if it pleaſe him to look into the difference of our Country of* England, *and ſome land of* Barbarians, *as* Braſile, *or ſuch other, where they live without Law or Government, I think he will find our bragging is not without ground. For wherein is the difference betwixt a Civil Government and a Barbarous Anarchy? Is it either that in a Civil Eſtate there be no Quarrels, or amongſt* Barbarians *there is no Quiet? The former would prejudice our Courts and Juſtice; the latter is impoſſible even in Nature. What is then the goodneſs of a Government, but in a well Governed Country there is a means to end Quarrels, and in Anarchy there can be no aſſured peace? This therefore is it we brag of, that amongſt us if any Controverſie ariſe, there is a way to end it, which is not amongſt them who parted from us. And Secondly, That there is no aſſured agreement amongſt thoſe who parted from us, for although to day they agree, there is no bond or tie why to morrow they may not diſagree. Theſe two things we brag of, and I think the Authour will not deny it. For he confeſſeth that we all agree, in that the Church is an infallible Miſtreſs. Then it is evident, that if in any Controverſie ſhe interpoſeth her judgment, the Controverſie is ended. He likewiſe confeſſeth, that who part from us, have no ſuch definitive authority amongſt them, and that Scripture, whereon they rely, hath no ſuch virtue to take up Controverſies clearly.*

Repl. Suppoſing that we agreed much leſs than you, yet a little, all in earneſt, that is unforced, is more conſiderable, than much conſtrained, and ſo peradventure much of that much but in appearance; Beſides, that you all agree in thoſe points, wherein if any diſagree, he becomes none of you, is no more than is ſo common to all Religions, that even the very Anabaptiſts may ſay as much for themſelves; For either all the Parts of them remain of aſſent, inſomuch that they are all ſtill of the ſame Religion, and ſo agree as well as your *Dominicans* and *Jeſuites*, or elſe their differences are ſuch, as to make them of ſeveral Religions, and then, why is want of Unity objected to them any more than it is to Chriſtians in general, among whom are ſo many diviſions, and yet not the whole, but the faulty party taxed? And truly in my opinion ſome Queſtions among your ſelves are as great, not onely as any among your adverſaries, but as any between you and them. I but you anſwer, we have a way of being agreed; we

reply,

reply, Is it a way ſure to lead to Truth as well as to Unity, or elſe ſo might we have by going to moſt at three throws, and reſolving to ſtand to that. Beſides, if you have, and make no more uſe of it, it ſeems there is no ſuch need that Queſtions be ended, as for that purpoſe to introduce a neceſſity of an Ender. But ſay you, neither are all ſuits in the Commonwealth ended; We reply, that yet truly thoſe Judges, who ſhould make no more haſte to end them, than your Judge doth theſe, would deſerve to loſe his place; but this they doe as faſt as the nature of the thing will permit; which being or depending upon matter of Fact, cannot be known enough to be judged, before examination of Witneſſes, and the like, be ended, and if they willingly defer the ending, they are confeſs'd to be in fault by all men, but thoſe who hold Perjury to be none. But you ſeem to conceive our grounds faulty, as not leading even to a poſſible Unity, whereas to a poſſible one I am ſure they do, (ſince what is concluded out of them by many, may be by all) nay indeed am confident, that all who receive the Scripture for the onely rule, and believe what is there plain to be onely neceſſary, would if they truly believed what they profeſs, and were not lead aſide either by prejudice, or private ends, or ſome Popiſh relicks of holding what they have long been taught, or following the authority of ſome by them much eſteemed perſons (either alive or dead) ſoon agree in as much as is neceſſary, and in concluding no neceſſity of agreeing in more, there being no doubt, but it would ſoon appear plainly what is plain.

Beſides, if no grounds be ſufficient for Unity, which produce not the effect, then it ſeems, the grounds of your grounds, thoſe Arguments, by which you prove, that there is a Judge, and a general Council is it, are inſufficient, ſince they are not able to make all Chriſtians about this queſtion: Again, although a Judge, and this Judge be received, yet this is ſtill an inſufficient ground for Unity, ſince the *Greek* Church agree thus far with you (which is as far as you agree with one another) and yet are not ſo bound by it to any univerſal Unity with them, but that they eſteem you Hereticks, and are eſteemed ſo by you: and if you ſay, that it is not, becauſe the grounds, upon which the Infallibility of the Church are built, lead not ſufficiently to Unity, that we joyn not with you in believing them to be infallible, not becauſe the determination of general Councils is not a ſufficient means of Unity, that the *Greek* Church admitting their authority, admits not of your opinions, but it is the fault of us (and of them) hardning our hearts againſt the truth; then we may as well ſay, that ſome of thoſe, who agree in our grounds, yet diſagree from our Doctrine, not that the grounds lead not to Unity, but that our Adverſaries will not be lead; or if (as you doe, and ſome others of you ſometimes) you confeſs, that they through an innocent errour diſſent from you, and doe this without any imputation in this reſpect to your grounds, I hope it will be lawfull for us to allow the ſame poſſibility, without any diſadvantage or prejudice to ours: Beſides, ſay you, though we agree to day, yet we may not to morrow, which to prove, were μάτην τὸ ὕδωρ ἀναλίσκειν, pains wholly loſt, we confeſs: For though *Tully* make it an expreſſion of his contempt to *Piſo*, in an Epiſtle to *Atticus*, *Ità nihil eſt, ut planè quid erit, neſciat*, yet I take it to be a true ſaying of man in general, who knows little of preſent things, and nothing of future; but this is common to us both, for if we change not our opinions, we ſhall agree as we do, and if you change yours, you ſhall not; which is poſſible, for not onely that opinion of the Infallibility of your Judges Decrees, may it ſelf be altered, which holdeth together all the reſt, but ſome of you may, holding that ground (like the Greek) either change their opinions concerning the authority of ſuch or ſuch a Council, as believing it unduly called, factiouſly carried, or not general as is pretended, or not ſo conſenting as is requiſite, or differ from the reſt, concerning the ſenſe of the Decrees: For whereas you ſay, you agree that the Church is an infallible Miſtreſs, and when ſhe interpoſeth her judgment, the Controverſie is ended: I anſwer, that, firſt, ſome of you, with whom I have ſpoken my ſelf, hold, that the Churches authority in defining, extends no farther than to ſuch points, whereof Tradition is of one part (as in many controverted there is, I believe, no ſuch) and that this rule ſhe may tranſgreſs, and ſo err.

Secondly, Neither the *Dominicans* nor their Adverſaries, are very ready to remain in ſuſpence to await her deciſion, but define all ready concerning her definitions, *Cùm utraque pars tenax contendat ſuam non aliam poſſe definiri ſententiam*, either part tenaciouſly urging, that the contrary opinion cannot be defined, which if they did to fright the Pope from defining, leſt the condemned party being even before, ſhould after make a Schiſm, they obtained their end.

Thirdly, What are you the nearer to Unity for your Infallible Miſtreſs the Church, when you neither agree of any certain and proper marks to know her by, nor when it is that ſhe interpoſeth her judgment? ſome take it to be the particular Church of *Rome*, others (of which number you are) all which communicate with her; ſuppoſing the firſt to be true, yet not being *de fide*, it will ſerve but ill, by your rules, to build our faith upon; and even when ſhe delivers her opinion, is not certainly agreed, whether the people of *Rome* be to have Votes, or onely the Clergy, or of them, onely the Pope with the Cardinals, or the Pope onely without them, if the Pope, whether onely in his Chair, and what circumſtances are required to his decreeing *in Cathedra*, would beget more queſtions. If all that communicate with her (as you ſay it is, as things now ſtand,)

Firſt, I would know whether they be ſure to be at all times the Church; to that you refuſe to determine, and ſo incluſively deny.

Secondly, It is not poſſible, that ſuch a multitude ſhould ever give any ſentence explicitly, nor can we ever know, that it hath even tacitly done ſo; if they be to decree onely by repreſentation, then how large a company repreſents them with all their power, of whom that company is to conſiſt, how many of them are to agree to make it a binding ſentence, *&c.* are things yet undefined, and like to be, and if any go about to determine them, their power being it ſelf ſtill a queſtion, could not end theſe: Therefore, whereas you ſay, that we have no definitive ſentence (beſides that truly to have one, and not to know when we have one, is much alike;) I anſwer, that whenſoever the Scripture ſhall ſeem to us to have defined, we are according to our Doctrine ready to yield, and ſo the Controverſie is ended (and ſure the Scripture may be ſaid to be a definitive ſentence, as well as the written Council of *Trent*) and till then, though we differ about interpretations of not plain places, we have as much Unity as you,

who are not reſolved upon the ſenſe of many Decrees of that and other Councils: and if a deſire and diligence to find the true meaning of them, and an aptneſs to aſſent when it is found, be thought to ſecure among you, thoſe who miſtake the true ſenſe of theſe Councils, why ſhould not the ſame diſpoſition in us towards the Scripture, be thought every whit as ſufficient, not onely to keep us in unity, but to ſecure us from danger?

To conclude, though Unity be a thing much ſpoken of by you, yet I find it chiefly onely in your diſcourſe; your differences are many and great, onely you ſay, you agree in what is neceſſary, and make the meaſure of things neceſſary what you agree in; ſo the ſum is, you agree in what you do agree (which it is impoſſible you ſhould not, though you had carried away the bays from *Bibrias* his Tomb) eager againſt us, and yet divided among your ſelves, like the ſtate of an Army in *Tacitus*, *Manente Legionum auxiliorumque, ubi adverſus Paganos certandum foret, conſenſu*; and if your Church *brag* of ſuch an Unity, I perceive a ſmall matter will make her brag.

Reſp. *Again, I do confeſs moſt* Engliſh-*men confeſs a Trinity, the Incarnation and Paſſion of our Saviour, but if to morrow, any one or more of them light upon ſome Book of an* Arian, Trinitarian, *or other Sect, ſo wittily written that he putteth probable ſolutions for the places of Scriptures, ſhews ſlight ways how our well meaning fore-fathers may have ſlipped into ſuch an Errour, what is there to retain thoſe men from diſagreeing with the reſt of their Brethren, and betake themſelves to the* Arians? *And when the heat is paſt, light upon ſome Rabbi, who ſhall cunningly exaggerate the abſurdities, (as he ſhall term them) of the Trinity, Incarnation; Say our Saviour did ſtrange things in virtue of ſome Conſtellation, and delivering theſe things ſo Oratorically, that for a new heat, ſome of theſe things ſhall ſeem more conformable than his* Arianiſm, *what then ſhall hinder this man to become a* Jew, *and at laſt to prove himſelf ſo great a Clerk as to write* de tribus Impoſtoribus? *Take away the power of the Church, which every man doth who taketh away the Infallibility, what can retain any man why he ſhould not yield to that diſcourſe which ſeemeth faireſt, ſeeing nothing is certain?*

Repl. And if you ſhould meet with a Book which ſhould give probable ſolutions to the places of Scripture, and reaſons which you now think prove the authority of the Church, and bring other (though ſuppoſe but ſlight, yet ſuch as may ſeem ſtrong) Arguments to prove it not infallible, and ſhew ways of the ſame kind, how your Anceſtours may have ſlipt in that, and by that into other errours, what is there to retain you with the reſt of your Brethren, from betaking your ſelf to us? If you ſay this is impoſſible to be done, ſo think the Proteſtants, that the *Arians* can give them no probable anſwer to their places of Scripture, and ſuch as will ſeem ſo to ſome, is no imputation to their grounds, ſince ſo may, and do our Anſwers and Objections to ſome of you, who thereupon leave you, and yet you count not your grounds diſparaged. For my part, I profeſs my ſelf not onely to be an Anti-Trinitarian, but a Turk, whenſoever more reaſon appears to me for that, than for the contrary, and ſo ſure would you be too; for the pretended infallibility of your Church could no longer hold you, if you thought you ſaw reaſon to believe it fallible, as you muſt do, if all weighed, more reaſon appeared of her adverſaries ſide, either your proofs of her authority not to be probable, or elſe your Doctrines taught by her, more contrary to reaſon, than her authority (though probably founded, yet not upon demonſtrations) is ſufficient to caution, and anſwer for; It is true, ſo long as you ſtick to this hold upon the *Roman* Church, you are ſure to receive no errour, but which ſhe offers you, (and indeed you need not, for thoſe are enough) but that deſtroyed (which is apter to be deſtroyed than moſt of the Proteſtants, as weaklier ſupported by reaſon) then no errour that a Proteſtant may fall into, but ſo may you too, and the other is but ſuch a Privilege, as I may have by ſticking to the *Engliſh* Church, as well as you to the *Roman*; And though this following your guide, may be able, as long as ſhe keep her ſelf, to keep you from ſome Ditches, into which you might otherwiſe fall, yet it may lead you unto others; and indeed there is no errour but by this way you are liable to, yea even of thoſe which ſhe now condemns, ſince though ſhe changed her opinion, which is neither impoſſible, nor unlawfull, yet you are by your blind obedience to believe that ſhe had not, and to ſubmit your underſtanding in this Queſtion to ſome diſtinction, though without a difference. Theſe things then I diſlike in what you ſay:

Firſt, Your ſaying, as though there is nothing to retain a Proteſtant from being of any errour, when it ſhall appear more probable to him than Truth, therefore there were nothing to keep him from thoſe errours; whereas you ſhould have conſidered, that the greater probabilities may ſerve reaſonably to hold him without a demonſtration, and the evidence of the thing, without a guide, and that if thoſe be not ground enough for a man to fix upon, in how ill eſtate are thoſe of your Church, in the Queſtion concerning the Church, in which they follow no guide, nor have any demonſtration, but profeſs they yield to her authority, but upon prudential motives, which kind of arguments ſure may as well, and as fixedly preſerve a Proteſtant in an Orthodox opinion againſt a Heretick, as the authority of the Church no ſurelier founded, can you againſt us: That every man ſhould yield to that diſcourſe which ſeemeth faireſt to him, I confeſs, it is always, not onely ſafe and fit, but alſo neceſſary, even for them who receive the Infallibility of the Church, ſince thoſe who believe that, believe it, becauſe that appears faireſt to them; and as you object to us, the poſſibility of being perſwaded from the truth by ſome witty Authour, why think you not the ſame Authour may poſſibly too, appear to you to deſtroy your prudential Motives, and ſo conſequently your whole Faith, which is built upon the Church, which is built upon them.

Secondly, I diſlike your ſeeming to believe, that any grounds, which are not demonſtrative, are too ſlippery to reſt upon, as not onely being contrary to reaſon, but to your ſelf, who told me before, that no more was required, than a main advantage on one ſide, and that we had reaſon to be ſatisfied with Probabilities to guide our Actions in Religion, ſince by them we were content to regulate all the other Actions of our life.

Thirdly, I diſlike, in your own parties behalf, your ſaying, that a *Proteſtant* is in good likelihood to turn *Arian* (for if you mean onely that it is poſſible, it concerns you as much as them) ſince this ſeems to infer, that the Scriptures do make more probably for them (which if they did, it is not Hereſie) and to contradict all thoſe, whom both parts call Fathers, who think enough plain in Scripture, not onely

onely to keep, but alſo to convert men from *Arianiſm*, as it appears, by their employing ſo ſolely thoſe Arms againſt them, that they needed the admonition of a Heretick, to counſel them to the uſe of another.

Fourthly, I diſlike your ſaying, that after being made an *Arian*, he is not unlikely to turn *Jew*, eſpecially, that he is likely to be perſwaded by any exaggeration of the Abſurdities in the Trinity, ſince both *Grotius* and other Authours, ſeem to ſay, that the *Jews* have their Trinity too in the ſame Notion; and howſoever the *Arian* is ſo fully perſwaded already, that thoſe are abſurdities (that perſwaſion being almoſt the form of that opinion which conſtitutes him an *Arian*) yet the exaggeration of them can never work upon him; And for the Conſtellation you ſpeak of, it were ſo irrational, and ſo unprovable a Crotchet, that no Oratory could ever make it ſeem to a reaſonable man, to have any inclination to ſenſe (and a fool may be made believe any thing, how contrary ſoever to his grounds) unleſs he be of thoſe, who are given over to vain imaginations, becauſe they love darkneſs better than the light; and the fault of no particular mens underſtanding or will, is to lead any man to condemn his grounds, for they are to be accuſed, not of whatſoever he concludes who holds (or rather in this caſe hath held) them, but onely of what he concludes reaſonably according to them. Beſides, for this cauſe it appears ſtrange to me, that truſting to Scripture alone, and without meaning the Church for my certain guide, ſhould bring a man into danger of parting with his Chriſtianity, ſince nothing can hold a man longer than he believes it, and as long as our ground, the Scripture, is by him believed, no man can poſſibly turn either *Atheiſt*, or *Jew*; and he who leaves to believe your ground, the Church, cannot by that be any more with-held from either: Beſides that, I think it is impoſſible (I am ſure it is irrational) that any of you ſhould believe in Chriſt, upon the authority of Chriſt's Church, ſince believing the latter (which claims no authority but from Chriſt) preſuppoſeth the belief of him, and ſo Chriſtianity is not the apter to be overthrown through the abſence of that, upon which it is not built: I fear rather, leſt your Doctrine known to be grounded it ſelf upon Tradition by ſuch a way, according to which, a *Jew* would have much advantage of a Chriſtian, may incline a man to *Judaiſm*, and your ſides general ſlighting all ways of knowing God's will, but onely by the Church, and then neither proving her power ſtronglier, nor teaching how to know her plainer, may make men ſink into *Atheiſm*, by being perſwaded by you, in letting go other ſtrong holds upon Truth, and receiving ſuch weak ones from you. Not to ſpeak of your loading Chriſtianity with ſuch impoſſibilities, as the Pillars of it, which are not abſolute Demonſtrations (of which, it may be, ſcarce any thing is in nature capable, but lines and numbers) are not able to bear, and uſing all your Wits and Induſtries to perſwade men, that it is equally unſafe to refuſe any part of your Religion, as to receive none; and ſo inſtead of making theſe your beliefs admitted for the ſake of Chriſtianity, cauſing Chriſtianity to be rejected becauſe of them.

But peradventure ſome may attribute Power to the Church without Infallibility; whom I would have conſider but what himſelf ſaith. For his Church by the Power it hath, muſt either ſay, I command you to believe, or I command you to profeſs this, whether you believe me or no. The ſecond, I think no enemy of equivocation will admit, and the former it is as much as if it ſhould ſay, I know not whether I ſay true or no, yet you muſt think I ſay true. Reſp.

We having received a command, that *all things be done decently, and in order*, and this being to be appointed by them, whom either the Law of the Land, (if that conſiſt of faithfull) or the conſent or cuſtome of Chriſtians hath appointed, for Eccleſiaſtical Rulers in this matter, in every place the Church (thus reſtrained to the Governours of the Church) may have in ſome caſes (though not to your purpoſe) Power without the leaſt Infallibility. And for inſtruction (which you aim at) no Church can give it, yours eſpecially, being too large a body ever to meet or joyn in doing it; and if you reſtrain the Church to the Clergy, (whereof yet many teach not, and they too are too many for any man to be ſure what they all agree in teaching, and when they differ, how ſhall I know which to follow, otherwiſe than by your Rule which I have anſwered) their duty indeed, but not theirs onely, (though Principally) is to inſtruct us in the way to Heaven, which they doing in the Perſons of Embaſſadours between God and us, and having no abſolute Letters of Credence to bid us to believe that God ſays, whatſoever they ſay, he ſays, (as much as can be wreſted out of Scriptures for any preſent Church, being ſaid of the *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, who yet proved themſelves not infallible) our beſt way is in my mind to examine their Commiſſion, and if they can ſhew that they treat according to that, to ſubmit to them, (as in the ſame caſe we muſt to any of the *Laity*) or rather to God, of whoſe commands they are but Organs, and if not, to beware of their Leaven. Yet it may be that ſome man may hold that ſuch an opinion is to be believed onely, becauſe ſuch a Church propoſeth it, and yet not believe her Infallible, ſince he may think her authority (by reaſon of her Learning, Multitude, Sanctity, Unity and Liberty) to be more probable than any contradicting argument, and that men are to aſſent to what is moſt probable; and truly if he could prove to me his *Major*, I am already ſo much of the opinion of his *Minor*, that I ſhould joyn with him in his Concluſion. *Repl.*

So that if I underſtand any thing, where there is no Infallibility, there is no Power; where no Power, no Unity; where no Unity, no Entity; where no Entity, no Church. Reſp.

How you tie Power to Infallibility I gueſs; but cannot how you tie Unity to Power: For how many things are all men even at Unity about, though one have no Power over another in them, onely cemented together by their clear evidence: And how many more do whole Bodies, and Sects of men agree about, without any ſuch power, though they differ in other points, as ſo do you too; Do not Proteſtants agree with you about many, and the chiefeſt *credenda*, and about almoſt all the merely *facienda*? Though not perſwaded to this agreement by the Power of any Judge which they do acknowledge; Nay if men could be at Unity about no thing, which were not propoſed by ſome Guide, or defined by ſome Judge endued with ſuch a power, how came all you to agree, that there is ſome ſuch Guide and Judge required, ſince ſure you receive not that upon its own authority; and if men may find the neceſſity of a Guide and Judge, without any Guide or Judge, and remain in Unity about *Repl.*

that,

that, why may they not alſo about whatſoever is clearly taught by God, which reaſon aſſures us to be all that is neceſſary? and if you ſay that all things neceſſary are not clearly taught, becauſe we do not (though it proves not that we might not) agree upon them, then I reply, that I may as well ſay, that neither is it clear that there is a Guide, becauſe we diſſent from you in it, although receiving the authority of the Scripture (out of which Cardinal *Perron* confeſſeth, that Saint *Auſtine* ſaith, that both the neceſſity of your Guide, the Church, and ſhe her ſelf, are to be known) and reaſon, which as they may be plain in this point for you, and yet perſwade us not, ſo may they be in all neceſſary points, and yet we who make theirs our ground, not perſwade one another.

As little ſee I why there can be no Entity nor Church, where there is no Unity.

For the firſt, though there be ſmall Unity among Chriſtians, yet certainly Chriſtians and their Religion have ſome Entity; indeed if what you ſay were true, there were no Entity in yours.

For the ſecond, I know not why two parties over-valuing their differences, may not conceive each other to be none of the Church, and ſo declare even by excommunications, and yet remain both Parts of it, (for if a Husband miſ-ſuſpecting his Wife of Adultery, declare her to be no longer his Wife, this cannot make her give over being ſo, if the bond be indeed not broken) as well as *Chryſoſtome* and *Epiphanius*, both excommunicated by each other, and yet both Saints, or as particular men may by your own confeſſion be interiourly in the Church, although ſeeming out of it, even to the Church her ſelf, and ſo thoſe be both of the Church, between whom there is no Unity: For not onely in your own *Cariophilus* his words τὸ πεμπόμενα βέλη ἐκ χειρὸς μὴ ἐχούσης τὸ κῦρος ἢ αἰδυτίαν, ἄσθενὸς ἄξια, but alſo though the perſons have power, yet if the cauſe have not ſufficiency, I take you to agree, that an excommunication is but a *brutum fulmen*, as *Victors* of the *Aſian* Biſhops: The beſt therefore and ſtricteſt definition (and which I think you will not refute) which I can give for the Church, is (eſpecially in that ſenſe, as out of it there can be no ſalvation) thoſe who are deſirous to know God's Will, (or Chriſt's at the ſtricteſt, for I am not certain, nor I believe is it defined among you, whether an explicite knowledge of Chriſt be abſolutely neceſſary to ſalvation, though I know no guiltleſs ignorance of him, can bring unavoidably upon any man eternal torments) and ready, when known, to believe and follow it; and ſure many of theſe may eternally diſagree even in points which are neceſſary, abſtracting from particular caſes, and yet their differences not exclude them from the Church, and conſequently a Church may be without Unity, *Quod erat demonſtrandum.*

Reſp. *Now for the Controverſies mentioned, beſides that there is a means to terminate them, they be ſuch as bring no breach of the ancient life and action of Chriſtians, which all thoſe opinions do, which for the moſt part are reputed to make Hereticks.*

Repl. You ſaw very well, that if [no Unity, no Church] were a true Propoſition, yours hath in it differences enough to deſtroy its being a Church, and therefore are fain to apply what ſalves you can; but all in vain: For your means to terminate them, doth not make them not to be, before they are terminated, and conſequently by your Rule yours is no Church till then. Beſides, their bringing no breach of the ancient life and action of Chriſtians, proves not but one of them may be a Hereſie, ſince you ſay not your ſelf, that all Hereſies are ſuch, but onely for the moſt part; and indeed to prove that, you muſt be able to ſet down what thoſe opinions are, which before a definition, may make a Heretick, which I believe you will not venture to doe in haſte, though we much deſire it at your hands, that we may know if none of them be ſuch.

Reſp. *That ſome Controverſies amongſt us are not reſolved, is a thing neceſſary amongſt humane affairs, where things muſt have a time to be born, to encreaſe, to fall, and the greater things are, the greater is their Period.*

Repl. It is true, that ſome time to be taken notice of muſt paſs between an opinions riſing, and being condemned; but that ſo long they ſhould run on, and many of your Councils having ſince been held, is ſure not neceſſary, and ſhews, that you eſteem not Unity ſo neceſſary as you pretend: ſome opinions I am ſure you can ſoon enough quaſh, as that not long ſince riſen in *Spain* concerning Fornication being but a Venial Sin: And whereas you ſay, *the greater things are, the greater their period*, though this be true in ſome things, yet not in this, for ſure the greater a difference is, the greater neceſſity is there that it be ſoon decided, and ſo if your deciſion have power to effect it, as you pretend among you it hath, it muſt fall as ſoon as it is born, like the ζῶα ἐφήμερα, *Creatures that live but a day.*

Reſp. *Wherefore I do not ſee why this may hurt the Church, more than the Suits which hang in our Courts, prejudice the government of the Land.*

Repl. If any of theſe opinions be of that importance, as that though uncondemn'd, the Holders are Hereticks, as ſome may be, and my definition being concluded of ſuch among you, ſome of theſe may be ſome of them, then ſure they hurt the Church much, and more than the Suits hurt the Government, which their hanging hurts not at all, though it hurts (ſometimes unavoidably) the Parties. But if where there is no Unity, there were no Commonwealth, as you ſay, where there is no Unity, there can be no Church, then the Government were much prejudic'd by the Suits, as your Church by this Rule, is made no Church by the differences; And indeed if men were not agreed about the power of the Governours (as you are not about ſome of your queſtions) it muſt be a maim to the Government of any Commonwealth, as conſequently theſe are to the Government of your Church.

Reſp. *The laſt point of the Authour's Diſcourſe is, to ſhew how errours might have crept in, wherein I ſhall have no oppoſition with him, for I do not think the queſtion is, how they ſhould creep in, but how they ſhould be kept out.*

Repl. Here, Sir, I cannot but believe, that you intended to refreſh your ſelf with ſome Mirth, as with Muſick between the Acts; for though both our ends be, that errours ſhould not creep in, yet the queſtion was, whether it were poſſible that they might creep in, and to my affirmative part it conduced to ſhew thoſe ways, by which either they have entred, or eaſily might do ſo, this ſhewing how they may ſteal in, teacheth how to keep them out, as it is an aid to the ſaving of a Town, to diſcover the breaches, which cannot be guarded without they be firſt known.

For the Fluxibility of humane Nature is ſo great, that it is no wonder if errours ſhould have crept in, the ways being ſo many; but it is a great wonder of God that none ſhould have crept in. This nevertheleſs I may ſay, if the Authour will confeſs, as I think he will not deny, but that it is diſputable, whether any errour in ſixteen Ages hath crept in, this very thing is above Nature. For if there were not an excellency beyond the nature of corruptible things, it would be undeniably evident, that not one or two, but thouſands of errours had quite changed the ſhape of the Church in ſo many years, tempeſts, diſ-unions, want of Commerce in the body of the Church. Reſp.

The greater wonder it were, if your Church had no errour, the greater it is to me, that upon one, at moſt but probable, Reaſon, you ſhould require all men to believe ſhe hath none; Neither doth it appear to me diſputable, whether ſhe have or no, but evident, that ſhe hath, not by Demonſtrations, yet by Probabilities of that multitude, and weight, upon which you ſay (and ſay truly) that in all other caſes we relie, and venture that we moſt eſteem: whereas indeed you, as you are of the impoſing Party, ought to bring at leaſt ſuch proofs, that you are fallen into none, and as you are of the Infallibility-pretending-party, your proofs are likewiſe to riſe from probable to Infallible: Neither do I conceive it to be probably argued, It is diſputable, whether this body of men have ever let in any errour, therefore it can never let in any, ſince it is at leaſt as diſputable, whether the *Grecians* have let in any, yet you will not allow, that upon this we ſhould adjudge to her Infallibility: Nay if it were demonſtrative, that your Church had yet never erred, yet it would but unwillingly follow, that ſhe never could, ſince all things neceſſary are ſo plain (without the confeſſion of which you ſeem to tax God) and it is naturally ſo plain what is plain, that I cannot but think it a miracle, that ſome one body of Chriſtians among ſo many, ſhould be free from any ſuch dogmatically-defended errour, eſpecially if Truth were ſo indifferently ſought after as it ought to be, and Paſſion were not often called to counſel, and Reaſon ſhut out of doors. *Repl.*

But this one Maxime, that ſhe receiveth her Faith by Tradition, and not from Doctours, hath ever kept her entire: And he that will ſhew the contrary, muſt ſhew how it ſhould come to paſs, that thoſe, who lived in ſuch an Age, would ſay unto our Children, this we received from our fore-fathers, as taught them by their fore-fathers, to have been received from Chriſt and his Apoſtles from hand to hand; which if it could not be, the queſtion is reſolved, that no errour is in the Church of God, which holdeth her faith upon that Tenure. Reſp.

Not to repeat, *uſque ad nauſeam*, what I have heretofore anſwered, as that others differing from you, hold upon the ſame Tenure that your ſelves have not always held, nor hold not upon it, *&c.* I will onely tell you what Cardinal *Perron* tells me of the *Jews* out of *Iſidore*, and that is, that they ſeeing in the Book of *Wiſedom* ſo clear proofs of Chriſt, plotted together to put it out of the Canon; which ſerves not ſo much his turn, if it were ſo, as it makes againſt yours, and ſhews how that might come to paſs, which you judge impoſſible, the Poſterity of the *Jews* having been deceived by this Complot; although pretending at leaſt, and for ought appears, believing that the Tradition of their Church is ſtill uncorrupted. *Repl.*

And truly if the Authour deſires to examine divers Religions, let him look their main ground wherein they rely, and ſee whether that be good or no: And I think amongſt Chriſtians he ſhall find but two, Tradition, and Scripture. Reſp.

Firſt, I allow not of your diviſion, for not to ſay now that you rely not onely upon Tradition, theſe Proteſtants, whoſe part in this I take, depend not onely upon Scripture, but upon Univerſal Tradition too, from which they receive that, and would more, if more ſeemed as clearly to them ſo to be delivered. *Repl.*

Secondly, I think it reaſonable not onely to examine what their Principles are, but whether they do conſtantly follow them, for a man may write awry, that hath a ſtreight Ruler, if he obſerve it not carefully.

And the Catholicks onely to rely upon Tradition, and all the reſt upon Scripture; and he ſhall ſee, that relying upon Scripture cannot draw to an Unity thoſe who rely upon it, and more than one cannot rely upon Tradition. Reſp.

If all that rely upon Tradition be Catholicks, you muſt admit the Eaſtern Churches into your Communion, although you now account them both Schiſmaticks and Hereticks: If all Catholicks do rely upon Tradition as their onely ground, and Tradition be ſo ſure and infallible, and unmiſtakable a deliverer, as you would perſwade us, how come ſo many differences between you, ſome ever counting thoſe things matter of Faith which others do not? which differences ſhew, if they all rely, in theſe Queſtions, upon the ground you ſay they do, that more than one may rely upon Tradition; and neither can Tradition, any more than Scripture, draw to an Unity, thoſe who rely upon it; if either neither part do, or either do not, then Tradition is not the Common Tenure of Catholicks, (not onely in different opinions, but even in ſuch as are moſt *de fide*, and as both parts think nothing but a definition (and ſome, ſcarce that) to make the Holders of the contrary to them, Heretick) ſince if it were, neither could one part of Catholicks rely upon any other than the Catholick ground, neither is it to be doubted, but that ſide which builds their opinion upon an Heretical foundation, againſt another, believed upon a Catholick ground, would long agone have been among you exploded, and the Pope have been not onely with ſo much pains perſwaded, but even of himſelf ready to have paſt his cenſure upon them; if not for their ſuperſtructions, yet for their foundation. *Repl.*

If I will be a Chriſtian, I muſt be of one ſide. Reſp.

If you mean I muſt be of one ſide, that is take one of theſe grounds, I anſwer, That I take both, one from the other, Scripture from Tradition, though not from the preſent Tradition of a Part, but from the Univerſal one of the firſt Chriſtians, oppoſed by none, but by them, who were inſtantly counted by the generality heterodox, and as ſoon oppoſed as known. If you mean that I muſt be of one ſide in points, I wholly deny any ſuch neceſſity. *Repl.*

By falling on the one ſide, I ſee my fortune in thouſands who have gone before me, to wit, that I ſhall be to ſeek all my life time, as I ſee they are, and how greatly they magnifie very weak pieces. On the other ſide, I ſee every man who followeth, as far as he followeth it, is at quiet. Reſp.

I ſee not but the greateſt part of thoſe who take the ground which you miſlike, are yet ſettled and confident enough in their opinion; and if they continued always ſeeking Truth for the love of it, I know not why they ſhould be the leſs likely to find Heaven: Neither think I that you will ſay (nay it is plain by your own words, that you will not ſay) that Saint *Auſtine* had been damned if he had died in his ſearch, nor conſequently any other in his caſe. And whereas you ſay, that all who follow the other, are *at quiet* as far as they follow it, I anſwer, So are all who fixedly believe themſelves to follow an infallible (although indeed a falſe) Guide, as the *Mahumetans*, being led by their *Mufty*: Which proves *Quiet*, no ſufficient caution for Truth, nor Security for Safety; and that, ſuppoſing yours the more eaſie and ſatisfying way, it follows not that it is the more reaſonable: And for what you ſay of a man's duty to judge himſelf rigorouſly, whether he ſeek as he ought, I ſubſcribe to that opinion, and approve of your Counſel.

Reſp. *Beſides this, he muſt have this care, that he ſeek what the Nature of the ſubject can yield, and not as theſe Phyſicians, who when they have promiſed no leſs than immortality, can at laſt onely reach to ſome conſervation of health, or youth in ſome ſmall degree; So I could wiſh the Authour well to aſſure himſelf, Firſt, that there is poſſible an infallibility, before he be too earneſt to be contented with nothing leſs. For, what if humane nature ſhould not be capable of ſo great a good, would he therefore think fitting to live without any Religion, becauſe he could not get ſuch a one as himſelf deſired, though with more than a man's wiſh?*

Repl. What you now ſay, I confeſs is very rational, (as indeed all you ſay, is as much as your cauſe will ſuffer) and I require you not therefore to prove your opinions to be infallible by infallible arguments, as neceſſary to be done in it ſelf, but as neceſſary to be done by them, of whoſe opinions their Churches infallibility is not onely a part, but a ground, and that the chief, if not the onely one, and of which an infallible certainty is the firſt and main condition of their Communion, and our want of it, one of their main Objections againſt us.

Reſp. *He that will make a judgment in an Art he is not Maſter in, if he be deceived, it is to be imputed to himſelf. The Phraſe commandeth us to believe every man in his Art, he who knoweth and underſtandeth himſelf, believeth not. Therefore when we ſee Maſters in an Art, we are not skill'd in, oppoſe us, we may believe we are in the wrong, which will breed this Reſolution in the Authour of the diſcourſe, that if himſelf be not skill'd in all thoſe ways in which he purſues his ſearch, he muſt find himſelf obliged to ſeek Maſters, who be both well skilled, and the matter being ſubject to faction alſo, very honeſt, and upright men, or elſe he doth not quit himſelf before God.*

Repl. Truly I am far from being Maſter either in this or any other Art, but if for this cauſe I ought to doubt, and becauſe much learneder perſons oppoſe me, I ought to believe my ſelf in the wrong, then ſo ought thoſe of your part to do, who are as Ignorant as I, we having many much more learned than they who oppoſe them, and take our part; though therefore I think not of my ſelf (what *Tully* in a Complement would perſwade one of his Friends,) that *Nemo eſt qui ſapientiùs mihi poſſit ſuadere meipſo*, yet I dare not chuſe (as you would have me) ſome Maſter to ſearch for me, and believe him blindfold, (though if I would, I ſee no cauſe why to chuſe any from among you, who have ſo many able Teachers at home) for you confeſſing that the matters are *ſubject to Faction*, and it being certain, that not onely, who are *honeſt*, is impoſſible to be known, but that eagerneſs and deſire to have, what they think Truth, prevail, makes even the honeſt men ſometimes deviate from the line of exact honeſty, and lie for God, which he not onely needs not, but forbids, (as is to be ſeen too frequently in the Quotations of both ſides) I conceive it the beſt way to follow my own Reaſon, ſince I know I have no will to cozen my ſelf, as they may have to cozen me: Eſpecially ſince neither could I build upon ſuch a way, an aſſent of ſuch a degree, as your Church requires, ſince ſuch Maſters, although learned, which I being unlearned may be deceived in, and honeſt, which all men might be deceived in, yet not infallible, could not in reaſon make me infallibly certain of the Orthodoxneſs of that ſide, which they ſhould chuſe for me: So that what was ſaid by the *Pagan Solomon*, *Socrates*, (who yet was no confident man of his knowledge) ἐγὼ οὖν τοιοῦτῳ οἵῳ μηδένα πείθεσθαι ἢ ἐμὸν λογισμὸν βελτίων φαίνεται, is my reſolution too, and indeed, in effect, if not wholly, yet almoſt every man's; for thoſe who truſt their Reaſon leaſt, yet truſt it in this, that ſome other inſtead of it, is to be truſted, and ſo chuſe who they are to truſt; againſt which the Arguments either from the fallibility of Reaſon in general, or in this particular, remain equally, an ignorant man being as likely to be deceived in the choice of his Guide, as in that of his Way, and that courſe being rather the ſhorter than the better, as venturing in the ſame, and no ſtronger a Bark, onely venturing all his wealth at once.

Reſp. *It is not all one not to incur damnation for infidelity, and to be in ſtate of damnation; for the man to whom infidelity is not imputed, may be in ſtate of damnation for other faults; as thoſe were, who having known God by his works, did not glorifie him as they ought.*

Repl. That men may be damned for other faults, concerns not our Queſtion, nor indeed is any.

Reſp. *Nay, they may be damned for want of Faith, and yet not be damned for incredulity; As for example ſake, if when they have ſinned, they know not what means to have them forgiven, though they be without fault in not believing, nevertheleſs dying without Remiſſion of ſin, they are not in ſtate to come to life everlaſting.*

Repl. This concerns no Chriſtians, none of which that I know differs from you in the neceſſary means of obtaining forgiveneſs for ſins; for though you require Confeſſion, yet you allow that Contrition will ſave without it: Neither do I believe, but an imperfect Repentance cauſed through faultleſs Ignorance, of what it is for it to be perfect, will ſtill be accepted by him who regards the Heart more than the Action; indeed, onely the Action, becauſe of the Heart; and knows, that if he uſe not the appointed means, it is onely becauſe he knows it not; elſe conſidering the many impoſitions from above, the great frailty within, and the great and many temptations without, ſo that to fall into no ſin, were morally impoſſible, he who ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, generally obſerved what he counted himſelf bound to obſerve, if for ſome faults which he was after heartily ſorry for, and had ſincerely reformed, he ſhould be damned for want of knowing more, how to purge himſelf from them, than he could poſſibly know, God would not be deſirous of the Salvation of all men, and it would ſeem agreeable to no Mercy, nor to

any

any Juſtice, except that *Summum jus*, which ever hath been thought condemnable in man, and conſequently incompatible in God.

Reſp. *As the man who ſhould venture into a wood without a Guide, although he did his beſt to have a guide, nothing leſs might fall out of his way, as well as he who neglected the taking of one; ſo if God ſent us his Son to ſhew us the way of Salvation, as well is he like not to be ſaved who never heard of ſuch a way, as he that heard of it and neglected it, for neither of the two goeth that way: And who goeth not on the way, is not like to come to the end.*

Repl. The way is believing and obeying Chriſt, for them to whom He and his Commands are ſufficiently propoſed; I mean, ſo, that it is their fault if they know them not: In general then, it is ſeeking the Truth impartially, and obeying diligently what is found ſincerely, and who treads this way, though he miſs of Truth, ſhall not miſs of his favour who is the Father of it; and if he be excluded Heaven, ſure God meant that he ſhould never come thither, and deſires not that he and all elſe ſhould, elſe he would not have propoſed onely ſuch a way, which it were poſſible for any to miſs without his own fault, and which he knew that many would. Truly, that opinion, that no errour is a ſin without the cauſe of it be one; and that God is not diſpleaſed with any man for not ſeeing what it is not his fault that he doth not ſee, is agreeable to the common Notions of Juſtice, and God; and it is a very good Negative way to trie ſuperſtructions by, to ſee whether they agree with theſe grounds of all Religion, whereof, rather than believe ſuch men ſhould be damned, I would believe they ſhould be annihilated, or keep your Children company, and have *pœnam damni*, though not *ſenſus*.

Reſp. *I know God is good and mercifull: But I know his decrees, as far as we know, are diſpenſed by the order of ſecond Cauſes, and where we ſee no ſecond Cauſes, we cannot preſume of the effects; and how am I aſſured he will ſend Angels to illuminate ſuch men as doe their endeavours, that their Souls may not periſh.*

Repl. A carefull ſearch of God's, and incluſively Chriſt's will, and readineſs to obey it, is ſecond Cauſe enough; For, for want of that ſecond cauſe, we muſt not ſuppoſe any thing to the diſhonour of the Firſt. As to believe, that they ſhould be ſo puniſht who doe their endeavours, is to lay their damnation to God's charge: One of the chief ways with which the Ancients oppoſed the *Pagans*, was ſhewing them that their Religion taught ſuch things of their Gods, as no Reaſon would allow not to be diſhonourable to the Deity. Now truly, if when by this Argument we have rooted out the *Pagan* Gods, we lay as ſtrange imputations upon the God of the Chriſtians, what effect is it likely to produce, but onely to make men call for their old Gods again, and think that we had as good kept thoſe, who delighted in the Sacrifices of men, who depoſed their Fathers, and ate their Children, as have changed hardly for the better. It is reported in the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that a Painter for drawing Chriſt in the likeneſs of *Jupiter*, had his hand dried up; and certainly they who figure him to themſelves, and others, with Attributes ſo contrary to his, and more fit for a *Jupiter*, do him much more wrong, than if they had drawn him *Tela triſulca tenentem*, with a thunder-bolt in his hand. What Maſter, Father, or King, would not be eſteemed a Tyrant, who ſhould inflict not onely an infinite, and an eternal, but a ſlight and a ſhort puniſhment upon a Servant, Child, or Subject, for not doing when commanded, what the Commanders ſaw, with all his endeavours, which he had diligently applied, he could not doe? and ſhall we lay ſuch an aſperſion upon that God, (who though he be Juſtice it ſelf, is more Mercifull than Juſt, who is Πατὴρ οἰκτιρμῶν, the *Father of Mercies*) as that like a *Pharaoh*, he ſhould exact Brick, when there is no poſſibility of getting Straw? You may believe what you think fit, but rather than I will believe that any man's Soul that hath done his endeavours, not onely ſhall, but that it is poſſible it ſhould periſh, (although not illuminated by Angels, which yet, if illumination were neceſſary, I know, ſome way or other he ſhould have) rather than I will believe, either that any be damned for what is no ſin, or that ſin is τι ἔξω ἐφ' ἡμῖν, *ſomewhat* out *of our power*, (which if we thought, it would be ſoon out of our care) rather than when God hath ſo often told us, *That he deſires not the death of a ſinner*, I will give him the lie, and ſay, that he deſires his damnation, even as a Creature without any reference to his ſin, by chalking out onely ſuch a way from Hell, which it was impoſſible for his ſearch to lead him into, and ſo make him as much a worſe Father than Satan, as to damn is worſe than to devour; rather I ſay than this, I will make yours, or the *Pagan Legend*, *Ovid's Metamorphoſis*, my Creed; nor would I be a member of the Chriſtian Church, if this belief were a neceſſary part of Chriſtian Religion, but ſhould cry out with *Averroes*, (whom Tranſubſtantiation kept a *Pagan*) *Sit anima mea cum Philoſophis*; for the excellency, and purity of the doctrine in all other points tending wholly to the honour of God, and the common happineſs of man, the ſanctified life, conſtant ſufferings, and wonderfull Miracles of the Divulgers of it, the wonderfull progreſs of it, (not a much leſs Miracle than they) the weak things of the World confounding the ſtrong, and Fiſhermen confuting Philoſophers, that a Doctrine ſo ſtrict and contrary to humane deſires, and not onely barring from ſo much pleaſure and glory, but alſo making the Sectatours liable to ſuch cruelty and contempt, ſhould perſwade ſo many, and ſo wiſe perſons, to leave preſent things in hope of future; all this and whatſoever elſe, any *Raimond Sebund*, *Vives*, *Pleſſis*, *Charron*, or *Grotius*, could either more ſharply deſign, or more eloquently expreſs, would not reaſonably prevail, if ſuch a block as ſuch a Doctrine were laid in the way, (of which ſort your Religion hath yet more) and that one dead flie would corrupt the whole ointment; the excellency of the reſt of the Doctrine of Chriſtianity would be thought the Art, and the great and many miracles would be thought the Act of ſome evil *Genius*, ſuch as befriended *Apollonius*, to enſnare men by thoſe means into the belief of that opinion, which ſo much derogates from the Maker of things, and the prevailing of it, though a very probable argument, would not ſerve for a Paſs-port to ſuch an impoſſibility.

Reſp. *But far more do I doubt, whether ever man, who had not the way of Chriſt, or even of thoſe who walked in it, did ever doe his beſt (except ſome few, and very few, perhaps not two of Chriſt his greateſt Favourites) and was not ſo culpable, that his Perdition would not have been imputed unto himſelf. God of his mercy put us in the ſcore of thoſe of whom he ſaith,* He will take pity upon whom he pleaſeth, and compaſſion of them he pitieth.

Repl. How few their number is, we will not diſpute, ſince God's juſtice is in them vindicated, and they, not He, the Authour of their damnation. But neither believe I, that God is ſo rigorouſly juſt, as to ſtand ready to catch at a ſlip, (like an Uſurer for the forfeiture of a bond) but is of long ſuffering and Patience, and will as well accept our Repentance, (joyned with amendment) for this neglect in our ſearch, as for other ſins: Howſoever I am ſo far from thinking your prayer needleſs, that I both thank you for it humbly, and joyn with you in it heartily; but ἄλλος ῥυθμός.

To conclude, I am to make two very contrary excuſes; The one that my Paper hath left ſome things in yours unanſwered: The other, that I have anſwered others too often.

Of the firſt, I proteſt (which the Reader will believe me in) nothing is left out, in which I conceived any weight of Argument lay, but onely ſuch things, as though they were ſuperfluous for the Logick, yet conduced to the Rhetorick of your Work; an eloquent Treatiſe, being always like a hopefull young Man, *in quo aliquid amputandum.*

Of the Second, My Method, or rather my no Method was one, and your own Repetitions another Reaſon, ſo that you may the better pardon me that fault, of which your ſelf are a party-cauſe.

But to ſeal up all, I deſire you, that how little aſſent ſoever you give to my Arguments, you will be pleaſed to give credit to my Aſſertions, when I ſeriouſly profeſs my ſelf,

Your very much obliged

and thankfull Servant.

A LET-

A LETTER OF Mr. Walter Montague TO HIS FATHER [*H.E.* of *MANCHESTER*] Concerning the Change of his Religion; WITH The Anſwer of his Father: And Another ANSWER OF The Lord of Faulkland.

Mr. Montague's *Letter to his Father.*

My Lord,

After much debate concerning the fitteſt expreſſion of my duty to your Lordſhip, whether I ought by ſilence ſeek to ſuſpend the belief of the declaration of my ſelf, I have made here, or by a clear profeſſion of it, aſſure you of what I may onely fear to preſent you with, as apprehenſive of a miſ-interpreted affection; I concluded what was moſt ſatisfactory to my firſt, and immediate duty to God, was moſt juſtifiable to my ſecond, and derivative to Nature, therefore I reſolved ſo ſoon to give you this ingenuous account of my ſelf.

The greateſt part of my life capable of diſtinction of Religions, hath been employed in places, and converſant with perſons oppoſite to the Faith I was bred in; therefore it had been ſtrange, if natural curioſity, without any ſpiritual provocation, had not invited me to the deſire of looking with mine own eyes upon the foundation I ſtood upon, rather than holding faſt blindfold by my education, to agree to be carried away always after it, inſenſible of all ſhocks I met to unfaſten me; and beſides I was ſolicited with the reproaches Proteſtants preſs upon Catholicks, that they blindly believe all the Impoſitions of

the Church, without any illumination of their judgments; this methought enjoyned the cleareſt information of my ſelf, of the differences between us, I could propoſe to my capacity.

So at my laſt journey into *Italy*, I did imploy all my leiſure to a more juſtifiable ſettlement of my belief, as I then imagined, by a confirmation of my judgment, in what had been introduced by my birth and education. I began with this conſideration, that there were two ſorts of queſtions between the Catholicks and Proteſtants, the one of Right or Doctrine, the other of Fact or Story; as this, whether *Luther* were the firſt erecter of the Proteſtants Faith; or whether it had a viſible appearance of Paſtours and Teachers before his time? I reſolved to begin my enquiry with the matter of Fact, for theſe Reaſons;

Firſt becauſe they were ſo few, and ſo comprehenſible by all capacities; and the controverſies of Doctrine intricate, and ſo many, as they required much time, and learning for their diſquiſition onely; and I found my ſelf unprovided of both thoſe Requiſitions, for this undertaking: and for the deciſion of the other, I needed not much preſumption to believe my ſelf a competent Judge, when it conſiſteth onely in a peruſal of authentick teſtimonies;

Secondly, I conſidered, that there was no one point of controverted Doctrine, whereon all the reſt depended; but that this one queſtion of Fact was ſuch, as the deciſion of it, determined all the reſt; for if *Luther* could be proved to be the Inventer of the Proteſtants Faith, it was neceſſarily evicted of not being the true, ancient, and Apoſtolical Religion; Therefore I began with this enquiry which Proteſtants are bound to make, to anſwer this Objection, to find out an exiſtence of ſome Profeſſours of the Reformed Doctrine before *Luther*'s time; for finding the Catholicks were not obliged to prove the Negative, it was my part to prove to my ſelf the Affirmative, that our Religion was no Innovation, by ſome Pre-exiſtence before that time.

But in the peruſal of all the Stories or Records Eccleſiaſtical or Civil, as I could chuſe, I could find no ancienter a diſſention from the *Roman* Church, than *Waldo*, *Wickliffe* and *Huſſe*, who ſcarce had relation to the now-profeſſed Proteſtancy, ſo as I could find an interval of about 800 years, from the time that all Proteſtants confeſs an unity with the Church of *Rome*, down to thoſe perſons, without any apparent profeſſion of different Faith. To anſwer my ſelf in this point, I read many of our Proteſtant Authours who treated of it; and I found moſt of them reply to this ſenſe, in which I cite here one of the moſt authentick, Doctour *Whitaker*, in his Contr. 243. *pag.* 479. *Where they ask of us, where our Church was heretofore for ſo many ages? We anſwer, that it was in ſecret ſolitude*, that is to ſay, it was concealed and lay hid from the ſight of men; and farther the ſame Doctour *Chap.* 4. *pag.* 502. *Our Church always was*, but you ſay it *was not viſible*; *doth that prove that it was not? No, for it lay hid in a ſolitary concealment.* To this direct ſenſe all the anſwers were, that ever I could meet with, to this objection; I repeat no more; thoſe places being ſo poſitive to our point.

This confeſſion of Inviſibility in our Church for ſo many ages, did much perplex me; it ſeemed even to offend natural Reaſon; ſuch a derogation from God's power or providence, as the ſufferance of ſo great an eclipſe of the light of his true Church, and ſuch a Church as this is deſcrib'd to be, ſeeming to me repugnant to the main reaſon why God hath a Church upon earth, which is, to be a conſerver of the Doctrine of Chriſt, and his Precepts, and to convey it from age to age, untill the end of the World. Therefore I applied my ſtudy to peruſe ſuch Arguments as the Catholicks brought for the proof of the neceſſity of a continual Viſibility of the true Church down from the Apoſtles time in all ages, and appearance of Doctours teaching and adminiſtring the Sacraments; In proof of this, I found they brought many Prophecies out of the Scripture, but this Text moſt literal, out of the fourth of the *Epheſians*: *Chriſt hath placed in his Church Paſtours and Doctours, to the conſummation of the Saints, till we meet in the unity of the faith.*

And next, the diſcourſe upon which they infer this neceſſary viſible ſucceſſion of the Church, ſeemed to me to be a moſt rational and convincing one, which is to this effect: Natural reaſon not being able to proportion to a man a courſe that might certainly bring him to a ſtate of ſupernatural happineſs; and yet ſuch a courſe being neceſſary to mankind, which otherwiſe would totally fail of the end it was created for; there remained no other way, but that it muſt be propoſed unto us by one whoſe authority we could not doubt of, and that in ſo plain a manner, as even the ſimpleſt might be capable of it, as well as the learned. This work was performed by our Saviour, from whoſe mouth all our faith is originally derived. But the ſucceeding age not being able to receive it immediately from thence, it was neceſſary it ſhould be conveyed unto them that lived in it, by thoſe that did receive it from Chriſt's own mouth, and ſo from age to age untill the end of the World; and in what age ſoever this thread of Doctrine ſhould be broken, it muſt needs be acknowledged, for the reaſon above mentioned, that the light which ſhould convey mankind through the dark paſſage of this world, was extinguiſht, and it left without a guide to inevitable ruine; which cannot ſtand with God's providence and goodneſs; which Saint *Auguſtine* affirms for his opinion directly in his Book *de Util. cred. cap.* 16. ſaying, *If divine providence does preſide over our humane affairs, it is not to be doubted, but that there is ſome authority conſtituted by the ſame God, upon which going as upon certain ſteps, we are carried to God*; Nor can it be ſaid, he meant the Scriptures onely by theſe ſteps, ſince experience ſhews us by the continual altercation about the right ſenſe of ſeveral of the moſt important places of it, that what is contained there, cannot be a competent rule to mankind, which conſiſteth more of ſimple than learned men; and beſides, the Scripture muſt have been ſuppoſed to have been kept ſafe in ſome hands, whoſe authority muſt beget our acceptance of them; which being no other than the Church of all ages, we have no more reaſon to believe that it hath preſerved the Scripture free from all corruption, than that it hath maintained it ſelf in a continual viſibility; which Saint *Auguſtine* concludeth to be a certain mark of the true Church, in theſe words in his Book *contra* Petil. *c.* 104. *The true Church hath this certain ſign, that it cannot be hid*; therefore it muſt be known to all Nations; but that part of the [Proteſtant] *Donatiſts* is unknown to many, therefore cannot be the true; No inference can be ſtronger than from hence, that the concealment of a Church diſproves the truth of it.

Laſtly,

Laſtly, not to inſiſt upon the allegation of the conſent of all the Fathers of the Church in every ſeveral age, which ſeemed to me moſt clear; that which in this cauſe weighed much with me, was the Confeſſion and Teſtimony of the approved Doctours themſelves of the Proteſtant Church; as *Hooker* in his Book of *Eccleſ. Pol. pag.* 126. *God always had and muſt have ſome viſible Church upon earth.* And Doctour *Field* the firſt of *Eccle. cap.* 10. *It cannot be but thoſe that are the true Church, muſt be known by the Profeſſion of the truth:* and farther the ſame Doctour ſays, *How ſhould the Church be in the World, and no body profeſs openly the ſaving truth of God?* And Doctour *White* in his *Defence of the Way, cap.* 4. *pag.* 790. *The providence of God hath left monuments and ſtories for the confirmation of our Faith; and I confeſs truly, that our Religion is falſe, if a continual deſcent of it, cannot be demonſtrated by theſe monuments down from Chriſt's time.* This appeareth unto me a direct ſubmiſſion of themſelves to produce thoſe apparent teſtimonies of the publick profeſſion of their Faith, as the Catholicks demand; but this I could never reade, nor know of any that performed it; For D. *White* himſelf for want of proof of this, is fain to ſay in another place in his *Way to the Church, p.* 510. *The Doctours of our Faith have had a continual ſucceſſion, though not viſible to the world*; ſo that he flies from his undertaking of a conſpicuous demonſtration of the monuments of his Faith, to an inviſible ſubterfuge, of a belief without appearance: for he ſaith in the ſame Book in another place, *pag.* 84. *All the external government of the Church may fail, ſo as a local and perſonal ſucceſſion of Paſtours may be interrupted*; and *pag.* 403. *We do not conteſt for an external ſucceſſion; it ſufficeth that they ſucceed in the Doctrine of the Apoſtles, and the Faithfull, who in all ages did embrace the ſame truth*; So as here he renounceth abſolutely all external proofs of ſucceſſion, which before he conſented to be judged by. I cannot ſay I have verbally cited theſe Authours, becauſe I have tranſlated theſe places, though the Originals be in Engliſh, yet I am ſure their ſenſe is no way injured; and I have choſen to alledge Doctour *White*'s authority, becauſe he is an Orthodox [Divine, and a] profeſſour of the Proteſtant Church.

The reflexion of the ſtate of this queſtion, wherein I found the Proteſtants defend themſelves onely by flying out of ſight, by confeſſing a long inviſibility in their Church in appearance of Paſtours and Doctours, [the ſame interruption] left me much looſned from the faſtneſs of my profeſſed Religion, but had not yet tranſported me to the Catholick Church; for I had an opinion that our Divines might yet fill up this vacuity with ſome more ſubſtantial matter than I could meet with. So I came back into *England*, with a purpoſe of ſeeking nothing ſo intentively, as this ſatisfaction; and to this purpoſe, I did covertly (under another man's name) ſend this my ſcruple to one in whoſe learning and ſufficiency I had much affiance, in theſe terms, *Whether there was no viſible ſucceſſion to be proved in the Proteſtant Church ſince the Apoſtles time down to* Luther; *and what was to be anſwered to that objection, beſides the confeſſion of* [*a latency and*] *inviſibility for ſo many ages?* To this I could get no other anſwer, but that the point had been largely, and learnedly handled by Doctour *White*, and many others of our Church.

Upon this I reſolved to inform my ſelf in ſome other points, which ſeemed to me unwarrantable and ſuperſtitious in the Ceremonies of the Church of *Rome*, ſince I had ſuch an inducement, as ſo little ſatisfaction in a point which ſeemed to me ſo eſſential: And in all theſe ſcruples, I found mine own miſtake in the belief of the Tenets of the Catholick Church, gave me the onely occaſion of ſcandal, not the practice of their Doctrine; and to confirm me in the ſatisfaction of all them, I found the practice and authority of moſt of the ancient Fathers, and in the Proteſtant Refutation of theſe Doctrines, the Recuſation of their Authorities, as men that might err; So that the queſtion ſeemed then to me, whether I would rather hazard the erring with them, than with the later Reformers, which conſequently might err alſo in diſſenting from them.

I will not undertake to diſpute the ſeveral Tenets controverted, nor doubt that your Lordſhip will ſuſpect, that I omitted my ſatisfaction in any of them, ſince my reſolution of reconciling my ſelf to the *Roman* Church, is not liable to any ſuſpicion of too forward or precipitate reſignation of my ſelf, my judgment may perchance be cenſured of ſeducement, my affection cannot be of corruption.

Upon theſe occaſions I did ſoon after my return laſt into *England*, reconcile my ſelf to the *Roman* Catholick Church, in the belief and convincement of it to be the true, ancient and Apoſtolical Church, by her external marks, and her internal objects of Faith and Doctrine; and in her I reſolve to live and die, as the beſt way to ſalvation. When I was in *England*, I did not ſtudy the diſſimulation of my Faith ſo dexterouſly as if my fortune had read it to me; nor do I now profeſs it ſo deſperately as if it were my fortunes Legacy; for I do not believe it ſo dangerous, but it may recover; For I know the King's wiſedom is rightly informed, that the Catholick Faith doth not tend to the alienation of the [heart of a] ſubject, it rather ſuper-infuſeth a reverence and obedience to Monarchy, and ſtrengtheneth the bands of our obedience to our natural Prince; and his grace and goodneſs ſhall never find any other occaſion of diverſion of them, from the natural and uſual exerciſe of themſelves upon thoſe that have had the honour to have been bred with approbation of fidelity in his ſervice; nor can I fear that your Lordſhip ſhould apprehend any change in my duty: even your diſpleaſure (which you may apprehend upon this miſ-interpreted occaſion) ſhall never give me any of the leaſt receſſion from my duty; in which profeſſion I humbly ask your bleſſing, as

Paris, 21. *Novemb.* 1635.

Your Lordſhip's moſt obedient Son,

W. Montague.

THE

THE

Anſwer of his Father.

Walter,

YOUR Letter ſent from *Paris* tells me how much debate you had with your ſelf, *whether with ſilence to ſuſpend my belief, or by a clear profeſſion to aſſure me what you feared to preſent me*; but *what was moſt ſatisfactory to your firſt duty to GOD*, that you thought *moſt juſtifiable to your derivative duty to nature, therefore reſolved to give me an ingenuous account* of the declaration you had made then: Had you asked my counſel, before you ſignified the reſolution, it would have ſhewed more duty in you, and bred leſs diſcontent in me; but think, how welcome that Letter could be, that at once tells of the intention, and ſignifies the reſolution.

Say, you could not expect from me ſo much Theological Learning as to ſatisfie your ſcruples, yet it had been a fair addreſs, of a Son to a Father, in a matter of that importance; nor are you ignorant of my care, I dare ſay knowledge ſtudied, for the ſettlement of my Children in that true Faith which their Father profeſſed, and the Church of *England* hath eſtabliſhed: Therefore it would have been your greater juſtification, and my leſs ſorrow, [ſo] to have loſt your ſelf with love, if I could not have held you in with religious reaſon. Haply you will return upon me the miſconſtruction of that ſpeech, *If any man come to me, and hate not his Father, he cannot be my Diſciple*. But I muſt tell you that by this poſt-dated duty, you have treſpaſſed both upon love and duty; for you have robbed me of the means of helping you with mine advice; which as it is the beſt part of a Father's portion to give, ſo it is not the leaſt teſtimony of filial duty to ask.

Now to lay ſuch a blemiſh upon all the cares of your former education, as not to think me worthy to ſee your aim, untill you have ſet up your reſt, is ſuch a neglect, that without over-much fatherly candour, cannot be forced into an excuſable interpretation. It makes me ſuſpect that ſome politick reſpects, or private ſeducements, if not diſcontentments, have wrought upon you. Policy and Religion as they do well together, ſo do they as ill aſunder, the one being too cunning to be good; the other being too ſimple to be ſafe: But upon policy to change Religion, there is no warrant for that, leſs for diſcontentments, or upon ſeducements.

When I look upon your Letter, which you termed an *ingenuous account of your ſelf*, it ſeems to me not an account of your new profeſſed Religion, but rather an exprobration of mine, and ſo of ours of the Church of *England*.

Had I known the doubts before, I might have been an Adviſer, but objecting them after you had reſolved, you call me up now to be a Diſputer: although I be of his opinion who thought that truth did oftentimes ſuffer by too much altercation, it being a common errour amongſt great Clerks, to contend more for victory, than for verity: yet ſince you have ſo punctually led me into it, though it be contrary to my firſt reſolution of ſilence (elſe you had heard from me ſooner) and finding that the Letter you ſent me, had a farther reach than to give me ſatisfaction, (elſe the Copies of it would not have been divulged before I came to receive it, and uſes made of it to my diſcomfort) I therefore thought my ſelf tied to give you an anſwer, leſt thoſe of your new profeſſion ſhould think (as ſome of them ſay) that a new lapſarian was more able by a few days diſcipline to oppoſe our Religion, than an old Father and long profeſſour was able to defend it.

Having this tie upon me, I hope, on the one ſide, our learned Divines will pardon me, if for my Son's ſake I dip my pen in their ink; and you on the other ſide will lay mine arguments more to heart, as proceeding from the bowels of a Father, than if they had been framed by the brains of a learned Divine.

In this caſe alſo I have ſome advantage of other men, who though they might write more learnedly, yet cannot doe it ſo feelingly: for mine intereſt is not onely in the cauſe, but in the perſon, for whom I muſt give an account, if there be failing in my part to reduce him to truth: A perſon whoſe Letter I take into mine hands, as he did the Urn of his Son's aſhes, to ſhed over it *veras lachrymas*, as arguments of the truth; both which I hope ſhall perſwade forceably, if there be any of that bloud left in you that I gave you. It is true, affection is not to rule Religion: yet in this way, nature may cooperate with grace.

Your Letter ſays truly, *the greateſt part of your life capable of diſtinction of Religions, hath been in places, and converſant with perſons oppoſite to the Faith I bred you in*; *therefore*, you ſay, *it had been ſtrange, if natural curioſity, without any ſpiritual provocation, had not invited you with deſire of looking upon the foundation you trode on, rather than holding faſt blind-fold by your education, to be always carried away after it.*

In your education, God knows, my firſt care was to ſeaſon you with true Religion, wherein from a boy you attained unto ſuch knowledge, as *Spain* will witneſs, (when you were but a youth) how ſtrong a champion you were for the Proteſtant profeſſion. The Court of *France*, nor yet all the Princes Courts of Chriſtendom (moſt of which you have viſited) could never till now taint your Faith, but always rendred you ſound in the Religion which you carried with you hence.

But now *Italy* hath turned you, becauſe *England* hath diſcontented you.

In

In your *laſt journey into* Italy, as you ſaid, *you applied all your leiſure to confirm your judgment in the doctrine introduced by your education*; which if you had done ſeriouſly, you could not ſo ſoon, nor would not at all, upon ſo weak motives, have let go your hold; for of all other their Tenets the two you mentioned are the weakeſt, and have received cleareſt ſatisfaction: whereby it appears, that you were reſolved to give up the cauſe, before you came at it; and what you would not *hold blind-fold*, to give up blind-fold, which is worſt.

Could that be a motive to your deſertion of our Church, as perſwaded that *Luther* was the Father of our Faith? your ſelf cannot forget, how that we build our Faith upon Chriſt, not upon *Luther*, upon the Doctrine of the Scriptures, not upon the inventions of men. Could it be proved againſt us, that *Luther* or any other man, how gray-headed ſoever, were the *inventer of our Faith*, there needed no more to be ſaid; we would contend no longer: But we renounce all men alike as *inventers* of Religion, or any part of it; but hold onely the Apoſtolical Doctrine of the ancient Primitive and Catholick Church, and preſume not to coin any new Creed.

Yet we are not unwilling to grant that *Luther* was one, but not the firſt of many, that reſtored the purity of the Doctrine, which had been long ſmothered by the Papacy: our Faith, if you take in the whole, is no other but what is exiconized in the Apoſtles Creed, included in the Scriptures: If you take it in a lower and ſtraiter way, for ſo much of it as is oppoſed to the corruption of Popery; you muſt remember, that theſe points are neither the whole nor greateſt points of Faith; there are not any points of our Faith, but we are able to ſhew they had maintainers, few or many, in all ages ſince the Apoſtles time; and every of theſe ages, thoſe ſubſtructures of Popery oppoſed, ſome by one man, ſome by another.

I wonder therefore to ſee you carried away with that common and trivial calumny, that *Luther* was the *inventer* of our *Faith*; and why ſay you, that for the intervall of 800 years before there was no apparent profeſſion of Faith different from *Rome?* and this you collect by hiſtorical ſearch of *all the Stories and Records Eccleſiaſtical and Civil.* It ſeems, *Italy* affords you no Copies of our Writers, elſe might you ſee in them a liſt which they carry out through all theſe ſpaces, and ſhew you, that moſt of our Tenets have had the ſuffrage of the learnedeſt of *Romes* ſide, and how many men in the decurſion of time, from the ancienteſt of Fathers, have declared themſelves, and ſome of them apparently, yea earneſtly contended for the truth of our Doctrine.

And where you object, that *Waldo*, *Wickliffe*, and *Hus*, *had ſcarce any relation to the now-profeſſed Proteſtancy*; if you mean, becauſe we diſclaim thoſe horrid opinions which are put upon them, (how true God knows) therein you ſay truly, Neither they to us, nor we to them have any relation: but in the main points of Doctrine touching Faith, and oppoſition of the ſuperſtitions and uſurpation of the Papacy, we have a joynt conſent of all the beſt Writers, Hiſtorians, and Divines, of both ſides, that they and we conſent in one.

It is ſtrange therefore to ſay, that theſe [and we] had no relation to the Proteſtant profeſſion, who for ſubſtance of Religion held as we do, their errours onely we own not: and the conſent of times do all agree, that the *Waldenſes* flew out againſt their corruptions 400 years before *Luther* was born; nay, ſaith *Reynerius*, *Quidam dicunt quòd ſecta illa duraverit à tempore* Sylveſtri, *alii quod à tempore Apoſtolorum*, deriving their fundamental Doctrine from the time of the Apoſtles: nor were they few, *ſed multiplicati ſuper arenas maris*; nor Plebeians onely, *ſed principum favore armati*, as the Kings of *Arragon*, the Earls of *Tholouſe*, and many moe. So that, there are witneſſes more than ſufficient, that there were many who oppoſed themſelves to the Papacy in the Proteſtants Tenets, long before *Luther*. This [is the] firſt ſuppoſition failing, I will now let you ſee the miſtakes in the ſubſequent paſſages, and open to you my ſenſe, hoping yet that I may draw you again to me.

You, as you conceive, having ſhewed a defect of *Viſibility* in our Church till *Luther*'s time, labour to prove a neceſſity of Viſibility to every true Church: If it were granted, that it were ſimply neceſſary to the eſſentiating of a Church, to be able to demonſtrate in all times, both the viſible number of profeſſours of the truth, as alſo a viſible ſucceſſion of Paſtours, we are able to demonſtrate both theſe, for our defence, to be as unqueſtionable in our Church as in the Church of *Rome*: they that are otherwiſe minded will account this a bold undertaking, but it is no hard matter to doe: Wherefore the vanity of that queſtion, to ask, where our Church was before *Luther*, becomes not any man that hath read any thing of our Church Monuments.

But you would ſeem to me to prove it two ways; firſt, by the teſtimony of our own Divines; ſecondly, by argument.

By teſtimonies of our Divines you would have Doctour *Field*, Doctour *White*, and Maſter *Hooker*, to confeſs needfulneſs of *Viſibility*: and yet, for their own Church, fly to *latency*. For this ſecond, you inſtance Doctour *Whitaker*, and Doctour *White*, one of them, to confeſs *our Church for many ages to have been in a ſecret ſolitude*; and the other to let go his defence of viſible ſucceſſion by *flying to an inviſible ſubterfuge of non-apparency*: If you had better peruſed the Tracts of thoſe Writers, they would have given you full ſatisfaction; but you miſtake both the perſons and the points. Theſe made a demonſtration of thoſe three points: Firſt, that neither the Churches obſcurity is repugnant to the *Viſibility* of it: Secondly, nor the *Viſibility* of it, ſuch as excludes all *latency*: Nor yet the *latency* of Orthodox Chriſtians in the ſwaying time of Popery, ſuch as had not requiſite lineaments of an accountable *Viſibility*.

But you muſt know, that *Viſibility* doth not always carry the ſame height, but admits of degrees, ſo that we cannot ſay, that that wants viſibility, which hath it in a lower degree. The Sun compared with it ſelf, is in a degree viſible, though in a miſt, yet not ſo clearly viſible as when it ſhines out: ſo it is with the ſtate of the Church, becauſe her ſplendour is not *in termino*, but ſuch as receives degrees by augmentation or diminution; like as the Sun is as truly viſible under a cloud, as in his brightneſs, though not ſo clearly viſible; ſo not to admit the Church to be viſible, except ſhe be glorious, is an errour; for there's a variation of the Churches Viſibility, in reſpect of her object: the want of which conſideration, I believe is one cauſe why ſo many deceive themſelves in this point. Secondly, there is

another diverſity, which ariſeth from the viſive organs; ſome may ſee, and will not; there the fault is not in the object, but in the beholders. Philoſophers ſay, *Viſibilia non ſunt minus viſibilia cum non videntur, quam quando videntur*, The objects of ſight remain ſtill diſcernible, when they are not diſcerned: ſo it is with the Church, there are ſtrictures of viſibility diſcernible in her obſcure condition, but it is as *viſibile non viſum*, which falls out when men will not open their eyes, or they ſhut them on purpoſe, which hapned in the prevailing times of Popery, when this notwithſtanding, yet there were lights which appeared for the defence of the truth, and the diſcovery of errour, in every age of the intervall.

But ſure our men labour in vain to demonſtrate that Viſibility, whilſt they of the Papacy are ſo diſaffected, as not to acknowledge it upon any terms; otherwiſe this controverſie had long ſince been ended, if they had been as well diſpoſed to ſee, as we ready to ſhew our Viſibility.

In this queſtion men are to conſider that there is a double ſplendour of the Church, which makes way for the viſibility of it.

The proper ſplendour of a Church conſiſts in purity of Doctrine.

The common ſplendour of a Church conſiſts in the outward accommodations, which appertain not to the being, but the well-being of the Church, as temporal peace, multitude of profeſſours, local ſucceſſion of Paſtours; yet perſecution may interrupt this ſucceſſion of Paſtours, it may cut off the multitude of profeſſours, Hereſie may ſo far prevail as to make the Orthodox Church pull in her head, witneſs the time of *Arianiſm*, when few but godly *Athanaſius*, and ſome with him were fain to keep in corners. And of this our Divines are to be underſtood, when they ſpeak of our *latency*, that for this outward ſplendour, it ſuffered a great obſcurity, for divers hundred years; yet when it was at the loweſt, the Doctrine was viſible, and ſome profeſſours ſtill in the eye of the World, I would wiſh you well to conſider the things which I ſhall tell you.

1. The ſtate of the Church is ſo ordered by our great Maſter Chriſt, that ſhe is to expect her times of obſcurity, as well as her times of ſplendour, he hath made her eſtate *militant*, and appointed her to a paſſive condition, as well as an active: deſigned her to viciſſitudes of obſcurity, as well as luſtre, and ſhews her no leſs glorious in her obſcurity than in her triumph, as *Tertullian* ſaith of vertue, *Extruitur duritia; deſtruitur mollitia.*

2. This Viſibility repreſented by an innumerous multitude, local Succeſſion, ſecular Eſtate, theſe were not conſidered in the firſt times, when the Church ſtood ſound, nor in the later times, when ſhe got ſome recovery; onely in the intermediate, when ſhe lay under the croſs: And were theſe the *probats* of Faith, it had been ill with the *Iſraelites* Church, in the time of *Elias*; worſe with the Apoſtolical Church, when the *Scribes* and *Phariſees* ſate in *Moſes* Chair; worſt in the time of *Arianiſm*, and in times of Antichriſtianiſm, which ſhall come, as moſt Writers ſay.

3. This glorious ſucceſſion, which *Rome* ſo much brags of, is a deceitfull *medium* whereby to meaſure the truth of a Church; becauſe a Church may be a true Church without it; and be alſo a falſe Church with it. *Non colligitur ibi neceſſariò eſſe Eccleſiam, ubi eſt ſucceſſio,* ſaith *Bellarmine*; though *Stapleton* be of another mind: *Alexandria* challengeth ſucceſſion as well as *Rome*; the Church of *Conſtantinople* takes her pedigree from Saint *Andrew* the Apoſtle, and brings it down to our times. A falſe Church may have ſucceſſion, and a true Church may want it; otherwiſe you will grant that *Rome* is no true Church: the Chair at *Rome* hath ſometimes lain empty, ſometimes it hath carried double, and both of them have been depoſed; theſe broken links mar the chain of that ſucceſſion. But becauſe this rather concerns the perſons, not the thing, It is otherwiſe to be clearly ſhewed, that it may be a true Church that hath not this uninterrupted ſucceſſion: for elſe no Church at all could be true in her firſt plantation. For ſucceſſions are by deſcent, deſcents have no place in firſt originals, whereas the Orthodox Faith doth the very firſt day put her in poſſeſſion of Apoſtolical ſucceſſion, as *Tertullian* well ſaith, That Churches which have not their original deſcent from the Apoſtles, are Apoſtolical, *propter conſanguinitatem doctrinæ.* The place which you cite out of the fourth to the *Epheſians*, proves clearly the neceſsity of orthodox Paſtours, not of local Succeſsion; you may hereby ſee, how in the informing of your ſelf in this particular, you are overtaken.

This thing alſo much troubles me, that your Letters ſaid, that when you laſt came back out of *Italy*, you *ſought nothing ſo attentively as ſatisfaction* in theſe points of controverſie, eſpecially that touching the Viſibility of our Church in all ages, but could receive none. Could you never in all the while of your laſt being in *England*, find the time to acquaint me with your deſire? doubtleſs, I muſt ſay, you did in this time *ſtudy the diſſimulation of your intention*, otherwiſe I muſt have known it.

I was heretofore more indulgent towards you, for God knows it, *Walter*, the Son of my body was never ſo dear unto me, as the ſalvation of my ſon *Walter*'s ſoul; your younger years can witneſs, how I ſhewed you the way which I my ſelf took to ſettle mine own ſalvation: for though it was my happineſs to be derived from vertuous and religious Parents, yet I took not my Religion merely by deſcent, but ſtudied and examined the ground on which I was to found my Faith; I read both Papiſts and Proteſtants, I found both confident, and contradictory. *Et quoties palpitavit mihi tremulum cor*, before I ſettled either way? ſometimes thinking ſafeſt to mean well, and to keep unſettled either way; yet I ſaw a neceſsity laid on me, to be of one of the two Churches, but how to find out which of them was the true Church, whereof I muſt be a member if I would ſecure my ſalvation, *hic labor, hoc opus eſt:* I eaſily reſolved, there was not two Churches whereof a man might chuſe which to be of; and after long ſtudy I found clearly that to be the true Church, which conſtantly held the common Faith, which Faith had the Scripture for the rule; this known and reſolved, which is undoubted, then I was not ſcared with that fearfull cenſure of the *Roman* Church, which pronounced all damned that are not of that Church.

But how much am I diſtaſted to find ſeveral arguments made in the Letter, all to inſinuate that the Scriptures are not a competent rule of Faith? and firſt, variety of interpretation; ſecondly, obſcurity of ſome places; thirdly, inauthentickneſs of themſelves; fourthly, their authority dependent on the Church; fifthly, the purity of them warranted by the viſibility of the Church; ſixthly, made authentick

by

by the Churches authority: ſtrange aſſertions; as if the true Church were not to be tried by the true Faith, but the true Faith by the *Church*. I know my ſelf bound to believe the authority of that Church which makes Scripture the rule of Faith; but as for the act of any Church, though it be a fit Miniſtery to ſhew me the way, yet it is not of authority ſufficient of it ſelf to ſecure me of my ſalvation; From true Faith the true Church is inferr'd, and which is the true Church, when all is done, muſt be tried by the Scripture: but it is now with us, as it was in the time of *Chryſoſtome*, when there was ſo much queſtion, which was the true Church, and men were of ſo many different opinions about it, as none could tell what Church to be of, or what Religion was ſafeſt to truſt to; ſo ſaith the Father of the Scriptures, which in matters of Faith neceſſary to ſalvation ſpeak ſo truly, ſo fully, ſo plainly, as it is but a ſhift for a man to ſay, he underſtands them not; and good Saint *Auſtine* finding that from controverſies in Religion, there came no other fruit, but *indeterminata luctatio*, ſaid with ſorrow, Why do we ſtrive about our Father's Will? *Nos ſumus fratres*, and our Father is not dead inteſtate, but hath left his Will and Teſtament in writing: let it be followed, and all controverſies will ſoon be ended.

Flatter not your ſelf, *Walter*, the Remonſtrance you make, ſhews that the *reſignation* you made of your ſelf to the Church of *Rome*, was *precipitate*, and then the *reſolution to live and die* there, deſperate; yet you give ſome hopes when you ſay, nor do you *now ſo deſperately profeſs, as if it were your fortune's legacy, for you do not believe it ſo dangerous but it may recover*. The King's benignity and goodneſs is always to interpret the beſt; but know, that his Majeſty hath a better opinion of thoſe who are bred ſuch, than of thoſe who become ſuch by relapſe. Nor am I willing to apprehend any change of your duty; yet take this for a caveat, that commonly all changes follow change of Faith. I never travelled of you till now, and it is with a great deal of pain; I thought you ſhould have wept over me, when Nature had called for her due; but you have prevented me; And yet, my Son, you may yet return to me, but I ſhall never go to you in this way, nor had I ever gone ſo far into this queſtion, but to fetch you again, my Son, otherwiſe a loſt Child.

Thus as your Letter began, ſo do I end; *after much debate concerning a fit expreſſion* of my ſelf, whether was better, by not writing to ſhew my diſlike, or by long writing to labour your recovery; this laſt was moſt *ſatisfactory* to my conſcience, though the other more agreeable to nature diſpleaſed; I have therefore reſolved, as you ſee, to give you this anſwer; and I pray God that he may bleſs you and me ſo in it, that my pen may have the fruit my heart wiſhes.

Your loving Father

Mancheſter.

THE

Lord of Faulkland's Anſwer.

A Letter of Maſter *Montague*, juſtifying his change of Religion, being diſpers'd in many Copies, I was deſired to give my opinion of the Reaſons, and my reaſon if I miſliked them: Having read and conſider'd it, I was brought to be perſwaded; Firſt, becauſe having been ſometimes in ſome degrees mov'd with the ſame inducements, I thought that what ſatisfied me, might poſſibly have the ſame effect upon him: Secondly, becauſe I being a Layman, a young man, and an ignorant man, I thought a little reaſon might in likelihood work more from my pen, than more from theirs, whoſe profeſſion, age and ſtudies might make him ſuſpect, that it is they are too hard for him, and not their cauſe for his: Thirdly, becauſe I was very deſirous to doe him ſervice, not onely as a man, and a Chriſtian, but as one whom all that know him inwardly, eſteem of great parts (and I am deſirous ſomewhat to make up my great want of them, by my reſpects to thoſe that have them) and as an impartial ſeeker of Truth which I truſt he is, and I profeſs my ſelf to be. And ſo much for the cauſe of this paper: I come now to that which it oppoſeth.

Firſt then, whereas he defends his ſearch, I ſuppoſe he is rather for that to receive praiſe, than to make apologies, all men having cauſe to ſuſpect that gold, which were given with this condition, that the Receiver ſhould not try it by any touchſtone.

Secondly, He ſaith, that there being *two ſorts of queſtions, the one of Right or Doctrine, the other of Fact or Story*, as *whether the Proteſtants Faith had a viſible appearance before* Luther, he *reſolved to begin his enquiry with the matter of Fact*, as being ſooner to be found (becauſe but one) and eaſier to be comprehended: To this I anſwer by ſaying, that if they would not appeal from the right Tribunal, or rather Rule, which is the Scripture, thoſe many might eaſier be ended than this one, (we building our Faith onely upon plain places, and all reaſonable men being ſufficient judges of what is plain;) but if they appeal to a conſent of Fathers, or Councils, whereof many are loſt, many, not loſt, not to be gotten, many uncertain whether Fathers or no Fathers, and thoſe which we have, and know, being too many for almoſt any induſtry to reade over, and abſolutely for any memory to remember, (which yet is neceſſary, becauſe any one clauſe of any one Father deſtroys a conſent) and being beſides, liable to all the exceptions which can be brought againſt the Scriptures being the Rule, as difficulty, want of an infallible interpreter, and ſuch like; and being denied to have any infallibility (eſpecially when they ſpeak as witneſſes, which a conſent of them never doth againſt us) by one party, which the Scripture is allow'd to have by both; then I wonder not if he think ſuch a way ſo uncertain, and ſo long, that he was willing to chuſe any ſhorter cut rather than travel it. Neither do I believe this to be ſo ſhort, or ſo concluding as he imagines; for if he conſider the large extent of Chriſtian Religion, ſo that we know little, from any indifferent Relater, of the opinions of the *Abiſſines*, ſo great a part of *Chriſtendom*; if he conſider the great induſtry of his Church in extinguiſhing thoſe whom they have call'd Hereticks, and alſo their Books, ſo that we know ſcarce any thing of any of them, but from themſelves (who are too partial to make good Hiſtorians) if he conſider how carefully they ſtop mens mouths (even thoſe of their own) with their *Indices Expurgatorii*; it will then appear to him, both a long work to ſeek, and a hard one to find, whether any thought like *Luther* in all ages; and that he concludes very raſhly, who reſolves there was none, becauſe he cannot find any, ſince they might have been viſible in their times, and yet not ſo to us (for men are not the leſs viſible when they are ſo, for not being after remembred) as a man may be a Gentleman, though he know not his pedigree: ſo that as I will not affirm that there were always ſuch, becauſe I cannot prove it, ſo neither ought they to make themſelves ſure there were none, without they could prove that, which is impoſſible; and therefore no argument can be drawn from thence: and if it could be proved, that ſuch a no-ways erring Church muſt at all times be, I had rather believe that there were ſtill ſuch, though we know them not, which may be true, than that theirs is it, which in my opinion cannot.

Thirdly, He ſays, he could find *no one point of controverted Doctrine, whereupon all the reſt depended, but that this one queſtion of fact was ſuch, as the deciſion of it, determined all the reſt.* To this I anſwer, that the queſtion of the Infallibility of the Pope, at leaſt of thoſe who adhere to him, which they call the Church, is ſuch a one, as if determin'd, muſt determine all the reſt, and not onely ſo to us, but to all men; whereas this (though granted neceſſary, and determin'd to his wiſh) would indeed conclude againſt us, but not for them; ſince the *Greek* Church would put in as good plea upon the title of Viſibility, as that of *Rome*; and he would be to begin a new with them, when he had ended with us.

Fourthly, He gives his reaſon: *If* Luther *could be evicted to be the Innovatour*, his Religion was then *evicted of not being the true ancient and Apoſtolical*; To this I anſwer, by confeſſing the conſequence; but he might be the Renovatour, and not the *Innovatour*; and then, no ſuch conſequence follows.

Fifthly, He ſaith, we are bound to find an exiſtence of ſome Profeſſours of the Reformed Religion before *Luther*, which requiry is grounded upon his ſuppoſition of the neceſsity of a continual ſucceſsion of a viſible and no-ways-erroneous Church. Now I will firſt examine the ſenſe of his terms: By the

firſt,

firſt, I conceive, by a place he cites out of Saint *Auguſtine*, that he means *Viſible* to all Nations; but I pray hath his been always ſo? I mean (at leaſt for many Centuries) to thoſe Nations which *Columbus* hath not long ſince diſcovered? By the ſecond term *Church*, I ſuppoſe he means a company of Chriſtians holding neither more or leſs than Chriſt taught (for in a more large ſenſe no man denies the Church to have been always in ſome degrees viſible) and in this ſenſe I not onely deny it neceſſary, that it ſhould always be *viſible*, but that it ſhould always be, for I doubt whether there be, or for a long while have been any ſuch. Next, that ſuch a one [as] he means, appears, becauſe when Catalogues have been brought of ſome who in all ages have differed from them in things which we hold, his ſide would not accept of them, becauſe they agreed not with us in all things; and yet when *Campian* intends to prove all the Fathers to be his, he uſeth onely this courſe, of inſtancing in ſome wherein they agree with him (though ſometimes not ſo much, but rather the contrary ought to be inferred, as in the inſtance of *Polycarpus*, for comparing his words with the Hiſtory, it will appear, that he concluded him a Papiſt for not being perſwaded by the Pope) though they differed from them in many other, as indeed all the notable Fathers do in more than one point. I will therefore ſay, that if this be required to ſhewing that a *Church* hath been ever *viſible*, it is more than either part can doe, and therefore I hope they will come, upon better conſideration, to confeſs that not neceſſary for us to doe, which is impoſſible for themſelves: For let any man look into Antiquity, I will not ſay without all prejudice, but without an abſolute Reſolution of ſeeing nothing in it that contradicts his preſent belief, and if he find not ſome opinions of the Church of *Rome*, as unknown to Antiquity, as either he or I, as the Popes Indulgences having power to deliver out of Purgatory (confeſt by Biſhop *Fiſher*, and *Alphonſus de Caſtro*, where they treat of Indulgences) if he find not others at firſt unknown, after known, but not held *de fide*, which are yet ſo at *Rome*, as prayer to Saints, their enjoying the beatifical viſion before the day of Judgment, the Aſſumption of the Bleſſed Virgin, and her being free from all actual ſin; If he find not ſome wholly unknown and abſolutely condemned, which we condemn, as the lawfulneſs of picturing of God the Father, whereof the firſt is confeſt by *Baronius* in the Margin, to an Epiſtle of a Pope, which ſays the ſame, and the latter is to be found in many places of Saint *Auſtine*, *Lactantius*, and others; nay, if he find not that all the Doctours, Saints and Martyrs of the two firſt ages (I mean as many as are now extant, and ſpeak of it) held ſomething which both parties condemn, as the opinions of the *Chiliaſts*; If, I ſay, he find not this, or I ſhew him not that he might have found it, I profeſs I will be ready to ſpend my life for that Church, againſt which I now employ my pen: So that this will be the end, Neither of our Churches have been always viſible; onely this is the difference, that we are troubled to ſhew our Church in the latter and more corrupt ages, and they theirs in the firſt and pureſt, that we can leaſt find ours at night, and they theirs at noon. And whereas he expects that D. *White* ſhould ſtand to this, to confeſs his Religion falſe, if a continual deſcent of it could not be demonſtrated; if he himſelf pleaſe to grant as much as he exacts, if he but continue in his Reſolution, and in this ſearch, I doubt no more but that he will ſoon leave to be a Papiſt, than I ſhould doubt if I ſaw him now receiving the Communion in the King's Chapel, that he had done it already.

Tom. 9. An. 726. *De fide & ſymb. 2. lib. 2. c.*

Sixthly, his reaſon for the neceſſity of the *Viſibility* follows, becauſe the contrary were a *derogation from God's power or providence*; I anſwer, to ſay he could not keep the truth exactly in mens belief, were to derogate from God's *power*; to ſay, he had not given ſufficient means to find the truth, and yet damned men for errour, the firſt would be a derogation from his *Providence*, the ſecond from his *Juſtice*; but to ſay, he ſuffers men to err, who neglect the means of not erring, and that he damns none for a mere errour, in which the will hath no part, and conſequently the man no fault, derogates from none of the three. But ſays he, this is *repugnant to the main reaſon why God hath a Church upon earth*, to be the *conſerver of the Doctrine of Chriſt, and to convey it from age to age*; I anſwer, to *conſerve it*, is every man's duty, but ſuch, as they may all fail in; and is indeed rather the form of the Church, than the end of the Church, an exact conſervation making an exact Church, as a leſs perfect conſerving, a leſs perfect Church. As for *conveyance* of Doctrine, the whole Church conveys none, whereof many (if his be it) have had but little convey'd to them. Particular Chriſtians (eſpecially Paſtours) teach others, which it is every man's duty to do, when he meets with them who want inſtruction which he can give, and they are likely to receive; yet is not the inſtruction of others, every man's main end.

But I know Maſter *Montague* perſwades himſelf, that ſome body of men are appointed to convey this Doctrine, which men are to receive, onely becauſe they deliver it; and this I abſolutely deny; for we receive no Doctrine from the Church, upon the Churches authority, becauſe we know her not to be the Church, till we have examined her Doctrine, and ſo receive rather her for it, than it for her. Neither for the conveyance of the Truth, is it neceſſary that any company of men in all times hold it all, becauſe ſome may convey ſome truths, and others other, out of which, by comparing their Doctrine with the Scripture, men may draw a perfect body of Truths: and though they delivered few other Truths, yet in delivering Scripture (wherein all neceſſary Truth is contain'd) they deliver all, and by that rule whoſoever regulates his life and Doctrine, I am confident, that though he may miſtake Errour for Truth in the way, he ſhall never miſtake Hell for Heaven in the end.

Seventhly, His next reaſon is their common *Achilles*, the fourth of the *Epheſians*, which he chuſeth onely to employ like his *Triarios*, his main Battel, leaving his *Velites*, his light armed Souldiers, ſome places too allegorical, even in his own opinion, to ſtand examination. The words are theſe, *He hath given ſome Prophets, ſome Apoſtles, ſome Evangeliſts, ſome Paſtours, and ſome Doctours, for the inſtauration of the Saints, for the work of the Miniſtery, for the edification of the body of Chriſt, till we all meet in the unity of Faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God unto a perfect man, and unto the meaſure of the age of the fulneſs of Chriſt; That we may be no more children toſt and carried away with every wind of doctrine*, &c. *Verſe* 11, 12, 13. Now out of this place I ſee not how a ſucceſſion may be evinced; rather I think it may, that the Apoſtle meant none: For firſt, he ſaith, not he will give, but *he hath given*; and who could ſuppoſe that the Apoſtle could ſay, that Chriſt had given then, the preſent Pope, and the Doctours who now adhere to him? Secondly, allow that by *he hath given*, were meant, he hath *promiſed* (which would be a

gloſs not much unlike to that which one of the moſt witty and moſt eloquent of our modern Divines, Doctour *Dun* notes of *Statuimus*, i. *Abrogamus)* yet ſince theſe ſeveral Nouns are all governed by the ſame Verb, and no diſtinction put, it would prove as well a neceſſity of a continual ſucceſſion of *Apoſtles*, *Prophets* and *Evangeliſts*, as of *Paſtours*, and *Doctours*; which is more than either they can ſhew, or pretend they can; ſo that it ſeemeth to me to follow, that theſe were then given to doe this, till then, and not a ſucceſſion of them promiſed till then, to doe this; and ſo we receiving and retaining the Scriptures, wherein what they taught is contain'd (as we would any thing elſe, that had as general and ancient a Tradition, if there were any ſuch) need no more; for if he ſay, that men are *toſt*, for all the Scriptures, I anſwer, ſo are they for-all their Doctours; nay, if theſe keep any from being toſt, it is the Scripture which does it, upon which their authority is by them founded upon their own interpretation, and reaſon, who yet will not give us leave to build any thing upon ours out of plainer places; and though they tell us that we cannot know the Scripture, but from the Church, they are yet fain (as appears) to prove the Authority of the Church out of Scripture, which makes me ask them in the words of their own *Campian*, and with much more cauſe, *Nihilne pudet Labyrinthi?*

Eighthly, There follows another reaſon to this ſenſe, that *Reaſon not being able* to ſhew a way to eternal *happineſs*, and without ſuch an one, man would *fail of the end* to which he was ordained, it *muſt be propoſed* by an infallible authority, *in ſo plain a manner, as even the ſimple might be capable of it*; which being performed by our Saviour, it muſt be conveyed to ſucceeding ages by thoſe who heard it from him; and whenſoever this thred failed, mankind was left without a guide to inevitable ruine: I anſwer, that though all this be granted, it proves not againſt us; for we have the Scripture come down to us, relating Chriſt's Doctrine, and written by thoſe that heard it, and which the ſimple are capable of underſtanding (I mean, as much as is plain, and more is not neceſſary, ſince other Queſtions may as well be ſuffered without harm, as thoſe between the *Jeſuites* and *Dominicans* about Predetermination, and between the *Dominicans*, and almoſt all the reſt, about the Immaculate Conception) and thoſe who are not, neither are they capable out of Scripture to diſcern the true Church; much leſs by any of thoſe notes, which require much underſtanding and large learning, as conformity with the Ancients, and ſuch like.

Ninthly, The ſame anſwer I give to this, ſerves alſo to the following words of Saint *Auſtin*, for whereas Maſter *Montague* concludeth, that he could not *mean the Scriptures* as a competent rule to mankind, which conſiſteth moſt of ſimple perſons, becauſe there hath been *continual altercations about the ſenſe of important places*; I anſwer, that I may as well conclude by the ſame Logick, that neither is the Church a competent guide, becauſe in all ages there have alſo been diſputes, not onely about her authority, but even which was ſhe; and to whatſoever reaſon he imputes this, to the ſame may we the other, as to negligence, pride, prejudication and the like; and if he pleaſe to ſearch, I verily believe he will find, that the Scriptures are both eaſier to be known than the Church, and that it is as eaſie to know what theſe teach, as when that hath defined, ſince they hold no Decrees of hers binding *de fide*, without a confirmation of the Pope's, who can never be known infallibly to be a Pope, becauſe a ſecret *Simony* makes him none; no not to be a Chriſtian, becauſe want of due intention in the Baptizer, makes him none; whereof the latter is always poſſible, and the firſt in ſome ages likely; and in hard Queſtions, a readineſs to yield to the Scriptures when they ſhall be explained, methinks ſhould ſerve as well, as a readineſs to aſſent to the Decrees of the Church, when thoſe ſhall be pronounced.

Tenthly, He ſaith the *Scripture muſt be kept ſafe in ſome hands, whoſe authority muſt beget our acceptance of them, which being no other than the Church of all ages, we have no more reaſon to believe, that it hath preſerved that free from corruption, than it ſelf in a continual viſibility:* I anſwer, that neither to giving *authority* to Scripture, nor to the *keeping* of them, is required a continual Viſibility of a no-ways erring Body of Chriſtians; the writers of them give them their authority amongſt Chriſtians, nor can the Church move any other; and that they were the writers of them, we receive from the general Tradition, and teſtimony of the firſt Chriſtians, not from any following Church, whō could know nothing of it but from them (for for thoſe parts which were then doubted of, by ſuch as were not condemned for it by the reſt, why may not we remain in the ſame ſuſpence of them that they did?) and for their being *kept* and conveyed, this was not done onely by their Church, but by [others, as by] the *Greeks*; and there is no reaſon to ſay, that to the keeping, and tranſmitting of Records ſafely, it is required to underſtand them perfectly, ſince the old Teſtament was kept and tranſmitted by the *Jews*, who yet were ſo capable of erring, that out of it they lookt for a temporal King, when it ſpake of a ſpiritual: and methinks, the teſtimony is greater of a Church that contradicts the Scripture, than of one which doth not, ſince no man's witneſſing is ſo ſoon to be taken, as when againſt himſelf, and ſo their teſtimony is more receivable, which is given to the Scripture by which themſelves are condemned: Beſides, the general reverence which ever hath been given to theſe Books, and the continual uſe of them (together with ſeveral parties, having always their eyes upon each other, ready and deſirous to have ſomewhat to accuſe in their Adverſaries) gives us greater certainty that theſe are the ſame writings, than we have, that any other ancient Book is any other ancient Authours, and we need not to have any other unerring company preſerv'd to make us ſurer of it: yet the Church of *Rome*, as infallible a Depoſitary as ſhe is, hath ſuffer'd ſome varieties to creep into the Copies in ſome leſs material things, nay and ſome whole Books (as they themſelves ſay) to be loſt; and if they ſay, how then can that be the rule, whereof part is loſt? I anſwer, that we are excus'd if we walk by all the rule that we have; and this makes much againſt Traditions being the rule, ſince the Church hath not lookt better to God's unwritten word than to his written, and if ſhe pretend ſhe hath, let her tell us the cauſe why *Antichriſt*'s coming was deferred, which was a Tradition of St. *Paul* to the *Theſſalonians*, and which without impudence ſhe cannot pretend [not] to have loſt; and if again they ſay, God hath preſerved all neceſſary Traditions, I reply, ſo hath he all neceſſary Scripture; for by not being preſerved, it became to us not neceſſary, ſince we cannot be bound to believe and follow, what we cannot find. But beſides, I believe that all which was ever neceſſary, is contain'd in what remains; for *Pappias* ſays of S. *Mark*, that he writ all

that

that S. *Peter* preach'd; as *Irenæus* doth, that *Luke* writ all that S. *Paul* preach'd; nay *Vincentius Lirinenſis* though he would have the Scripture expounded by ancient Tradition, yet confeſſeth that all is there that is neceſſary (and yet then, there was no more Scripture than we now have) as indeed by ſuch a Tradition as he ſpeaks of, no more can be proved than is plainly there, and almoſt all Chriſtians conſent in; and truly I wonder that they ſhould brag ſo much of that Authour, ſince both in this and other things he makes much againſt them, eſpecially in not ſending men to the preſent Roman Church, a much readier way (if he had known it) than ſuch a long and doubtfull one as he preſcribes, which indeed it is impoſſible that almoſt any queſtion ſhould be ended by.

Eleventhly, He brings S. *Auſtine*'s authority to prove, that the true Church muſt be always viſible; but if he underſtood *Church* in Maſter *Montague*'s ſenſe, I think he was deceived. Neither is this impudence for me to ſay, ſince I have cauſe to think it but his particular opinion, by his ſaying (which Cardinal *Perron* quotes) that before the *Donatiſts*, the queſtion of the Church had never been exactly diſputed of, and by this being one of his main grounds againſt them, and yet claiming no Tradition, but onely places of Scripture, moſt of them allegorical; and if it were no more, then I may better diſſent from it, than he from all the firſt Fathers, (for *Dionyſius Arcopagita* was not as yet hatcht) in the point of the *Chiliaſts*, though ſome of them (*Pappias* and *Irenæus*) claimed a direct Tradition, and Chriſt's own words. Secondly, as he uſeth this kind of liberty, ſo he profeſſeth it in his nineteenth Epiſtle, where he ſaith, that to Canonical Scriptures he had onely learnt to give that reverence, as not to doubt of what they ſaid, becauſe they ſaid it, and from all others he expected proof from Scriptures, or reaſon. Thirdly, the Church of *Rome* condemns ſeveral opinions of him, and therefore ſhe ought not to find fault with them who imitate her examples.

Twelfthly, He adds two reaſons more, *the conſent of the Fathers of all ages*, and the *confeſſion of Proteſtants*: To the firſt I anſwer, that I know not of any ſuch, and am the more unapt to believe it, becauſe Mr. *Montague* vouchſafes not to inſiſt upon it, nor to quote any, which I gueſs he would have done, but that he miſdoubted their ſtrength. Secondly, ſuppoſe that all the Fathers which ſpeak of this, did ſay ſo; yet if they ſay it, as private Doctours, and claim no Tradition for it, I know not why they ſhould weigh more than ſo many of the now-learned, who having more helps from Art, and no fewer from Nature, are not worſe ſearchers into what is Truth, though leſs capable of being witneſſes to what was Tradition. Thirdly, they themſelves often profeſs they expect not to be read as Judges, but as to be judged, by their and our rule, the Canonical Scriptures. Fourthly, Let him pleaſe to reade about the immaculate conception *Roſa*, *Salmeron* and *Wadding*, and he will find me as ſubmiſſive to antiquity, even whilſt I reject it, as thoſe of his own Party; for they, to prefer new opinions before old, are fain to prefer new Doctours before old, and to confeſs the latter more perſpicacious, and to differ from thoſe of former times, with as little ſcruple as he would from *Calvin* (whom *Maldonat* on purpoſe to oppoſe, confeſſeth he chuſeth a new Interpretation before that of all the Ancients, which no witneſs but my eyes could have made me believe) nay, and produce other points wherein their Church hath decreed againſt the Fathers, to perſwade her to doe ſo again, although *Campian* with an eloquent brag, would perſwade us, that they are all as much for him, as *Greg.* the 13th. who was then Pope. *In 6. cap. Joh.*

To the ſecond I anſwer, that Infallibility is not by us denied to the Church of *Rome*, with an intention of allowing it to particular Proteſtants, how wiſe and learned ſoever.

Thirteenthly, He ſays next, that he after *inform'd himſelf in other points which ſeem'd to him unwarrantable*, and *ſuperſtitious*, and *found, onely his own miſtakes gave him occaſion of ſcandal*; To this I anſwer, that I cannot well anſwer any thing, unleſs he had ſpecified the points; but I can ſay that there are many, as picturing God the Father (which is generally thought lawfull, and as generally practiſed) their offerings to the *Virgin Mary* (which onely differs from the hereſie of the *Colliridians* in that a *candle* is not a *cake*) their praying to Saints, and believing *de fide* that they hear us, though no way made certain that they do ſo, and many more, which without any *miſtake* of his, might have given him occaſion to be ſtill *ſcandalized*; for whereas he ſaith, that theſe points were grounded upon the *authority of the ancient Fathers*, which was *refuſed* as inſufficient by Proteſtants, I anſwer, that none of theſe I name, have any ground in the Ancienteſt, nay, the firſt is by them diſallowed; and if any other ſuperſtition of theirs, have from them any ground, yet they who depart from ſo many of the Ancients in ſeveral opinions, cannot by any reaſon be excuſed for retaining any errour, becauſe therein they have conſent; nor have the Proteſtants cauſe to receive it from them, as a ſufficient Apology, neither hath he to follow the Fathers rather than Proteſtants, in a caſe in which not the perſons, but the reaſons were to be conſidered: For when Saint *Hierome* was by this way both brought into, and held in a ſtrange errour, though he ſpake ſomething like Maſter *Montague*, *Patiaris me errare cum talibus*, *Suffer me to err with ſuch men*, yet he could not obtain Saint *Auguſtine*'s leave, who would not ſuffer him, but anſwered their reaſons, and neglected their authorities.

Fourteenthly, He ſpeaks of his Religion *ſuper-infuſing* loyalty, and if he had onely ſaid, it deſtroyed or weakned it not, I (who wiſh that no doubt of his allegeance may once enter his mind to whom we all owe it, but profeſs my ſelf his humble ſervant, and no ways his enemy though his adverſary) would then have made no anſwer; but ſince he ſpeaks as if Popery were the way to *obedience*, I cannot but ſay, that though no tenet of their whole Church (which I know) makes at all againſt it, yet there are prevailing opinions of that ſide, which are not fit to make good ſubjects, when their King and they are of different perſwaſions. For beſides that Cardinal *D' Oſſat* (an Authour which I know Maſter *Montague* hath read, becauſe whoſoever hath but conſidered State matters, muſt be as well skilled in him, as any Prieſt in his Breviary) tells us, that it is the *Spaniards* maxime, *that faith is not to be kept with Hereticks*, and more, that the Pope intimated as much in a Diſcourſe intended to perſwade the King of *France* to forſake the Queen of *England*; he ſays moreover, ſpeaking in another place about the Marquizat of *Saluces*, that they hold at *Rome*, that the Pope, to avoid a probable danger of the increaſing of Hereſie, may take away a territory from the true owner, and diſpoſe of it to another; and many alſo defend, that he hath power to depoſe an Heretical Prince, and of Hereſie he makes himſelf the Judge:

ſo

ſo that though I had rather my tongue ſhould cleave to the roof of my mouth, than that I ſhould deny that a Papiſt may be a good Subject, even to a King whom he counts a Heretick, ſince I verily believe that I my ſelf know very many very good; yet Popery is like to an ill air, wherein though many keep their healths, yet many are infected (ſo that at moſt, they are good ſubjects but during the Pope's pleaſure) and the reſt are in more danger, than if they were out of it.

To conclude, I believe that what I have ſaid may at leaſt ſerve (if he will deſcend to conſider it) to move Maſter *Montague* to a farther ſearch, and for *Memorandums* in it; which if it do, he will be ſoon able to give as much better reaſons for my concluſion [that ſuch a viſible Church neither need, nor can be ſhewed] as his underſtanding is degrees above mine. I hope alſo, by comparing the body of their belief, and the ground of their authority, that little that can de drawn out of the fourth of the *Epheſians*, with the Myriads of contradiction in Tranſubſtantiation, he will come to ſee that their pillars are too weak to hold up any building, be it never ſo light, and their building is too heavy to be held up by any pillars, be they never ſo ſtrong; and truſt, he will return to us, whom he will then find that he hath cauſeleſly left, if he be (which I doubt not) ſo ingenuous, as not to hold an opinion, becauſe he turned to it, nor to ſtay, onely becauſe he went.

Diſſerta-

A REPLY TO The Catholick Gentlemans Anſwer TO THE Book of Schiſm.

Whereunto is Annexed,

An Account of *H. T.* his *Appendix* to his *Manual* of *Controverſies* concerning the *Abbot of Bangor's Anſwer* to *Auguſtine.*

The Introduction.

THE *Letter* from the *Catholick Gentleman*, which undertakes to have *anſwered* the *moſt material parts of the Book of Schiſm*, is ſaid to expect ſome *account* from me. And I ſhall give it, if not quite with the ſame *brevity*, yet directly in the ſame *method* which he hath choſen, *attending* him, as he ſhall pleaſe to *lead*, not by reſuming the whole matter again, but by *reflecting* on thoſe *few* paſſages, which he hath thought good to take notice of, and freeing them from all, though the *lighteſt exceptions*, which he hath made to them. *Numb.* 1.

Upon this *account*, I ſhall ſay very little to his *Proœm* in theſe words, 2.

SIR,

You have been pleaſed to ſend me Doctor Hammonds *Book of Schiſm, or a Defence of the Church of* England, *againſt the exceptions of the Romaniſts, as alſo your Letters, wherein you lay commands on me to read it, and thereupon to give you my opinion: Truly, Sir, both the one and the other could never have come to me in better ſeaſon; for having heard from ſome of my friends in* England *a good while ſince, of another Book, written by Doctor* Ferne *to the ſame purpoſe, as alſo one lately come out, of the Biſhop of* Derries, *and of this which you have ſent me, I was wondring what thoſe, who call themſelves of the Church of* England, *could ſay to defend themſelves from Schiſm; but now through your favour of letting me ſee this of Doctor* Hammond's, *I am freed from my bondage, and ſatisfied, in ſuppoſition, that the moſt can add little to what hath been upon that ſubject of Schiſm ſaid by him, whom you ſtile Wiſe and Learned, and well may he be ſo; but here he hath failed, as all men muſt that take in hand to defend a bad cauſe, which I think to make appear to you, or any indifferent judge, and which I will do rather upon ſome obſervations of ſeveral paſſages in his Book, than conſideration of the whole, which I will leave for ſome other, who hath more leiſure. In the mean time I muſt ſay with the Poet, ſpeaking of ſome Lawyers in his time,*

Fur es, ait Pedio, Pedius quid? Crimina raris
Librat in Antithetis:

The Roman Catholick ſays to Doctor Hammond, *You are an Heretick, you are a Schiſmatick, and Doctor* Hammond *replies good Engliſh, ſome Criticiſms, much Greek, with many citations out of Antiquity, indifferent to both parts of the queſtion.*

I ſhall not here need ſolemnly to *avert* the *good* words beſtowed on me, becauſe 1. if they had been meant in earneſt, they have yet no *influence* on the matter in hand; As *unlearned* a Man as I, and as *learned* as he, which is by ſome *characters* thought to be the *Author* of this *Anſwer*, may agree in this *common* fate, that as one is not able to *defend* a *bad cauſe*, ſo the other hath not in any eminent manner *betrayed* a *good*: 3.

2. becauſe 'tis evident, that it was *deſign* and *artifice* to beſtow the good words on me, that ſo he might get himſelf the eaſier task: And therefore the only thing that is here neceſſary for me to tell the *Reader*, by way of *Proœm*, is, that ſince the publiſhing this *Tract* of *Schiſm*, that moſt *excellent* diſcourſe on the ſame ſubject, written by the *Biſhop* of *Derry*, hath truly made that former care of mine very *unneceſſary*, and ſo ſhould in all reaſon have been undertaken and anſwered by this *Catholick Gentleman*, if he had really deſigned to *ſatisfie conſcience* in this *queſtion*. And ſhould it be believed by him, what here he ſaith in the *Title* page, that he hath *anſwered* the *moſt material parts* of *Doctor* Hammond's *Book of Schiſm*, yet I can aſſure him he is ſo much miſtaken in his *ſuppoſal*, that there *can little be added by any to what hath been ſaid by him*, that he is in all *juſtice* to undeceive the *Reader*, and make him *amends* by giving him not a *ſlight*, but *punctual anſwer* to every part of that *Biſhops Book*, before he think he may ſafely charge the *Church* of *England* with *Schiſm*, as ſtill he adventures to do.

4. Having ſaid this, I ſhall make no kind of *Reply*, to the reſt of his *Proœm*, but proceed immediately to his firſt and only *exception*, wherein the *firſt Chapter* is *concerned*.

CHAP. I.

Of the Cauſe of Schiſm being left out of this Debate.

SECT. I.

No Cauſe able to juſtifie Schiſm. Every voluntary Diviſion a Schiſm, whatſoever the motive were. Maſter Knot's *Teſtimony.*

Numb. 1. HIS words are theſe,

But to draw near your ſatisfaction, His firſt Chapter is, for the body of it, common to both parts, yet I cannot omit one ſtrange piece of Logick at the end of the firſt Chapter, Sect. 9. *where he concludeth, that the occaſion or motive of Schiſm is not to be conſidered, but only the fact of Schiſm, Of which poſition I can ſee no connexion to any premiſſes going before, and it ſelf is a pure contradiction, for not a Diviſion, but a cauſeleſs diviſion is a Schiſm, and how a Diviſion can be ſhewed to be unreaſonable and cauſleſs, without examining the occaſions and motives, I do not underſtand, nor (with his favour) I think he himſelf.*

2. What want of *Logick* there is in that *concluſion* of the *firſt Chapter*, which extorted this *animadverſion* from the *Romaniſt*, and what ſtore of that *faculty* (ſomewhat neceſſary to the managing of a *Controverſie*) we are to expect from him, will ſoon be diſcernible by the view of that place which is accuſed by him, where having premiſed the *criminouſneſs* and *weight* of *Schiſm*, and *unexcuſableneſs* of all, that, upon what provocation ſoever, break the *unity* of the *Church*, I conclude that he that ſhall really be guilty of it, and the *fact*, wherein that guilt conſiſts, *proved* againſt him, will no way be able to defend himſelf by *pleading* the *cauſe* or *motive* to his *Schiſm*, there being no ſuch *cauſe* imaginable, which can juſtifie this *fact* of his, as both out of *Irenæus* and Saint *Auguſtine* had been newly vouched. Upon which, my reſolution there, was (as to me ſeemed) but neceſſary, to devolve the *whole debate* into this one *quære*, whether we of the *Church* of *England* were *de facto*, guilty of this *crime*, were *Schiſmaticks* or no? concluding that if we were, there were nothing to be ſaid in *excuſe* of us.

3. From this view of the τὸ λογικὸν the *rational* importance of that *Section*, 1. It is evident (what the *Romaniſt* profeſſeth not to be *able to ſee*) what is the *connexion* of my *poſition* to the *premiſſes* foregoing, *viz.* this, *no cauſe* can excuſe the *Schiſmatick*, therefore the *examination* of the *cauſe* is *unneceſſary*, whatſoever can be pretended on that head, is not worth the *producing* or heeding in this matter.

4. 2. 'Tis as evident how far the *poſition* it ſelf is removed from being a *contradiction*, which yet the *Romaniſts Logick* hath pronounced to be a *pure* one. A *pure contradiction* is in our *Logick*, *eſt* and *non eſt*, *It is a Schiſm*, and *It is not a Schiſm*, It is *cauſleſs*, and it is *not cauſleſs*, and the like. But certainly my concluding that *no cauſe can juſtifie a Schiſm*, or if the *Schiſm* be *proved*, 'tis in *vain* to *plead* that we had *cauſe* for it, contains no ſuch *contradictory* enuntiations. He that ſhould ſay that a *Seditious* perſon or a *Rebel* is worthy of *death*, whatſoever *cauſe* it were that incited him to that *villany*, doth neither affirm the *Rebel* to be *no Rebel*, nor the *cauſe* he pretends, to be *no cauſe*, only he ſaith indeed, that whatſoever the *cauſe* be, 'tis *incompetent* to *juſtifie* ſo *foul* a *fact*.

5. 3. The *proof*, which he adds to conclude this *poſition* to be a *pure contradiction*, is very far from *proving* it. The *proof* is this; *For*, ſaith he, *not a diviſion, but a cauſleſs diviſion is a Schiſm.* But this hath been ſhewed to have no truth in it, becauſe *Diviſion* and *Schiſm* being exactly the ſame, one a *Latine*, the other a *Greek* word, every *Diviſion* is and muſt neceſſarily be, in him who is guilty of it, a *Schiſm*, and if a *voluntary Diviſion*, a *criminous Schiſm*, whatſoever were the *motive* or *cauſe* of it, by *Diviſion* or *Schiſm* underſtanding (as I declare my ſelf to do) a *ſpontaneous receding*, or *dividing* from the *unity* of the *Church*, not being *cut off* or *driven* from it.

6. Laſtly, What he adds as a *conſectary* of his *proof*, that [*he doth not underſtand how a Diviſion can be ſhewed unreaſonable and cauſleſs, without examining the occaſions and motives*] he may now, if he pleaſe, without much *difficulty* comprehend, *viz.* by conſidering, that no *cauſe* or *reaſon*, how weighty ſoever, is ſufficient to juſtifie a *diviſion*. For as long as this is either *proved* or *granted*, the *concluſion* will be *indubitable*, without examining of the *motives*, that the *diviſion* is *unreaſonable* and *cauſleſs*. Let it once be *granted* or *proved* by the *known* Laws of a *Nation*, that every act of *Sedition* is a *tranſgreſſion* of *Law*, *criminous* and *puniſhable*, whatſoever the *motive* be that incited it, and then there will need no more than *conviction* of the *fact*, to conclude that *fact* unreaſonable. That which is in it ſelf ſo *culpable* and *inexcuſable*, that no *reaſon* whatſoever can be able to *juſtifie* it, is ready for the *ſentence* of *condemnation*, without farther proceſs; when 'tis *reaſonably* reſolved, that no *reaſon* can *excuſe* ſuch a *fact*, what *reaſon* can there be to loſe time in *examining reaſons?* This is the very caſe in hand, as 'tis apparent to any that will but view the

the place, and 'tis not much for my incouragement in this task, that the *Gentleman*, to whom I muſt reply, was willing to think this ſo deep a *riddle*, ſo much above *common* underſtandings.

I ſhall here only add, that what was thus ſaid, was not in reaſon to provoke the *Romaniſt*, being a *conceſſion* that cut me off from many viſible *advantages*, and ſo deſerved his *reward*, much better than *rebuke*, and being thus *early* and *unexpectedly* fallen under his ſhort *diſpleaſure*, by my endeavour to *oblige* him, I have yet a *ſhield*, which promiſeth me ſecurity from the *continuance* of it, I mean not the *evidence* of the *truth* affirmed by me, (for that is not an *amulet* always to be depended on, when it is againſt *intereſt* to acknowledge it) but the *ſuffrage* of his own great *Champion Maſter Knot*, who hath directly *affirm'd* what *I affirmed* (and therefore I may be allowed not to *underſtand*, how this ſhould be ſo unintelligible) citing it out of St. *Auguſtine*, That *there is no juſt neceſſity to divide Unity, and that it is not poſſible that any man ſhould have juſt Cauſe to ſeparate*, —*Infidel unmasked*, cap. 7. num. 5. And ſo it is as manifeſt that this part of the *firſt Chapter* is *common to both*, as the *former* of which he *affirms* it, the *Concluſion* in all reaſon being involved in the ſame *condition* which belonged to the *Premiſes*, and it was only my ill *luck* or his *willingneſs* to find *fault*, that it was not formerly *apprehended* to be ſo. 7.

CHAP. II.

Concerning Hereſie, Excommunication, Infallibility.

SECT. I.

Of paſſing ſlightly over the difference betwixt Hereſie and Schiſm.

THE *exceptions* to the *ſecond Chapter* are *three*; the *firſt* concerning *Hereſie*, the *ſecond* concerning *Excommunication*, the *third* concerning Maſter *Knots Conceſſion*, which uſhers in a Diſcourſe of *Infallibility*. *Numb.* 1.

The former in theſe words, 2.

He ſlightly paſſes over the diſtinction of Hereſie and Schiſm, as if he would not have it underſtood, that all Hereſie is Schiſm, though ſome Schiſm be no Hereſie.

What is here called the *ſlight paſſing over the diſtinction of Hereſie and Schiſm*, is one piece of injuſtice in him, and the cauſe to which it is affixt, my *unwillingneſs* that it ſhould be *underſtood that all Hereſie is Schiſm*, will ſoon appear to be another. 3.

For the *firſt*, It is evident that in that *Sect.* 3. of *Chap.* 2. I do not at all conſider the *diſtinction* of *Hereſie*, and *Schiſm*, nor could, without abſolute *interruption* and diſturbance of the *Diſcourſe* in hand, and direct *tranſgreſſion* of all *Rules* of *method*, ſay any thing to that *Subject*, in that place. The thing that I there manifeſt, is, the *difference* betwixt *Excommunication* and *Schiſm* (and ſure that is not *Hereſie* and *Schiſm*, unleſs *Excommunication* be *Hereſie*, and ſo the *puniſhment* of the *Sin*, be the *Sin* it ſelf) between the *paſſive* and the *active*, or *reciprocal diviſion* or *ſeparation*; and all that I ſay in that *Section* which can relate to *Hereſie*, is, that where the offence, for which a man is excommunicated, is *Hereſie* and not *Schiſm*, there it is evident, that his *Excommunication*, which ſtill is his *puniſhment* and not his *ſin* (the *cauſe* of it alſo being not *Schiſm*, but ſomewhat elſe, *Hereſie*, or the like) cannot be the *guilt* of *Schiſm* in him that is ſo *puniſhed*. 4.

Now it is evident, that I cannot be ſaid to *paſs over* that *ſlightly*, which I do not ſpeak to *at all*, and to which I had no *occaſion* to *ſpeak*, and conſequently that I was no way liable to this *exception*. 5.

And that being ſaid, the ſecond part of the ſame *exception*, that of the *ground* on which I do this, muſt needs be as *cauſeleſs* as the former. For 1. 'tis certain, that my *thoughts*, or *wiſhes*, or *deſigns*, are not things which can duely fall under this *Objectors cognizance* (he cannot upon any ſure grounds, *divine* or affirm, what I aimed at in ſuch or ſuch a *ſlight paſſage*) and 2. 'tis yet more certain, that no *collection* can juſtly be made from my doing that *ſlightly*, which I did not meddle with *at all*. But then 3. to remove all *ſcruple* or poſſible occaſion of *jealouſie* in this matter, 'tis the deſign of *Chapter* 8. (the method then leading to it) under a ſecond ſort of *Schiſm*, to conſider the *departure* from the *Unity* of the *Faith*, which being but a *periphraſis* of *Hereſie*, is conſequently the defining all *Hereſie* is *Schiſm*, and ſo the profeſt avowing of that, which he ſuſpected me *unwilling to have underſtood*. And ſo ſtill there is not the leaſt appearance of *juſtice* in this ſuggeſtion. 6.

SECT. II.

Excommunication how it differs from Schiſm. Wilful continuance under cenſures, is Schiſm. The Biſhop of Rome *is not our lawful Governour. The ſevere Conditions of their Communion.*

HIS ſecond *Exception* is perfectly of the ſame making with the former, thus, *Numb.* 1.

Again, ſaith he, *treating of Excommunication, he eaſily ſlideth over this part, that wilful continuance in a juſt Excommunication, maketh Schiſm.* 2.

Here again 'tis evident, that I treat not of *Excommunication*, nor have any occaſion fitly to treat of it, farther than to ſhew, That *Schiſm*, being a *voluntary ſeparation*, the word in no propriety pertains to that act of the *Governour* of the *Church*, whereby he *ſeparates* or *cuts off* any by way of *Cenſures*. Certainly, he that is put to *death* by *Sentence* of *Law*, cannot be adjudged a *Felo de ſe*, one that hath voluntarily put himſelf out of the number of the *living*, or be liable to thoſe *forfeitures*. 3.

feitures which by the *Law* belong to ſuch. He that is *baniſhed* out of the *Kingdom*, cannot be guilty of the *breach* of that *Statute*, which forbids all Subjects *going* out of it; nor be *puniſht* juſtly, for that which is his *ſuffering*, not his *deed*; his *puniſhment*, not his *delinquency*.

4. As for his *wilful* continuance under juſt *Cenſures*, the *wilfulneſs* of that, certainly, makes him *culpable*, and the *continuance* in *Excommunication*, being alſo *continuance* in *ſeparation* from the *Church*, which is *Schiſm*, whenſoever it is *voluntary*, I make no doubt of the *conſequence*, that ſuch *wilful continuance* in *Excommunication*, be it *juſt* or *unjuſt*, is *actual Schiſm*, ſuppoſing (as the word *wilful* muſt ſuppoſe) that this *continuance* is wholly imputable to the *will* of the *Excommunicate*, *i. e.* that if he will *ſubmit* to that which is *lawful* for him to *ſubmit* to, he may be *abſolved* and *freed* from it.

5. If this were it, that he would have had more *explicitely affirmed*, then I anſwer, that as there I had no *occaſion* to ſpeak to it, ſo now upon his *ſlighteſt* demand, I make no ſcruple to give him my full ſenſe of it, that he, which being caſt into *Priſon* for *juſt* cauſe, may upon his *Petition*, and *Promiſe* of *Reformation* be releaſed, or if the *cauſe* were *unjuſt*, may yet without doing any thing any way *unlawful*, regain his *Liberty*, from thenceforth becomes not the *Magiſtrates*, but his *own* Priſoner, and is guilty of all the *damage*, be it *diſeaſe*, *famiſhing*, *death* it ſelf, which is conſequent to his *impriſonment*. And the *Analogie* holds directly in *Excommunication*; He that continues under the *Cenſures* of his *Eccleſiaſtical Ruler*, when he might fairly obtain *abſolution* from them, is by *himſelf ſentenced* to the *continuance* of this *puniſhment*, as by the *Governour* of the *Church*, to the *beginning* of it. But then all this while, this is not the condition of *our Church*, in reſpect of the *Church* of *Rome*, they being not our *lawful Superiours*, indued with *juriſdiction* over us; and for other *communion*, ſuch as alone can be maintained or broken among fellow-brethren, or *Chriſtians*, it is carefully maintained by us, as far as it is *lawfully* maintainable.

6. And both theſe being there evidenced in that, and the enſuing *Chapters*, I did not *warily* or *purpoſely* abſtain from (becauſe I had nothing that ſuggeſted to me any *opportunity* of) ſaying any thing more to *this* purpoſe. The *ſevere Conditions* which are by the *Romaniſts* required of us to render us capable of their *Communion*, *ſubſcription* of *errour*, or *profeſſion* againſt *Conſcience*, make it *impertinent* to *propoſe* or *diſcuſs* either of theſe *two* Queſtions, 1. *Whether we lye under a juſt Excommunication*, 2. *Whether, if we did, we would wilfully continue under it*, or conſequently, whether we be now *guilty* of *Schiſm* in this Notion?

SECT. III.

Mr. Knot's *Conceſſion and Concluſion. The power of a fallible Church to require belief. Of Antiquity, Poſſeſſion, Perſwaſion of Infallibility, Motives for Union. Uncertainty of the Proteſtants Reaſons. The grand Hereſie and Schiſm of not believing* Rome *infallible. Belief ſufficient without infallibility. Fictions of Caſes.*

Numb. 1. THE third *Exception* enlargeth to ſome length in theſe words,

2. *What he calls Maſter* Knot's *Conceſſion, I take to be the publick profeſſion of the Roman or Catholick Church, and that Nature it ſelf teacheth all rational men, that any Congregation that can lye, and knoweth not whether it doth lye or no, in any Propoſition, cannot have power to bind any Particular to believe what She ſaith, neither can any man of underſtanding have an obligation to believe what She teacheth, farther than agrees with the Rules of his own reaſon: Out of which it followeth, that the Roman Churches binding of men to a profeſſion of Faith (which the Proteſtants and other Heretical multitudes have likewiſe uſurped) if She be infallible, is evidently gentle, charitable, right, and neceſſary; as contrariwiſe, in any other Church or Congregation, which pretends not to infallibility, the ſame is unjuſt, tyrannical, and a ſelf-condemnation to the Binders: ſo that the ſtate of the Queſtion will be this, Whether the Catholick or Roman Church be infallible or no, for She pretendeth not to bind any man to tenets or beliefs upon any other ground or title. By this you may perceive much of his Diſcourſe — to be not only ſuperfluous and unneceſſary, but alſo contrary to himſelf; for he laboureth to perſwade that the Proteſtant may be certain of ſome truth, againſt which the Roman Catholick Church bindeth to profeſſion of errour, which is as much as to ſay, as he who pretendeth to have no infallible Rule by which to govern his Doctrine, ſhall be ſuppoſed to be infallible, and he that pretendeth to have an infallible Rule, ſhall be ſuppoſed to be fallible; at moſt becauſe fallible Objections are brought againſt him: now then conſider what a meek and humble Son of the Church ought to do, when of the one ſide is the Authority of Antiquity and Poſſeſſion (ſuch Antiquity and Poſſeſſion without diſpute or contradictions from the Adverſary, as no King can ſhew for his Crown, and much leſs any other perſon or perſons for any other thing) the perſwaſion of infallibility, all the pledges that Chriſt hath left to his Church for Motives of Union: on the other ſide uncertain Reaſons of a few men pretending to learning, every day contradicted by incomparable numbers of men Wiſe and Learned, and thoſe few men confeſſing thoſe Reaſons and themſelves uncertain, fallible, and ſubject to errour; certainly without a bias of intereſt or prejudice, it is impoſſible for him to leave the Church if he be in it, or not return if he be out of it: for if infallibility be the ground of the Churches power to command belief, as She pretends no other; no time, no ſeparation within memory of Hiſtory, can juſtifie a continuance out of the Church: You may pleaſe to conſider then how ſolid this Doctors Diſcourſe is, who telleth us, for his great evidence, that we (ſaith he) who do not acknowledge the Church of* Rome *to be infallible, may be allowed to make certain ſuppoſitions (that follow there.) The Queſtion is, Whether a Proteſtant be a Schiſmatick, becauſe a Proteſtant? and he will prove he is not a Schiſmatick, becauſe he goeth conſequently to Proteſtant, that is Schiſmatical grounds: I pray you reflect, that not to acknowledge the Church to be infallible, is that for which we charge the Doctor with Schiſm and Hereſie* in Capite, *and more than for all the reſt he holds diſtinct from us, for this Principle taketh away all belief, and all ground of belief, and turneth it into uncertainty and weather-cock opinion, putteth us into the condition to be* circumferri omni vento Doctrinæ, *ſubmitteth us to Atheiſm and all*

ſort

ſort of miſcreancy, let him not then over-leap the Queſtion, but either prove this is not ſufficient to make him a Schiſmatick and an Heretick too, or let him acknowledge he is both.

This Diſcourſe thus enlarged to the *conſideration* of *fallibility* and *infallibility* in a *Church*, is 3.
certainly a *digreſſion* in this place, and taking the occaſion from ſome words of mine, *Sect.* 6. of a *conceſſion* of Maſter *Knot*'s, it is a little neceſſary to recount, what *conceſſion* that was, and the uſe that I there made of it, that ſo it may appear, whether there were any thing *blameable* in my *procedure*.

The Subject I was upon, *Sect.* 5. was the undoubted *lawfulneſs* of being and continuing *excluded* 4.
from any ſuch *Church*, the *conditions* of whoſe *Communion* contain *Sin* in them. To this *head* of Diſcourſe I mentioned a *conceſſion* of Maſter *Knot*'s, that it is perfectly *unlawful to diſſemble, equivocate, or lye in matters of Faith*; and this, as a *confirmation* of my then preſent *Aſſertion*, that when I am not *permitted* by the *Romaniſts* to have *external communion* with them, unleſs I do thus *diſſemble, equivocate* and *lye*, affirm my ſelf to *believe* what I do *not believe*, I may lawfully *continue* thus *excluded* from their *Communion*. But then I could not juſtly conceal what Maſter *Knot* there added as his *concluſion* from hence (together with the acknowledged *unlawfulneſs* of forſaking the *external communion* of *Gods viſible Church*) that therefore the *Church* of *Rome* is *infallible*, becauſe otherwiſe men might *forſake* her *Communion*.

Here indeed I thought it very *ſtrange*, that this *concluſion* ſhould be thus deduced from ſuch *pre-* 5.
miſſes, that it ſhould be deemed *lawful* to ſeparate from a *Church* for every *errour*, or for no more but being *ſubject* to *errour*, being *fallible*, though it were actually guilty of no *errour*, which I conceived to be the ſame in *effect*, as to *affirm* it *lawful* to *forſake* the *communion* of all but *Saints*, and *Angels*, and *God* in Heaven, becauſe all others were *peccable* and *fallible*. But yet I thought not fit to go farther out of my way to *preſs* the *unreaſonableneſs* of it, but contented my ſelf with that, which was for my preſent turn, his *confeſſion* that it was *lawful* to *ſeparate* or *continue* in *ſeparation* from the *Church* of *Chriſt*, in caſe we could not without *lying*, &c. be permitted to *communicate* with it.

This being the whole buſineſs, as it lyes viſible to any in that fifth and ſixth *Section*, Let us 6.
now ſee what a *confuſion* is made to gain ſome ſmall *advantage* from hence, or *excuſe* for a long *digreſſion*.

Firſt it is the *concluſion*, viz. [*that any Congregation that can lye*, &c. *cannot have power to bind any* 7.
to believe what She ſaith] which he ſaith is called by me Maſter *Knot*'s *conceſſion*. But this is a great *miſtake*; I never lookt on this as his *conceſſion*, never called it by that title, but as a *concluſion* that he made a ſtrange *ſhift* to deduce from another *conceſſion*.

A *conceſſion*, this *Gentleman* ſhould in reaſon have underſtood to be ſomewhat which the *Adverſary* 8.
yields, and which the *Diſputer* gains *advantage* by his *yielding* it; ſuch was his *Aſſertion*, that *all lying* and *diſſembling* was *unlawful*, and that rather than that ſhould be admitted, it were *lawful* to *forſake* the *external communion* of the *Church* of *Chriſt*. And that, and nothing but that, was by me cited as his *conceſſion*.

Secondly, That *concluſion* it ſelf, that the *Congregation that is fallible, cannot have power to bind to* 9.
believe,— is not ſo much as *conſidered* by me in that place or elſewhere; I ſaid not one word againſt it, which might provoke this *Objector* to take it up, and confirm it; neither was it in the leaſt *needful*, or pertinent to the matter then in hand, to enter into the *conſideration* of it. All that was by me taken notice of (and that but in *paſſing*) was the *conſequence* or *coherence* betwixt the *premiſſes* and that *concluſion*, which naturally inferred a third thing, that it was in Mr. *Knot*'s opinion, *lawful to forſake the Communion of any fallible Church*, which I thought by the way, would be ſure to excuſe us (though we ſhould be granted to have *forſaken* and *continued wilfully* in *Separation* from the *Roman Church*) if it *might but appear, that either that were guilty of any one errour, or liable to fall into any one*. And this being intirely all that was there ſaid by me, there is no reaſon I ſhould ſo far attend this *Gentleman* in his *digreſſion*, as to conſider what here he proceeds to ſay, upon his new-ſprung Subject of Diſcourſe, very diſtant from that of *Schiſm*, to which I endeavoured to *adhere*, having elſewhere purſued at large, the *Romaniſts* other *Hypotheſis* concerning their *Churches Infallibility*.

Were it not thus *remote* from our matter in hand, and perfectly unneceſſary to the *defence* of 10.
our *Church* from *Schiſm*, I might diſcover farther many infirm parts in this *procedure*. I ſhall but briefly touch on ſome of them.

1. For the truth of that *Propoſition* [*that a Congregation that can lye*, i. e. *a Church that is fallible*, 11.
and knoweth not (*i. e.* hath no *infallible certainty*) *whether it lye or no in any Propoſition, cannot have power to bind any to believe what She ſaith*] I may certainly affirm, 1. That this is no *infallible* truth, being no where affirmed by any *infallible* Speaker, or deduced from any *infallible* Principle. For as to the *Scripture*, it is not pretended to be *affirmed* by that; and for *Natural Reaſon*, that cannot be an *infallible Judge* in this matter of defining what power may be, or is by *God* given to a *Church*, without *defining* it *infallible*. A *Prince* may no doubt be impowered by *God* to give *Laws*, and thoſe *Laws oblige* Subjects to *obedience*, and yet that *Prince* never be imagined *infallible* in making *Laws*. And *natural reaſon* cannot conclude it impoſſible, that a *Church* ſhould have a *proportionable* power given it by *God* to bind *belief*, &c.

As for the *Catholick* or *Roman Church*, 1. That is a *miſpriſion*, the *Catholick* is not the *ſingle* 12.
Roman Church, nor the *Roman* the *Catholick*. 2. There no where appears any ſuch *definition*, either of the *Catholick*, i. e. *Univerſal Church* of *God*, or particularly of the *Roman Church*, no Act of *Council* repreſentative of that *Church*, no known affirmation of that *diffuſed* Body under the *Biſhop* of *Rome*'s *Paſtorage*, that all *authority* to oblige *belief* is founded in *Infallibility*. 3. If any ſuch *definition* did appear, it could no way be *foundation* of *belief* to us, who do not *believe* that *Church*, or any *definition* thereof, as ſuch, to be *infallible*.

2. If we ſhall but *diſtinguiſh* and limit the terms, 1. What is meant by [*can lie*] 2. By *knowing* or 13.
not knowing whether it *lie* or no, 3. By *power to bind*, 4. By *belief* (as every of theſe have a *latitude* of ſignification, and may be eaſily miſtaken, till they are duly *limited*) It will then ſoon appear

that

that there is no *unlimited truth* in that which he ſaith is the whole *Churches* affirmation, nor *prejudice* to our *pretenſions* from that *limited* truth, which ſhall be found in it.

14. 1. The Phraſe [*can lye*] may denote no more than ſuch a *poſſibility* of *erring*, as yet is joined neither with *actual errour*, nor with any *Principle*, whether of *deficiency* on one ſide, or of *malignity* on the other, which ſhall be ſure to betray it into *errour*. Thus that particular *Church*, that is at the preſent in the *right*, in all matters of *faith*, and hath before it the *Scripture* to guide it in all its *deciſions*, together with the *traditions* and *doctrines* of the *Antient* and *Primitive Church*, and having skill in all thoſe knowledges, which are uſeful to fetch out the true *meaning* of *Scripture*, and ability to enquire into the *antient* Path, and to compare her ſelf with all other conſiderable parts of the *Univerſal Church*, and then is *diligent* and faithful to make *uſe* of all theſe *ſuccours*, and in uprightneſs of heart *ſeeks* the truth, and applies it ſelf to *God* in humble, and ardent, and continual Prayer for his *guidance to lead into all truth*, This *Church*, I ſay, is yet *fallible*, *may* affirm and teach *falſe*, i. e. this is *naturally* poſſible that it may, but it is not ſtrongly *probable* that it will, as long as it is thus *aſſiſted*, and *diſpoſed* to make *uſe* of theſe *aſſiſtances*, and means of true *defining*.

15. 2. That *Churches knowledge*, whether it *define truly* or no in any *Propoſition*, may ſignifie no more than a *full perſwaſion* or *belief* (*cui non ſubeſt dubium*, wherein they neither *doubt*, nor apprehend *reaſon* of *doubting*) that what they *define*, is the very *truth*; though for *knowledge* properly ſo called, or *aſſurance*, *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, which is *unerrable* or *infallible* in ſtrictneſs of ſpeech, it may not have *attained*, or pretend to have *attained* to it.

16. 3. By *power to bind*, may be meant no more, than *authority* derived to them from the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, to make *deciſions*, when difficulties ariſe, to preſcribe *Rules* for *Ceremonies* or *Government*, ſuch as ſhall oblige Inferiors to due *obſervance* and *obedience*, by force of the *Apoſtles* πείθεσθε ἡγουμένοις, his *Precept* to *obey* the *Rulers* ſet over us in the *Church*, which we may do, without thinking them ſimply, or by any *promiſe* of *God*, *inerrable* or *infallible*; as the *obedience* which is due to *Civil* Magiſtrates, which ſuppoſes in them a *power* of *binding Subjects* to *obey*, doth yet no way ſuppoſe or imply them *uncapable* of *erring* and *ſinning*, and giving *unreaſonable* commands, and ſuch as wherein it is *unlawful* to yield obedience to them.

17. Beſide this, there may farther be meant by it, a *general obligation* that lies on all men, to *believe* what is with due grounds of *conviction* propoſed to them, ſuch as the *diſbelieving* or *doubting* of it, ſhall be in them *inſeparable* from *obſtinacy*; and this *obligation* is again the greater, when that which is thus *convincingly* propoſed, is propoſed by our *Superiors*, from whoſe mouth it is regular to *ſeek* and *receive Gods will*.

18. *Laſtly*, *Believing* may ſignifie, not an implicite, *irrational*, *blind*, but a well-grounded, *rational*, explicite *belief* of that which, as the truth of *God* is duely propoſed to us; or again, where there is not that degree of *manifeſtation*, yet a *conſent* to that which is propoſed as moſt *probable*, on the *grounds* afforded to judge by, or when the perſon is not competent to ſearch *grounds*, a bare yielding to the *judgment* of *Superiors*, and deeming it better to adhere to them, than to attribute any thing to their own *judgment*, a *believing* ſo far as not to *diſbelieve*. And this again may *rationally* be yielded to a *Church*, or the *Rulers* and *Governours* of it, without deeming them *inerrable* or *infallible*.

19. Nay, where the *Propoſition* defined is ſuch, that every Member of that *Church* cannot, without *violence* to his underſtanding, yield any ſuch degree of *belief* unto it, yet he that believes it not, may behave himſelf *peaceably* and *reverently*, either duely repreſenting his *grounds*, why he *cannot* conſent to it, or if his *ſubſcription* or *conſent* be neither *formally* nor *interpretatively* required of him, quietly enjoy his *contrary* opinion. And this may tend as much to the *peace* and *unity* of a *Church*, as the perſwaſion of the *inerrability* thereof can be ſuppoſed to do.

20. By this view of the *latitude* of theſe terms, and the *limitations* they are capable of, it is now not ſo difficult to diſcern, in what ſenſe the *propoſition* under conſideration is *falſe*, and in what ſenſe it is *true*, and by us acknowledged to be ſo.

21. A *Congregation* that is *fallible*, and hath no knowledge or *aſſurance* (*cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*) that it is not deceived in any *particular Propoſition*, may yet have *authority* to make *deciſions*, &c. and to require *Inferiors* ſo far to *acquieſce* to their *determinations*, as not to *diſquiet* the *peace* of that *Church* with their contrary opinions.

22. But for any *abſolute infallible belief* or conſent, *that* no *Church*, which it not it ſelf abſolutely *infallible*, and which doth not *infallibly know* that it is *infallible*, hath power to require of any.

23. By this it appears in the next place, in what ſenſe it is *true*, which in the following words is *ſuggeſted* of *Proteſtants*, that they *bind men to a Profeſſion of Faith*, and how unjuſtly it is added, that, *ſuppoſing them not to be infallible*, *it is unjuſt*, *tyrannical*, *and ſelf-condemnation to the Binders*. The contrary whereto is moſt evident, underſtanding the *obligation* with that *temper*, and the *infallibility* in that Notion, wherein it is evident we underſtand it. For what *injuſtice* or *tyranny*, &c. can it be in any *lawful Superior*, having defined what verily he believes to be the truth of *God*, and no way doubts of his having deduced it rightly from the *Scripture*, but yet knows that he, as a *man*, is *fallible*, and that it is *poſſible* he may have ſome way *failed* in this, as in any other his moſt *circumſpect* action, what *injuſtice*, I ſay, can it be, *authoritatively* to direct this *definition* to thoſe, who are committed to his *charge*, and expect their due *ſubmiſſion* to it? meaning by *ſubmiſſion* what I have here expreſt to mean by it.

24. So again it appears of the *Roman Church*, how far it is from *gentle* or *charitable* in them, to bind men to *profeſs*, as *matter* of *faith*, whatſoever is by that *Church* defined, upon this one account, that the *Church* is *infallible* and can't *err*; when this very thing, that it is *infallible*, is not at all made *probable*, much leſs *infallibly* deduced from any *reaſon* or *teſtimony* that is *infallible*.

25. Next then, when he ſaith, that *the ſtate of the Queſtion will be this*, *Whether the Roman Church be infallible or no*; I am not ſure I know what *Queſtion* he means, whether the main *Queſtion* on which the *Tract* of *Schiſm* was written, *i. e.* whether the *Church* of *England* be *ſchiſmatical* or no, or whether the *particular Queſtion* which this *Gentlemans* haſte hath framed to himſelf in this place, Whether

ther a *fallible Church* may have *power* to *bind* any to *believe* what She ſaith? But I ſuppoſe by ſome *indications*, that the latter is it, and then, as from hence I learn what he means by *infallible*, a *Church* that cannot *poſſibly* err, all whoſe *definitions* are ſuch, *quibus nequit ſubeſſe falſum*, ſo until this be proved of that *Church*, I muſt be allowed to ſpeak like one who think not my ſelf *obliged* to the *belief* of it, and being ſure of this, that a *Proteſtant* is or may be verily perſwaded of ſome *truth*, againſt which the *Roman Church* bindeth to *profeſſion* of *errour* (meaning by *verily perſwaded*, ſuch a *certainty* only, *cui non ſubeſt dubium*, he hath no *doubt*, nor reaſon to induce *doubting* of it) I cannot imagine how that part of my *Diſcourſe*, wherein I have *ſuppoſed* or *aſſerted* this, can be either *ſuperfluous*, *unneceſſary*, or (whatever other *weakneſs* it be guilty of) *contrary to my ſelf*. For certainly I that think I am *fallible*, may yet *verily believe*, without all *doubt*, the truth of many *Propoſitions*, which if I ſhould *affirm* my ſelf not to *believe*, I muſt doubtleſs *lie*, and then *ſin*, by Mr. *Knot*'s former *Conceſſion*. And 'tis as certain on the other ſide, that he that pretendeth to have an *infallible* Rule, may yet foully *miſtake*, both in that *general*, *original*, and in many other *particular*, *derivative* pretenſions; His ſuppoſed *infallibility*, if it be not rightly *ſuppoſed* (and till it be proved, it will not be ſo) will be ſo far from an *amulet* to keep him ſafe from all *errour*, that it is the *likelieſt* way to deliver him up to it, as the *premature perſwaſion* of his *particular election* may be the *ingulphing* any, through *ſecurity* and *preſumption*, in the moſt certain *ruine*.

In the proceſs of this *diſcourſe* he is pleaſed to mention *four* advantages of the *Roman Church* above any other, *Antiquity*, *poſſeſſion*, *perſwaſion of Infallibility*, the *pledges* that *Chriſt* hath *left* to his *Church* for *motives* of *union*; and nothing but *uncertain reaſons* on the other ſide, which ſaith he, muſt make it *impoſſible for any, without intereſt or prejudice, to leave the Church, if he be in it, or not return, if he be out of it.* 26.

To this imaginary ſetting of the *Scales* between them and us, and particularly to the *fourth advantage* pretended to, the *pledges* that *Chriſt* left for *motives* of *union*, it is ſufficient to reply in *general*, that for us, which have not *voluntarily ſeparated*, but are by them *violently* removed from *communion* with them, and cannot be admitted to *reunion*, but upon *conditions*, which without *diſſembling* and *lying* we cannot undergo, it is in vain to ſpeak of *motives* or *obligations* to *return* to their *communion*. We that are *bound*, *as much as in us lies, to have peace with all men*, muſt not admit any *known* or *wilful* ſin, in order to that moſt *deſirable* end. And this one thing as alone it is pertinent to the matter in hand, that of *Schiſm*, ſo it is neceſſarily the *concluding* of this *Controverſie*, We that are not *permitted* to return, (and ſo we are, if the *Conditions* of our return be ſo *incumbred*, as to include *ſin*,) cannot with any *juſtice* or *equity* be charged for not returning. 27.

Againſt this, here is nothing ſaid, any farther than the bare mention of the three other *advantages* on their ſide. And none of theſe are of any force to *perſwade* our *return*, upon ſuch *conditions* as theſe, much leſs to exact it as a Duty from us. 28.

By *Antiquity* and *Poſſeſſion*, as *here* they are ſpoken of, I am apt to ſuppoſe he means not *antiquity* of the *Roman Church*, or the *preſent* Doctrines (and therefore I ſhall not ſpeak of them) but the *antiquity* of our *communion* with them (if he mean a *Poſſeſſion* in the *belief* of the *Popes Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak of that * hereafter.) And if this be granted, (as, for *fraternal communion*, and ſuch as is due from one *Siſter Church* to another, it is willingly granted,) then this will devolve the *blame* on thoſe who are *guilty* of this breach, who have caſt us out, and permit us no way of *returning* with a good *conſcience*; And ſo this is little for the *Romaniſts* advantage. 29. * Chap. 7. Sect. 1.

But if inſtead of *fraternal communion*, it be *ſubjection* to the *Roman See*, that is by his words claimed, and pretended to by *poſſeſſion*; then, as we willingly grant to that *See*, all that the *antient Canons* allowed to it and ſo cannot in that reſpect offend againſt *Antiquity*, ſo what, contrary to thoſe *Canons*, they have at any time *aſſumed*, and unlawfully *poſſeſt* themſelves of, can no way be pretended to be their Right, or they to be *bonæ fidei Poſſeſſores*, *true* or *fair Poſſeſſors* of it, which *qualification* and *condition* is yet abſolutely neceſſary to found their Plea from *Poſſeſſion*, and which alone can bear any proportion with that, which *Kings* can ſhew for their *Crowns*, or *Proprietaries* for their *inheritances*. 30.

Of this Head of *poſſeſſion*, or *preſcription*, it were eaſie to add much more, by conſidering that *claim* and *title*, by the known Rules whether of the *Canon*, or *Civil Law*. The *Civil Law*, which is generally more *favourable* to *Preſcription*, doth yet acknowledge many ways of *interrupting* it, as by calling it into *queſtion*, and that is ſufficiently done in ſome Caſes, *per ſolam conventionem*, by *citing*, or *ſummoning* the Poſſeſſor; and when *conteſtatio litis*, the entring a *Suit*, is actually *required*, yet ſtill he that appears to have cauſed the *impediment*, and kept it from coming to this *conteſtation*, is not to gain any *advantage* by his *guilt*, but *adverſus eum lis habetur pro conteſtato*, *he ſhall be look't on, as if the Suit had been actually conteſted againſt him.* See *Bartolus in l. ſi eum* § *qui injuriarum in fi. ff. ſi quis caut.* 31.

But as to the *Canon Law*, which in all reaſon the *Catholick* is to owne in *this Queſtion*, it is known that it admitteth not any the longeſt *preſcription*, without the *bonæ fidei poſſeſſio*, (he that came by any thing *diſhoneſtly*, is for ever *obliged* to *reſtitution*) and for the judging of that, allows of many ways of *probation*, from the *nature of the thing* (the courſe we have taken in this *preſent* Debate) and from other *probable indications*, and where the appearances are *equal* on both ſides, the *Law*, though it be wont to judge moſt *favourably*, doth yet incline to *queſtion* the *honeſty* of coming to the *poſſeſſion*, and to preſume the *diſhoneſty*, upon this account, becauſe *mala fides*, *diſhoneſty* is preſumed induſtriouſly to contrive its own *ſecreſie*, and to lye hid in thoſe *receſſes*, from which at a diſtance of time it is not eaſily fetcht out. So *Felinus in C. ult. de præſcript. per leg. ult. C. unde vi.* And in a word, it is the affirmation of the *Doctors*, *preſumi malam fidem ex antiquiore adverſarii poſſeſſione*, the *preſumption* is *ſtrong that the poſſeſſion was not honeſtly come by, when it appears to have been antiently in the other hands*, and the way of *conveyance* from one to the other is not *diſcernible*. See *Panormit.* and *Felinus in c. ſi diligenti X de præſcript. Menochius arbit. Quæſt. Caſu* 225. *n.* 4. and others referred to by the *learned Grotius in Conſil. Jurid. ſuper iis quæ Naſſavii*—*p.* 36. &c. But I have no need of theſe *nicer diſquiſitions*. 32.

As

33. As for the *perſwaſion* of *Infallibility*, meaning, as they *muſt*, their *own perſwaſion* of it, that can have no *influence* upon us, who are ſure that we are not ſo *perſwaded*, unleſs the *grounds*, on which their *perſwaſion* is founded, be ſo convincingly repreſented to us, that it muſt be our *prejudice*, or other *vicious defect*, or *affection* in us, that we are not in the like manner *perſwaded* of it. But on this we are known to *inſiſt*, and never yet have had any ſuch *grounds* offered to us: As may in ſome meaſure appear by the *view* of that *Controverſie* as it lyes viſible in the Book, intituled, *The view of Infallibility*.

34. As for the *uncertainty* of the *reaſons* on the *Proteſtants* ſide, by *uncertainty*, meaning *fallibility*, and the *poteſt ſubeſſe falſum*, whilſt yet we are, without *doubting*, verily *perſwaded* that our *reaſons* have force in them; that cannot make it *poſſible* for us to *believe* what we do not *believe*, or *lawful* upon any the *faireſt* intuition to *profeſs* contrary to our *belief*. I believe that *Henry* VIII. was *King* of this *Nation*, and the *reaſons* on which I believe it, are, the *teſtimonies* of meer men, and ſo *fallible*; yet the bare *fallibility* of thoſe *teſtimonies* cannot infuſe into me any *doubt* of the *truth* of them, hath no force to *ſhake* that but *humane belief*; and while I thus *believe*, I am ſure it were *wilful* ſin in me, though for the *greateſt* and moſt precious *acquiſitions* in my *view*, to *profeſs* I do *not believe it*. The like muſt be ſaid of any other *perſwaſion* of mine, denied by the *Romaniſts*, and the *denying* whereof is part of the *condition* required of me to make me capable of *communion* with them.

35. But it is not now time to inſiſt on this, both becauſe here is *nothing* produced againſt it, and becauſe here follows a much *higher* undertaking, which ſwallows up all theſe *inferior* differences between us, *viz.* that not to *acknowledge* the *Church* (that muſt be the *Roman Church*) *to be infallible, is the great crime of Schiſm and Hereſie* in capite, *and more than all that I hold diſtinct from the Romaniſts.*

36. This I acknowledge was not foreſeen in the *Tract* of *Schiſm*, and may ſerve for the *una litura*, the *one anſwer* to remove all that is there ſaid. For if our *grand Fundamental Schiſm* and *Hereſie* be all ſummed up in this one *comprehenſive* guilt, our not acknowledging the *Church* of *Rome* to be *infallible*, then it was and ſtill is impertinent to diſcourſe on any other Subject, but that one of *Infallibility*; for if that be gained by them to belong to their *Church*, I am ſure we are concluded *Schiſmaticks*; and till it be gained, I am ſure there is no *reaſon* to *ſuppoſe* it.

37. But then as this is a *compendious* way of *anſwering* the *Tract* of *Schiſm*, and I wonder, after he had ſaid this, he could think it *ſeaſonable* to proceed to make exceptions to any other Particulars, this one great *miſtake* of the *Queſtion* being diſcovered, made all other more *minute* conſiderations *unneceſſary* (as he that hath ſprung a *Mine* to blow up the whole *Fort*, need not ſet *Wiſps* of Straw to ſeveral *corners* to *burn* it) ſo it falls out a little unluckily, that this doth not *ſuperſede*, but only remove this *Gentleman's labour*, it being now as neceſſary that he ſhould defend his *Hypotheſis* of the *Church* of *Rome's Infallibility*, againſt all that is formerly ſaid by me on *that Subject*, as now it was to make this *Anſwer* to the *Book* of *Schiſm*, and till that be done, or attempted to be done, there is nothing left for me to *reply* to in this matter.

38. For as to his bare *affirmations*, that the *not acknowledging* their *Infallibility*, *takes away all belief and ground of belief, turns all into uncertainty*, &c. *nay, ſubmitteth to Atheiſm and all ſorts of miſcreancy.*] It is, ſure, but a *miſtake* or *miſunderſtanding*, as of ſome other things, ſo particularly of the *nature* of *belief*; For beſide that I may have other *grounds* of *belief*, than the *affirmations* of the *Roman Church*; the *authority* of *Scripture*, for the Severals contained in it, and the *Teſtimony* of the *univerſal Primitive* (that ſure is more than of the *preſent Roman*) *Church*, to aſſure me that what we take for *Scripture* is *Scripture*, and to derive *Apoſtolical Traditions* to me, and ſo I may believe enough without ever knowing that the *Roman Church* defines any thing *de fide*, but much more, without acknowledging the *truth* of all She *defines*, and yet much more, without acknowledging her *inerrable* and *infallible*: Beſide this, I ſay, it is evident that *belief* is no more than *conſent* to the *truth* of any thing, and the grounds of *belief*, ſuch *Arguments* as are ſufficient to exclude *doubting*, to induce *conviction* and *perſwaſion*, and where that is actually induced, there is *belief*, though there be no pretence of *infallibility* in the Argument, nor *opinion* of it in him that is perſwaded by it.

39. That all that *God* hath ſaid is *true*, I believe by a *belief* or *perſwaſion*, *cui non poteſt ſubeſſe falſum, wherein I cannot be deceived*, and there I acknowledge *infallibility*, upon this ground, whether of *nature* or of *Grace*, of *common* dictate, or of *Religion*, that it is *impoſſible for God to lie*, to *deceive*, or to *be deceived*; But that the whole *Canon* of *Scripture*, as it is delivered to us by the *Laodicean Council*, is the *Word* of *God*, though I fully *believe* this alſo, and have not the leaſt doubt to any part of it, yet I account not my ſelf *infallible* in this *belief*, nor can any *Church* that affirms the ſame, unleſs they are otherwiſe *priviledged* by *God*, be *infallible* in *affirming* it, nor any that *believes* that *Church*, be *infallible* in their *belief*; And as that *priviledge* is not yet proved, by any *donation* of *Gods*, to belong to any *Church*, particularly to the *Roman*; ſo till it be *proved*, and proved *infallibly*, it can be no competent *medium* to induce any new *act* of *infallible belief*, the want of which, may denominate us either *Hereticks* or *Schiſmaticks*.

40. In the mean time, this is certain, that I that do not pretend to *believe* any thing *infallibly* in this matter, not ſo much as that the *Church* is not *infallible*, muſt yet be acknowledged to *believe* her *fallible*, or elſe I could not by this *Gentleman* be adjudged a *Schiſmatick* for ſo *believing*: And then this ſuppoſeth that I may *believe* what in his *opinion* I believe *untruly*, that ſure is, that I may *believe* what I do not *believe infallibly*. The matter is *viſible*, I cannot think fit to *enlarge* on it.

41. One thing only I muſt farther take notice of, the *ground* which he here had, on which he *founds* his *exception* againſt the *ſolidity* of my *Diſcourſe*, calling it my *great evidence*, that *we that do not acknowledge the Church of* Rome *to be infallible, may be allowed to make certain ſuppoſitions that follow there.*

42. The matter in that place *Chap.* II. *Sect.* 12. lies thus. In examining the nature of *Schiſm*, I have occaſion to mention one (not *real*, but) *fiction* of *Caſe*; Suppoſe *firſt*, that our *Anceſtors* had *criminouſly* ſeparated from the *Church* of *Rome*; and ſuppoſe, *ſecondly*, that we their *Poſterity* repented, and deſired to *reform* their ſin, and to be *reunited* to them; yet ſuppoſing, *thirdly*, that they ſhould require to our *reunion*, any *condition* which were *unlawful* for us to perform, in this conjuncture, I ſay, we could not juſtly be charged for *continuing* that *ſeparation*.

This

This *fiction* of Case, I could not think had any weak part in it; for as it supposed that on one side, which I knew a *Romanist* would not grant, *viz.* that they should *require any condition unlawful for us to perform*, so it supposed on the other side, that which we can no way grant, *viz.* that our *Ancestors* criminously *separated*; But this I knew was ordinary to be done in *fictions* of Cases; *Suppositio non ponit*, is the acknowledged Rule, my *supposing* either of these, was not the taking them for *granted*; And yet after all this, I foresaw that *Objection*, that the *Romanist*, who acknowledges not any such hard *condition* required to our *reconciliation*, will conceive this an *impossible* Case; And to this I answered, that we, that acknowledge not their *Church* to be *infallibile*, may be allowed to make a *supposition* (meaning as before, a *fiction* of Case) which is founded in the *possibility of her inserting some errour in her confessions, and making the acknowledgment of it, the indispensable condition of her Communion.* What I have offended herein, I cannot imagine; for 1. I only set a *fiction* of Case, do not take their *infallibility* for a thing confestly false, nor in that place so much as *dispute* against it. Only I say that which was sufficiently known before I said it, that their *Infallibility* is not acknowledged by us, and so that her *inserting* some *errour* in her *Confessions*, is to us, *i. e.* in our *opinion*, a thing *possible*, and so for *disputation* sake *supposable*, in the same manner as I suppose that which I am known not to *believe*; and if this *Gentleman* be thus *severe*, I shall despair to approve my *Discourses* to him. 43.

Secondly, That I make it my *great evidence*, is not with any appearance of *reason* suggested by him; it comes in merely as an *incidental*, *last* branch, the least necessary, most *unconsiderable* of any, and that which might have been *spared* then, or left out now, without any *weakning* of, or *disturbing* the *Discourse*. 44.

Thirdly, Whereas he adds, that I *proceed to make certain suppositions that follow there*, this is still of the *same* strain; I make but *one supposition*, *viz.* in case She make any *unlawful act* the *indispensable condition* of her *Communion*, And that *one*, certainly, is not in the *plural*, *more*, or indefinitely *certain suppositions*. 45.

That I put this *one* Case as *possible*, and then proceeded to consider, what were by the *Principles* acknowledged by all, particularly by Mr. *Knot*, to be done in that one Case, was agreeable to the strictest *Laws* of *Discourse* which I have met with. And if in compliance with this *Gentleman*, I must deny my self such *liberties*, and yet yield him so much *greater*, on the other side; If I must at the *beginning* of a *defence* of the *Church* of *England*, be required to grant the *Church* of *Rome infallible*, *i. e.* to yield not only that She speaks *all* truth, but also that it is *impossible* She should speak any thing but *truth*, whom yet, by entring on this Theme I undertake to *contradict*, and to prove injurious in *censuring* us for *Schismaticks*; this were, as I have said, an *hard* task indeed; The very same as if I were required to begin a *Duel* by presenting and delivering up all *weapons* into the *enemies* hand, to *plead* a Cause, and *introduce* my defence by *confessing* my self *guilty* of all that the *Plaintiff* doth, or can have the confidence to *charge* upon me. 46.

And if these be the *conditions* of a *Dispute*, these will questionless be hard, whatsoever the *conditions* of our *reunion* be conceived to be; and moreover, this *Gentleman* will be as *infallible* as his *Church*, and then 'tis pity he should lavish out *medicines*, that is so secured by *charms*, that he should *defend* his Cause by *reasons*, which hath this one so much *cheaper* expedient, to *answer* a whole Book in one *Period*. 47.

And so much for his *Animadversions* on this *second Chapter*, which are no *excellent presage* of that which we are to expect in the *ensuing*. 48.

CHAP. III.

Exceptions to the third Chapter answered.

SECT. I.

The Division of Schism justified. Of Schism against the authority of Councils. Of unanimity of belief in the dispersion of the Churches.

THE *Exceptions* against the *third Chapter* are reducible to four Heads: The *first* about the *insufficiency* of the *division* of *Schism*, in these words, *Numb.* 1.

In his third Chapter, what is chiefly to be noted to our purpose, is, that his division is insufficient, for he maketh Schism to be only against Monarchical power, or against fraternal charity, which is very much besides the Principles of those Protestants, who pretend so much to the authority of Councils; methinks he should have remembred there might be Schism against conciliatory authority, whether this be called so when the Council actually sitteth, or in the unanimity of belief in the dispersion of the Churches; so that the Doctor (supposing he concluded against the Pope) hath not concluded himself no Schismatick, being separated from the Catholick World. 2.

And again in the next Page, by way of *recollection* or *second* thoughts, thus,

But I must not forget here what I omitted to insert before, that in his division of Schism he omitteth the Principal, if not indeed, and in the use of the word by the Antients, the only Schism, which is, when one breaketh from the whole Church of God; for though a breach made from the immediate superior, or a particular Church, may in some sort, and in our ordinary manner of speaking be called a Schism, yet that by which one breaketh away from the communion of the whole Church, is properly, and in a higher sense called Schism, and is that out of which the present Question proceedeth, whereas other divisions, as long as both parts remain in communion with the Universal Church, are not properly Schisms, but with a diminutive particle, so that in this division he left out that part which appertained to the Question.

3. My *diviſion* of *Schiſm* is that which I could not conceive ſubject to the *exceptions* of any *rational* man, of what perſwaſions ſoever; *Schiſm* being a *breach* of *unity* and *communion*; as many ſorts as were conceivable of *unity* and *communion*, ſo many, and no more, I ſet down of *Schiſm*, ſome as breaches of the *ſubordination* which *Chriſt* ſetled in his *Church*, others of *mutual charity*, which he left among his *Diſciples*.

4. For is it not evident, that *all* men in the World are either our *Superiors*, or *Inferiors*, or our *Equals*? and can I break *communion* with any, as long as being an *Inferior*, I live *regularly* under all my *Superiors*, and *brotherly* with all my *Equals*? There is certainly no place of *doubt* in this. When therefore in his ſecond *period* here ſet down, he mentions it, as the *principal*, (and in the *Antients* uſe of the word) the *only Schiſm*, when one *breaketh from the whole Church of God*, It is ſtrange he ſhould think that man was not comprized in either *member* of my *diviſion*, when certainly he is guilty of *both*. For how can he *ſeparate* from the *whole Church*, unleſs he *ſeparate* both from his *Superiors* and his *Equals* too? And if he *ſeparate* from *both*, then queſtionleſs he ſeparates from *one*, and from more than *one* of them.

5. Was it poſſible for any care more *ſolicitouſly* to have *prevented* this *exception*, than that which by me was uſed, when among the *branches* of *equality*, with which every one is obliged to preſerve *unity* and *communion*, I reckoned up, not only the *Believers* of the *ſame* Congregation, *&c.* but the ſeveral *Communities* of *Chriſtian* men from *Pariſhes* and *Dioceſes*, to *Climes* of the *whole Chriſtian World*, *Chap.* 3. §. 5. And indeed it is a great piece of *auſterity*, that when I have endeavoured to prove that we of the *Church* of *England* have not *voluntarily ſeparated* (and that only is the *crime* of *Schiſm*) from any *one* particular *Church*, and no *one* of thoſe proofs is *invalidated*, nor as yet ſo much as *excepted* againſt; it ſhould yet be thought ſeaſonable to *reply*, that we have *broken off from the whole Church of God*.

6. Is not that *whole* made up of theſe *ſeverals*, as a *Body* of *Limbs*, the *Univerſal* of *Particulars*? And can the *hand* be broken off from the whole *Body*, when it is not *broken* off, but remains in perfect *union* with every part of the *Body*? If the *arm* be *broken* from the *Body*, the *hand*, which remains *united* to the *arm*, may yet be *ſeparate* from the *whole Body*, becauſe by being *faſtned* to the *arm* 'tis *united* but to *one*, and not to *all* the Members of the *Body*. But an *union* to *all* the Members of the *Body* ſuppoſes a *ſeparation* from no one part that remains in the *Body*, and ſure that muſt be an *union* with the *whole* Body, which is nothing elſe, but *all* the *Members* together.

7. And ſo as his *ſecond thoughts* were *effects*, not *remedies* of his *forgetfulneſs*, the very ſame, which he had mentioned before under the Style of *ſeparation from the Catholick World*, ſo certainly they were again *effects* of his *inobſervance*, that his *principal* ſort of *Schiſm*, *ſeparation* from the *whole Church*, was comprehended by me under this Style, *ſeparation from the ſeveral communities of the whole Chriſtian World*.

8. As to the former branch of his exception, that in my *diviſion* of *Schiſm*, into that which is againſt *Monarchical* (I ſaid, and when he recites my words, he ſhould do ſo too, *paternal*) *power*, and that which is againſt *fraternal charity*, *I omit to mention the authority of Councils*, It is evidently a *cauſeleſs* ſuggeſtion. For 1. if *Councils*, as he ſaith, have any *authority*, that will certainly be reducible to *paternal* power. And if they have *none*, any farther than by way of *counſel* and *advice*, that will directly fall under the Head of *fraternal* charity.

9. *Secondly*, If by *Councils* he mean *Provincial Councils*, it is evident that the power which ſeverally belongs to the *Biſhops* of each *Province*, is united in that of a *Provincial Council*, where all the *Dioceſan Biſhops* are aſſembled, and the deſpiſing of that, is an offence under the *firſt* ſort of *Schiſm*, a *breach* of the *ſubordination* to the *Biſhop*, yea, and the *Metropolitan* too, who preſides in the *Provincial Council*.

10. So again, if he mean *National Councils*, the power of the *Biſhops* of all the *Provinces* there aſſembled, devolves upon this *Aſſembly*, compounded of all of them, the *deſpiſing* thereof is the *deſpiſing* of theſe *Eccleſiaſtical Superiors* of the whole *Nation*, and culpable, and *ſchiſmatical* upon that account.

11. As for *Oecumenical* or *General Councils*, if they be truly ſuch, the power of *all* the *Biſhops* of *all* the *Provinces* in all *Chriſtian* Nations devolves upon that, and ſo cannot be *deſpiſed* without *deſpiſing* of all Ranks of our *Eccleſiaſtical Superiors*, *Biſhops*, *Metropolitans*, *Primates* or *Patriarchs*; and therefore this ſort of *Schiſm* could not be deemed to be omitted, where all thoſe other branches, of which it is made up, were ſo *particularly* handled.

12. That any more *ſpecial* conſideration was not taken of *General Councils* in that Diſcourſe, the account (beſide that which is now given) is more than intimated in that *Tract* of *Schiſm*, pag. 60. firſt becauſe they were *remedies* of *Schiſm*, and *extraordinary*, not any ſtanding *Judicatures*, to which our *conſtant ſubordination* and *ſubjection* was required. 2. Becauſe theſe were ſuch, as without which the *Church* continued for the firſt three hundred years, and ſo could not belong to a *general* Diſcourſe, which ſpake of all the *certain* and *ordinary* and *conſtant* ſorts of *Schiſm*, and ſuch as *all* times were capable of, and enlarged not to thoſe other of *accidental emergencies*. 3. Becauſe they are now *morally* impoſſible to be had, the *Chriſtian* World being under ſo many *Empires*, and divided into ſo many *Communions*, that it is not viſible to the eye of man how they ſhould be *regularly* aſſembled.

13. As for thoſe that are already *paſt*, and are on due grounds to be acknowledged truly *Oecumenical*, the *communion*, which is poſſible to be had or broken with them, is that of *compliance* with, or *receſſion* from their *definitions*, and our *innocence* in that reſpect is avowed, p. 160. as the congregating of the like (when *poſſible*, and *probable* toward the end) is recommended, p. 158. as a *ſupply*, when there ſhould be need of *extraordinary* remedies.

14. *Laſtly*, If none of this had been done, or if this had not been undertaken ſo ſolemnly and *formally*, as ſome other ſuppoſed branches of *Schiſm* were, in that *Tract*, yet the account of that is viſible to any, becauſe the *principal* ſort of *Schiſm* charged by the *Romaniſt* on the *Church* of *England*, is that of caſting out the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, not contemning the *authority* of *Councils*, and therefore I was in reaſon to apply my Diſcourſe moſt *largely* and particularly to that Head, to which their *Objections*,

not

not my own *choice* directed me. So evidently contrary to the notoriety of the fact, is this *complaint* of this *Gentleman*, that my *diviſion* of *Schiſm* was *inſufficient*, and that I took no *notice* of this (as he pleaſes to call it) *conciliatory authority*.

That to make his ſuggeſtion ſeem more *probable*, he *adviſedly* choſe to *change* the terms of my *diviſion* from that which was againſt *Paternal*, to that which is againſt *Monarchical* Power, upon this apprehenſion, that *Paternal* power would viſibly include that of the *Fathers* in *Council* aſſembled, as well as in *ſeveral*; but *Monarchical* power could not ſo fitly bear it, I ſhall not enter into his *ſecrets* to divine. This I am ſure of, that the *unanimity* of *belief* in the *diſperſion* of the *Churches*, cannot with any propriety (as by him it is) be defined a *branch* of *Conciliatory authority*; for certainly the *Churches diſperſed* are not *met* together the διασπορὰ or *diſperſion* of the *Jews* differed much from the *Council* aſſembled at *Jeruſalem*, and the *Chriſtian Church* at this day is without Queſtion no *Oecumenical Council*. 15.

And then what *authority ſcattered* Members can have, which never legally *command*, or *exerciſe authority*, but when they are in *conjunction*, I ſhall not here make ſtay to demonſtrate: whatſoever there is of this nature will moſt properly be comprized under the *Head* of *Communion* or *unity fraternal*, and the *Schiſm* which is a *tranſgreſſion* of that, being at large handled alſo, *Chap.* 8, 9, 10. there was no inſufficiency, in any *juſtice*, to be charged on this *diviſion*. 16.

SECT. II.

Of the extent of the Roman Province. The Biſhops of Italy *diſtinct from thoſe that belong to* Rome. *The Eccleſiaſtical diſtributions agreeable with the Civil.* Ruffinus *vindicated.*

THE ſecond charge on this Chapter is about the *extent* of the *Roman Patriarchy*, in theſe words: *Numb.* 1.

In this Chapter he telleth us many things, ſome true, ſome not ſo, but all either common to us both, or not appertaining to the Controverſie, until he concludes, that certainly the Roman Patriarchy did not extend it ſelf to all Italy, *and this he does out of a word in* Ruffinus, *which he ſuppoſeth to be taken in a ſpecial propriety of Law, whereas indeed that Author's knowledge in Grammar was not ſuch as ſhould neceſſarily exact any ſuch belief, eſpecially learned men ſaying the contrary.* 2.

The place, to which this *exception* belongs, is not ſet down by this *Gentleman*, but by annexing the teſtimony out of *Ruffinus*, I diſcern it to be that of pag. 52. where ſpeaking of the *Picenum ſuburbicarium* and *Annonarium*, I ſay the former belonged to the *Præfecture* of *Rome*; the latter, with the *ſeven Provinces* in the *broader part* of *Italy*, belonged to the *Dioceſe* (as it was antiently called) of *Italy*, of which *Milan* was the *Metropolis*. 3.

This being the *affirmation* which he excepteth againſt, I did not, nor yet do make any *queſtion* of *vindicating*, and defending it againſt any *objection*. 4.

That *learned men ſay the contrary*, is here ſuggeſted, in the cloſe, but as there is not one *learned* man named, nor *teſtimony* produced (which therefore amounts no higher than the bare opinion or affirmation of this one *Gentleman*, without any one *reaſon* or *authority* to ſupport it) ſo when any ſuch *learned* mens names and *teſtimonies* ſhall be produced, it will be eaſie to ſhew, that there is very little of their *learning* expreſt in ſo ſaying. 5.

On the other ſide I had (pag. 50. in the *margent*) referred to ſome *teſtimonies* whereon my *Aſſertion* was founded, *viz.* thoſe which manifeſtly diſtinguiſht the *Province* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, from the *Province* of *Italy*, which could not have had truth in them, if the *Province* of the *Patriarch* of *Rome* extended to all *Italy*. 6.

Such was that of * *Euſebius* diſtinctly mentioning the *Biſhops* of the *Cities* of *Italy*, and the *Biſhops* that belong to the *City* of the *Romans*. The *teſtimony* out of the *Edict* of the *Emperour Aurelian*, in the Controverſie betwixt *Paulus Samoſatenus* and *Domnus*, where it is decreed, that the *houſe*, about which they contended, ſhould be delivered οἷς ἂν οἱ κατὰ τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὸ Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἐπίσκοποι * ᾧ δόγματι ἐπιτάλοιεν, *to thoſe to whom the Biſhops through* Italy *and the City of the Romans ſhould decree it.* 7. * l. 7. c. 30. * γρ. διὰ

The like was that of the *Council* of *Sardice* ſet down in * *Athanaſius* in the *title* of their *Epiſtle* to the *Alexandrians*, Thus, Ἡ ἁγία Σύνοδος ἡ κατὰ θεὸν χάριν ἐν Σαρδικῇ συναχθεῖσα ὑπὸ Ῥωμῆς καὶ Σπανίων Γαλλίων, Ἰταλίας, &c. *The holy Synod by God's grace aſſembled at* Sardice, *from* Rome, *and* Spain, France, Italy, *&c.* 8. * *Apol.* 2. *ad Imp. Conſt. Edit. Par. Tom.* 1. p. 756.

So in * *Athanaſius*'s declaration of his own affairs, and the (συμφωνία) *agreement* of many *Biſhops* with him, he ſpecifies, who and how many they were, πλείους δὲ ἦσαν ὑ. ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης Ῥώμης, καὶ τῆς Ἰταλίας πάσης, Καλαβρείας τε, &c. *There were more than four hundred both from great* Rome, *and from all* Italy, *and from* Calabria, &c. Where the *Biſhops* of the *Roman Province* are diſtinguiſht from the *Biſhops* of *Italy*, as thoſe again from the *Biſhops* of *Calabria*, &c. 9. * Ἐπιστ. τοῖς μονήρη βίον ἀσκοῦσι. *Pariſ. Edit. Tom.* 1. p. 827. C.

So among the names prefixt to the * firſt *Council* of *Arles*, we have *ex Provincia Italiæ, Civitate Mediolanenſi*, &c. *ex Urbe Româ, quos Sylveſter Epiſcopus miſit ex Provincia Romana, Civitate Portuenſi, &c. of the Province of* Italy, *from the City of* Milan, &c. *from the City of* Rome *thoſe whom Biſhop* Sylveſter *ſent, of the Province of* Rome, *from the City of* Porta, *&c.* ſuch and ſuch were aſſembled at that *Council*, where again the matter is clear as to the *diſtinction* of thoſe *Provinces* of *Rome* and *Italy*, the former under the *preſidency* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, the later of the *Biſhop* of *Milan*. 10. * *Concil. Tom.* 1. p. 266.

By this it might have appeared to this *Gentleman* (if as he pleaſed to mention the *much Greek*, in his *Preface*, ſo he had been at leiſure to conſider the *importance* of it) that beſide the *teſtimony* (which he will call *a word*) of *Ruffinus*, I had made uſe of other ways of *proof*, that the *preſidency* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* (I ſuppoſe that he muſt mean by the *Roman Patriarchy*) did not extend it ſelf to *all Italy*. 11.

12. Again, after the *teſtimony* of *Ruffinus*, I mentioned another evidence, from the *proportioning Eccleſiaſtical juriſdictions to the Temporal of the Lieutenants*; This may appear *in theſe*, by the words of
* *Cont. Celſ. l.* 3. * *Origen*, of which I ſhall now, becauſe I did not there, take notice, ὅτω ἡ κὴ ἀρχοντα ἐκκλησίας ἑκάστης πόλεως ἄρχοντι πρὸ ἐν τῇ πόλει συγκείσθαι, *It is fit that the Prefect of the Church of each City, ſhould correſpond to the Governour of thoſe which are in the City.* And that ſo it was, appears by the *ſecond Canon* of the *Council* of *Conſtantinople*, where the *juriſdictions* of the *Biſhops* are ſtill proportioned to the *condition* of the *Cities* where they were, the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria* to have *power* over all *Ægypt*, the *Metropolis* whereof was *Alexandria*, and ſo in the reſt. And this is in the *Tract* of *Schiſm* largely deduced and cleared alſo, p. 54, 55, &c. and need not be here again *repeated*. And ſo here was more again than the word of *Ruffinus*, for what I ſaid.

13. *Laſtly*, That for which *Ruffinus* was cited, being but this, that the *Biſhop of* Rome *was authorized by the* Nicene *Canon to take care of the ſuburbicarian Regions*, I could not ſure be miſtaken in thinking, that he took the word *ſuburbicarian* in ſuch a *propriety* (I ſay not of *Law*, but) of *common language*, as will conclude the *Picenum ſuburbicarium* to belong to the *Roman Prefecture*, as the *Annonarium* did to the *Dioceſe* of *Italy*.

14. And certainly *Ruffinus*, that lived ſo near the *Council* of *Nice*, and that in *Italy*, a *Preſbyter* of *Aquileia*, (and of whom * *Palladius* affirms ὃ γνωσιώτερον ἢ ἐπικίνδυνον ἐν ἀνδρᾶσιν ἐκ ἠνείσκετο) knew how
* *Hiſt. Lauſ. c.* 118. that was diſtributed in his time, better than this *Gentleman* at this diſtance can pretend to do; may alſo be allowed to know ſo much of *Grammar*, as to expreſs his own ſenſe (in a *Paraphraſe*) of that *Nicene Canon*.

15. In a matter ſo clear I ſhall add no more, but the words of a moſt *excellent perſon*, *Jac. Leſchaſſerius* in his *Conſultatio ad Clariſ. Venet. Ruffino Bellum indicunt Scriptores Romani hujus temporis, &c. The Romaniſts of this time are diſpleaſed with* Ruffinus, *not knowing what Churches they were, which the Nicene Canon underſtands to be under the firſt and ordinary power of the Pope. Whereas* Ruffinus *underſtood it of the Churches of the ſuburbicarian Provinces and Regions, which are four, the firſt the Roman, with the bounds of the Prefecture of the City, and three other with which that is incompaſt, All Campania, Picenum ſuburbicarium, and Tuſcia ſuburbicaria*, of which there is frequent mention in the *Notitiæ* of the *Roman Empire*. And of this the ſame *Authour* hath written a *learned Tract*; And ſo here is a diſtinct *teſtimony* of a very *learned* man, and this is a ſufficient *Anſwer* to his bare indefinite *affirmation* that *learned men ſay the contrary*.

SECT. III.

The Identity of the Office of Primates and Patriarchs, the authorities of Gratian, *and* Anacletus, *and* Anicetus.

Numb. 1. THE third *charge* wherein this third *Chapter* is concerned, remains about the *identity* of the *Office* of *Primates*, and *Patriarchs*, in theſe words:

2. *Then he telleth you, that the Office of Primates and Patriarchs was the ſame, only authorizing that affirmation from an Epiſtle of* Anacletus, *the which, as ſoon as occaſion ſerveth, he will tell you is of no authority, but fictitious.*
He urgeth *Gratian* too.

3. What I ſaid of *Primates* and *Patriarchs*, that though the *Patriarchs* had the *precedence* in *Councils*, the deference in reſpect of *place*, yet the *power* and *juriſdiction* of *Primates* was as great as of *Patriarchs*, and the *Office* the ſame, I thought had ſufficiently been evidenced to the *Romaniſt*, p. 58. For as one manifeſt indication of it was there mentioned, *viz.* that in Authors the very *titles* are confounded, witneſs *Juſtinian* who commonly gives *Primates* the name of *Patriarchs* of the *Dioceſes*, ſo the reference to thoſe two authorities ſo acknowledged and owned by the *Romaniſts*, the *Epiſtle* of *Anacletus*, and the *Decree* of *Gratian*, ſeemed to me to put it out of all *queſtion*.

4. For in the *Body* of their *Canon Law corrected* and ſet out by *Pope Gregory* XIII. as *Gratian*'s *Decree* makes up the firſt and principal part, ſo in that *par.* 1. *diſt in.* 99. we have theſe words, *De Primatibus autem quæritur quem gradum in Eccleſia tenuerint, an in aliquo à Patriarchis differant, The Queſtion is made concerning Primates, what degree they have in the Church, and whether in any thing they differ from Patriarchs.* And the Anſwer is, *Primates & Patriarchæ diverſorum ſunt nominum, ſed ejuſdem officii, Primates and Patriarchs are of different names, but of the ſame office.*

5. What could have been ſaid more *punctually* and expreſly to the buſineſs in hand? What more *authentick* and dilucid *teſtimony* could have been produced to any *Romaniſt*, with whom I had to do? And 'tis a little ſtrange, that this *Gentleman* ſhould ſay, that I *only authorize my affirmation from an Epiſtle of* Anacletus, and then either he, or ſome Superviſor for him put as in a *marginal* Note, *He urgeth Gratian too*; When 1. If I urged *Gratian*, I did not urge *Anacletus only*; and 2. it is evident I did urge *Gratian* as punctually as *Anacletus*; and 3. *Gratian*'s words are ſo *expreſs* as nothing can be more; and 4. *Gratian*'s *authority* with them is as great as any could have been produced; and 5. there is not one word offered to avoid the *force* of *Gratian*'s teſtimony, as to that other of *Anacletus* there is, which argues that this *Gentleman* was concluded by *Gratian*, yet would not *conſent* to the Propoſition unanſwerably inferred from him. And this may ſuffice to be noted concerning that *teſtimony*.

6. Then for *Anacletus*, 1. his words are theſe, *Provinciarum diviſio ab Apoſtolis eſt renovata, The diviſion of Provinces was renewed by the Apoſtles, Et in capite Provinciarum — Patriarchas vel Primates, qui unam formam tenent, licèt diverſa ſint nomina, Leges Divinæ & Eccleſiaſticæ poni & eſſe juſſerunt, ad quos Epiſcopi, ſi neceſſe fuerit, confugerent, eoſque appellarent, And in the Head of the Province — Patriarchs, or Primates, who hold the ſame form* (are of the ſame *nature*) *though they be divers names, are placed by Divine and Eccleſiaſtical Laws, ſo that to them the Biſhops, when 'tis needful, may reſort and make their appeals.* This teſtimony again is as punctual to the purpoſe as could have been deviſed.

And

And then *secondly*, this being by the *Romanists* received as a *Decretal Epistle* of that *Pope* and *antient Bishop* of *Rome*, was in reason, whatsoever it were to us, to stand with the *Romanist* in full authority. 7.

Thirdly, This being in perfect *concord* with the *Decree* of *Gratian*, is in the aforesaid *Body* of their *Canon Law* approved, and set out by *Pope Gregory* XIII. annext to that *Decree* of *Gratian*, *Distinct.* 99. c. 1. 8.

And *fourthly*, whereas this *Gentleman* saith, that *as soon as occasion serves, I will tell you* this *Epistle* of *Anacletus* is of *no authority*, I must say, 1. that I have no where, that I remember, ever said so. 2. That this *Gentleman* cannot without *divining* tell me now, what I *shall* do hereafter. 3. That *occasion* not yet requiring it of me, but *Anacletus* affirming what I affirm, I have no *temptation* to do so, and so as yet he can have no pretence to make use of this subterfuge. 4. That there are things called *argumenta ad homines*, *arguments* that may bind *him* who acknowledges the *authority*, from which they are drawn, though they conclude not *him* that allows not those *authorities*; and such is this of *Anacletus*'s *Epistle*, to a *Romanist*. 9.

And by the same *Logick* that he can inferr that *Anacletus*'s *authority* was unduely produced by me, who (as he but thinks) will not *stand* to *Anacletus*'s *authority*, I may sure conclude that *Anacletus*'s *authority* was duely produced by me, because against him, who, I have reason to presume, must *stand* to *Anacletus*'s *authority*. 10.

A *third testimony* of the same nature, I shall now add, which must again have force with a *Romanist*, that of *Anicetus ad Episcopos Galliæ*, which follows there in the * *Corpus Juris Canonici*. *Primarum Civitatum Episcopos Apostoli & Successores Apostolorum regulariter Patriarchas & Primates esse constituerunt. The Apostles and their Successors regularly appointed that the Bishops of the Prime Cities should be Primates and Patriarchs.* And till somewhat be produced to the contrary, as 'tis sure here is nothing offered by this *Gentleman*, this may at the present suffice in this place. 11.

* *Decret. Grat. par. 1. dist. 92. c. 2.*

SECT. IV.

The Supreme Ecclesiastical power of Patriarchs. The power of convoking Councils, a Prerogative of Supremacy. That the Bishop of Rome *is not over Patriarchs. Proofs from the Councils, and Canons Apostolick; and the* Corpus Juris, *and Pope* Gregory*'s arguing.*

THE last exception concerns the *supreme Power* of *Patriarchs*, or the no *superiority* of any *Ecclesiastical Power* over them, Thus; *Numb.* 1.

Then he saith, there was no power over the Patriarchs; his proof is, because the Emperour used his secular authority in gathering of Councils, concluding, that because the Pope did not gather General Councils, therefore he had no authority over the Universal Church; which how unconsequent that is, I leave to your judgment. 2.

That there was no *supreme power* in the *Bishop* of *Rome*, nor in any other above that of *Primates* and *Patriarchs*, but only that of the *Emperour* in the whole *Christian* World, as of every *Sovereign Prince* in his *Dominions*, I thought sufficiently proved by this, that the *power* of *convoking Councils* did not belong to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, but to the *Prince* in every *Nation*, and the *Emperour* in the *whole* World. And I deemed this a sufficient proof, not because there are no other Branches of a *supreme Authority* imaginable, or which are claimed by the *Bishop* of *Rome*, save only this; but 1. because this of *convoking Councils* is certainly *one* such Prerogative of the *supreme* power, *inseparable* from it, and he that hath not that, hath not the *supreme* power (as in any *Nation* some *Prerogatives* there are which always are annext to the *Imperial Majesty*, and wherever any one of them truly is, there is the *supreme* power, and 'tis *treason* for any but the *supreme*, to assume any one of them, and one of that number is calling of *national Assemblies*) And *secondly*, because the *Bishop* of *Rome* doth as avowedly challenge this power of *convoking General Councils*, as any other I could have named or insisted on. And truly that was the only reason why I specified in this, because this of all others is most *eminent* in it self, most *characteristical* of the *supreme power*, and most *challenged* by the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and most due to him, in case he be the *Universal Pastor*. 3.

And then where there be *several* Branches of a *power*, all resident in the same Subject *inseparably*; from the *absence* of one, to collect the *absence* of all, I must still think, a *solid* way of *probation*, and cannot discern the *infirm* part, or *inconsequence* of it. If I could, it would be no difficult matter to *repair* it, and supply the *imperfectneß* of the proof, by what is put together in the *Corpus Juris Canonici* (even now cited) *Decret. par. 1. dist. 99. c. 3, 4, 5.* 4.

The thing that I had to prove, was, that there was not antiently any *summum genus*, any *supreme* either of, or over *Patriarchs*, beside the *Prince* or *Emperour*. To this, as far as concerns the *negative* part, that the *Bishop* of *Rome* is not this *summum genus*, I now cite from that third Chapter. *Primæ sedis Episcopus non appelletur Princeps Sacerdotum, vel summus Sacerdos, The Bishop of the first Seat ought not to be called Prince of the Priests, or supreme Priest.* And this testified out of the *African Council*, *Can.* 6. where the very words are recited with this addition of [*aut aliquid hujusmodi*] he is not to be called by any *other title* of the *same kind*, *sed tantum primæ Sedis Episcopus, but only Bishop of the first See*; and there were three such at that time, (those named in the *Nicene Canon*) *Alexandria*, *Rome*, *Antioch*, as is sufficiently known. 5.

And that he may see, the *practice* of the *Church* was perfectly concordant with that *definition*, I refer this *Gentleman* to the *Milevitan Council*, *cap.* 22. where speaking of *appeals* from their *Bishops*, the Rule is, *non provocent nisi ad Africana concilia, vel ad Primates Provinciarum suarum, They must appeal to none but the African Councils or the Primates of their own Provinces. Ad transmarina autem qui putaverint appellandum, à nullo intra Africam in communionem recipiantur. But if any shall think fit to appeal to any transmarine* (foreign) judicature, *they are not to be admitted to communion by any within* Africa. 6.

And

7. And indeed the same had been before *defined* by the *first Nicene Council*, c. 5. where the Sentence pronounced against any by the *Bishops* in each *Province*, was to stand good according to the *Canon* (I suppose the 12. *Apostolick*) which pronounces τὰς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθείσας, ὑφ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσίεσθαι, that *they which are excommunicated by some, shall not be received by others.* And accordingly in the *Synodical Epistle* of the *African Council* to *Pope Celestine*, which is in the Book of *Canons* of the *Roman Church*, and in the *Greek* collection of the *Canons* of the *African Church*, we find these words, ἱκετεύομεν, ἵνα τοὺς λοιπὸν παρ' ὑμῶν τοὺς ἐνθένδε παραγινομένους εὐχερῶς μὴ προσδέχησθε, μηδὲ τοὺς παρ' ἡμῶν ἀποκοινωνήτους εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ λοιποῦ δεδήσασθε δέξασθαι, ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο καὶ τῇ ἐν Νικαίᾳ Συνόδῳ δεδοκται εὐχερῶς εὑρεῖν ἢ σὺν εὐσεβασμιότητι, *We entreat you* (the style of one *Church* to another) *that for the future you will not easily admit those who have come to you from hence, and that you will not receive to your communion those who are excommunicated by us, seeing the Council of* Nice *hath thus defined, as you may easily discern.*

8. By all which put together, by the *African* out of the *Nicene*, and by the *Nicene* out of the *Apostolick Canon*, it is evident that the *Bishop* of *Rome* hath not power to *absolve* any person *excommunicate* by any *Bishop* of another *Province*, and that 'tis unlawful for any such to make *appeal* to him; which certainly will conclude against every the most inferior Branch of his pretended *authority* over the *Universal Church.*

9. If this be not enough, then add the 34 *Apostolick Canon*, τοὺς ἐπισκόπους ἑκάστου ἔθνους εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὡς κεφαλὴν. *The Bishops of every Nation must know him that is the first among them*, i. e. their *Primate, and account him as their Head.* Which sure infers that the *Bishop* of *Rome* is not the one only *Head* of all *Bishops.* The same is afterward transcribed by the Ninth *Canon* of *Antioch.*

10. But to return to their *Corpus Juris*; so again *Decret. par.* 1. *dist.* 99. c. 4. *Nec etiam Romanus Pontifex universalis est appellandus. The Pope of* Rome *is not to be called Universal Bishop*, citing the *Epistle* of *Pope Pelagius* II. *Nullus Patriarcharum Universalitatis vocabulo unquam utatur, quia si unus Patriarcha universalis dicatur, Patriarcharum nomen cæteris derogatur. No Patriarch must ever use the Title of Universal, for if one be called universal Patriarch, the name of Patriarch is taken from all the rest.* And more to the same purpose; the very thing that I was here to prove.

11. So again Ch. 5. out of the *Epistle* of *Pope Gregory* to *Eulogius Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, where refusing the title of *Universalis Papa, Universal Pope*, or *Father*, or *Patriarch*, and calling it *superbæ appellationis verbum*, a *proud title*, he adds, *si enim Universalem me Papam vestra Sanctitas dicit, negat se hoc esse, quod me fatetur Universum, If the Patriarch of* Alexandria *call the Pope Universal Father*, he doth thereby *deny himself to be that which he affirms* the *Pope* to be *universally*; The meaning is clear, If the *Pope* be *universal Patriarch*, then is he *Patriarch* of *Ægypt*, for sure that is a part of the *Universe*; and then, as there cannot be *two Supremes*, so the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* cannot be *Patriarch* of *Ægypt*, which yet from St. *Mark*'s time was generally resolved to belong to him, and the words of the *Nicene Canon* are expres to it, that according to the ἀρχαῖα ἔθη, *original, Primitive customs*, the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* should have power over all *Ægypt, Libya*, and *Pentapolis*, adding ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Ῥωμῇ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθὲς ἐστιν, &c. *seeing this is also customary with the Bishop of* Rome, *of* Antioch, &c. τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ἐκκλησίαις, *that the priviledges should be preserved to the Churches.*

12. All which arguing of that *Pope*, yea, and that *great Council*, were perfectly unconcluding (*inconsequent*, as mine was said to be) if the *Bishop* of *Rome*, or any other, had power over *Patriarchs*, or *authority* over the *universal Church*, which here this *Gentleman* is pleased to affirm, and so sure must think *Gregory* more than *fallible*, when he thus *protested*, and *disputed* the contrary.

13. How much higher than this the same *Gregory* ascended in expressing his detestation of that *title*, is sufficiently known from his *Epistle* to *Mauritius* the *Emperour*, *In regist.* l. 4. *Ep.* 3. I shall not here trouble him with the recitation of it.

14. What is after these passages set down in their *Body* of the *Law*, shews indeed that the *Popes* continued not always of this mind; Neither was I of opinion that they did, the *Story* being known to all, how *Boniface* III. with much ado obtained of *Phocas* the *Emperour* an *Edict* for the *Primacy* and *Universal Jurisdiction* of the *Church* of *Rome* (see *Paul. Diac. de Gestis Romanorum*, l. 18.) which yet is an Argument that till then it had no *foundation.*

15. Whether there were antiently any such, higher than *Patriarchs*, and whether now there ought to be, was the *Question* before me; and both those I must think *concluded* by what I have here set down, as far as relates to any true, *i. e. original* right, from any *appointment* of *Christ*, or title of *succession* to St. *Peter.*

16. Much more might be easily added to this Head, if it were not evident that this is much more than was *necessary* to be replied to a bare suggestion, without any specifying what that *power* is, which *may* belong to the *Pope* over the *Universal Church*, though convoking of *Councils* did *not* belong to him, and without any offer of *proof*, that any such did *really* belong to him.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the fourth Chapter.

SECT. I.

The Romanists pretensions founded in St. Peter's *Universal Pastorship. Of Possession without debating of Right. What power the Pope was possest of here.*

IN the *fourth Chapter*, his Objections begin to grow to some *height*; they are reducible to *three Heads*, the first is by way of *Preface*, a charge of a very considerable *default* in the whole *Discourse*, that *I remember not what matters I handle*; the other *two* are refutations of the *two* evidences I use, to disprove the *Popes* claim of *universal Primacy* from *Christ*'s *donation* to S. *Peter*. *Numb.* 1.

The first of the three is set down in these words:

In the fourth Chapter he pretendeth to examine whether by Christ his donation S. Peter *had a Primacy over the Church, where not to reflect upon his curious division, I cannot omit that he remembers not what matters he handles, when he thinketh the Catholick ought to prove that his Church or Pope hath an universal Primacy; for it being granted that in* England, *the Pope was in quiet possession of such a Primacy, the proof that it was just belongeth not to us, more than to any King, who received his Kingdom from his Ancestors, time out of mind, to prove his pretension to the Crown just: for quiet possession, of it self, is a proof, until the contrary be convinced, as who should rebel against such a King, were a Rebel, until he shewed sufficient cause for quitting obedience; with this difference, that obedience to a King may by prescription or bargain be made unnecessary, but if Christ hath commanded obedience to his Church, no length of years, nor change of humane affairs can ever quit us from this duty of obedience, so that the charge of proving the Pope to have no such authority from Christ, lieth upon the Protestants now as freshly, as the first day of the breach, and will do so until the very last.* 2.

My *method* in the beginning of *Chap.* 4. is visibly this; The *Church* of *England* being by the *Romanist* charged of *Schism* in departing from the *obedience* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and this upon pretence that he, as *Successor* of S. *Peter*, hath a *supremacy* over *all* the *Churches* in the World; I undertake to examine the truth of two Branches of this *suggestion*, one whether Saint *Peter* had this *universal Supremacy* given him by *Christ*; the *second*, whether this *power*, if supposed to be *instated* on Saint *Peter*, devolved on the *Bishops* of *Rome*. The former of these I examined in that *Chapter*. And I must now discern, if I can, how I have failed in any Particle of my undertaking. 3.

First, saith he, he will not reflect on my *curious division*. And I that know there was no *curiosity* in any *division* of mine, but on the other side, such *perspicuity* as was agreeable to a desire and endeavour to set down the whole matter of Debate between us as *distinctly* and *intelligibly* as I could, that the *Reader* might be sure to judge whether I answered their charge, or no, I have no reason in the least to suspect the *fitness* and *usefulness* of my *Division*, nor consequently to be impertinently *solicitous* in *reflecting* on it. 4.

That which he saith he *cannot omit*, I shall make haste to consider with him, *viz.* my great *mistake*, in *thinking the Catholick ought to prove his Church or Pope hath an Universal Primacy*. 5.

To this I answer, 1. that there is no manner of *foundation* or pretence for this *exception* here. For I no where say the least word towards this purpose of *requiring* the *Romanist* to *prove* his pretensions, or to prove them by this *medium*; Only I take it for granted, that he doth actually produce *Arguments* to infer the *Pope*'s *Universal Primacy*, and that *Christ*'s *donation* to S. *Peter* is one of those *Arguments*. And that I was not herein mistaken, I shall, instead of a larger deduction of evidences from all sorts of *Romish Writers*, make my appeal to the *Objector* himself, in several places of this little Tract, *particularly* p. 20. where he hath these words, *We relie on the first, as the foundation, and corner-stone of the whole Building*. And what that *first* is, appears by the words immediately *precedent*, that the *pretensions for the Pope's supremacy in* England, *must be founded as Successour to S.* Peter *in the universal Pastorship of the Church*, so including *England* as a Member thereof. From whence instead of *recriminating* and *retorting* on him the charge of the *ill memory*, I shall only make this undeniable *Inference*, that I was not mistaken in thinking that the *Romanist* doth actually found his *pretensions* in the *universal Pastorship* of Saint *Peter*; and consequently, If I prove that to fail, I have removed that which in his own Style is the *foundation* and *corner-stone* of his *whole Building*. 6.

But then 2. because he here pretends that it belongs not to a *Romanist* to *prove his pretensions just*, but that it sufficeth that he hath the *possession*, I desire to propose these three things to his consideration, 1. By demanding whether at *this* time, or for these hundred years, the *Pope* hath had the *possession* of the *obedience* of this *Nation*; I suppose he will say he hath *not*; And if so, then by the force of his own Argument, that *possession*, and all the *Arguments* deducible from thence, are now lost to him, the *prescription* being now on *our* side, as before on *theirs*, and there is nothing left him to plead, but the *original right* on his side, against the *violence* of the *succeeding possession*: And if he come to the *pleading* of the *right*, then that is the very *method* that I proposed, and so did not *offend* or *forget* my self in so doing. 7.

Secondly, Concerning their *possession* before *Henry* VIII. his days, I shall demand how *long* they had it, and *how* they acquired it; If he will not at all think fit to *answer* this *Question* in either part, then I confess he hath made an end of the *Dispute*, and by refusing to give account of the *right* he had to his *possession*, he will leave every man to *catch* and hold what he can, and then to *imitate* him, and give no account to any how he came by it; which as it is an *unchristian* method, every man being obliged to clear his actions from manifest charges of *injustice* and *violence*, so again 'tis an *evil Lesson* against himself, and unless we will confess our selves *Schismaticks* in *casting* off their *obedience*, 'tis impossible for him 8.

him ever to *prove* us such; this kind of *Schism*, which now we speak of, being by all acknowledged to be a *separation* from our *lawful Superiors*, and no way being imaginable to prove the *Pope* to be such to this *Nation* without offering some proof to the Point of *right*, as well as adhering to his *possession*.

9. To which purpose it is farther observable, 1. That even in *secular* things it is not every *possession* that gives a *right*, but 1. either the *bonæ fidei possessio*, a *possession honestly* come by, or the *unjustness* of whose *original* is not contested or made to *appear*. And 2. whatsoever *privilege* by *humane Laws* belongs to *prescription*, yet in *Divine* or *Ecclesiastical* matters *prescription* can be of no force against *truth* of *right*, and so this *Gentleman* seems to acknowledge here, extending the force of *possession* no farther than till *sufficient cause* be shewed to the *contrary*. 3. That though whilst I am in *possession* I need not be bound to *prove* my *right*, yet when I am *out* of *possession*, there is not, beside *absolute force*, any way possible to recover a *possession*, but this of *contesting* and evidencing the *right* of it; and that, 'tis evident, is the *present* Case.

10. But if he shall think fit to *answer* the *Question* in *either* part of it, then by the Answer to the *first* part of it, he must be forced to set down the *original* of it; and by Answer to the *second*, the *right* of that *original* (and so he hath been fain to do, as elsewhere, so in this very *Paragraph*, where he speaks of *Christ*'s commanding *obedience* to his *Church*, I suppose he must mean the *Church* of *Rome*) and that is again the very *method* in which I proposed to debate, and consider this *matter*.

11. *Thirdly*, For the *power*, of which the *Pope* was *possest* in this *Kingdom*, either it was no more than an *Ecclesiastical Primacy*, such as by the *antient Canons* belongs to a *Primate* or *Patriarch* over *Metropolitans* and *Bishops*, or else it was a *supreme power* over the *King* himself, whether in *Spiritual*, or also in *Temporal* affairs.

12. If it pretend only to be the *former* of these, then the *power* of *Kings* to *erect* or *translate Primacies* or *Patriarchates*, which is insisted on and evidenced in the *Tract* of *Schism*, c. 6. § 9. was sufficient then to justifie what here was done, no *possession* being pleadable against the *King*, to restrain or exclude this *exercise* of his *power*, and so *now* to free us from *Schism* (by this *Gentleman*'s Rule) this act of the *Kings* in *translating* the *Primacy*, being sufficient cause for quitting our *obedience*, supposing the *Bishop* of *Rome* formerly to have been our *Primate*.

13. But if the *pretensions* be higher, even for the *Supremacy* it self, either in *whole*, or in *part*, then 1. I may surely say, they were never *bonæ fidei Possessores* of that; And 2. that the *King*, who by being so, is *supreme* in his own *Kingdom*, and cannot admit of another *supreme* either in or out of it, hath all the advantages of *possession*, which are here spoken of by this *Gentleman*, and must not be divested of his *right*, nay *must* not, *cannot* (remaining a *King*) *divest* himself of it, nor might any without the *guilt* of *rebellion* quit his *obedience* to him.

14. *Lastly*, to remove all appearance of reason from this whole *exception*, 1. It is manifest that at the time of *casting* out the *power* of the *Pope* out of this *Kingdom*, there were (I must have leave to suppose, *convincing*) *Reasons* given for the doing of it, A Breviate of which the *Reader* may find in that one *Treatise* (mentioned in the *Tract* of *Schism*, p. 135.) *De vera differentia Regiæ & Ecclesiasticæ potestatis*, then composed and published by the *Bishops*, and since reprinted by *Melchior Goldastus* in *Monarchia*, *tom.* 3. p. 22. under the title of *opus eximium*, a very notable *excellent Work*. 2. That how *meanly* soever it hath been performed, yet this was one *special* design of the *Tract* of *Schism* (which this *Gentleman* saith will always lye upon *Protestants*) to prove the *Pope* to have no such *authority* from *Christ*, as the *Romanist* pretendeth him to have. And this I hope may suffice to be said to his *σκιαμαχία*, his *prelusory skirmish* against this *fourth Chapter*.

It had the same Title in the first Edition, 1534.

SECT. II.

The condition of S. Peter's *Province*. *The Apostles distribution of their great Province, the World, into several Portions.* Κληρὸς. Κληρὸς Ἀποστολῆς. Ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος, Act. 1. *the Interpretation thereof vindicated.*

Numb. 1. I Proceed now to his refutations of the first *evidence* I make use of, to *disprove* the *Pope*'s *claim* to *universal Primacy* from *Christ*'s *donation* to S. *Peter*.

2. My evidence is taken from the condition of S. *Peter*'s *Province*, as by Agreement betwixt him and his Fellow *Apostle* S. *Paul*, it was assigned him, *Gal.* 2. 7, 9. that he should be the *Apostle* of the *Circumcision* or *Jews* (which certainly was not the *whole* World) *exclusively* to the *Gentile* part, or the *Uncircumcision*, which was remitted to S. *Paul* both there and *Rom.* 11. 13. and this, as is * there specified, *in every City where they met together*. And because the *universal* extensive *commission* of *Christ* to all and every *Apostle*, giving them *authority* to *go* and *preach* to the *whole World*, might seem to be contrary to this *special* assignation, I took care to prevent this *Objection*, by premising that this *Commission* given by *Christ* indefinitely, and unlimitedly, and extending equally to the *whole* World, was restrained by some *subsequent* act or acts of the *Apostles* themselves, who distributed their *universal Province* into *several Portions* and assignations, called κληρὸς Ἀποστολῆς, *Portions of Apostolacy*, and the several *Provinces* where they were thus to labour, styled each of them ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος, to *each* an *assigned peculiar place*, Act. 1. 25.

* Of Schism p. 74.

3. Now to this *ground-work* of my ensuing *probation*, he makes his first *exception* in these words:

Sect. 5. *As for his Proofs, which he calls Evidences, he telleth us first that S.* Peter *was the Apostle of the circumcision exclusively to the uncircumcision or Gentiles; To prove this, he saith the Apostles distributed their Universal Province into several* κληρὸς Ἀποστολῆς, *that is, by his interpretation, lesser Provinces, and citeth* Act. 1. 25. *where S.* Peter *with the other Apostles prayeth God to shew which of the two proposed he was pleased to have promoted to the dignity of being an Apostle, this they call* κληρὸν Ἀποστολῆς, *and this rigorous Interpreter saith, it signifies the special Province S.* Matthias *was to have, though the Scripture it self expresseth the contrary, saying the effect was that afterwards he was counted amongst the Apostles; Could any*

man

man not blinded with errour make ſo wretched an interpretation? but he goes on preſently adding that S. Peter *in the ſame place calleth theſe particular Provinces* τόπον ἴδιον, *and will you know what this* τόπος ἴδιος *or proper place is, read the Text, and you ſhall find that S.* Peter *ſpeaketh of* Judas's *going to Hell to receive his eternal damnation: Methinks you ſhould wonder I can go on without aſtoniſhment at ſuch blaſphemous explications, for ſure it can be no leſs ſo to abuſe the Word of God; and after this what do you expect?*

Here are *two* great charges, the *firſt* introduced by ſtyling me a *rigorous Interpreter*, and proſecuted, 4.
by affirming me *blinded with errour*, my *interpretation wretched*, and *contrary* to what the *Scripture expreſſeth*. But the *ſecond* is of no leſs than *blaſphemy*, and *abuſing* the *Word* of *God*; and his Friend is
to *wonder* that he is not *aſtoniſhed*, and after I have been guilty of ſuch *crimes* as theſe, 'tis in *vain* for-
ſooth to *expect* any thing from me, the whole enſuing Diſcourſe is utterly *defamed* and blaſted, like * the * *A.Gel.l.18.c.*
good *counſel* in the *Senate* of *Lacedæmon*, by being delivered by ſo *ill* a man, ſo *infamous* a perſon, as 3.
a *Blaſphemer* is juſtly deemed by him.

But I am not to be *diſquieted* with this, or to prepare any Reply to the *Rhetorical* paſſionate part of 5.
it; if the *interpretations* ſhall be found agreeable to *Scripture*, the *aſtoniſhment* and the *outcry* will be
ſoon at an end. And therefore that is the only care that I ſhall here aſſume on me.

And 1. I ſhall ſuppoſe it evident from the *Story*, and from the very *end* to which this *commiſſionating* 6.
ſo great a number of *twelve Apoſtles* was deſigned, that all the *Apoſtles* were not to go *together*, in con-
ſort, to preach unto *all* the *World*; It would have been long e're the *Faith* would have been propaga-
ted to *all* the *World*, if this *ſlower* method had been taken.

To this it is conſequent, that our *Saviour* having left the World in *common* before them, the di- 7.
ſtribution of that one wider into ſeveral leſſer *Provinces* muſt be an *act* of the *Apoſtles* themſelves;
as when *God* had given the *Land* of *Canaan* to the twelve Tribes of *Iſrael*, *Eleazer*, and *Joſhuah*, and
the *Heads* of the *Fathers* of the *Tribes*, diſtribute to every *Tribe* their κλῆρος or *portion* (which be-
cauſe it was to continue to their *Poſterity*, we ordinarily ſtyle their *inheritance*) *Joſ.* 14. 1.

And as there is no doubt of the truth of this *fact*, ſo if this one thing be granted me, there is no 8.
more incumbent on me to *prove* in this matter; and though neither of thoſe *Phraſes*, *Act.* 1. 25.
ſhould be for my turn, yet my *concluſion* remains good to me, as far as it pretendeth to be deducible
from thoſe *Phraſes*, viz. that the *Apoſtles* diſtributed their great *Province*, the *whole World*, into ſeve-
ral *leſſer Provinces*, one, or poſſibly more than one, to go *one* way, the other another.

It was therefore *ex abundanti*, more than was *neceſſary*, that I annexed the uſe of thoſe *Phraſes* to 9.
that purpoſe, not undertaking to *prove* this (as this *Gentleman* ſaith) by thoſe *Texts*, much leſs *Pe-
ter*'s being *Apoſtle* of the *Circumciſion* (which was a *conſectary*, and had its *ſeveral* probation after-
wards) but only *accommodating* thoſe *phraſes* to the matter in hand, and by the way *aſſigning* what I
thought the moſt *probable* Notion of them.

And although it be ſtill as unneceſſary to impoſe my *explications* on this *Gentleman*, the *concluſion* 10.
having as yet no *uſe* of them, yet being obliged to give him ſuch an *account* of my *actions*, as
may free me from *blaſphemy*, and *abuſe* of the *Word* of *God*, I ſhall here adventure to make my *A-
pology* by premiſing 1. not out of *Grammarians* only, but out of the *Scripture* it ſelf, the Notion of the
word κλῆρος, which ſignifying *originally* a *lot*, or way of *diviſion* (into *ſeverals*) of that, which be-
longs to all in *common* (one means of ſetling *propriety* among men) it comes next by an eaſie *figure* to
ſignifie that which is thus *divided*, or which in the *diviſion* falls to every man as his *portion*.

So ſaith *Phavorinus*, κληροῦται, διαιροῦται and κληρώσει, μεείσει, the *Verb* ſignifies *diſtribution*, both
active and *paſſive*: and accordingly in the *Son* of *Syrach* we have διαίρεσις κλήρου *diviſion of*, or, *by lot*,
Eccl. 14. 15. and by that we may underſtand a leſs *obvious* expreſſion, c 37. 8. *beware of a Counſeller*,
&c. μήποτε βάλῃ ὄπ σοὶ κλῆρον, *leſt he caſt the lot upon thee, i. e.* leſt he help another to *cheat* thee, and
then go *ſharer* with him, *divide* thee betwixt them.

So in like manner ſaith *Phavorinus* of the *Subſtantive* κλῆρος, μέρος, λαχμὸς and μέρις, it ſignifies a 12.
part, that which falls to one's *lot*, a *portion*, As *Act.* 8. 21. μέρις and κλῆρος *portion* and *lot* are all one.
And he that hath a *poſſeſſion* thus ſetled on him, and *dominion* by that means, or he that undertakes to
dreſs or till ſo much Land, δεσπότης and γεωργὸς, the *Lord* and the *Husbandman*, are both the *interpre-
tation* of κληροῦχος, he that *hath* ſuch a *lot* or *portion* aſſigned him.

Proportionably, thoſe that any *Governour* of the *Church* is ſet over, are called his κλῆροι or *lot*, and 13.
1 *Pet.* 5. 3. ſuch *Governours* are commanded μὴ κατακυριεύειν τῶν κλήρων, not to behave themſelves as the
Roman Pretors were wont to do over their *ſeveral Provinces*, oppreſſing and *tyrannizing* over them.

To this it is agreeable, that κλῆρος διακονίας *Act.* 1. 17. ſhould denote ſuch a *portion* of *miniſterial* 14.
Office, as belonged to one that was ſent or *commiſſionated* by *Chriſt* περὶ ἔργου *to a task* or *work*, expreſt v.
20. by ἐπισκοπὴ αὐτοῦ *his Epiſcopal Office* (for that though it be a *Rule*, yet is alſo διακονία a *miniſtery*,
Matth. 23. 11. in the *Church*.

Hence again, that *portion* of *employment* in preaching the *Faith*, teſtifying the *reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, 15.
which belonged to one ſingle *Apoſtle*, ſuch as *Judas* was, and ἐξ ἧς παρέβη *from which he departed* by his
ſin, and to which another *ſucceeds* by way of *ſurrogation*, is as fitly ſtyled κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς *a portion of
Apoſtolacy*, a μέρις or *diviſion* of that grand employment.

And what either one ſingle *errour* or act of *blindneſs* was committed in thus *interpreting*, much 16.
more *occœcation* or being *blinded with errour*, which I ſuppoſe the compound *accumulation* (whether
only *ſin* or *puniſhment* alſo) of *many errours*, what *rigour* or *wretchedneſs* of *interpretation*, I am ſtill ſo
blind as not to diſcern, and this *Gentleman* is not ſo *charitable*, as to give me his leaſt *directions* to reco-
ver to my *way*, or my *eyes* again.

For as to the *Scriptures* expreſſing the *contrary*, in ſaying *he was counted among the Apoſtles*, that ſure 17.
is no evidence againſt my *interpretation*; for *Matthias* may become one of the *twelve*, ſucceed to *Ju-
das*'s Office and *lot*, that which did, or ſhould, if he had lived, have belonged to him, and yet nei-
ther he, if he had lived, nor now *Matthias* in his ſtead, have more than a *particular Province*, this or
that *Region* (not the *whole World* in common) aſſigned for his *apartment*.

So that as yet I cannot diſcern that I have done the leaſt injury to the *Text*, in thinking κλῆρον Ἀπο- 18.

σολῆς, the *lot* or *division of Apostolacy*, to be the *several* task that belonged to any of the *twelve Apostles*, or that *portion* of *labour*, that by consent at their parting one from another should be *assigned* to each of them.

19. And then the *Analogy* will still hold perfectly, that as this *distribution* of tasks consisted in going to several *Quarters* for the *preaching* of the *faith* of *Christ*, one, one way; another, another; so he that had received his κληρὸς ἀποστολῆς *portion of Apostolacy*, should be said to have ἴδιον ἢ τόπον a *peculiar* or *proper place*, and having so, should (not immediately, but soon after the *Holy Ghost*'s descent) πορευθῆναι εἰς αὐτὸν, *go*, or, *betake himself to it*.

20. This therefore, and upon these grounds of *fitness*, both in respect of the words, and the *context*, I take to be the meaning of that Phrase πορευθῆναι εἰς ἢ τόπον ἢ ἴδιον, *to go to his proper place*, his *peculiar* assignation; And I cannot imagine the least inconvenience that can lye against this rendring.

21. For 1. in Case it should not be the *true*, yet it can be any thing as soon as *blasphemy*, thus to interpret it. 'Tis certainly nothing to the *dishonour* of *God*, to say that *Matthias* went and preacht the *Gospel* in such a *Region* peculiarly, and so there is no *blasphemy* in that, *viz.* the matter of the *interpretation*; and for the *abusing* of the *Word* of *God*, it is hard to divine how that can be deemed such, which affixeth nothing to the *Word* of *God*, but that which is *notoriously* true (for so it is, that *Matthias* went one way to *preach* the *Gospel*, and S. *John* and S. *Bartholomew* each of them another) and would be acknowledged to do so, if this *Text* were not applied to it.

22. As for the other *interpretation* of the words (which this *Gentleman* is pleased to prefer, and might have enjoyed his own judgment, without *censuring* them as *Blasphemers*, that differed from him in expounding one *difficult Phrase*) by affixing it to *Judas*, and not to *Matthias*; 1. there is no indication in the *Context* that favours that; it was sufficient to say of *Judas*, that which had been said, v. 16, 17, 18, 19. to set out the *horror* of his fact, which soon attended it in his *own* breast, and the *bloody* death which it brought upon him, but he needed not proceed to *revealing* of *secrets*, the sadder consequents, which remained in arrear after death, and 'tis *Chrysostome*'s observation on v. 16. *behold*, saith he, τὸ φιλόσοφον τῆς ἀνδρὸς, the *wise Christian* carriage of S. *Peter*, πῶς οὐχ ὑβρίζει, οὐδὲ ἐνυβρίζει, *how he doth not reproach, and insult on him*, calling him μιαρὸν ἢ παμμιαρὸν, *villain, or detestable villain*, ἀλλ' ἁπλῶς τὸ γινόμενον δηλοῖ, *but sets down the fact simply*, and on v. 18, ὅτι τῆς παρούσης δίκης διαλέγεται, *he sets down*, saith he, *his present vengeance*, that, sure, is it which befel him in *this World*, which, by the way, cannot well consist with the interpreting it of *Hell*.

23. 2. The use of *Parentheses* in *Scripture* is very ordinary, and if that be here admitted (which it well may, without any more formal expression of it, than by putting a *comma* after Ἰούδας, as it is already in the *printed* Copies) then the interpretation is clear and unavoidable, to *receive the lot* or *portion of his Ministery and Apostleship (from which* Judas *by transgression fell) to go*, or *that he may go to his proper place*.

24. 3. *Hell* being the κοινὸς τόπος, the *common place* or *lot* of all wicked men, it cannot fitly be expresst with such a double *emphasis*, ἢ τόπον ἢ ἴδιον, *the place, the proper place*, i. e. the *place peculiar* to him, which yet may very fitly be affirmed of *Matthias*'s *Province*, so *his*, as it was not any mans else.

25. *Lastly*, It is not near so proper to say that he *sinned* πορευθῆναι *to go to Hell*, as that the other was *chosen* and *surrogated* into *Judas*'s *place* πορευθῆναι *to go* to *preach* to such a *Quarter* of the *World*, or that the *Apostles* desired *God* to signifie his pleasure whom he had *chosen*, that so he might take his *portion* of *labour* and *go*; His *going* was visibly the *end* intended in all this, but *damnation* or punishment, *going to Hell*, was never intended by *Judas* in his *transgression*, though it be supposed the deserved reward and *consequent* of it.

26. All this amassed together, may, I hope, vindicate an *innocent*, and, I hope, *obvious* (far from *wrested*) interpretation from such an *accumulation* of charge, as is laid upon it, without any tender of reason against it, but the ὦ κακόδαιμον, *O wretched* (*blasphemous*, &c.) in *Lucian*. And so much in answer to that *Paragraph*.

SECT. III.

Saint Peter *the Apostle of the Circumcision*; *The Agreement betwixt the Apostles.* Peter's *preaching to* Cornelius.

Numb. 1. HIS second *exception* is to the Position it self, of *Peter*'s being the *Apostle* of the *Jews* exclusively to the *Gentiles*, and it is in these words:

2. *His Position is as directly against Scripture, as if he had done it on purpose, the Scripture telling us how by a special vision S.* Peter *was commanded to preach to* Cornelius *a Gentile first of all the Apostles, and himself in the Council of* Jerusalem *protesting the same; and yet this Doctor can teach he was made Apostle to the Jews, exclusively to the Gentiles, though all Story say the contrary.*

3. The Position, which is here said to be so *directly against the Scripture*, was to my understanding the express *affirmation* of *Scripture* it self, I am sure from thence it was that I learnt it, and I must fail very much in my expectation, if this *Gentleman* himself do not acknowledge the *testimony* produced, *Gal.* 2. 7. to be sufficient ground to infer it. There *Peter* is said to be πεπιστευμένος τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῆς ἀκροβυστίας, *intrusted with the Gospel of the circumcision*; That the *circumcision* there signifies the *Jews*, and the εὐαγγέλιον, which we render *Gospel*, the *office* of *preaching* or *revealing* the *faith* to them, ἀποστολὴ ἀκροβυστίας, *the Apostolacy of the circumcision*, v. 8. if it be not of it self plain enough, 'tis made so by ver. 9. where it is added that *Peter*, &c. were by agreement to go εἰς περιτομὴν *to the circumcision*, where *circumcision*, being the object or term of his motion, must needs be the *Jews*, not *circumcision* it self, and so Saint *Chrysostome* at large expounds it, ὃ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἄλλα τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, not to signifie the *thing*, *circumcision*, but the *persons*, the *Jews*, in opposition to τὰ ἔθνη *the Gentiles*, in the former words, and then *going to* them must needs be *preaching* to them, going to them as to a *Province*, the care of which

was

was intrusted to him; and the *right hands of fellowship*, the agreement that was made betwixt them, *James* the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, and *Peter*, and the *beloved Disciple* on one side, and *Paul* and *Barnabas* on the other side, is sure the interpretation of the περιτετμημαι the *being intrusted* or having that, as a *Province*, *committed* to them.

And this is the special importance, saith S. *Chrysostome*, of the ἀλλὰ τουναντίον, *but contrariwise* (the beginning of ver, 7.) as that is opposed to the προσανέθεντο, their *adding* to him, v. 6. *James*, saith he, and *Peter* and *John*, ‖ were so far from *opposing* any thing that he had done, from advising any thing more, from telling him any *circumstance* more than before he knew, that they * not only approved, but *commended* what he had done; and to set the things the more unquestionably for the *future*, made this *agreement* with him and *Barnabas*, that whensoever they should come to the same *City*, mixt of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, *Peter* and *John* should betake themselves to the *Jewish*, and *Paul* and *Barnabas* to the *Gentile* part of it. For, as it was said, it was not by any *particular assignation* of *Christ*'s, but by *agreement* among themselves, that this assignation of *Provinces* was made. 4.

‖ τοσοῦτον ἀπέχον τοῦ μεμαθηκέναι ὅτι καὶ ἐπῄνεσαν

* ὁ μόνον (so certainly it ought to be read) ἐκ ἐπετίμησαν

And therefore as in point of *propriety*, when that which is supposed to lie by *Nature* in *common* to all, is, to avoid *contentions* and *confusions*, and the state of *perpetual hostility*, so distributed by *agreement* among the *fellow-communers*, as that one portion shall be assigned as the *propriety* and *apartment* of one, the other of another, then and from thenceforth that which is the *proportion* of one, is so his, that it belongs to no other, and again, so *his*, that he hath no *right* to any other part (which I should express by saying that that *part* is *his exclusively* to any *other* part, for sure his standing to any such *division* cuts him out, and so *excludes* him from any *farther* right) so here after this *agreement* betwen those *Apostles* jointly made, concerning the *two parts* of mankind, *Jews* and *Gentiles*, to which they were to *preach*, and among whom to *preside*, the *Jews* are become S. * *Peter*'s peculiar, or *portion*, or *Province*, and that so *his*, as the *Gentiles* were not *his*, they being left to *S. Paul* and *Barnabas*) who is both there affirmed to have them *committed* to him, and *Rom.* 11. 13. to be the *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*; And that I expresst by that Phrase, *Peter was the Apostle of the Jews* (so it is said of him expressly, *Gal.* 2. 8.) *exclusively to the uncircumcision*] and truly I knew not (nor yet do) how to express it more *significatively*, and more to the rendring of the *full* importance of those plain *Texts*, and this *Gentleman* hath not pleased to direct me how to do it better. 5.

* See *Baron. An. Christ.* 39. n. 14.

And having the *Scripture* thus clear and irrefragable for my *position*, if now I should not be able to salve the *Antinomies*, to answer his *objections* from *Scripture* to it, this were certainly but my *dulness* (another that hath a greater ἀσχνοια might be *able* to do it) and therefore ought not to be any *prejudice* to the *truth* of the *affirmation*. But unless the *difficulties* be greater than as *yet* appear, I shall not much doubt of undertaking the *task*, of reconciling all the ἐναντιοφανείαι that can be *phansied*. 6.

For what if *Peter* by *special vision* was once commanded to *preach* to *Cornelius* a *Gentile*? Sure this is very *competible* with my *Position*; For not to mention that this is acknowledged to have been a *peculiar commission*, by *special vision* determined to that *particular* person and his *Family*, which, till he had this *vision*, he thought it utterly *unlawful* to preach to, *Act.* 10. 28. (And it is certain that one *special* Case were no *prejudice* to the *general* Position) and again that *Cornelius*, though a *Gentile*, was yet a *Proselyte* of the *Jews*, such as they called a *Proselyte* of the *Gates*, though not of *justice*, a σεβόμενος or *devout* man, though not *circumcised*; To omit these, I say, the *Answer* is obvious, 1. That this *agreement* of which I speak, was at the time of *Paul*'s going up to *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 15. *i. e.* some years *after* this of *Peter*'s preaching to *Cornelius*, as may appear *Gal.* 2. 1. which defines it to be about fourteen *years* after St. *Paul*'s *conversion*, whereas that of *Peter*'s preaching to *Cornelius*, *Act.* 10. placed in the next *Chapter* to that which described the *conversion* of *Paul*, must needs be some considerable space *before* this time of his going up to the *Council* of *Jerusalem*. And so that of *Peter*'s preaching to *Cornelius*, and his *protesting* the same in the *Council* of *Jerusalem*, hath nothing of *opposition* to this *agreement* (made for the *future*, sure, not for the time *past*) what should be done in their *after-preaching*, I suppose I need add no more to that which is thus *evident*. 7.

Secondly, I have already sufficiently * expresst, how far this *agreement* extended, and how far *exclusive* it was; not that it should be *unlawful* for *Peter* to preach to a *Gentile*, or for *Paul* to preach to a *Jew*; but that when they met in the *same City* (as at *Antioch* certainly they did, and there, saith *Baronius*, *An. Chr.* 39. *n.* 14. *Peter* preached peculiarly to the *Jews*, and gathered a Church of them only; and at *Rome* also, I make no *question*) then the one should constantly apply himself to the *Jews*, receive *Disciples*, form them into a *Church*, leave them to be governed by a *Bishop* of *his* assignation, and the other should do in like manner to the *Gentiles*. 8.

* *Tract of Schism.* c. 4. §. 7.

And that this was so in the *consequents* of the Story, is largely shewed in that *Tract*. What could have been said more punctually to prevent this *exception* taken from *Peter*'s *preaching* to *Cornelius*, I cannot yet discern. I wish this *Gentleman* had pleased to take notice of it; As it is, I hope he will *now* be more sure to do so. 9. C. 4. §. 8. &c.

SECT. IV.

Paul's *first preaching to the Jews in every City. To what the Agreement between him and* Peter *belonged.*

ANother Argument he adds much to the same purpose, which will make his *third Exception*. *Again, if he were made the Apostle of the Jews, exclusively to the Gentiles, by the same reason Saint* Paul *was made Apostle of the Gentiles exclusively to the Jews, for the words are like; and yet the Scripture teacheth us, that whereever he came, he preached first to the Jews: Is not this to make Scripture ridiculous?* *Numb.* 1. 2.

Here is great *severity* again, a charge of making *Scripture ridiculous*; But I hope I have been far from any *guilt* of it. That S. *Paul*, whensoever he came to a *City*, where the *faith* had not been *preached*, and where there was any *Synagogue* of the *Jews*, went into that *Synagogue* in time of their 3.

publick assembling, I never made any *Question*, were this *before*, or were it *after* the *Story* of *Act.* 15. when I suppose this agreement to be made betwixt him and S. *Peter*, &c.

4. Great *reason*, and no small *obligation* there was for that; For 1. *Christ* had commanded that the *preaching* should *begin at Jerusalem*, the *Metropolis* of the *Jews*, and as to the *Jews first* (ὑμῖν πρῶτον) *God had raised up his Son Jesus*, *Act.* 3. 26. so the *Gospel* of the *resurrection* was to be revealed (Ἰουδαίῳ πρῶτον) *to the Jew first*, Rom. 1. 16.

5. And although in *Paul*'s *commission* from *Christ*, it were peculiarly expresst that he should *preach the Gospel to the Gentiles*, *Act.* 9. 15. & 22. 21. yet according to this great *fundamental œconomy*, he counted it *necessary*, *first* to make tender of his *service*, and of the glad *tidings* of the *Gospel*, to the *Jews*, and so he tells them *Act.* 13. 46. *It was necessary that the Word of God should first have been spoken to you*, and till the *Jews* refuse it and *reject* it, he doth not betake himself so *peculiarly* to the *Gentiles*.

6. Again, this was in some measure necessary to his *publishing* the *Faith*; For that was most advantageously to be done in the *publick Assemblies*, that it might be known to *all* that were in the *City*: And the *Synagogues* of the *Jews* being such, were in all reason by him, that was a *Jew*, to be preferred before the *Idolatrous Temples* of the *Heathens*: And according to these *obligations*, and inducements, so generally he did; But then, as this no way *prejudiceth* his title of *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, to which he was at the first assigned by *Christ*; so neither is it any way *contrary* to, or unreconcileable with the *agreement* which I suppose to be made between him and *Peter* and *John*, which concerned only those *Cities* and *Regions*, where they *met*, and came to plant *Churches*; There, and there only it is, that I *affirm* this *distribution* of *Provinces* to have been made, and consequently, the *affirmation* is no farther in any *justice* to be extended, than thus, that when they so *met*, *Paul* betook himself to the *Gentile* part, compacted the *Gentile Proselytes* or *Believers* into a *Church*, put them into the *hands* of a *Bishop* of his own *assignation*, *Ignatius* at *Antioch*, *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, whereas *Euodius* was in the former, *Bishop* of the *Jewish* part, and in the *latter*, and in all *Asia*, *John* was the *Apostle* of the *circumcision*, and constituted *Bishops* there. And this I suppose, without farther enlarging, may satisfie the importunity of his *second Argument*.

SECT. V.

Of the Gentiles being Saint Paul's *Province peculiarly.*

Numb. 1. HIS *fourth exception* is to my *producing* the words of *Scripture*, *Gal.* 2. 7, 9. to the proof of my *Position*, Thus.

2. *But he goes on telling us, that the Gentiles exclusively to the circumcision were the lot of S.* Paul *by S.* Peter's *own confession, his words are, for the uncircumcision or Gentiles they were not S.* Peter's *Province, but peculiarly S.* Paul's, *&c. but look on the place and you shall find no word of exclusion as* [peculiarly] *is, and whereon lieth the whole Question, so that the Doctors evidence is his own word against the main torrent of Scripture on the other side.*

3. How truly it is suggested, that the *torrent* of the *Scripture* is against me, hath already been made manifest in the foregoing *Sections*, where the *contrary* appearances, by this *Gentleman* produced, as they are far enough from a *main torrent*, or from the *common* force of such, (or but even of an *ordinary stream*) *carrying* the whole *business* before them, so they are severally examined and allowed, as far as they have any *force* in them, and found perfectly reconcileable with our pretensions.

4. And so likewise it hath already been cleared in what sense this *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, so styled by himself, and so, by *agreement* betwixt the *Apostles*, acknowledged by S. *Peter*, was so, *peculiarly* or *exclusively* to the *Jews*.

5. As for his *Argument* drawn only from hence, that in the *Text* to the *Galatians* there is no word of *exclusion*, that sure is of little force; If there were any *agreement*, and *division*, and *several* assignation of *Provinces*, it must follow that what was said to be *one* mans *Province*, is his, so as it is *not* the *others*, and so *peculiarly*, and so as far as that *agreement* holds, *exclusively* his, As in the *Estate* first held in *common*, and then after by *agreement* divided, it hath appeared so evidently, that I need *add* no more to that matter.

SECT. VI.

Of Saint Peter's *withdrawing from the Gentile-communion. Of the Gentile Diet. The prudence of Saint* Peter's *action.*

Numb. 1. HIS *fifth exception* concerns an *incidental* passage about S. *Peter*, and is an *actio injuriarum*.

2. *Again* (saith he) *see how he wrongs S.* Peter *and his Jewish Proselytes, where he says he withSect.* 8, 9. *drew from all communion with the Gentile Christians. Whereas the Text expresseth no more, than that he withdrew from eating with them, that is, keeping the Gentile Diet.*

3. What *wrong* I have done S. *Peter* and his *Jewish Proselytes*, I am yet to learn, nor am I sure that I know wherein this *Gentleman* placeth the supposed *injury*; But I think it most *probable* to consist in this, that I say he *withdrew from all communion with the Gentile Christians*, whereas he conceives that he *withdrew* only from *keeping the Gentile Diet*.

4. But 1. let me demand of this *Gentleman*, what he means by *Gentile Diet*? I suppose using those sorts of *meats*, which were by the *Jewish Law* forbidden; And if that be acknowledged of S. *Peter*, that he would not thus *eat* with the *Gentiles*, lest he should seem to *offend* against the *Jewish Law*, then by the same reason he must certainly be supposed to *abstain* from other *communion* with them, because it was equally against the *Jewish Law*, that a *Jew* should *converse* with a *Gentile*, as the *Woman* of *Samaria* tells *Christ*, when he *spake* to her, but to *draw* him some *water*, *John* 4. 9. *How*, said she, *dost*

thou

thou being a Jew, ask me to drink (and it was but *water*, none of the *interdicted Gentile Diet*) *being a Woman of Samaria?* and either *She* or the *Evangelist*, renders the *reason* in as *comprehensive* terms as mine were, ὐ γὰρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρείταις, *for the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans*; and accordingly v. 27. the *Disciples marvelled that he talked with the woman.* And therefore certainly *Peter* did abstain from all those other ways of *converse* and *communion* with the *Gentiles*, which the *Jews* thought as *unlawful*, as *eating* of the *Gentile Diet*, or else he failed of the *end* of his action, which is evident what it was, a fear of *scandalizing* his Country-men, and from thence a shew of *compliance* with them, lest he should be thought by those that came from *Jerusalem* to *forsake* the *Judaical Law*.

That the very *preaching* to a *Gentile* (which was the *loosest* degree of *communion*) was, according to the *Jewish Principles*, as *unlawful* as *eating* any *unclean meat*, using the *Gentile Diet*, is plain by *Peter*'s *vision*, *Act.* 10. 12. where the one is *represented* by the other; and had he not received that *vision*, which made it *lawful* to him to *eat* all *kind* of *meats*, he acknowledgeth that he durst not have adventured to *come to one of another Nation*, v. 28. affirming in as plain words as could be, that it was an *unlawful* thing for a *man that was a Jew to keep company or come to one of another Nation*, κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσέρχεσθαι, which certainly includes *all communion*, and not only that of the *Gentile Diet*. Thus unhappy is this *Gentleman* continually in his *Objections*. 5.

ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξέ μοι κέλευσε παρὰ νόμον εἶναι κολλᾶσθαι. Chryst. in loc.

It were here obvious, and easie to shew the *opinion* of the *Antients*, of the * *prudence*, and no kind of *uncharitableness* of S. *Peter*'s action, which would farther evidence how far I am from *wronging* S. *Peter* or his *Proselytes*, in affirming what I affirm of them. But the present Objection doth not make that necessary; I refer the *Reader* for it to the (Ἐμφασις) *interpretation*, or *Comments* of * S. *Chrysostom*, who sets it down exactly † not as a *Quarrel*, but as an οἰκονομία, an act of *prudent managery*, a *wise ordering*, designed by him and S. *Paul*, as most likely to reduce the *Jews* from their *errors*, when he that did thus much to comply with them (not for *fear* of *persecution* from them, but for *fear* of *averting* them from *Christianity*) and was herein *seemingly* opposed by S. *Paul* (the κατεγνωσμένῳ ὡς v. 11. being not to be rendred, *he was to be blamed*, in *Paul*'s opinion, but *he was blamed* by the *Gentile Christians*) made no manner of *reply* in *defence* of that *compliance* with the *Jews*, and so yielded that S. *Paul* was in the right, and not the *Judaizers*. This *interpretation* of *Chrysostome* is followed by the *Greek Commentators*, and taken up by *Jerome*, but disliked by *Augustine* in his *Epistles* to *Jerome*, and therefore I lay not *weight* upon it, nor have my *pretensions* any need of it. 6.

* See *Baron. Ann. Ch.* 51. *n.* 32, &c.

* *Savil. Ed. t.* 3. p. 730, 731.

† ὐ μάχης τὰ ῥήματα ἀλλ' οἰκονομίας.

SECT. VII.

The two Plantations of Gentile and Jewish Christians at Antioch. Euodius *and* Ignatius. *The differences of the Antients about them reconciled. The two Bishops at* Rome. *Jews in* England. Simon Zelotes. Gentium Ecclesia *the Church of Jews as well as Gentiles.*

HAving gained so little by the several steps of his *exceptions*, and the *Position* remaining still firm against all, I have less reason to suspect what is *built* upon this *foundation* in the ensuing *Sections*: Yet against them all together he casts one *stone*, before he will part, in these words, *Numb.* 1.

Upon this wisely laid ground, he would perswade us, followed the division of the Bishopricks both in Antioch *and* Rome, *but bringing not one word of Antiquity proving this to have been the cause, yet is he so certain of it, that he will find a Colony of Jews even in* England, *for fear S.* Peter *should have touched a Gentile, and yet he cites S.* Prosper, *that both S.* Peter *and S.* Paul *founded the Church of Gentiles in* Rome. 2.

What force there is in any part of this *suggestion*, I shall not here need to set down at large. There be *three* Branches of it, 1. That I *bring not a word of Antiquity* to prove (what I say) that this is the *cause* of the *divisions of the Bishopricks both in* Antioch *and* Rome. 2. That I will *find a Colony of Jews in* England. 3. That I *cite* Prosper, *that both S.* Peter *and S.* Paul *founded the Church of Gentiles in* Rome. 3.

For the *first*, I desire the Reader to *review* what is already said in the *Tract* of *Schism* c. 4. from §. 8. to §. 20. and I shall much wonder if he return of this *Gentleman*'s mind, that there is *not one word* there brought out of *Antiquity* to *confirm* what I say. The short is, It is there manifested from *Antiquity*, that the *Church* of *Antioch* was *founded* by S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, that there were † *two Churches* there, one of *Jewish*, the other of *Gentile Christians*, that in those *Churches* at the same time sate *two* distinct *Bishops*, * *Euodius* and *Ignatius*; by which means some appearing *difficulties* in *antient* Writers are explained. 4.

See *Baron. An.* 45. *n.* 14.

† *Seorsim qui ex Judæis erant Ecclesiæ habebantur, nec his qui erant è Gentibus miscebantur.* Hieron. in Gal. 1. 22.

To what is there said, I shall, instead of *repeating*, *add* thus much more. Of *Euodius*, *Suidas*'s words will be easily turned to, in Χρονικοῖ, Ἐπὶ Κλαυδίου βασιλέως Ῥωμαίων, Πέτρῳ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ χειροτονήσαντος Εὐόδιον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, &c. *In the reign of Claudius Cæsar, Peter the Apostle ordained Euodias Bishop at Antioch.* Of *Ignatius* the † *Author* of the *Constitutions* is express, Ἰγνάτιος ὑπὸ Παύλου, *Ignatius was ordained Bishop there by S.* Paul. Now seeing in those *Acts* of *Ignatius* which are put together by *Simeon Metaphrastes*, *Ignatius* is said to *succeed Euodius*, as *Euodius succeeded Peter* (Πέτρου μὲν ὁ μέγας Εὐόδιος διαδέχεται. Εὐόδιον δὲ Ἰγνάτιος) and the *anonymous antient* Writer of the *Acts* of *Ignatius*, which remains *unprinted*, hath the same, Εὐόδιον γὰρ Ἰγνάτιος διαδέξατο, *Ignatius succeeded Euodius*; and seeing this *Ordination* of *Ignatius* is also said by * *Theodoret*, and by † *Felix* III. *Bishop* of *Rome* to have been done by the *hand* of Saint *Peter*, This seeming difference is removed by * *Joannes Malela Antiochenus*, who thus sets down the whole matter, ἐν τῷ ἀνιέναι αὐτὸν (Πετρὸν) ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ, διεχομένου αὐτῆς δὲ Ἀντιοχείας τῆς Μεγάλης, συμβὰν τελευτῆσαι Εὐόδιον τὸν Ἐπίσκοπον, καὶ Πατριάρχην Ἀντιοχείας, καὶ ἔλαβε τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς Ἰγνάτιος, τῷ ἁγίῳ Πέτρῳ τῷ Ἀποστόλῳ χειροτονήσαντος αὐτὸν καὶ ἐνθρονίσαντος, *When* Peter *went to* Rome, *passing by* Antioch *the* Great, Euodius *Bishop and Patriarch of* Antioch *happened to dye, and* Ignatius (who was, as was said, first *constituted* by S. *Paul* over the *Gentiles* there) *received the Bishoprick* (that I suppose must now be, of the *Jewish Province* also, over which *Euodius* had been in his life time) S. *Peter ordaining and enthroning him.* And so that is become most clear which * S. *Chrysostome* said of this *Ignatius*, that καὶ σὺ μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων χεῖρες, &c. 5.

* in Ἀλεξάνδρῳ

† *Epist. ad Zenon.*

* in Chron. (M.S. *Oxon.*) l. 10.

* *Excom. Ignat.*

the

the hands of the bleſſed Apoſtles, (in the *plural*, firſt of *Paul*, then of *Peter*) *had been laid on* Ignatius.

6. The other part which concerned *Rome*, * was ſo cleared by the words of *Epiphanius*, who ſaith of
Sect. 9. *Peter* and *Paul* both, that they were ἐν Ῥώμῃ Ἀπόστολοι καὶ Ἐπίσκοποι, *Apoſtles and Biſhops at Rome*, and ſo many other evidences produced to the ſame purpoſe, from the *inſcription* on their *Tombs*, by *Gaius* contemporary to *Pope Zephyrinus*, by *Dionyſius Biſhop* of *Corinth*, by *Proſper*, by the *ſeals* of the *Popes*,
Sect. 12. and ſo again by the *Eccleſiaſtick ſtory*, that makes *Clement* S. *Peter*'s *Deacon* and *ſucceſſor* in the *Biſhoprick*, and *Linus* S. *Paul*'s; that ſure there can be no need of farther proofs or *teſtimonies* from *Antiquity* in this matter.

7. Whilſt in the mean, other *Churches* are * inſtanced in, particularly the *Churches* of *Aſia*, wherein
Sect. 14. S. *Paul* and S. *John* had all the *command*, and S. *Peter* had nothing to do, whether in *planting* or *governing* them, which alone is ſufficient to carry the whole matter againſt S. *Peter*'s *univerſal Paſtorſhip*, and no word is by this *Gentleman* replied to that ſo conſiderable a part of my *probation*. Only inſtead of it, a far more compendious way, that of the *ſcornful* or *faſtidious ſcoffing* at my *wiſely laid ground*, as he pleaſeth to call it, and adding that I *bring not one word of Antiquity*, &c.

8. As to the *ſecond branch* of his *ſuggeſtion*, that I *will find a Colony of Jews in England*, that is no where ſaid by me; only thus, that upon *ſuppoſition*, *if the ſaying of Simeon Metaphraſtes* (ſpeaking of S. *Peter*'s *preaching* and *ordaining Biſhops* in *England*, *Neronis* 12) *ſhould be thought to have truth in it*, it muſt be extended no farther than the *Jews*, which might at that time be *diſperſed* there.

9. Where, as my *concluſion* from that ſuppoſition is founded in the *analogy*, that as, where S. *Paul* and S. *Peter* met in any *Plantation*, they divided their *Province*, *&c.* ſo in reaſon it ought to be, where S. *Peter* and *Simon Zelotes*, or *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, met in like manner; ſo all, that of the *Jews* in *England* I there affirm, is only this, that it was *poſſible they that were diſperſed in ſo many regions*, *might be*, *ſome of them*, *diſperſed in Britanny*, which how *improbable* ſoever it may appear at that time, is ſure as *probable*, as that S. *Peter preached* and *ordained Biſhops* in *Britanny*, and in *conſequence* to that only it was, that I made the *ſuppoſition* of the *poſſibility* of it, knowing it the affirmation of our *Antiquaries*, that *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, or *Simon Zelotes* ('tis poſſible alſo that *Simeon Metaphraſtes* might miſtake *Simon Peter* for him, and then that matter is at an *end*) planted the *faith* in this *Iſland*.

10. As for his laſt *ſuggeſtion*, that I *cite Saint* Proſper, *that both S.* Peter *and S.* Paul *founded the Church of Gentiles in* Rome, I deſire the truth of it may be conſidered by the words which I cite from him,
* *Dimid. Temp.* c. 5. * *In ipſa Hieruſalem Jacobus, & Joannes apud Epheſum, Andreas & cæteri per totam Aſiam, Petrus & Paulus Apoſtoli in urbe Roma Gentium Eccleſiam pacatam unamque poſteris tradentes ſanguine, memoriiſque ſuis ex dominicâ pactione ſacrârunt*, James *at* Jeruſalem, John *at* Epheſus, Andrew *and the reſt through all* Aſia, Peter *and* Paul *at* Rome, *by their blood and memories conſecrated the Church of the Nations*. What *Nations* were theſe? ſure, of *Jews*, as well as *Gentiles*, elſe *Jeruſalem* could not be any *part* of them, no nor *John*'s converts at *Epheſus*, for they were *Jews*. And if the Reader will conſult the place, he ſhall find theſe words immediately ſubſequent; *Huic generali Eccleſiæ communicans Chriſtianus eſt Catholicus*. By which 'tis evident, that *Gentium Eccleſia* is *generalis Eccleſia*, the *Univerſal Church*, which it cannot be, unleſs it contain the *Jewiſh* as well as the *Gentile* Chriſtians: and therefore this *Gentleman* did not do well to ſubſtitute the word *Gentiles* for *Nations*; and yet could not, without doing ſo, have made this *exception* to my words.

11. And ſo much for *exceptions* to my *firſt evidence* againſt the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of S. *Peter*.

SECT. VIII.

No promiſe of Keys to S. Peter, *which was not made and performed to all the Apoſtles*, Joh. 20. 21. *the completion of the promiſe*, Matt. 16. 19. Paſce oves. Joh. 21. *an exhortation*, *not commiſſion*.

Numb. 1. THE *ſecond ſort* of *Exceptions* follows, thoſe againſt my *evidence* drawn from the *power* of the *Keys*, which I ſay, and prove both from *Scripture*, and expreſs *teſtimonies* of the *Fathers*, that it was given *equally* to *all* the *Apoſtles*; And his *Exceptions* begin thus:

2. *A ſecond evidence he bringeth from the donation of the Keys*, *which he ſaith were given equally to the Apoſtles*, Matt. 28. *yet confeſſeth the Keys were eſpecially promiſed to S.* Peter, Matt. 16. *but performed only in common*, Matt. 28. *which though they may be both true*, *yet is abſurdly ſaid*, *for who acknowledgeth a ſpecial promiſe*, *ſhould have found out a ſpecial performance*, *which is done*, Joh. 21.

3. This *Exception* being not to the *matter* of what I ſay, but to the *abſurdneſs* of the *expreſſion* (to which *cenſure* I muſt ſuppoſe every thing liable, which is *contrary* to his *pretenſions*, and yet proved ſo *manifeſtly* that it cannot be *denied* by him) I ſhall briefly *evidence* how *commodious*, and *proper* the *expreſſion* was.

4. And 1. whereas he ſets it down as my *confeſſion*, that the *Keys* were *eſpecially promiſed to S. Peter*,
Sect. 20. this is not with *truth* ſuggeſted; my words are, *This power* Matt. 16. 19. *is promiſed to S.* Peter] But the [*eſpecially*] is an *interpolation* of this *Gentleman*'s, to prepare my words for his *exceptions*, for which otherwiſe they were no way *qualified*.

5. All that can be fetcht from any words of mine towards this *ſenſe*, is, that in the *next Section*, I *foreſaw*, and ſo mentioned an *objection* from *Chriſt*'s making this *promiſe* to him *peculiarly* (and yet even that is not, to him *eſpecially*, but to him *particularly*, or *ſingly*, *I will give unto thee*, &c.) To this, as to an *Objection*, I preſently made a *reply*, that the *repetition* of that *promiſe*, *Matt.* 18. 18. to *all* the *Apoſtles indefinitely*, and without any *peculiarity* of *reſtriction* (*I ſay to you*, in the *plural*, and, *Whatſoever ye ſhall bind*, &c.) will take away all *appearance* from this *objection*.

6. And ſo it will from this *Gentleman*'s *exception* alſo: For if what was at one time *promiſed* to S. *Peter* ſingly, was ſo ſoon after promiſed to all the *Apoſtles indefinitely*, what *abſurdity* is there in *ſeeking* no other *performance* of this *promiſe*, than that which was at once afforded to *all* the *Apoſtles* together, in the *deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt*, when the *fire*, that repreſented that *Spirit*, divided and *ſat upon every one* of them, and they were *all filled with the Holy Ghoſt*, and no ſhew of *peculiarity*, or mark of *eſpecial* eminence to S. *Peter* in all this.

As

As suppose a *General* should *promise* a *Commission* this day to *one*, and to morrow should make the like promise to *eleven* more, that one being in their *company*, and then, upon a set day, some *weeks* after, should send *twelve Commissions* sealed to those *twelve*, one for *each* of them, I wonder who would doubt of the *exact* performance of this *promise* to that *first*, or *seek* for any more *special performance* of it. 7.

But this *Gentleman* having phansied a *special promise* (as that is with him somewhat more than a *particular promise*, for otherwise a *common performance* might have served the *turn*, it being certain that an *Universal* contains every *particular* under it) must needs have a *special performance*, and that *Joh.* 21. I suppose in those words of *Christ* to S. *Peter*, *Feed my Sheep*, and, *Feed my Lambs*, thrice repeated. 8.

But for this, 1. I cannot acknowledge that it hath any *particular* reference to the words of the *promise*, *Matth.* 16. 19. The *promise* was, *I will give thee the Keys* — and, *Whatsoever thou shalt bind* — And sure the direct completion of this, as far as could be expected from *Christ* personally, whilst he was here on *Earth*, is that of *Joh.* 20. 21. where, as the *sending* or *commissionating* is answerable to *giving* the *Keys*, the Ensign of the *OEconomous*, so *remitting* and *retaining* of *sins* is all one with the *binding* and *loosing*. 9.

As for that which is after this *Chap.* 21. it is, 1. by that very *Position* of it; but 2. more by the *occasion*, and yet more 3. by the *matter* of the words, *prejudged* from being any more than an *exhortation* to *discharge* that *Duty*, for which in the former *Chapter* he, with the rest of the *twelve*, had received his *commission*, and so is still as far from being a *special performance*, as that of *Matth.* 16. had been from a *special promise*. 10.

The *Pasce Oves*, *Feed my Sheep* and *Lambs*, thrice repeated, was certainly a *direction* to him how he might approve his *love* to that *Master* and *Saviour*, whom he had *thrice renounced*; *testifie* it now to be a *sincere constant love* (such as would *cast out* all *fear* of danger, through which formerly he had *fallen*) by an *eminent* diligence in discharge of that *Pastoral Office*, which was intrusted to him; but 'twas not so much as an *intimation*, that his *diligence* would be actually *greater* than all others (for sure S *Paul* said truth, that he *laboured more abundantly than they all*, of whom S. *Peter* was one) but rather, that he, that after such *professions* had *fallen* so *foully*, had the more need now of having this proof of his *love* inculcated and prest, lest he should *fail* again (much less is it a *sealing* any power or *authority* to him, *above* that which before had been conferred on him, and with him on those others also. 11.

And nothing being here offered to prove that there was any more of *energy*, or special *Commission* in these words, but only the thing *crudely* affirmed, by naming *Joh.* 21. there is no need of making any farther *Answer*, a bare *denial* is a proportionable return to an unproved *affirmation*. 12.

Only this I shall add, that 'tis certain that S. *Peter* thus understood the *reiteration* of *Christ*'s Question, as a *reproach* of his three *denials*; The *Text* saith, *Peter was grieved, because he said unto him the third time, Lovest thou me?* Which sure he would not have been, if he had looked on it, as an *introduction* to so great a preferment, as it must be, if the *Supremacy* and *Universal Pastorship* of the *Church* were by those words conferred on him. 13.

SECT. IX.

Of the peculiarity of the power given to Saint Peter.

TO this Head of Discourse about the *power* of the *Keys* follows a *second Exception* in these words, *Again, he would perswade the World that the Catholick Church holdeth, none had the Keys but S.* Peter, *calling it a peculiarity and inclosure of S.* Peter, *as if the other Apostles had them not; which is a calumny.* *Numb.* 1. 2. Sect. 2.

How far I have been in this matter from *calumniating* the whole *Catholick Church*, or any one Member of it, will appear by this brief *review* of what is there said; It is this, The *power* of the *Keys* is promised S. *Peter Matth.* 16. but to him that from hence, *i. e.* from the *promising* it to him *singly* in that place, pretends this *donative* and consequent *power* as a *peculiarity* and *inclosure* of *Peter*'s, two considerations are there offered, and thought sufficient to supersede any such conclusion. 3.

Here certainly a bare *supposition* will not be the *accusing* or consequently *accusing falsly*, i. e. *calumniating* of any. If no man say this, besides my losing my pains in *superseding* such a (but *possible*) conclusion, there is no other *harm* done. Only I shall demand, Is that *promise* of the *Keys* to Saint *Peter*, *Matth.* 16. made use of by a *Romanist* to prove *Christ*'s *promise* of some *special* power to S. *Peter*, which was not *promised* to the *other Apostles*? If this *Gentleman* answer, No; then 1. I must infer that this *Gentleman* is no *Romanist*, because in this very *page* he mentions the first words of this *Text*, *Tu es Petrus*, as one of the most *considerable* Texts of *Scripture*, fit to be alledged for S. *Peter*'s *supremacy*. 2. I shall conclude from this his present supposed *negation*, together with his own words in the last *Paragraph*, that the words of *Christ*, *Joh.* 21. *Feed my Sheep*, &c.] were not the *instating* of any *power* on S. *Peter*, which was not *common* also to the rest of the *Apostles*, for those words *Joh.* 21. were, saith he, a *special performance*, answerable to that *promise* of the *Keys* to *Peter*, *Matth.* 16. as a *special promise*, and consequently if there were nothing in that *promise* peculiar to S. *Peter*, there was nothing in that *performance* peculiar to him. And so neither he nor any *Romanist* must henceforth *conclude* any thing for S. *Peter* from either of those particular *addresses* of *Christ* to him, *Matth.* 16. or *Joh.* 21. which they will not equally yield from thence to all the other *Apostles*; And then, that will more *compendiously* perform what I by a greater *circuit* of considerations endeavoured to do, *i. e. supersede* all the *Romanists conclusions* from *one* or *both* these places; for certainly if they pretend not to *infer* somewhat for S. *Peter*, which is not by them *equally* granted to *all* the *rest* of the *Apostles*, all that those *Texts* will be able to do, is to confute the *Presbytery*, not to establish the *Papacy*, no more being from hence deducible for the *Bishop* of *Rome* the *Successor* of one *Apostle*, than for the several other *Bishops*, *Successors* of the other *Apostles*. 4.

But

5. But if upon the sight of these *consequences*, he shall now say, that in this of *Matth.* 16. 19. there is any thing, be it never so little (so as to be capable of the *Phrase*, a *special promise*) ensured upon S. *Peter*, which was not elsewhere promised also to the other *Apostles*, I shall then conclude, that it seems I have not *calumniated* him, or the *Church* which he *defends*, in saying that they make this *power* a *peculiarity* and *inclosure* of Saint *Peter*, for so it must be, if it belong to him and not to others.

6. And 'tis not sufficient to say, that the *power* of the *Keys* was *common* to him with the other *Apostles*, but yet some other *special power* was there reserved to S. *Peter*; For of that *specialty*, whatsoever it is, my present *dilemma* proceeds, and desires to be informed, whether any *Romanist* conclude it from that *Text* of *Matth.* 16. and if he do not, then the *inconveniences* will press him, which I have here mentioned. If he do, then I shall now conclude anew (not that the *Catholick Church*, but) that this *Catholick Gentleman* holds that which he will not be able to prove, because there is not the least *minute* portion of *power promised* to him in that sixteenth *Chapter*, which is not elsewhere *promised* to all the *Apostles*; *Peter* is called a *stone*, on which the *Church* shall be *built*, and to *Peter* the *Keys* are *promised*; and the *twelve Apostles* are in like manner, and all equally *twelve foundation-stones* of the same *building*, and the *Keys* are *equally* promised to all them. And this being there proved at large, *Sect.* 21. and the *probations* extended, not only to the *power* of the *Keys*, but (after) to the *compellation* of *Tu es Petrus* (and they will be *extensible* to all the most *diminutive* imaginary *fractions* of either of those *powers*) I shall farther conclude, that whatsoever he shall now return to this *Dilemma*, will equally secure me from having *calumniated* either him, or the *Church* maintained by him.

SECT. X.

Sitting on twelve Thrones, Matth. 19.

Numb. 1. HIS *third Exception* to this *Chapter* is to another *interpretation* of mine, which it seems hath not the luck to *approve* it self to him, Thus,

2. *I cannot pass without noting another odd interpretation of Scripture, in his* 20. Sect. *out of* Matth. 19. *speaking of the twelve Thrones at the Day of Judgment, he explicates, to rule or preside in the Church.*

3. I do acknowledge to understand the *twelve Thrones*, Matth. 19. of the *Apostles ruling* and *presiding* in the *Church*, and S. *Augustine* long before, so understood it; and if *Christ*'s sitting on the *Throne* of his *Glory*, may be the *interpretation* of ἐν παλιγγενεσίᾳ, whether it be rendred *in the regeneration*, or *in the resurrection*, meaning thereby *Christ*'s *resurrection* and *ascension* to the *Throne* of his *Glory*, there will then be no *difficulty* so to understand it, that when *Christ* was gone to *Heaven*, these should *succeed* him in the *Government* of his *Church* on *Earth*, and so (as the *Phylarchæ ruled* and *judged* the several *Tribes* of *Israel*) exercise *judicature*, *bind* and *loose*, *excommunicate* and *absolve* in the *Church*, no one having the πρωτεία, any more than of *order*, among them.

4. But this *Gentleman* gives no reason for *preferring* any other *interpretation*, only calls mine an *odd* one; And, when I have replied *first*, that this place comes in *ex abundanti*, only as it is (being thus interpreted) in *concord* with that other of *Matth.* 16. & 18. and therefore *secondly*, it is not an *odd* one, and *thirdly*, the Cause in hand will stand as *firm*, though this *interpretation* should be found to have no *truth* in it: *fourthly*, that my *interpretation* is reconcileable with his, and therefore his, if granted, will not be *exclusive* of mine, they that shall *judge* the *World* hereafter may for *some time* have *presided* in the *Church*, and so also *judged here*; *fifthly*, that this *place*, and the *grounds* of this *interpretation* are * elsewhere insisted on at large; I shall need add no more to this *single* dislike of his, in this place.

* *Annot. on Matth.* 19. d. *and Power of Keys*, c. 5. §. 13.

SECT. XI.

The equivalence of Πέτρα *and* Πέτρος. *Twelve foundation-stones.*

Numb. 1. HE concludes with some shew of dislike of what I had said to the vulgar place of *Tu es Petrus*, Thus,

2. *His quibling about the word, is so light a thing, as it is not worth consideration, the sense being plain, that upon* Peter *the Church was built especially, though not with exclusion of others.*

3. What I said of the *equivalence* and perfect *identity* of the words, Πέτρος and Πέτρα for a *stone*, seemed to me particularly useful to the understanding of the meaning of *Christ*'s speech, when he said, he would *build* his *Church* on this πέτρᾳ or πετρᾳ, *i. e.* this *stone*. For not to mention what hath by divers of the *Antients* been said of that *Text*, applying it not to the *person* of S. *Peter*, but to the *faith*, whereof he then had newly made *confession*, I was here willing to grant the *Romanist* the utmost that he could pretend to, *viz.* that the *person* of *Peter* was that *Petra* or *stone*, on which *Christ* promised to *build* his *Church*: And why this *Gentleman* should be so unwilling to be *gratified*, or why the setting down the bare *notation* of the *Greek* word, should deserve his *reproach*, and be called *quibling* or *levity*, I profess I can render no reason but his *haste*, which permitted him not to consider either the *undeniable* truth, or his own *advantages* from what was said.

4. The force of my Answer lay in *another* Branch of that *fourth Section*, *viz.* that this *stone*, from whence *Peter* had his name, peculiarly relating to a *building*, and so being to be considered as a *foundation-stone*, not only he, but *all* the rest of the *Apostles* were herein made equal with *Peter*, being all partakers of this *common* appellation, δεκάλιθοι δώδεκα *twelve foundations*, *Apoc.* 21. 14. and those by circumstances in that *Text*, manifested to have an *equal* proportion of *power* and *Province* assigned to *each* of them. And to this there is nothing here answered by this *Gentleman*, and his unprovoked quarrel at that, which was said concerning the *nature* of the word, is an *indication* that he had nothing more to *object* to it.

When

When therefore he saith, that *on* Peter *the Church was built especially*, I demand what he means by *especially?* If no more than that he was one *special* person, on whom the *Church* was *built*, then I grant it, and reply, that so was *John*, and so was *Andrew*, and so was every other of the *twelve*, a *special foundation-stone* of the *Church*. But if by [*especially*] he mean in an *extraordinary*, or more *eminent* manner, than any of the other *Apostles*, Then I Answer, 1. That *Christ*'s telling him he was a *stone*, on which he would *build* his *Church*, implies no such matter; the other *Apostles* each of them are by *Christ*, in *Vision* to S. *John*, affirmed to be *foundations* of this *building*, as well as he; 2. That among *foundation-stones*, there is but one, that hath any *eminence* above others, and that is the ἀκρογωνιαῖον, the *chief* or *head corner-stone*; and that title belongs not to S. *Peter* (as neither to any other *Apostle*) but only to *Christ* himself. *Ephes.* 2. 20. And so still nothing belongs to *Peter* in this matter of being a *stone* or *foundation*, which doth not *equally* appear to belong to those *others*, as well as him. And so much for the *vindicating* of the *Evidences* set down in the *fourth Chapter*. 5.

CHAP. V.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the fifth Chapter.

SECT. I.

Of slight passing over Pasce oves, *and* Tu es Petrus.

THE first thing he here *excepts* against, is my *too slight passing over two*, which he thinks the most *considerable texts*, to support the *supremacy* of S. *Peter*, in these words, *Numb.* 1.

In the fifth Chapter he lightly passeth over the two most considerable Texts of Scripture fit to be alledged for S. Peter's *supremacy*, viz. Feed my sheep, *and* Thou art Peter: *because they have no appearance, and have been often answered: Why no appearance? because he and his fellows say so, and as if being so often repeated, was not as likely to shew the answer was naught, as the answering to impeach the objecter: but who understands the principles of Catholick Faith, knows, that as well for other points of our Faith, as for this of* S. Peter's *supremacy, we relie not only upon such places of Scripture.* 2.

For this of the *light passing over* those *two places* of *Scripture*, I think I can give a very reasonable account, 1. From his own words *p.* 10. where he tells me that I am *mistaken in thinking that the Catholick ought to prove that the Pope hath an Universal Primacy*; For if he be not obliged to *prove* it, if the right pretended depend wholly upon *possession*, why should not I make haste through those *proofs*, which some have *ex abundanti* (as to him it seems) made use of. 3.

Secondly, I did in the *simplicity* of my heart verily believe (what here is recited from me) that those *two texts* had so very little *appearance* of *strength* in them, and this so often manifested by the *variety* of *answers* made to them by our *writers*, that no *Romanist* would in earnest have laid such *weight* on them, as to require of me a more *punctual answer* to them, than I had before given in the former *Chapter*. There I had evidenced that the whole world was not S. *Peter*'s *Province*, but only one *portion* of *one* part of the *world*, the *Jewish believers* in *Antioch* and *Rome*, *&c.* the *Gentile Christians* in those very *Cities* being under S. *Paul*, and the *Jewish* of other *Countries* under other *Apostles*; those of *Asia* under *John*, *&c.* 4.

This to my understanding made it evident, that in case *Christ*'s *Pasce oves*, &c. *Feed my sheep* and *my lambs*, were granted to be a form of *commission*, instating of *power* on him, it must yet be restrained to his *particular Province*, so as to leave other his *fellow Apostles* their *Provinces* also, and not extended to an *Universal Pastorship*. 5.

But then when this *farther* consideration was behind, that indeed this of *Pasce oves*] was not the form of *commission* to S. *Peter*, but that in the former *Chapter*, *Joh.* 20. 21. *As my Father sent me, so send I you*, &c. and that to S. *Peter* in *common* with the rest of the *Apostles*, and not the least indication of any branch of *power appropriated* to him (on which I have already insisted in this *Reply*, though in that *Tract* of *Schism* I did not think it necessary) I hope I may have pardon for not returning to a *strict* survey of it in that *fifth Chapter*. 6.

As for that of *Tu es Petrus*, that was the very *text* wherein the *donation* of the *Keys* was promised to S. *Peter*, *Matt.* 16. 18. and that had particularly been examined in both parts of it, both as to the *Keys*, and the *compellation*, in the *fourth Chap.* and the *Keys promised* him, manifested by other *texts* to belong *equally* to *all* the other *Apostles*, and so the compellation of *stone*, or (which is all one, as was there shewed) *foundation*, or *foundation-stone* in the *building* of the *Church*, bestowed equally upon the rest of the *twelve Apostles* also. And so considering what I had already done my self, and what *others* had done much more largely, there remained little appearance of force in those *texts*, which might suggest to me a more diligent survey of them. And all these together, if not *two* of them alone, were a competent reason of *passing lightly* over them in that *fifth Chapter*, where I was ingaged in a new *stage*, *i.e.* of not returning *afresh*, and *loco non suo*, to a yet *larger* consideration of them. 7.

I should now from this *notice* of his *displeasure* indeavour to *pacifie* him by reforming my former *omission*, and enter upon a yet more *solemn* survey of these *two texts*, but that I see him already resolved not to trust his cause to the *support* which those *Texts* can afford him, telling me in the close, that he *relies not only on such places of Scripture*, and if I should dwell longer upon them, I should be thought *impertinent*, and again reprehended, as *forgetting what matter I handle*: And therefore till he please to tell me *how far* he *relies* on them, and shew me that I have not yet removed them from being a *foundation so far* to be *relied* on, I shall spare mine own and the *Readers* pains, and flatter my self, that I 8.

have said much more to *invalidate* any conclusion, which he shall infer to his *advantage* from these two places, than he hath yet said in my *hearing*, to *confirm* his *pretensions* from both or either of them.

SECT. II.

The Bishop of Antioch's *Title from succession to Saint* Peter *equal to the Bishops of* Rome. Peter *formed a Church there. His dying at* Rome *no Argument.*

Numb. 1. AFter his *velitation* he now proceeds to the *weightier impression*, excepting first to an *Argument* taken from the *Primogeniture* of *Antioch*, Thus,

2. *Next he urgeth that if the succession to S.* Peter *were the base of the Popes supremacy*, Antioch *should*
Sect. 3. *be the chief See, because S.* Peter *sat there*; *wherein to omit his first and second Question, whereof the first is untrue, I answer to the third negatively, that the constituting a Church and Bishop at* Antioch, *before at* Rome, *did confer no priviledge extraordinary on that Church, and the reason is clearly deduced out of his second Quære, because it was before* Rome, *for he could not give any such authority, but by divesting himself, since there cannot be two Heads to one Body, and therefore this authority and priviledge of S.* Peter *can rest and be no where but where he died.*

3. In this matter I must first premise what I had warned the Reader of in that *fifth Chapter, Sect.* 2. that what I there produced against the *power* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, under the Notion of *Successor* to S. *Peter*, was perfectly *ex abundanti*, more than *needed*, the whole matter being sufficiently concluded in the former *Chapter*, which concerned S. *Peter's person*, and had shewed that S. *Peter* himself had no *Universal Pastorship* belonging to him, or *supremacy* over any other *Apostle*, from whence it was evidently consequent, that to his *Successor*, as such, no such power pertained.

4. This being premised, I did not pretend, that what should then follow, should *proceed* with that *evidence* as to *demonstrate* again what was so sufficiently cleared already; Only to those, whose *curiosity* was not satisfied, when their *reason* was, I proposed some *considerations*, which pretended to no more than this, that beside that *Peter* had no *supremacy*, there were also other defects in the *Bishop* of *Rome's tenure*, particularly this, that he did no more succeed S. *Peter*, than the *Bishop* of *Antioch* did, nay, that S. *Peter* having left a *Successor Bishop* at *Antioch*, before he did at *Rome*, the *Bishop* of *Antioch* had in a manner the *Primogeniture*, and by that, as good (if not a better) title to *preheminence*, as any the *Bishop* of *Rome* had, upon that *tenure* of *Succession* from S. *Peter*.

5. Now to this part of Discourse which pretended but to *probability*, there can lye no *exception*, unless it *appear* either to be *untrue* in any part, or in the whole less *probable* than what is offered by the *Romanist* for the other side; And this is now to be examined.

6. And 1. saith he, the *first Question* is *untrue*; But he is so reserved as not to express his *reason* for so saying. I shall therefore give my *reasons* to the *contrary*, 1. because a *Question* cannot be *untrue*, all truth and falshood being in *affirmations* and *negations* (and asking a *Question*, or *proposing* a thing to *consideration* whether it be so or no, is neither of those) in *answering*, not in *asking* of *Questions*.

7. *Secondly*, Because this *Question* being resolved into an *affirmation*, *viz.* that *Peter* as truly planted a *Church* at *Antioch*, and left a *Successor Bishop* there, as he is or can be supposed to have done at *Rome*, it relies on the *uncontradicted Testification* of *antient* Writers.

8. By *planting* a *Church*, I mean not that he was the *first* that *preach'd* the *Gospel* at *Antioch* (though *Leo* the *Great* seems to affirm it, (*in Antiochena Ecclesia primum prædicante beato Apostolo Petro, Christianum nomen exortum est*, *Ep.* 53.) and from thence pleads the *right* of *precedence* to belong to that *Church* (*in paternæ constitutionis ordine perseveret*) against *Anatolius Bishop* of *Constantinople*) for that seems by S. *Luke* to be attributed to those that were *scattered abroad* upon the *persecution that rose about S.* Stephen, *Act.* 11. 19. but his *forming* them into a *Church* or *regular Assembly*. And that so he did, and left *Euodius Bishop* there, and after his death, *Ignatius* the *Martyr*, is elsewhere *manifested* at large, and I shall not *repeat* it, but only add one *Testimony* (which I suppose will be *authentick* with him) of *Leo* the *Great*, *Bishop* of *Rome*, *Ep.* 62. to *Maximus Bishop* of *Antioch*, bidding him be mindful of that *Doctrine*, *Quam præcipuus Apostolorum omnium, beatissimus Petrus, per totum Mundum quidem uniformi prædicatione, sed speciali Magisterio, in Antiochena & Romana Urbe fundavit.* Where it is the clear affirmation of that *Pope*, that S. *Peter* founded the *Doctrine* of *Christ* first in *Antioch*, then in *Rome*, by a special *authority*, or *power*, or *magistery*, which he had in those two *Cities*, more than in the rest of the World. And so I cannot guess what untruth there could be in that *affirmation*, if it had been such, which was but a *consideration*, or *Question*, as he calls it.

9. Next, he saith, that S. *Peter's constituting* a *Church* and *Bishop* at *Antioch*, before he did the like at *Rome*, is a proof that he conferred no *extraordinary priviledge* on *Antioch*, and renders the *reason* for it, because he could not do it without *divesting himself*, and consequently this *priviledge* must rest *no where but where he died*, and consequently at *Rome* only, because he dyed there.

10. That he left any *extraordinary priviledge* at *Antioch*, I do not believe, any more than he did so at *Rome*; and therefore I cannot be required to *prove* any more than this, that it is as *reasonable* for me to affirm it of *Antioch* upon the title of *Succession*, as for him to assume it of *Rome*, upon the *same* Title.

11. From *Christ* there is nothing that will fix it at *Rome*, rather than at *Antioch*; and in the *Law* of *Nations*, concerning *inheritances*, nothing is or can be applied to this purpose. It must needs be then from the free *act* of S. *Peter's* will, whatsoever is pretended to. And in respect of that, 'tis sure as *reasonable* to believe, that he which planted a *Church*, and placed a *Bishop* first in one, after in *another* City, should delegate the διπλὴ τιμὴ, *double portion*, the greater *dignity* and *priviledges* to the *former* as to the *latter*. If the Right of *Primogeniture* be no *Right* in this matter, yet sure the *younger Sister* hath neither *Law*, nor *custom*, that the *inheritance* should belong to *her*.

And

And for his *own reason* here offered, that it cannot belong to the *Elder*, that is no *reason*; For St. *Peter* might do, as *Christ* did, make an assignation of *power* in his life-time, fix it by *promise*, yet not divest himself of it till his *death*; And if S. *Peter* had done so, if at his planting a *Bishop* at *Antioch*, on consideration that in that *City* they were *first called Christians*, he had decreed that after his own *death* that *Bishop* should *succeed* to *all* that *authority*, which he had received from *Christ*, with *power* to communicate it to any, I shall ask this *Gentleman* whether he might not have done it without either *divesting* himself whilst he *lived*, or making *two* Heads to *one* Body, or whether his bare dying at *Rome*, would have invalidated any such former act of his in Case he had done so. If it would, there must then be more owing to his *death* than to his *life*, to his *martyrdome* than to his *preaching* or *ordaining* of *Bishops*, that this *priviledg* belongs to *Rome*. And then again *Jerusalem*, where *Christ* himself *died*, will by that *title* of his *blood* shed *there*, have a more unquestionable *right*, than that *City* where *Peter* did but faintly *transcribe* that Copy, which had in a more eminent manner been set him by *Christ*. 12.

Lastly, If by this *Argument* of *Rome*'s being the place where *Peter died*, the *supremacy* had belonged to that *See*, *precisely* or *peculiarly*, how could it be transferred to *Avenion*, as we know it was, and there continued for some time? But I shall no longer insist on such *fiction* of *Case*, as this, *if* that had been which *never was*, what then would certainly have *followed*, whether if S. *Peter* had been *Universal Pastor*, it must *eo ipso* be concluded that his *Successour* of *Rome*, and not at *Antioch*, was such after him, when it hath been rendred evident in the former *Chapter*, that S. *Peter* had no such *supremacy*. 13.

SECT. III.

The Act of the Council of Chalcedon; *of the ground of* Rome's *precedence. The safety of the Church reconcileable with removing the chief See. Of the Bishop of* Constantinople *being ashamed of that act. No tumult in the Council. The Story of it.*

THE next dislike is to my deriving the *original* of that *precedence* which belongs to *Rome*, as the *Council* of *Chalcedon* had derived it, Thus: *Numb.* 1.

Then he tells you, that the dignity or precedence of the Bishop of Rome *is surely much more fitly deduced by the Council of* Chalcedon *from this, that* Rome *was then the Imperial City, or ordinary residence of the Emperour: a very wise judgment, that the quality upon which the unity, that is the safety of the Church Universal relies, should be planted upon a bottom fallible and subject to fail; but the resolution was so shameful, that the very Patriarch was ashamed, and imputed it to his ambitious Clergy, who how tumultuary and unruly they were, is to be seen in the Acts of the Council.* 2.

Here two *Objections* are made to the *wisdom* of that *Act* or *judgment* of that *Council*; and I, that foresaw it would be thus *rejected* by him, and from thence observed how little *Councils* are considered by them, when they *define* not as they would have them, and therefore laid no more weight on that *Canon*, than the *Romanists* very *rejecting* it, allowed me, might now spare the pains of *defending* the *judgment* of that *Council*. Yet it is so easie to return answer in few words to his two *Objections*, that I shall not decline doing it. 3. Sect. 5.

To the first, that the *precedence* of *Rome*, which there I speak of, being a *Primacy* only of *dignity* and *order*, and not of *Power*, is no such *quality*, on which the *unity* and *safety* of the *Church relies*. For how can that be concerned what *Bishop* sits *uppermost*, gives the *first* or *last suffrage* in a *Council*? This *Gentleman* thinks of a *supremacy* or *power*, when he thus speaks, but that he cannot but know is denied by us to be placed in any one *Bishop*, and therefore must not imagine me to assign the *original* of that, to which I deny a *Being*. And it matters not though he say I am *injurious* in denying it, for beside that that is *petitio principii* on his side, to say so, 'tis also certain that the *Question* now betwixt us in this *Paragraph*, is not whether I am *just* in denying that *supremacy*, but whether it be more than a *Primacy* of *order*, which I devolve to this *original*. 4.

Nay if I had spoken of the *supremacy* it self, and fixed it on a *bottom* so far *fallible*, as that it might be *removed* by the change of *Empires* from one *City* to another, if it were but resolved that the *supreme Ecclesiastical Power*, and so the *fountain* of *unity* should follow the *Imperial Seat*, I see not why the *safety* of the *Church* might not by this means be *provided* for. 5.

Let it but be judged of in *little* first, as it is easily supposeable. Suppose the *Church* of *England* αὐτοκέφαλος, nay for Argument's sake, suppose there were no other *Church* but that of *England*, and suppose there were a *supremacy* in one *Bishop*, in him, whosoever were the *Bishop* of that *City*, where the *Royal Throne* were placed, and suppose that that were for the *present* removed to *York*, and so that the *Bishop* of *York* were the *supreme Bishop*, and by that means the *unity* and *safety* of the *Church* competently *provided* for; I shall then demand, in Case the *Royal Seat* should be removed to *Winchester*, could there be any *Question*, but the *supreme Episcopal See* would be *removed* so too? and might not all *Appeals* be made from thenceforth to *Winchester*, and the safety of the *Church* be as well provided for by this way, as by its being fixt *unmoveably* at *York*? 6.

The *Primacy* we know hath oft thus been *removed*, and never more *inconvenience* come of it, than by S. *Peter*'s *See* being removed to *Avenion*. And if any *supremacy* belonged to any *Succession* of *Bishops* over the whole *World*, and that were never mutable, but by the *removal* of the *Imperial Seat*, a certain, illustriously *visible* thing, it is not easily *discernible*, how this should more *prejudice* the *safety* of the *Church*, than the *change* of that *power* from one *Bishop* that dies, to his *Successour* in the same *See*. But this is still much more than needed to have been said. 7.

As for the *Patriarch*'s (I suppose he must mean of *Constantinople*) being *ashamed* of that *resolution* of that *Council*, and imputing it to his *ambitious Clergy*, 1. he gives us not any *testimony* for this, only saith, that in the *Acts of that Council may be seen how tumultuary and unruly they were*. And to that *affirmation*, and that not very *pertinent* proof of it, I have two things to say, which indeed the *Acts* of that *Council*, and the *Epistles* both of *Anatolius Bishop* of *Constantinople*, and *Leo Bishop* of *Rome*, may 8.

assure us to have truth in them, 1. That if by being *ashamed*, be meant *retracting* or *renouncing* this *resolution* of the *Council*, It then hath no *truth* in it, that the *Patriarch* was *ashamed*.

9. For 1. it is so evident that of all *Leo*'s reprehensions in this matter of the *Primacy* adjudged him by that *Council*, *Anatolius* chose to take no *notice*, and to return no Answer, that *Leo* tells the *Emperor* of it, *Ep.* 59. *maluit prædictus Antistes meam gratulationem tacere, quam suam ambitum publicare*, and chargeth it upon *Anatolius* himself, that he made no *reply* to what he had said to him; *Ad quas cum non rescriberes ipse, te à colloquii nostri consortio separâsti, by not making any return to my admonitory Letters, thou hast thy self separated thy self from the communion of our Discourse*, Ep. 71.

10. 'Tis true indeed, when *Leo* charged it upon him as an *act* of *ambition* and *pride*, that he had procured that *Canon* to be made (as he doth at large, * *Ep.* 53. making it an *invasion* of the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* and *Antioch* his Right setled by the *Council* of *Nice*, and so in his † *Epistle* to *Martian* the *Emperor*, and * another to the *Empress Pulcheria*) *Anatolius* writing to him upon occasion, tells him that the *Clergy* of the *Church* of *Constantinople*, and ‖ not he, brought this matter before the *Council*, and therefore *Leo* needed not to be so *angry* with him, and complain so *sharply* against his *ambition*.

* Colon. Edit. fol. 118.
† *Ep.* 54. fol. 119.
* *Ep.* 55. fol. 120.
‖ *Culpam quam de augenda potestate, aliena (ut asseris) adhortatione contraxeras, etsi non ad sola Clericorum concilia transtulisses.* Leo, Ep. 71.

11. And this I suppose is it which this *Gentleman* must refer to, if there be the least *colour* of *truth* in his suggestion; But sure this disclaiming of *pride* or *ambition* in what was done, *regularly*, according to a long *continued custom*, and the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Constantinople*, is much more the *justifying* his *innocence*, than the *acknowledgment* of any *fault*, an act of *confidence* and *assurance*, no *indication* either of *guilt* or *shame*, no *disowning* the *dignity* confirmed to him by the *Council*.

12. Many *evidences* there are in the *Story* of those times, that the *Bishop* of *Constantinople* did no way reject this *power* and *dignity*, which that *Council* had confirmed to him; 'Tis annex'd to the *Acts* of that *Council*, how he exercised it in an *eminent* manner on the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, *Leo* the *Emperour* having put wholly into his hands the judging of a great *Affair*, and quieting a *disturbance* in that *Church*; see the * third part of that *Council* of *Chalcedon*. In which matter may be observed that in the *Epistle* of the *Ægyptian Bishops*, and *Clergy* of *Alexandria*, in a *recitation* of the *Bishops* of the whole World, the *first* place being reserved to *Leo* the *Bishop* of *Rome*, the second is given † *Regiæ Constantinopolis Anatolio, to Anatolius of Constantinople the Royal Seat*, and then follows *Basil* of *Antioch*, and *Juvenalis* of *Jerusalem*.

* *Edit. Paris. Tom.* 3. *p.* 504. &c.
† *Ibid. p.* 506. B.

13. And indeed if it be but remembred, 1. That what was done here at *Chalcedon*, was for the main but the *reciting* and confirming what was done formerly at the *Council* of *Constantinople* (a *judgment*, saith * *Euagrius*, that this matter was *well ordered already*, ἐδικαιώθη ἡ Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως δεῖπνον ἐνθὺς μὲν ἡ Ῥώμης τελέσθαι, and what the *Bishop* of *Constantinople* held by *Custome* before that *Council* also, † τὸ ἐκ πόλλου κρατῆσαν ἔθος, *a custom that had been long in force*, and ‖ ἐκ τῆς παλαιᾶς συνηθείας, *by a precedaneous custom*, &c. *Secondly*, that this was done by this *Council* (if their *professions* may be believed) ὑ τοσοῦτον τῷ θρόνῳ Κωνσταντίνου πόλεως τὶ παρέχοντες, ὅσον ἡ μητροπόλεσι τῶν ἐπαρχίαν πρυτανεύοντες, *not so much to add any thing to the See of* Constantinople, *as to provide for the quiet of other Metropoles* in *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thracia*. *Thirdly*, That the *Council* attested all this, and sent a *relation* of it to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, πεπεισμένοι ἂ τῶν ὑμετέρων ἁγιωσύνων διδαχθεῖσαν, ὑποδέχεσθαί τε ταῦτα ἂ βεβαιῶν, *being perswaded that he being rightly informed, would receive and confirm it*, though his *Legates* had obstinately *opposed* it. *Fourthly*, That all the *Objections*, which the *Pope* or his *Legates* had to it, were proposed and clearly answered in the * *Council*; that of the *contrariety* of the *Canon* to the *Decree* of the *Council* of *Nice*, by *reading* that *Decree*, and shewing that it was perfectly *reconcileable* to it; That of *invading* the *rights* of the *Metropoles* of *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thracia*, by the several *Bishops* of those *Regions* being examined by the *Emperours Proxies*, whether they consented to it οἰκείᾳ γνώμῃ, ἢ ἀνάγκης τινὸς αὐτοῖς ἐπενεχθείσης, *by their own will, or by any necessity imposed on them*, and their several *cheerful answers*, ἀπὸ γνώμης ὑπέγραψα ὡς ἐνώπιον θεοῦ, *I subscribed willingly as in the presence of God*, and the like, To which if we add the *depression* of the Bishop of *Antioch*, which * *Leo* objects, it is likewise answered by *Maximus* the *Bishop* of *Antioch* his *subscription* to this *Canon*. *Lastly*, That as this was enacted by † *Baronius*'s own confession, by six hundred *Bishops*, *i. e.* by the *whole Council*, not only by a Party of it; So the *Bishop* of *Constantinople Anatolius* * subscribed it in the first place, and next after him the *Bishop* of *Antioch*; there will be no possibility of finding any *truth* in this *Gentleman*'s affirmation, that the *Patriarch* was *ashamed* of this *judgment* of the *Council*.

* Concil. T. 3. p. 460.
p. 461. D.
* *ad Maxim. Antioch. Ep.* 62. fol. 124.
† *Tom.* 6. *An.* 454. N. 13. &c.
* p. 453.

14. It is much more reasonable to affirm on the other side, that the *Pope*, though not *Leo*, was *ashamed* of his *opposing* it, for within thirty years after, we find *Felix* III. of his own accord consenting to his *Primacy*, and acknowledging *Acacius Bishop* of *Constantinople* to have power over the *Bishops* that were under him, *Ep.* 1. and *Innocent* III. confirms it with a solemn *constitution*, cap. *Antiqua. de Privileg.* that I add not the *establishment* of it again by the *Council* of *Florence*, *sess. ult. in lit. Unionis*.

15. As for the *reason* which is here offered to *confirm* the truth of his *affirmation*, it hath it self no *truth* in it, and so cannot be a *reason* of the *affirmation*. It is not *true*; for there was no *tumults* nor *unruliness* in the *Council*, only the *Pope*'s *Legates* opposed the *Canon*, and made their *complaint* to the *Judges*, and were heard most *regularly* in all they could *pretend*, and at length the *Canon* was defined by the cheerful *consent* of all but them. See the *Story* of it in *Binius*, πεζ. ἐκκαιδεκ.

16. After the passing of the *Canon*, the *Legates*, *Paschasinus* and *Lucentius* make their address to the *Judges*, the Ἐνδοξότατοι ἄρχοντες, that supplied the *Emperours* place, who bad them speak what they would have; They say, that *yesterday after the Judges and they were risen, some things were done against the Canons, and desire they may be read*. That was appointed to be done; but first *Ætius Archdeacon* of *Constantinople* makes a *relation*, how after matters of *faith* agreed on, they proceeded according to the *manner*, to some *constitutions*, in these they desired the *Legates* to *join* with them, they *refused* saying, they had *received commands* from *Rome* to do so, which being *remonstrated* to the *Judges* they had bid the *Council proceed*, and hereupon the *Council* had *unanimously decreed*; Appealing to them all whether it were not true, nothing being done ἐν παρέβυσῳ ἢ κλοπῆς τρόπῳ, *clancularly or by stealth*, but πράξει ἀκολούθῳ ἂ κανονικῇ, *of course, regularly and canonically*. Then the *Canon* was read, being a plain

recitation

recitation of what was before done in the *Council* of *Conſtantinople*, and then all the *Subſcriptions* follow. Then the *Legates* deſire it may be *enquired*, whether none have *ſubſcribed* by *force*, ſuggeſting that the *Conſtantinopolitan Canon* was *contrary* to the *Nicene*; Thereupon the *Canons* were both *read*, and upon the *Judges* appointment, they that were moſt *concerned*, the *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, *Pontus*, and *Thracia*, who were now brought under the *Patriarchate* of *Conſtantinople*, being ſuppoſed formerly to be *free*, were called out *ſeverally*, and asked whether they had *acted* under any *force*, and they ſeverally profeſs the *contrary*. Whereupon the *Judges* ſumm up the buſineſs and conclude, that they had *weighed* all, and found that none had *injury*, the *priviledges* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* were *preſerved* intire according to the *Canons*, and that the *Biſhop* of *new Rome*, *Conſtantinople*, was to have *equal priviledges* with *him*, &c. And this being their *ſenſe*, they deſire the whole *Council* to deliver *theirs*, and they all cryed out, αὕτη δικαία ψῆφος. ταῦτα πάντες λέγομεν, ταῦτα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκει, αὕτη δικαία κρίσις, τὰ τυπωθέντα κρατείτω. *This is a juſt Sentence. This we all ſay, let this be conſigned and confirmed*, deſiring they may now be *diſmiſs'd* every man to his *home*, and ſo the *Judges pronounce*, Πάντα ἡ σύνοδος ἐκύρωσε, *The Synod hath confirmed all.* p. 463.

No diſſent of any but of the *Legates*, and that, it ſeems, went for *nothing* when the *reſt* ſo *univerſally conſented*; ſo far is this *ſuggeſtion* from all *ſhew* of *truth*, that the *Clergy* of *Conſtantinople* were *tumultuary* and *unruly*. 17.

If any the leaſt *unrulineſs* there were, it was on the *Legate*'s part, who would thus *ſtand* out and *complain* without the *leaſt* reaſon to do ſo, not on the *Councils*, which proceeded according to the *precedent* cuſtom and *Canon*, and ſuch grounds to which neither the *Pope* nor his *Legate* did then ſo much as *object* any thing, *viz.* the ſame *title* by which *Rome* it ſelf aſcended to her *greatneſs*, * by being the *Imperial City*. 18.

* διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην.

SECT. IV.

The Popes judging in his own Cauſe. His Legates ſuffrages in Councils, of what neceſſity. Antioch's *equality to* Rome. Conſtantinople *preferred to no more but a Patriarchy. The dignity of the Biſhop of* Rome *meerely from* Rome's *being the Imperial City.*

IN this matter of that *Council* of *Chalcedon two* Exceptions more he offers (which are not ſo *weighty*, but they may be put together) in theſe words, *Numb.* 1.

Secondly, He cavilleth at the priviledge of Supreme Magiſtracy, calling it a method of ſecurity beyond all amulets: then he tells us of Antioch's *being equal to* Rome, *and that* Conſtantinople *deſired but the ſame priviledges, againſt the very nature of the Story; for* Conſtantinople *being then a Patriarchy, if that made it equal to* Rome, *as this Doctor feigneth, what did it pretend* ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *for? ſeeing the Doctor aſſumes before, that all Patriarchs were equal, neither* Rome *it ſelf, and leſs* Antioch *had cauſe to complain.* 2.

For the former of theſe, which he calls my *cavilling at the priviledge of Supreme Magiſtracy*, that ſure is but *gratis dictum*, and a *begging* of that, which in the whole *Controverſie* he knows to be moſt *denied* him. 3.

That he, that *aſſumes* a *ſupreme Magiſtracy* to himſelf, ſhould by no means be *concluded* to be an *Aſſumer*, till he make his own *confeſſion* of it, and give his *ſuffrage* to his *condemnation*, I mentioned, and cannot but look upon ſtill, as a *method* of *perfect ſecurity*, beyond all *amulets* and *defenſatives*; For how can it be imagined, that he, that *conteſts* a Right, ſhould at the ſame time *acknowledge* it not to belong to him, when he knows that nothing but this *confeſſion* is ſufficient to *deprive* him of it? As for any ſuch *priviledge* belonging to *ſupreme Magiſtracy* in *general*, or any way applicable to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, in relation to a *General Council*, it may be worth conſidering a while. 4.

And firſt for *ſupreme Magiſtracy* in *general*, This *priviledge* doth not extend to all matters. In a *conteſt* of *particular* Right between a *ſupreme Magiſtrate* and a *Subject*, brought before any *legal judicature*, 'tis certain the *ſupreme Magiſtrate* may be *concluded* without his own *ſuffrage* or *conſent*, and agreeable to that it was, when the *Queſtion* was brought in this *Council* before the *Judges* by the complaint of the *Pope*'s *Legates*, whether the *Canon* were the Day before, after the *Legate*'s departure, duely paſſed or no, For if it were not ſo, what needed this *complaint* to the *Judges*, the bare *abſence*, and ſo *not conſenting* of the *Legates* had been ſufficient to *caſſate* and *annul* the *Acts*: Whatſoever *Magiſtracy* therefore was then pretended to by the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, this *priviledge* doth not then ſeem to have belonged to it, that his, or his *Legate*'s *ſuffrages* ſhould be neceſſary to the paſſing every *Canon*. 5.

That they might have *liberty* to come to the *Council*, that nothing were done *clancularly* or by *ſtealth*, at a time when they *knew* not of it, that no *force* were uſed on thoſe that were *preſent*, nor the like to hinder the *preſence* of any, this was neceſſary to the *freedome*, and ſo to the very being of a *Council*, and conſequently to the *validity* of every *Act* thereof; and accordingly, on theſe Heads it was, that the *Legates* in their complaint to the *Judges* inſiſted (and ſo doth * *Baronius*, ſtyling that *laſt Action* of that *Council*, *ſpuriam & clandeſtinam, & ab* Anatolio *furtim adjectam, a ſpurious clandeſtine action, ſtollen in by* Anatolius) as alſo, on the *authority* of the *Nicene Canons*, which they pretended to be infringed by that latter of *Conſtantinople*, on which this of *Chalcedon* was *founded*; and this they thought ſufficient to *caſſate* this *Act*; but for this of the *Pope*'s or his *Legate*'s *ſuffrage*, that it ſhould *invalidate* that *Decree*, it is not ſo much as pretended by the *Legates*, in the *relations* of the *paſſages* of that *Council*. 6.

* *Tom.* 6. *Ann.* 451. *Num.* 143.

And therefore according to that Saying of S. *Hierome*, put into their *Canon Law*, *ſi authoritas quæritur, Orbis major eſt Urbe, if authority be looked for, the whole World is more than the one City of* Rome; it is the reſolution of * *Almain, merito Concilium Chalcedonenſe Leoni reſiſtenti prævaluiſſe*, that the *Council of* Chalcedon *did well* in *ſtanding* out againſt *Pope Leo*, and did *juſtly prevail* againſt him. 7.

Decret. par. 1. *diſt.* 193. c. *Legimus.*

* *de Author. Eccl.* 7.

This

8. This *amulet* it seems had not virtue to stand him in so much stead, as * *Baronius* is pleased to *phansie*, setting out the *power* and *greatness* of *Pope Leo* by this, that he did alone *cassate* what this *Council* had *decreed by the suffrages of six hundred Bishops*. Which how well it consists with his former *affirmation*, that this *Canon* was *spurious* and *clandestine*, and *stoln* in by *Anatolius*, I shall not here examine. 'Tis sure, if the *Popes authority* were so *soveraign*, the act needed not have been made *spurious* first, to qualifie it for the *cassation*. But this of the *power* or *superiority* of a *Pope* over an *Oecumenical Council*, is a question not so necessary here to be debated, unless what this *Gentleman* was pleased to mention of the *priviledge of supreme Magistracy*, had been indeavoured some way to be *proved* by him.

* *Anno* 454. *Num.* 13, &c.

9. Next he quarrels my saying that *Antioch* was *equal* to *Rome*, and that *Constantinople desired but the same privileges*; and this he saith is *against the very nature of the story*.

10. That *Antioch* had the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal privileges* with *Rome*, so far as to the *dignity* of a *Patriarchate*, &c. (allowing to *Rome* the *Primacy* of *order* and *dignity*) I thought was competently concluded from the *Pope*'s pretensions against that *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, making it an *invasion* of the *rights* of *Antioch*, and as *derogatory* to that as to *Rome*; and so still it seems to me; For if *Antioch* had not ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal privileges* with *Rome*, how could *Constantinople*'s aspiring to *equal privileges* with *Rome*, be as derogatory to *Antioch* as to *Rome*? But I need not this help from *Pope Leo*'s Argument, the thing asserted by me, is not denied, that I know of, by any *Romanist*, *viz.* that *Antioch* had the dignity of a *Patriarchate*, for that is all that I express my self to mean by *Antioch*'s having ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal privileges* with *Rome*, and I that maintain (as this *Gentleman* truely saith I do) that all *Patriarchs* are *equal* (in respect of *Power*, differing only in *order* or *precedence*) cannot be imagined to mean any thing else by it.

11. So again, that *Constantinople* desired no more but the *privileges* of a *Patriarch* and that that is the meaning of the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal privileges*, is by me said in *opposition* to acquiring any *ordinary jurisdiction* over other *Churches*; and this, instead of being *contrary* to the nature of the *story*, is directly agreeable to the whole *course* of it, and to the express words of the *Canon*, which defines, that as the *City* of *Constantinople* was honoured with the *Empire* and *Senate*, and enjoyed *equal privileges* with *old Imperial Rome*, so the *Church* of *Constantinople* (ὡς ἐκείνῳ μεγαλωσύνης) *should be exalted to the same height with that*, δεύτερον μετ' ἐκείνην ὑπαρχουσαν, *having the next place after it*; adding that the *Metropolitans* (and none else) of *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thracia*, &c. should be ordained by the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, the *Bishops* of each of those *Provinces* being left to be *ordained* by their respective *Metropolitans*; This is so plain that there can be no need of farther *proof* of it.

12. And for this *Gentleman*'s *Objection*, by way of *Question*, that *Constantinople* being then a *Patriarchy*, if that made it equal with *Rome*, for what did it pretend ἴσα πρεσβεῖα? I Answer, 1. That *Constantinople* being by *custom*, and by *Act* of the *Council* held in that *City*, a *Patriarchate* already, it sought not to *acquire* any *new* advantage or increase by this *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, but only to continue what already it had.

13. This again appears by the *story*, where that *Canon* of *Constantinople* was produced and read, as the *foundation* on which this *new Canon* was *built*, and so by the express words in the beginning of the *Canon*, Παραχῶ τοῖς ὑπ' ἁγίων πατέρων ὅρους ἑπόμενοι, &c. *following constantly the definitions of the Holy Fathers, and knowing the Canon* newly read *of the hundred and fifty Bishops assembled in the Reign of the Emperour* Theodosius *at the Imperial City* Constantinople *or new* Rome. And agreeably *Euagrius* sets down the *story*, that in this *Council* of *Chalcedon* ἐδικαιώθη *it was thought just* or *determined* that the *Constantinopolitan See* εὐθὺς μετὰ τῆς Ῥώμης τετάχθαι, *was rightly* and *duly placed next after* Rome.

14. And when this *Gentleman* assumes, that if this were so, then *neither* Rome *it self*, *and less* Antioch *had cause to complain*, I shall most willingly joyn with him in it, being no way obliged by my *pretensions* to justifie the *Pope* or his *Legates* dislike to that *Canon*. And for *Antioch* I am sure enough that the *Bishop* thereof, *Maximus*, though he had received an *Epistle* from the *Pope* to *exasperate* and *perswade* him to stand upon his *right*, did very readily *subscribe* it, setting his name and *consent* next after the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, as hath formerly been set down out of the *story*.

15. And if *Antioch* did so, who was the *loser* by it, if *precedence* signifie any thing? I confess I can render no cause (unless it be the *Pompejúsve parem*, *impatience* of any *equal*) why the *Bishop* of *Rome*, who lost not so much as *precedence* by this *advancement* or confirmation of *dignity* to the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, should be so *obstinately* and implacably offended at it.

16. Thus have I Answered every *attempt* and *tittle* of *exception* offered by this *Gentleman* in this matter, and have now leisure to *complain*, that the one thing that I desired to be taken notice of from this *Canon*, is not so much as considered, or at all replied to by him, *viz.* that *the Dignity that old* Rome *had by antient Canons injoyed*, was given it upon this account, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην, because *Rome* was the *Imperial seat*; which as it is the proof of my whole *pretension*, that the *Pope* was not *Universal Pastor*, upon title of his *succession* from S. *Peter*, (for if whatsoever he had, the *Councils* gave it him, οἱ πατέρες ἀπέδοσαν, saith the *Canon*, and gave it him as *Bishop* of the *Imperial See*, then sure 'twas no *inheritance* from S. *Peter*) so it was truely observed out of the *story* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, and may be seen both in the *Legate*'s *complaint* to the *Judges*, and in the *Epistles* of *Leo* to the *Emperour Martianus*, the *Empress Pulcheria*, *Anatolius Bishop* of *Constantinople*, and *Maximus* of *Antioch*, and his *instructions* to his *Legates*, that he never made any *exception* to that branch of the *Canon* that thus derived the *original* of his *greatness* from the *Imperial dignity* of the *City*, never thought himself injured by *this* way of setting down his *title*.

SECT.

SECT. V.

Of the Canon of Epheſus. *The power of Metropolitans, of Primates. The caſe of the Archbiſhop of* Cyprus *no peculiar caſe. The deduction thence againſt the Popes Univerſal Paſtorſhip. Of the Popes tenure by the inſtitution of Chriſt.*

THE next *Exception* concerns the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Epheſus*, thus, *Numb.* 1.

As for the Canon of Epheſus *touching the Archbiſhop of* Cyprus, *it plainly ſheweth that the Metropolitans were ſubordinate to the Patriarchs, ſeeing this caſe of* Cyprus *was a peculiar excepted caſe,* 2. Sect. 6 *the reaſon given doth ſhew that the ſuperiority of Patriarchs was by cuſtom received from their Anceſtors, contrary to that which the Doctor before affirmed; however it is ſtill nothing to the purpoſe, becauſe the authority, which we ſay belongs to the Pope, is neither Patriarchal, nor derived from any inſtitution or cuſtom of the Church, but from the inſtitution of Chriſt.*

This *Canon* of *Epheſus*, ſaith he, *plainly ſhews that Metropolitans were ſubordinate to Patriarchs,* 3. *ſeeing this of* Cyprus *was a peculiar excepted caſe.* To this I ſee not how any *pretenſions* of ours oblige me to make any *return*; yet becauſe it may be *ſubject* to ſome *miſtake* for want of *excepting*, I ſhall clear that whole matter by theſe *three Propoſitions.*

Firſt, That the *Controverſie*, which occaſioned that *Canon*, was this, Whether the *Biſhop of Conſtance, Metropolitan* of the *Province* of *Cyprus*, was to be *ordained* by the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, or (without ſeeking *abroad*) by his own *Synod*, the *Biſhops* of *Cyprus*. Thus is the ſtate of the *Queſtion* ſet down 4. in the *Councils*, *Tom.* 2. p. 670. at the *beginning* of the 7 *Action*. *Diſcuſſa eſt controverſia inter Rheginum Epiſcopum Conſtantiæ Cypri, & Johannem Antiochenum, qui ſibi Cyprias Eccleſias ſubdere moliebatur. The Controverſie was diſcuſſed between* Rheginus *Biſhop of* Conſtance *of* Cyprus, *and* John *of* Antioch, *who endeavoured to bring the Cypriots Churches into ſubjection to himſelf.*

Secondly, That the *antient cuſtom* had been favourable to *Rheginus* his *pretenſion*, and ſo the claim 5. of *Antioch* is defined πρᾶγμα παρὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς θεσμοὺς — καινοτομούμενον, *a thing innovated againſt the Eccleſiaſtical Laws*, and ſo τῆς πάντων ἐλευθερίας ἀπτόμενον, that which, by the *example*, or *precedent*, *would concern the liberty of all Churches.* Cod. Can. Eccl. Un. 90.

Thirdly, That the *Council* defined on the *Cypriots* ſide, that according to the *Canons*, and *antient* 6. *cuſtom*, the *Biſhops* of *Cyprus* ſhould *retain* their *privilege inviolable*, δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰς χειροτονίας τῶν ἐυλαβεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ποιούμενοι, *ordaining their Biſhops within, and by themſelves*; and conſequently, that it was an *act* of *aſſuming*, and *invaſion* in the *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, to claim τὰς ἐν Κύπρῳ ποιήσας χειροτονίας, *to make any Ordinations within* Cyprus. And what was thus adjudged in the caſe of the *Cypriots*, was by that *Council* in the ſame *Canon*, thought fit to be *extended* in like manner to all other *Provinces* (τὸ δ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἐπὶ ἄλλων διοικήσεων, καὶ ἐπὶ ἁπασταχοῦ ἐπαρχιῶν παραφυλαχθήσεται, *the ſame ſhall be obſerved alſo through all Dioceſes and Provinces every where*) ὥστε μηδένα, &c. *that no Biſhop ſhall meddle with another Province, which hath not from the beginning been under him*, i. e. *under his predeceſſors power.* And ſo there is no truth in what is here ſuggeſted, that this of *Cyprus* was a *peculiar excepted caſe*; It certainly, by the expreſs words of the *Canon*, belonged to *all other Metropolitans* and their *Provinces* over all the world, that neither *Biſhop* of *Antioch* nor of *Rome* was to meddle with any *ordinations* except in their own *particular Provinces*, but the *Synod* of the *Biſhops* of each *Province*, δι' ἑαυτῶν τὰς χειροτονίας ἐπισκόπων ποιούμενοι, *to make the Ordinations of their Biſhops by themſelves.*

What he adds of the *ſuperiority* of *Patriarchs* by *cuſtom* received from their *Anceſtors*, *Firſt*, that 7. the reaſon given in that *Epheſine Canon* doth ſhew it; *Secondly*, that it is *contrary* to that which the *Doctor before affirmed*; *Thirdly*, that it is ſtill nothing to the *purpoſe* in hand, of the *authority* of the *Pope*; hath not, that I can diſcern, any *truth* in any part of it. For as to the *firſt*, whatſoever *ſuperiority Patriarchs* be acknowleded to have, there is no word of mention concerning it in that *Canon*, neither was there any *occaſion* to define any thing of it: It was the *Synod*, and *Biſhops* of *Cyprus* their right, that was *invaded* and of that only that *Canon* ſpeaks, devolving it to *original* cuſtom, and *Canons*, and ſo for all other *Metropolitans*. But that is not the *ſuperiority* of *Patriarchs*. *Secondly*, for my *affirmation*, certainly it was never ſuch as could be *deemed contrary* either to that *Epheſine Canon* about *ordination* of their *Metropolitans*, or that due *ſuperiority*, which by *Canons* or *cuſtoms* doth belong to *Primates* or *Patriarchs*; what this is, I have often ſet down, and need not again repeat it.

Laſtly, For the application of this *Canon* to the preſent affair of the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of the 8. *Biſhop* of *Rome*, thus much is evident, *Firſt*, that all *Provinces* every where, αἱ ἁπασταχοῦ ἐπαρχίαι were concluded by this *Canon*, that they ſhould *ordain* their *Biſhops* within themſelves; and then I pray, how can the χειροτονία power of *ordaining* all, belong to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*; and *ordination* and *juriſdiction* going together, how can he have the *Univerſal Juriſdiction*, or which is all one, the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip?*

Secondly, If the *Pope* his *authority* be not *Patriarchal*, as this *Gentleman* here ſaith, then till he hath 9. proved that it is more than *Patriarchal*, and anſwered all that is ſaid to the *contrary* in that *Tract* of *Schiſm*, that which is by the *Epheſine Canon* judged in order to the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, will alſo *conclude* him.

And *Thirdly*, That which is held by the *inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, being certainly derived ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *from* 10. *the beginning*, muſt needs be included in the words of this *Canon*, which requires that all ſhould remain, as by *cuſtom* (immemorial) *from the beginning* it had been; to which therefore we appeal, and inquire, whether *Cyprus* was not as *Independent* from *Rome* at that time, as from *Antioch*; if not, how any ſuch *dependance* at that time appears, or how is it imaginable there ſhould be any ſuch, when all *Provinces* every where were to be *ruled* and ordered δι' ἑαυτῶν *by their own Synod* and *Biſhops.*

As for the *tenure*, by which the *Pope* is now, in the cloſe of this *Paragraph*, clearly ſaid to ſtand, 11. not *from any inſtitution or cuſtom of the Church, but from the inſtitution of Chriſt. Firſt*, This is more than ever this *Gentleman* would acknowledge before, telling us p. 14. that *who underſtands the Principles of the Catholick Faith, knows they relie not only upon ſuch places of Scripture, as, Thou art* Peter,

and

and *Feed my Sheep*, From whence I thought my self obliged to conclude they *relied* not *only* on *Christ*'s *institution*, for that I suppose must be set down in some, and if in any, sure in *those Scriptures*,
p. 10. And in another place, that I *forget my self when I think a Catholick ought to prove that the Pope hath an Universal Primacy* referring all to his *Possession*) whereas in case he pretend to hold by the *institution* of *Christ* (as here he saith) certainly he is obliged to produce that *institution*, and that is to prove his *pretension*.

12. But then *secondly*, that there is indeed any such thing, that the *Pope* holds by *Institution* of *Christ*, is still the thing denied by us, and the contrary, I think, demonstrated in the former *Chapter*, and all the places producible for it, answered, and so it must not be here *begged* or assumed, without any word added for the *proof* of it.

SECT. VI.

The Exemption of Justiniana Prima; *The several Exceptions against this Instance answered.*

Numb. 1. HIS next *Paragraph* pretends to be *answer* to the *evidence* brought from the *example* of *Justiniana Prima*, which was by the *Emperour* made *independent* from any other *Ecclesiastical* Power. His Answer is this,

2. *Then he goes on with two Examples, in which he would perswade us that* Justiniana Prima, *and* Carthage *were made exempt Cities by the Emperour, and seeth not that his own instance giveth the Answer, for as in the temporal donation, he doth not exempt them from his own subjection, so neither from the Popes in spiritual, nor as much as giveth them the Style of Patriarchs; though the Bishop of* Constantinople *in his own City ordinarily had it.*

3. That *Justiniana Prima* was by *Justinian* exempted from all others (and so from the *Bishop* of *Rome* his) *Jurisdiction* (and so *Carthage* also, being invested with the same *privileges*) I thought sufficiently proved by the plain words of the *Constitution*, that for any differences that should befal in that *Province*, the *Archbishop* of that new erection from time to time, should decide them finally, *nec ad alium quendam eatur*, and *they should go to no other* for *decision*, or by way of *appeal*; and so in the *Novel*, ἔχῃ ὑπὸ τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοδοσίαν τὰς ὁπισκόπους, &c. he shall *have under his own jurisdiction the Bishops of* Dacia, *&c* which what is it, but a perfect *exemption* and *independency?*

4. The same appears also by the other part of the *constitution*, that concerning *ordination* of that *Archbishop*, it was, as was said, to be done by his *own Synod* of *Metropolitans*. To which agrees that of the *Novel* 131. Αὐτόνομος ὑπὸ τῆς οἰκείας συνόδου χειροτονείσθω, *He must be ordained by his own Synod.*

5. To this Answer given here, *and given*, saith he, *by my own instance*, is no more than this, that as in the *temporal donation he doth not exempt them from his own subjection, so neither from the Popes in spiritual.* But sure there is no force in this *comparison*; For the *not exempting* him in *temporal* things from his own *power*, doth no way conclude a *non-exemption* from the *Pope*; When *Henry* VIII. removed the *Papal* power out of this Nation, no man thinks he divested himself of the *Regal*; the *Archbishop* of *Canterbury* was made *Independent*, and *exempt* from the *Bishop* of *Rome*, but remained still *subordinate* to the *King*: So in like manner *Justinian* might do, make *Justiniana* a *Primacy*, and yet leave the *Bishop* and his whole *Province* in the same *subjection* to the *Emperour*, that before it had been; And as this is very possible, so if it were not the plain truth of the *fact*, that must be made appear by the *Story*, or by the *investiture*.

6. In that, there is no sound of any word for the *exempting* that *Bishop* from the *Imperial subjection*, and so we cannot imagine, without any *ground*, that there was any such thing; but for *Ecclesiastical judicature* and *ordination*, they are both distinctly specified, that he and his *Metropolitans* should have them within themselves, without fetching them abroad from any other; and so by that, the *Bishop* of *Rome* is explicitely excluded from having any thing to do there.

7. This farther appears, not only by the matter of *fact*, for after the *first Archbishop* was ordained by *Pope Vigilius*, his *Successours* were constantly *ordained* by their own *Metropolitans*, and not by the *Bishop*
* Νεαρ. ρλα. of *Rome*; but also by farther expres words in the * *Novel*, ἐν δὲ αὐταῖς κατακυρώσεις αὐτῷ ἐπαρχίας ἢ τοπὸν ἐπέχειν αὐτὸν τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ῥώμης θρόνου, *In the Provinces subject to him, he shall hold the place of the Apostolical Seat of* Rome, *i. e.* do all within those *Provinces* that the *Bishop* of *Rome* was wont to do, before this *Primacy* was erected; and this, it seems, by direct *consent* of *Vigilius* then *Pope*, as there it follows, καὶ τὰ ὁρισθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Πάπα Βιγιλίου, *according to what was defined by the Holy Father* Vigilius.

8. Which words if they be conceived to denote no more than a *deputation* from the *Pope*, by which this *power* was held, and so be made use of as an *argument* to infer his *continued* dependence on the *See* of *Rome*, that will be found to be a mistake, the whole *investiture* giving the *Archbishop* there αὐτοκεφαλία a perfect *freedom*, and *absoluteness*, to *be Head* within his *Province*, *independent* from all others. And should it by any other way appear that *Vigilius*, who *ordained* the first *Bishop* there (as 'tis sure he must be ordained by *some* body, and none fitter for it than the *Bishop* of *old Rome*) did farther give him a *deputation*, as I see it affirmed (but not by this *Gentleman*) both of *Vigilius*, and after him of *Gregory*; yet certainly this was but a *formality*, without any farther *effect* or *influence* on the *investiture*; the *privileges* of that *See*, came to it meerly by the *Act* of the *Emperour* (and that *Act* was entred a part of the *Imperial Law*) to which the supposed *addition* of the *Pope*'s *deputation* can be no *prejudice*; And *secondly*, the *Bishop* of *Carthage*, which by that *Constitution* is invested with the very same *privileges* by the *Emperour*, is not pretended to have received any such *deputation* from the *Pope*, and yet by virtue of the *Emperour*'s act was freed from all *former dependence*, and enjoyed the πρεσβεῖον and δίκαιον μητροπολιτικὸν the *privilege* of a *Metropolitan*, in the same manner, as *Justiniana* did.

9. What this *Gentleman* adds, that the *Emperour* gave not so much as the *style* of *Patriarch* to the *Bishop* of *Justiniana*, *though the Bishop of* Constantinople *in his own City ordinarily had it*, will soon appear to

to ſignifie nothing; For *firſt*, the *power*, not the *title*, is that we ſpeak of, and that may be had in *plenitude*, without the name; the *Archbiſhop* of *Cyprus* was by the *Council* of *Epheſus* adjudged to have all power within himſelf, ſo as to go neither to *Antioch* nor to *Rome* for it, and yet was not raiſed to any higher title, than that of *Archbiſhop*.

Secondly, I ſuppoſe *Primate* and *Patriarch* to be perfectly all one, as to matter of *power* and *dignity*; 10.
that the *Archbiſhops* of *Conſtantinople* and *Hieruſalem*, ſo ſtyled in the *antient Canons*, were yet ordinarily called *Patriarchs*, was no injury to the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, ſaith *Theod. Balſamon*, himſelf *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, in his μελέτη περὶ Παλειαρχ. πεφυμ. διὰ τὴν ταυτότητα τῆς τιμῆς, *becauſe of the identity of the honour*. And acccordingly in the *Councils*, the *Archbiſhop* of *Conſtantinople*, under that title, is placed before the *Patriarch* of *Antioch*, yea and of *Alexandria*, who yet by the θεῖαι καὶ ἁγίαι γεγραφαὶ, *divine and holy Writings* (*i. e.* the *Canons*) by the πάτριαι παραδόσεις, *traditions of the Fathers*, was ſtyled *Pope*, ſaith *Balſamon*. And therefore for *Juſtiniana* alſo this was ſufficient; It was made a *Primacy*, and then it matters not, though it were not ſtyled a *Patriarchy*; The *exemption* from *Rome* and all other foreign power, is all I pretend this *City* had, and of that there can be no *Queſtion*, whatſoever title belonged to it.

Thirdly, This *Gentleman*'s ſaying that the *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople* had the *title* of *Patriarch in his* 11.
own City, would make one believe that he had it not *elſewhere*, which yet it is notorious that he had, Παλειάρχας ἀνακηρύτλειν, he and the *Archbiſhop* of *Jeruſalem* were *publickly called Patriarchs*, ſaith *Balſamon*; and he renders the reaſon, διὰ τὸ ἐπέχειν τὰς πέντε παλειάρχας τοπὸν τῆς μιᾶς κεφαλῆς τῷ σώματος, πλαδὴ τῆς ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ, *becauſe the five Patriarchs* (of which number they were *two*) *held the place of the Head of the Body, to wit, of the holy Churches of God*. But whatſoever the *title* were, it is ſtill ſure enough, it had the *power* and *dignity* of a *Patriarchate*, firſt by *cuſtom*, then by *Canons* of *two General Councils*, *Conſtantinople* and *Chalcedon* (for I ſuppoſe the ſetting is next and *equal* to *Rome*, and before *Antioch* and *Alexandria*, will amount to this) alſo by that very *Novel* of *Juſtinian*, where Νεαρ. 131.
the *privileges* are conferred on *Juſtiniana*, τὸν μακαριώτατον Ἀρχιεπίσκοπον Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τῆς νέας Ῥώμης δευτέραν τάξιν ἐπέχειν μετὰ τὸν ἅγιον ἀποστολικὸν θρόνον τῆς πρεσβυτέρας Ῥώμης, ὥστε ἄλλων πάντων πρωτιμᾶσθαι, *the Archbiſhop of new* Rome, Conſtantinople, *hath the next place after the Apoſtolical See of old* Rome, *and the precedence of honour before all others*. And ſo much for the *Exceptions* to the *fifth Chapter*.

CHAP. VI.

An Anſwer to the Exceptions made to the ſixth Chapter.

SECT. I.

The Plea for the Popes power from the converſion of England. *Of acquiring of Right by two Titles.*

THE Plea from *plantation*, which was *conſidered* in the *ſixth Chapter*, he now proceeds to, in *Numb.* 1.
theſe words,

In his ſixth Chapter he examineth another title peculiar to England, viz. *that our Nation was con-* 2.
verted by miſſion from Rome; *and this is totally beſide the Queſtion, for no man is ſo ſtupid as to pretend* Sect. 1.
S. Peter *or the Church of* Rome *to have power over the Univerſal Church, becauſe his Succeſſours converted* England: *But ſome pretend a ſpecial title of gratitude, the violation of which, aggravateth the ſin of ſchiſmatizing from the Church of* Rome *in our Nation, yet no man, as far as I can underſtand, thinks this latter obligation of ſo high a nature, as that for no occaſion or never ſo great cauſe, it may not be diſpenſed with, but only preſs it then when the benefit is ſlighted, or by colourable Arguments to the contrary unworthily avoided: And yet this Doctor quite miſtaking the Queſtion, frameth an Argument, as full of words as empty of* Sect. 2.
matter, affirming there cannot be two ſucceſſive titles to poſſeſſion of the ſame thing, telling us, that he who claimeth a reward as of his own labour and travel, muſt diſclaim a donation, &c. if any paſſed before, and that if a King have right by deſcent, he cannot claim any thing by Conqueſt, by which you may ſee his underſtanding the Law, is not much more than his underſtanding of our Principles.

What this *Gentleman* here premiſeth, that this *Plea* from the *Converſion* of this *Nation* by *miſſion* 3.
from *Rome* is not uſed by the *Romaniſt* to prove us *Schiſmaticks*, I have no reaſon to confute, but ſhall from thence ſuppoſe that that *ſixth Chapter* might have been ſpared out of that little *Treatiſe*, and our *Church* competently juſtified by the *precedent Chapters*; And then all that I ſhall need add, is, *Firſt*, that I hope what was by me added *ſuperfluouſly*, above the neceſſities of our cauſe, will not deſtroy what was before ſaid *pertinently*; and then, as I ſhall only have loſt my *pains*, and there is no farther *hurt* done, ſo it muſt needs be very *unneceſſary* for this *Gentleman* to adapt any farther *Anſwers* to that *ſixth Chapter*, when he hath once adjudged all that is there ſaid, to be totally beſide the *Queſtion*.

Secondly, That if others had been as *prudent*, as this *Gentleman*, I had certainly ſpared that *Chapter*, 4.
It being no intereſt of mine to invent *Pleas* for the *Romaniſt*; and although, as this *Gentleman* hath pleaſed to ſet it, it be a competent ſtupidity, and that which I never thought any *Romaniſt* guilty of, to make the *converſion* of *England* a *Plea* to *power over the Univerſal Church*; yet *England*, and not the *Univerſal Church*, being the Subject of our *Queſtion*, there is not quite ſo much *ſtupidity* in it, to plead the *Popes* power over *England* from the *ſuppoſed converſion* of *England*. And certainly I did not dream that ſome *Romaniſts* have thus *pleaded*, but, as I ſaid before, if this *Gentleman* will not inſiſt on it, neither ſhall I farther *importune* him about it.

For that of *gratitude* which he now mentions only as an *aggravation* of the ſin of *ſchiſmatizing*, 5.

which that we are guilty of, he acknowledges muſt be proved by ſome other means, I yield to the force of it, that it might juſtly add a *weight* to the obligation, which formerly lay upon us, ſuppoſing any ſuch there were, but cannot lay an *obligation* to *obedience* where before it was not due, much leſs were it due unto *another*. All the benefits that can be heaped on me by any man that gives me not my Being, cannot *oblige* or *engage* my *ſubjection* to him, without the *intervenience* of my own *conſent*, if I am perfectly free to chuſe my *Sovereign*, and without the conſent of my former *Sovereign*, if I have any.

6. So that the whole *Queſtion* muſt be, whether by any *original right*, the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had power over this *Kingdom*, and ſo whether by that, our *obedience* was due to him; for if it were, then this *gratitude* was not the *tenure*, but that other; and if it were not, then neither of the *titles* are in force againſt us; not the firſt, which hath no *being*; nor the ſecond, which whatſoever it be, obligeth not to *obedience*.

7. This I thought was apparent by the *inſtance* of the ſeveral *claims* to a *Kingdom*, by *deſcent*, and by *conqueſt*, the one of which, if it ſtood, as the *title*, ſuperſedeth the other, he that holds by *inheritance*, cannot be properly ſaid to hold by *conqueſt*, even when it is true that he hath *conquered* alſo. For in that Caſe, when the right Heir being forced to make uſe of his *Sword* to give him *poſſeſſion*, is *ſucceſsful* and *victorious* in it, all that his *Sword* doth, is to give him *poſſeſſion*, not to give him *right*, for that he had before by *inheritance*.

8. That the ſame *right* cannot be held by two *tenures*, appears by this; becauſe if it might, it being evidently poſſible that thoſe two *tenures* might be *ſeparated* and placed in ſeveral *Subjects*, the *inheritance* in one, the *conqueſt* in another, it muſt follow from thence, that each of thoſe perſons ſhall have the *right*; which as it is unimaginable, ſpeaking of the whole *right* or *propriety in integrum* to the whole *power*, for if one have it *all*, the other can have no part of it, ſo if it be applied to a *partial right* (which more than one may have, either *ſeverally*, or *ſocially*, and *jointly*, to the ſame thing) then that is the changing of the *Queſtion*, which ſpake of the *whole right*, and not only of ſome one or more *parts* or *branches* of it.

9. And therefore as this *Gentleman* agrees with me in the *concluſion*, that *Rome* hath no title to our *obedience*, from that of *converting* us, or if it had, it could not plead the ſame from S. *Peter*'s *univerſal Paſtorſhip*; ſo I cannot diſcern, why my way of *inferring* it, was diſliked, or my *ignorance* in the *Laws* cenſured, for ſaying that the *title* of *deſcent* is excluſive to that of *conqueſt*, meaning it not of *ſeveral* parts, of which one comes by *deſcent*, the other by *conqueſt*, but of the ſame whole thing, of which he that hath the right by *deſcent*, may by the *ſword* and *conqueſt* vindicate his *right*, and *acquire quiet poſſeſſion*, but cannot be ſaid to *acquire* his *right* by thoſe means, being ſuppoſed to have had it, before he made uſe of them

SECT. II.

The Britiſh Church not converted from Rome.

Numb. 1. HAving granted me my *concluſion*, that our *obedience* to *Rome* is not due from the *Nation*'s *converſion* by *miſſion* from thence, he is yet reſolved to examine my *Arguments*, by which I prove what he *grants*. And there be *three* things, that here he takes notice of. The firſt in theſe words,

2. *But to come to ſome matter; His firſt Argument is, that this Iſland was converted before S.* Auguſtine's *time; ſurely he means by the name of Iſland, the Land and Mountains and Trees, for if he ſpeak of the men, what hath the converſion of the former Iſlanders to do with the ſubjection and duty which the Saxons owe?*

3. I anſwer, by this *Iſland*, I mean not the *Mountains*, nor *Trees* on one ſide, any more than the *preſent individual perſons* on the other ſide, but the *inhabitants* of it *indefinitely*, who have *ſucceeded* one another, whether *Britiſh* or *Saxon* by extraction. For, *firſt*, of the *Britiſh* it is certain that they were not converted by *miſſion* from *Rome*, but were *Chriſtians* long before S. *Auguſtine*'s coming hither; And *Secondly*, of the *Saxons* it may be remembred, that *Auguſtine* did not *abſolutely* introduce *Chriſtianity* among them here, but *Luidhardus*, that came out of *France* with *Bertha*, *Ethelbert*'s Wife, and was a *Biſhop* here, had prepared the way for *Auguſtine*. See *Bede Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. 1. c. 25, 26. And *Thirdly*, if *Auguſtine* were the firſt *Converter* of the *Saxons*, and ſo that be, without farther *Queſtion*, granted of him, yet that cannot belong to the whole *Iſland*, the *Dominion* of *Wales* being neither of *Saxon* extraction, nor converted from *Rome* to *Chriſtianity* And this is the deſign of that Argument of mine, In Caſe there were a Duty owing to that *See*, from whence the Converter came, and in Caſe that were acknowledged to pertain to the *Saxons*, yet ſtill the *Britiſh* part would not be concluded by either of theſe, it being certain that their *Anceſtors* were not comprehended in this number.

4. But becauſe this *Gentleman* waves this title from *converſion*, neither ſhall I farther inſiſt to diſprove it; But rather ask, why no *Anſwer* was made to thoſe *teſtimonies*, which in that Caſe were occaſionally vouched to ſhew that at the time of *Auguſtine*'s *coming* into this *Iſland*, the *Chriſtian Church* here acknowledged no ſubjection to *Rome*, or to any other *Church*, to be due from them; which certainly is ſome *prejudice* to the claim drawn from the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of S. *Peter* and his *Succeſſor* at *Rome*.

5. To that which is there ſaid for the evidencing this out of the *Annals* of *Giſbourn*, It will not be amiſs here to add what our *Stories* tell us, that when the *Pelagian Hereſie*, which firſt ſprang from *Morgan* a *Britain*, was by *Agricola* brought into this *Iſland*, the *Britains* * *unwilling to receive their infuſions*, and yet *unable to reſiſt them* without aſſiſtance from ſome other *Church* in this time of need, applied not themſelves to *Rome*, as in their † *ſecular* diſtreſſes they had accuſtomed, but to their Neighbours of *France*, who calling a *Council* ſent *Germanus Altiſiodorenſis* and *Lupus* to their aid, by which means the *Catholick Faith* was much revived and increaſed and *propagated* among them.

* Neq; ſuſcipere dogma perverſum vellent, neq; verſutiam nefariæ perſuaſionis refutare verbis certando ſufficerent. Bed. l. 1. c. 17. † *Bed.* l. 1. c. 12, 13.

SECT.

SECT. III.

S. Paul's *plantations an argument against the Universal Pastorship of S.* Peter. *S.* Paul's *being Bishop of* Rome, *no answer to it.*

THE *Argument* which he next speaks to, is that wherein from *Paul*'s having planted some *Churches*, which yet are not subjected to the *Chair*, where S. *Paul* sate (whether *Antioch* or *Rome*) I conclude against this *claim* of power from the *title* of conversion: To this he thus speaks, *Numb.* 1.

His next Argument demandeth, whether all that S. Paul *converted, were obliged to be under him; truly if it were to purpose, I believe there might be proof that S.* Paul *expected it; but he doth not remember that he told us, S.* Paul *was Bishop of* Rome, *and so it cometh to the same question; but indeed he quite misseth the matter, for no body stateth this for the Popes title, but aggravation of the Schism.* 2. Sect. 8.

To what purpose it is to say, there *might be proof*, and yet to *produce* none, I know not: This only I desire to note, that if any such *proof* were produced, and, without that, by the bare pretending that it *might* be *proved*, *S.* Peter's *Universal Pastorship* must be disclaimed, and consequently all right which derives its *original* from thence. 3.

For *S.* Paul's *labours* being more *abundant than all* the *Apostles*, 'tis certain great numbers were *converted* by him, and if all they were to be under S. *Paul*, how can S. *Peter* be *Pastor* and *Ruler* of *all*, it being certain, that S. *Paul* was not *subordinate* to S. *Peter*? 4.

And it is of little force what I am reminded of (though sure I never *forgot* it) that *S.* Paul *was Bishop of* Rome, *and so it cometh to the same question*: For 1. S. *Paul* being *Bishop* of the *Gentile* part of the *Roman Christians*, as S. *Peter* of the *Jewish*, and those then *disparate* congregations, S. *Paul* cannot be thought in his *converting* the *Gentiles* of other nations, to bring in *subjects* to S. *Peter*; And 2. it is evident that S. *Paul* was not *Bishop* of *Rome* when he placed *Timothy* over *Asia*, and *Titus* over *Crete*, and consequently the *conversion* and establishment of those *Churches* was not in any reason to acquire any *Dominion* to *Rome*, which S. *Paul* had never seen at that time, and which was it self *converted* after those, and that was it which I was proving. 5.

But he bethinketh himself at last, and confesseth that this of *conversion* is not the *Pope*'s *title* to *England*; And having done so before, why might he not have permitted me to bring undeniable *evidences* for the proof of it? 6.

SECT. IV.

The concernments of Rome *in the Princes power to remove Patriarchates. The examples of it.* Justiniana, *the Canon of* Chalcedon, *and the the sixth Council.* Valentinian *making* Ravenna *a Patriarchate.* Ἄνωθεν δοθεῖσα.

TO put this whole matter out of *controversie*, *viz.* that the *Church* of *England* is not bound to be *subject* to that *Church*, from which it first received the *Faith*, one head of *Argument* Ipitcht on, the *power* of *Kings* to *remove* or *erect Primacies* and *Patriarchates*, which if it hath truth in it, evidently proves, that in case we were once under the *See* of *Rome*, as our *Patriarchate* or *Prime See* (supposing that of *Universal Pastorship* disproved before, and not reconcileable with this *title* to *England* by having *converted*) yet it was in the *power* of our *Kings* to *remove* that from *Rome* to *Canterbury*. For the proof of this, evidences were brought both from the *Council* (and that *Oecumenical*) of *Chalcedon*, and from the *practice* of *Princes*, particularly *Justinian* in an eminent instance, and *Valentinian* and others before the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, and many the like examples in the *Records* of this *Kingdom*, and of others, as is shewed at large, and the ground of all insisted on, the *supreme* power of *Kings* in *Ecclesiastical* affairs, and this is done in *sixteen Sections*, from the *ninth* to the end of that *Chapter*. Against all which (that we may see how true the *title* of this *Gentleman*'s *Book* is, *An Answer to the most material parts*, &c.) that which is confronted, is contained in these words, *Numb.* 1.

Thirdly, He saith it was in the Emperors power to constitute Patriarchs whether that be so or not, it will not be much to our purpose to dispute here; only this I say, that he seems neither to understand the question, nor proves what he would; he understands not the question, which hath no dependency on the nature of Patriarchs, or terms of gratitude, but on the donation of Christ: he proves not what he would, for he produceth only the act of an Emperour accounted Tyrannical towards the Church, without proof and discussion whether it was well or ill done, which was requisite, to make good his proof; neither doth he say, whether the thing were done or no by the consent of Bishops, especially since the Pope was an Actor in the business; he addeth an Apocryphal decree of Valentinian *the third, for giving of privileges purely Ecclesiastical to the Bishop of* Ravenna, *which out of his liberality he makes a Patriarch, but on the whole matter this is to be observed, that generally the Bishops consents were predemanded or preordered, as in the Council of* Chalcedon, Can. 17. *it is ordered that the Church should translate their Bishopricks according to the Emperors changing of his City, and when the Emperors did it, it is said they did it according to the power given them, to wit, by the Church; so that a few examples to the contrary, produced in the Reigns of head-strong and tyrannical Princes, as the most of those are noted to be, under whom they are urged, prove nothing; and if they did, yet cannot they be taken as testimonies, when these matters of fact are only so attributed to Princes, as no way to exclude the Church; but whatsoever it was, it doth not at all appertain to the question, since the Popes authority, in the sense he calls him Pope, is not properly Patriarchal, nor hath any dependency upon or from change of places made by the command of Princes.* 2.

The first thing here answered is, that it is not much to the *Romanists* purpose to *dispute*, whether or no the *Emperor* hath power to *constitute Patriarchs*. (He ought to have added, or to *translate* 3.

them from one *City* to *another*; for that is in that *Tract* alſo expreſly proved; but this I ſuppoſe not without *reaſon* omitted, becauſe the power to *erect* or *conſtitute*, ſuppoſes and implies the power to *tranſlate* them.) And if this be not this *Gentleman*'s intereſt to *diſpute*, I ſhall then by his good leave, *ſuppoſe* it yielded me, and obſerve what the *conſequences* will be.

4. And 1. In caſe the *power* of the *Pope* be a *Patriarchal* power, and no more, and that appear to be all that the *antient Councils* ever allowed it to be, then it immediately follows, that it is in the power of the *Emperor* to *tranſlate* and *remove* it from that to any other *See*; and in that caſe, what befel *Conſtantinople* by way of *advancement*, from the *title* of an *ordinary Suffragan Biſhops* See, it aſcended to *equal* dignity and *privileges* with *Rome* it ſelf, will in the *reverſe* be the condition of *Rome*; from the firſt *Patriarchal* See in the *whole* world, nothing hinders but that it may become the *See* of the moſt *ordinary Biſhop*. And ſure 'twill be the *Romaniſts* concernment to diſpute that principle, from which this may poſſibly be the *undeniable concluſion*.

5. But if, as here it ſeems to be interpoſed, the *power* of *Rome* be that of *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, no way dependant on the nature of *Patriarchs*, or on any other tenure, but the *donation* of *Chriſt* to S. *Peter*, then 1. it muſt be remembred that after the refuting of any ſuch *right* from *Chriſts donation* in the former *Chapters*, the *removal* alſo of this, was in all reaſon to prove of ſome *intereſt* to the *Romaniſt*, and ſo it muſt, till the proofs of thoſe *Chapters* be perfectly anſwered, which yet hath not been done in any *degree*, as this reply to the few anſwers applyed to thoſe *Chapters* hath *ſhewed*.

6. *Secondly*, This adhering thus wholly to this *donation* of *Chriſt*, and the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* deduced from thence, is the direct diſclaiming of all the *Canonical Privileges* belonging to *Rome*, on the ſcore of *Patriarchy*, and ſo in caſe that firſt *tenure* ſhall fail, it is the *degrading* of *Rome* from that *dignity*, which by *antient Canon* belong'd to it, that of the *Prime Patriarchy*, and ſo cuts the *Romaniſt* off from all the advantage he can reap either from the affirmation of *Fathers* or *Councils*, any farther than they are founded in, and refer to *Chriſts donation* of *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* to Saint *Peter*; which whether it will prove to be the *intereſt* of this *Gentleman*, I muſt leave him to judge for himſelf, and only add in the laſt place, that againſt him that aſſerts the *Biſhop* of *Romes Univerſal Paſtorſhip* upon what title ſoever, this will neceſſarily be a ſhrewd *prejudice*, if it be not diſputed but yielded, that it is in the *power* of *Princes* to *erect* or *tranſlate Patriarchies*, by *Patriarchies* underſtanding (as it is evident I do in that diſcourſe) chief *Independent* authorities over other *Churches*, ſuch as was by *Juſtinian* conferred on *Juſtiniana Prima* and *Carthage*, by *Valentinian* on *Ravenna* without any *ſubordination* to, or *dependence* on any other, particularly on the *See* of *Rome*.

7. Can any thing be more *prejudicial* to the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of *Rome* than this? Can *Rome* be *Paſtor* of thoſe who have no *dependance* on her; or can that be *Univerſal*, from which ſome particulars are *exempt?*

8. This made it but *neceſſary* for this *Gentleman* to undertake *two* things in the following words, that I *neither underſtand the queſtion, nor prove what I would*; for if I ſhall yet appear to *judge* aright of the *queſtion*, even as it is by this *Gentleman* brought back to that which had been debated in the *former Chapters*, whether the *Biſhop* of *Rome* be *Univerſal Paſtor* by *Chriſts donation* to S. *Peter*, and if I have really proved that it is in the *power* of *Emperors* and *Princes* to *conſtitute* and *remove Patriarchies*, It will certainly follow, that I have done all that I *undertook* to do, evinced the matter of the *queſtion*, and ſhewed that it is in the *power* of *Princes* to exempt ſome *Churches* from the *Popes* dominion, and ſo ſuperſeded the *Univerſality* of his *Paſtorſhip*.

9. As for the *validity* of my *proofs*, that muſt be judged by the *view* of the *Anſwers* applyed to them, 1. that I *produce only the act of an Emperor accounted Tyrannical towards the Church*. To this I anſwer, *Firſt*, That the word [*only*] excluding all others, the *propoſition* can have no truth in it, it being evident that I produce many other *acts* of the ſame *Imperial power*, as the *Reader* may find by caſting his eye on the place, the latter part of that *ſixth Chap.* and this *Gentleman* himſelf ſhall be my witneſs, (who ſaith of me [*he addeth an Apocryphal decree of* Valentinian] which though it be not a *recitation* of all that are by me added, yet is ſufficient to *teſtifie* the *contrary*, to what the [*only*] had affirmed.)

10. *Secondly*, The *character* that is given that *Emperor*, whoſe act I firſt produced, that he is *accounted Tyrannical towards the Church*, will, I ſuppoſe, ſignifie but this, that he that did any thing *derogatory* to the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, is by this prejudged from yielding us any *competent* teſtimony in this diſpute; which is in effect, that this *Gentleman* is in the *right*, and all that is, or ſhall, or can be brought *againſt* him, muſt ſignifie *nothing*; which ſure is not the way of *anſwering* arguments, but adhering to *concluſions*, without weighing what is or can be brought againſt them.

11. *Thirdly*, For that *particular* act, and the *Emperor* which is thus *cenſured*: It is *Juſtinian*, that *great* and *famous Emperor*, his making the *Biſhop* of *Juſtiniana Prima* the head of all *Dacia*, *&c.* of which this *Gentleman* had paſt a very different *judgment*, when it came under his *view* in the *former* Chapter.

12. There his *anſwer* was, the *Emperor exempted* it not from the *Popes ſubjection*, *pag.* 15. and yet now when the very ſame *paſſage* comes in his way again, he hath forgotten himſelf; and the *Emperor*, that juſt now had as great *care* of the *Popes ſpiritual power*, as of his *own civil*, is in a moment become *Tyrannical towards the Church*. I deſire one of theſe *anſwers*, being thus engaged, may make good the *conteſt* againſt the other.

13. But then *Fourthly*, whatſoever can be ſaid of that *Emperor* in other reſpects, 'tis certain that this erecting of *Juſtiniana*, was no act of *tyranny* againſt the *Church*; but the very thing that is *authoriſed* by the *ſeventeenth Canon* of the *General Council* of *Chalcedon* (which is one of thoſe that the *Pope* at his *conſecration* ſolemnly vows to obſerve, and all the *Ordinances* made in them) for that reſolves, that if any *City* be built or reſtored by the *Kings power*, the *Eccleſiaſtical* order muſt follow the *Political*, τύποι *i. e.* the βασιλικὰ πραγμάτα, ſaith the *Scholiaſt*, the *Imperial decrees* concerning that *City* * ἔχειν ἀξίωμα ἢ μητροπόλεως, *to have the dignity of an Epiſcopal or Metropolitical See.* And the ſame again in the ſame words was decreed by the *ſixth Council in Trullo*, *Can.* 38. from whence certainly *Balſamon*'s Concluſion is irrefragable, † ὅτι ἔξεστι τῷ βασιλεῖ πρυτάνια ἐκκλησιαστικὰ ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, *that it*

* *Balſam. in Concil. in Trull. Can.* 38.
† 1 *Concil. Chal.* 17.

it is lawful (and ſo ſure not *Tyrannical*) *for a Prince to take away* (or *remove*) *the privileges of the Church* of any *City*, and * ἀναλυτὴν τὰ βασιλέα αὐτῷ χάειν τῶν ἐπισκοπικῶν δικαίων, *to determine, as he ſhall pleaſe,* * *Ib. pag.* 342. *concerning the Privileges of Biſhops.*

His ſecond *Anſwer* is, that I do *not ſay whether the thing were done or no by the conſent of Biſhops,* 14. *eſpecially ſince the Pope was an Actor in the buſineſs.* To which I anſwer, that when I have made it appear to be the *Act* of the *Emperour*, and that by the *Canons* of *Councils* it was acknowledged fully *lawful* for the *Emperor*, and ſo for other *Princes*, to do ſo; I need neither enquire whether the *conſent* of *Biſhops*, or of the *Pope* himſelf were added to it; ſuch *formalities* of *conſent* may be had or omitted, without any *diſturbance* to, or *influence* on the matter.

His third *Anſwer* is applied to that *Act* of *Valentinian*, which made *Ravenna* a *Patriarchate*, and 15. firſt he calls the *Decree* of that *Emperor* an *Apocryphal Decree*; 2. He ſaith that it was *giving to the Biſhop privileges purely Eccleſiaſtical*, reproving me for making him a *Patriarch*. For the *firſt*, I anſwer, that as I never thought it any piece of the *Canon* of *Scripture*, by which *Valentinian* did this, or any more than a *Reſcript* of an *Emperor*, which, if ſuch, is certainly ſufficient to expreſs it an *Imperial Act*, ſo the *authorities* for this, may reſcue it from farther *Queſtion*; for though it were not *Baronius*'s intereſt to *believe* it, and ſo it is by him *ſuſpected* of *forgery*, *An.* 432. *n.* 93. yet even *he* acknowledgeth it to be *very antient*, and owned by *ſeveral Writers*, n. 92. and afterwards, when the ſame *authorities* which are produced for this, *Hier. Rubeus*, and the *Records* of *Ravenna*, ſeem to favour his *grand* deſign, *i. e.* make for *Rome*, he can then very fairly make uſe of them, though it be but a *narration* of a *viſion*, *An.* 433. n. 24. But I need not lay more *weight* on this, than the *Apocryphal* (as he calls it) *Decree* will be able to ſupport; this is no *ſingular* Precedent, many *examples* there are of the like, which are there mentioned in the *Tract* of *Schiſm.*

For the ſecond, *Patriarchal* power *Ravenna* had, without any *dependence* on the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, 16. and I pretend no more for the *Biſhop* of *Canterbury*, and therein alſo ſhall bate him the title of *Patriarch*. What he adds (by way of obſervation on the whole matter) *Firſt*, that *generally the Biſhops conſents were predemanded or preordered, as in the Council of* Chalcedon, *Can.* 17. *Secondly*, that what the *Emperors did*, they *did* by the *power given them by the Church*, will ſoon appear to bring him little *advantage*, For

1. The *Biſhop*'s (I ſuppoſe he means the *Biſhop* of *Rome*'s) *conſent* was not *asked*; One part of the 17. *Story* is, that when the *Biſhop* of *Ravenna*, being fain to flye to the *Biſhop* of *Rome* for ſupport againſt the *Longobards*, ſubmitted himſelf to him, the people of *Ravenna* thought themſelves *injured* thereby; And 2. it is not truly ſaid, that it was *preordered*; and the *Canon* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon* cannot be brought to that purpoſe, this *Act* of *Valentinian*'s dated *Anno* 432. being nineteen years before the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, which was aſſembled *Anno* 451. and ſo ſure not *preordained* by that which was ſubſequent; And indeed the *Canon* of that *Council* mentioning *Cities* and *Churches* in the *plural*, which had been * before the *Seſſions* made *Metropoles* by *ſeveral Kings*, is a clear evidence that there were other ſuch, beſide that of *Ravenna*, and † *Balſamon* expreſſeth them by the name of *Madyta* and *Abydus*, &c.

* ὅσαι ἢ ἤδη πόλεις διὰ γεγραμμάτων βασιλικῶν τῆς μητροπόλεως ἐτιμήσαν, Can. 12. † διαφόροι βασιλεῖς ἐπισκοπὰς εἰς μητροπόλεις ἐτίμησαν, *Balſam. in Can.* 12.

Thirdly, If this be acknowledged an *Act* of *Council* confirming the *lawfulneſs* of what the *Emperor* 18. had thus done, and decreeing (as clearly the *Council* of *Chalcedon* and that other *in Trullo* did) that generally it ſhould be thus, that as the *Prince* made an *ordinary* City a *Metropolis*, the *Church* of that City ſhould be a *Metropolitical Church*, then ſtill this is the fuller evidence, that it was *lawful* for *Princes* thus to do, and that as oft as they did, ſuch changes in the *Churches* followed; for ſure a *King* was not obliged to ask the *Churches* leave to repair or *build* a *City*.

Laſtly, What out of *Balſamon* was cited by me, that what the *Emperors* did in this matter, they 19. *did according to the power that was given them*] was, it ſeems, either an *occaſion* of *ſtumbling* to this *Gentleman*, or an *excuſe* of it; For from hence he concludes, that this *power* was *given* them by the *Church*; This if it be true, is the thing that I would *demand*, and ſo, far from anſwering mine *inſtance*: for if the *Church* have given *Princes* this *power*, then they may *freely* and *lawfully* make uſe of it; and *Juſtinian*'s doing ſo, could be no *tyrannical act* againſt the *Church*. But let us view * *Balſamon*'s * *in Chalced.* words, They are theſe, τὰς τοιάυτας γινεσθαι θεσμὰς παρὰ μὲν βασιλέων καὶ τὴν δοθεῖσαν αὐτοῖς ἄνωθεν ἐξουσίαν, *Can.* 12. *ſuch definitions are made by Kings according to the power given them from above.* The word ἄνωθεν *from above*, ſometimes ſignifies in reſpect of *time*, ſometimes alſo in reſpect of *place*; In the *firſt* reſpect it ſignifies *from of old*, and is oft joined with ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *from the beginning*; and if it be ſo taken here, as *Gentianus Hervetus* interprets it *olim*, it muſt then ſignifie, that this *power* was yielded to *Kings* either by the *Apoſtles*, or by the *Primitive Canons* of the *Church*; and if it were thus *given* them by the *Church*, then ſure they might juſtly *challenge* and *exerciſe* it freely. But in the ſecond ſenſe, it is as certain that ἄνωθεν ſignifies *from above*, i. e. *from Heaven*, ſo *Joh.* 19. 11. *Chriſt* tells *Pilate*, *thou couldſt have no power over me*, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν, *unleſs it were given thee from above*, i. e. ſure *from Heaven*, from *God*, by whom *Kings reign* and have their *power*, and ſo it very frequently ſignifies in the * *Scripture*; And if that be the meaning, then this *Gentleman* ſees how well he hath *inferred* his *concluſion* from this paſſage. * *Jam.* 1. 17. 3. 15, 17, &c.

By all this it already appears what truth there is in this ſuggeſtion, that the *examples produced* are 20. but *few*, and thoſe of *tyrannical Princes*, and *no way excluding the Church*] juſt as much, and no more, as was in the *premiſſes*, which induced it, and thoſe being *diſcovered* already, it is *ſuperfluous* to make repetitions ſo ſoon in this place.

In the cloſe he thinks fit to retire again to his old *fortreſs*, that the *Popes power* is not *Patriarchal*, 21. and ſo that he is ſtill ſafe from all that hath been ſaid on that Head; But it hath now appeared, that if any other be made a *Patriarch* or *Primate*, or (whatever the ſtyle be) a *Biſhop* without any *dependence* on the *Pope*, this is a *prejudice* ſufficient to his *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, and other *diſadvantages* he is rather in reaſon to expect by diſclaiming the *Patriarchal authority*, which the *Canons* have allowed him, than hope to gain any thing by contemning his *inheritance*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VII.

An Anſwer to the Exceptions made to the ſeventh Chapter.

SECT. I.

King Henry's *deſire of Reconciliation to* Rome. *The Sacriledge*, &c. *no Argument againſt Regal Power to remove Patriarchies. Poſſeſſion in the belief of the Popes ſupremacy. Preſcribing for errour.* Napier's *teſtimony. Poſſeſſion, if granted from* Auguſtine's *coming into* England, *no Argument of truth. Confeſſions of Popes.* Auguſtine *required it not. Pope* Gregory's *teſtimony. Many evidences that this belief was not received after* Auguſtine's *time.*

Numb. 1. WHAT in the next place is replied to that part of the *ſeventh Chapter*, which concerned *Henry* VIII. his *act* of *ejecting* the *Power* of the *Pope*, will be full matter for a *firſt Section* of this *Chapter*. He begins thus,

2. Begun in *Henry* the VIII.

In his ſeventh Chapter he intends a juſtification of the breach, whereof as he doth not teach the infamous occaſion, and how to his dying day the ſame King deſired to be reconciled, as alſo that it was but the coming two days ſhort of a Poſt to Rome, *which hindred that the reconcilement was not actually made, as may be ſeen in my Lord of* Cherbery's *Book* fol. 368. *and that the moderate Proteſtants curſe the day wherein it was made; ſo the very naming of* Henry *VIII. is enough to confute all his Diſcourſe, one of the Darlings of his Daughter having given him ſuch a Character, as hath ſtamped him for* England's Nero *to future Poſterity, and as it was ſaid of* Nero *in reſpect of Chriſtian Religion, ſo might it be of him reſpecting the unity of the Church*, viz. *it muſt be a great good that he began to perſecute and aboliſh: and as for the* Acts *paſſed in the Univerſities, Convocation or Parliament, let the blood ſhed by that Tyrant bear witneſs what voluntary and free Acts they were, eſpecially thoſe two upon his* Seneca *and* Burrhus, *Biſhop* Fiſher, *and the Chancellor* More, *that he might want nothing of being throughly parallel'd to* Nero.

Sir *Walter Raleigh* in Pref. to Hiſtor. of the World.

But methinks the Doctor differs not much in this, ſeeming tacitely to grant the Biſhops were forced, awed by that noted Sword in a ſlender Thred, the Præmunire which did hang over their Heads, though in the concluſion of that Section he ſays we ought to judge charitably, viz. *that they did not judge for fear nor temporal Intereſts, yet after waves the advantage of that charitable judgment, and ſaith, That if what was determined were falſly determined by the King and Biſhops, then the voluntary and free doing it, will not juſtifie; and if it were not, then was there truth in it, antecedent to, and abſtracted from the determination, and it was their Duty ſo to determine, and crime that they were unwilling: laying the whole weight of the Argument upon this, that the pretenſions for the Popes ſupremacy in* England, *muſt be founded either as Succeſſor to S.* Peter *in the univerſal Paſtorſhip of the Church, ſo including* England *as a Member thereof; or upon paternal Right reſpecting S.* Auguſtine's *converſion, or upon conceſſion from ſome of our Kings*, &c. *To which I anſwer, that we rely on the firſt as the foundation and corner-ſtone of the whole building; On the ſecond as an action worthy the Succeſſor of S.* Peter, *which requires a grateful conſideration from us; And on the third not as a conceſſion, but as a juſt acknowledgement of what was neceſſary for the good of Chriſtian Religion, taught our Kings by thoſe who taught them Chriſtian Religion; of which belief, I mean that the Pope as Succeſſor to S.* Peter *is Head and Governour of the Univerſal Church, we have been in poſſeſſion ever ſince the converſion of our Engliſh Anceſtors, then Saxons, to the Chriſtian Religion, made by* Auſtin *the Monk ſent hither by Pope* Gregory *for that purpoſe; until that good King* Henry *VIII. out of ſcrupuloſity of conſcience (no doubt) was pleaſed to cut the Gordian knot of thoſe Bonds, within which all his Anceſtors limited themſelves; neither ſhall all that the Doctor and his Fellows have ſaid, or can ſay, juſtifie themſelves ſo, but that ſuch a poſſeſſion, as I here ſpeak of, will convince them of Schiſm, though all thoſe Replies, which by ours have been forty times made to every one of thoſe Arguments the Doctor uſes, ſhould bear but equal weight in the Scale, which we think hoiſes it up into the Air, for the Arguments muſt be demonſtrative and clear to men of common ſenſe, that muſt overthrow ſuch a poſſeſſion; and therefore it is, that the Puritans, who are much leſs friends to the Church of* Rome *than to the Church of* England, *wave all diſputing out of Antiquity, and confeſs that the Church of* Rome *hath born a ſway without any debatable contradiction over the Chriſtian World twelve hundred and ſixty years, a time that no King in the World can pretend to by ſucceſſion from his Anceſtors for poſſeſſion of his Crown, and yet I believe the Doctor would conclude thoſe Subjects guilty of Rebellion, which ſhould go about to deprive ſuch a King of his Crown, though he could not ſhew Writings evidently concluding for him twelve, fourteen, fifteen or ſixteen hundred years ago, how much more if he could ſhew them demonſtrating his Right, in the interpretation of as wiſe and learned men as the World hath, and twenty times the Numbers of their Adverſaries.*

Napier on the Revelation.

3. The firſt thing here objected to my *Diſcourſe*, is, as *Orators* are wont to do for the raiſing of *paſſions*, a mention of ſome *circumſtances*, which though *extrinſecal* to the matter, may yet hope to have ſome *influence* on an *unwary* Reader, and infuſe no ſmall *prejudices* into him; ſuch are the *infamous* occaſion of the *breach* begun by that *King*, and ſuch is the odious *character* faſtned on him of *England*'s *Nero*, &c.

4. But it cannot be neceſſary for me to offer an *Apology* on either of theſe two Heads; If that which he did in this particular of *ejecting* the *Papal* power, be in it ſelf *juſtifiable*, both in reſpect of the matter of the *action*, and the competency of the *power* that did it; it matters not what moved him to do it, or how inclinable he was to have *reſcinded* it. The farther he were from a truly *pious* man, the more likely it is, he might be brought by *ſecular intereſts* (and the leſs likely that it was by any *religious*) to *undo* all that upon the *weightieſt* grounds of *reaſon*, had been eſtabliſhed by him. Without examining therefore the truth of that *ſuggeſtion*, that to *his dying day he deſired to be reconciled*, and without demanding what is meant by that Phraſe, *deſired to be reconciled*, whether any *overture* to receive the *Pope* on his *own* terms, into full *poſſeſſion* again, or only a *deſire* to *approve* himſelf to the

Pope,

Pope, that he ſtill maintained the *Catholick*, nay *Roman Faith* (as we know he put men to *death* for denying ſome *Doctrines* profeſt at *Rome*) that what he had done was no whit *injurious* to *him*, prejudicial, or derogatory to any *right*, which could juſtly be challenged by the *Pope* in this *Kingdom*; without either of theſe inquiries, I ſay, If I ſhall take for granted the *utmoſt* that can be pretended, that for a *long* time together he *deſired* to have *reſcinded* what he had done, I ſee not what *diſadvantage* this can be to our *pretenſions*.

For 1. I ſhall demand, was he all this while, that he thus deſired to be *reconciled*, a truly *changed* and *Pious Prince*, was that *principle* of wicked *life* ſo ſoon *eradicated*, which even now denominated him a *Nero*, and made it fit to eſteem that a *great good*, *which he began to aboliſh*, and did he thus continue a *new*, *reformed penitent* to his *dying* day? If ſo, then truly Sir *W. R.* was very *unkind* and *unchriſtian*, in recording his *crimes*, and omitting his *repentance*; and it is no *excellent* part of this *Gentlemans character*, that he thought fit to *imitate* and *quote* him in this; the ſame *injuſtice* in an *Hiſtorian* or *Obſervator*, that it had been in *Euſebius* to take ſo much of the *life* of *Conſtantine* out of *Zoſimus* or *Julian Cæſar*'s, as ſhould render him juſtly *odious*, and to omit the whole *latter* part of his *life*, which was ſo eminently *vertuous* and *Chriſtian*. 5.

But if this *Prince* ſtill continued to be like that *image*, which here is *pourtrayed* of him, then ſure I ſhall with the ſame *evidence* of *proof*, be allowed to object thoſe *vices*, and thoſe no excellent *Chriſtian* motives that incited it, to his *deſire* of being *reconciled*, or his willingneſs to *re-admit* the *Papal* power into this *Kingdom*, and conclude, that the *ejection* of it muſt be a *great good*, which he was ſo *inclinable* to *aboliſh*, and ſo, the *faith* of the *reformed*, which he ſo more than *began* to *perſecute*; and all this as *regularly* as his *perſonal vices*, and the *infamous occaſion*, be it never ſo truly ſo, can be *objected* to that *act* of State, which paſt in that *Kings* reign, for the *diſclaiming* the *Papal* powers among us. 6.

Nay, if that *paſſage* in his ſtory had acquired a yet farther degree of *Truth*, if the *Poſt* had come *two days ſooner* to *Rome*, and ſo had actually compoſed the *difference* between that *King* and that *Pope*, ſo as had been moſt for the *intereſt* of *Rome*, yet it is evident, that my diſcourſe had no way been concerned in this; This evidently had been no more, than what afterwards came to paſs in *Queen Mary*'s days, and it would ſtill be in the *power* of *King Henry*'s *immediate ſucceſſor*, to remove the *power* from *Rome* to *Canterbury*, as it had been in the *power* of *Henry* either to do it, or *undo* it again. 7.

And therefore the whole matter ſtill devolves (as it did in the *Tract of Schiſm*) to that *one queſtion*, whether the *Biſhop* of *Rome* had at that time any *real authority* here, which the *King* might not lawfully *remove* from him to the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*, and muſt be decided as there it is, by the view of *Evidences*, whether that pretended from *Peters Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, or that from *Auguſtine's planting Chriſtianity* here, or that from the *voluntary conceſſion* of ſome *Kings*; and each of them is ſo diſproved there, that till ſome competent *anſwer* be rendered to thoſe particulars, (which certainly is not yet done by this *Gentleman*, who only here tells us the manner how he *relies* on each of theſe, and the *poſſeſſion* they had of the *belief* that the *Pope* was head of the *Univerſal Church*) 'tis perfectly unneceſſary farther to conſider what is here added, only to *inflame paſſions*, but not to *ſatisfie Conſcience*, to *exaſperate*, not to *argue*. 8.

For what if *moderate Proteſtants* ſhould truly *curſe the day*, &c. or, in a more *Chriſtian dialect*, expreſs their *diſlike* to the great *Sacriledge*, and ſome other *enormities*, which were committed in that *Princes reign*, what prejudice will this be to any *lawful exerciſe* of that *regal power*? 'Tis certain that all the *Acts* of a *bad Prince* are not *invalid* or *null*; and much more evident ſtill, that he that hath not *offended* in *aſſuming* the *power* which *really* belongs to him, may by being *denyed* that, be *inraged*, and laid open, to importune *Temptations*, and if he be not a through *Chriſtian*, *conſtant* and *maſterly*, fall, and that foully, under thoſe *temptations*. And if *Henry* VIII. did ſo, ſtill this is very *extrinſecal* to the *preſent* inquiry, whether he as *King* had power to *remove* a *Patriarchy*, and by that, to *remove* all foreign *juriſdiction* or *authority* out of this *Church*. 9.

All that remains in this *Section*, farther to be ſpoken to, is the *poſſeſſion* that is here *pleaded*, not in the *power* it ſelf, (if it were, that hath *formerly* been ſpoken to) but in the *belief*, that the *Pope* as *ſucceſſor* to S. *Peter*, is *head* and *Governour* of the *Univerſal Church*; This *belief*, ſaith he, they have been in *poſſeſſion* of, ever ſince the *Converſion* of our *Engliſh Anceſtors*, till *King Henry*; and for this, beſide his own *bare* affirmation, he brings no other *proof*, than one *teſtimony* of *Napier* on the *Revelation*, *confeſſing* that the *Church* of *Rome hath born a ſway over the Chriſtian world above twelve hundred years*. 10.

And *Firſt*, for this kind of *Poſſeſſion*, *poſſeſſion* in the *belief* of any thing, any farther than that which is believed is *true*, and that appear ſome other way, than by our having ſo *long believed* it, certainly this is no matter of any deep *conſideration* to us, If it ſtill appear to be *true* upon grounds of *reaſon*, thoſe grounds are the *conſiderable*, and not the *belief*. And if the *grounds* be diſcovered to be *fallacious* and the *contrary* to be more *reaſonable* to be *believed*, then ſure this hath but the advantage of an *Antient errour*, and the *older* it is, the fitter not to be longer continued in, it muſt be immediately *depoſited*. And againſt this, or inſtead of doing thus, to talk of *poſſeſſion*, is *unnatural* and *irrational*, the ſame plea that may ſerve for any *ſin* that hath had the *luck* to get the firſt *hold* in us, the ſame that would certainly have held for all the Idolatry of the *Heathens*, when *Chriſt* came into the world; And he that hath long lived in *obſcurity* and *miſery* (he, and his *Anceſtors*) for many years together, and were now offered an *advancement* out of that *ſad* condition, would he ever be ſo *unkind* to himſelf as to refuſe that *offer*, upon this one *account*, becauſe it is the *turning* him out of a *poſſeſſion*? This *preſcribing* for *Errour*, and *preſcribing* for *Sin*, and *preſcribing* for *Miſery*, are in effect the ſame, equally *unnatural* and *irrational*, ſuppoſing it to be truly *Errour*, and *Sin*, and *Miſery*, which we treat of. 11.

But then *Secondly*, waving this, and applying our ſelves to the *particular* before us, how doth it appear that the *Romaniſt* hath been in *poſſeſſion* in this *belief*, ſo long as he pretends? He here brings but one *Teſtimony* to confirm it, that of *Napier*; But for this *teſtimony* the anſwer is eaſie, that the *affirmations* or *confeſſions* of ſuch as *Napier* was (and is by this *Gentleman* acknowledged to be) in their 12.

arguing

arguing againſt the *credit* of *Antiquity*, or to make good other *Hypotheſes* of theirs, are of as little *authority* with us, as I ſuppoſe they will be with them, when they are *contrary* to their *pretenſions* or *intereſts*; *Secondly*, that the *Popes bearing a ſway over the Chriſtian world*, is not interpretable to ſignifie his *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*; The *Biſhop* of the *Prime imperial See*, may juſtly be very *conſiderable*, and ſo *bear* a *ſway*, but it follows not thence, that his *ordinary juriſdiction* hath been thus extended to the *whole Chriſtian world*.

13. Nay *Thirdly*, the *contrary* to this hath been ſufficiently evidenced *Chap.* 4. and 5. both as concerns S. *Peter* himſelf, and the *Biſhop* of *Rome* as *ſucceſſor* to S. *Peter*; and till thoſe evidences are refuted, the *affirmation* of *Napier* being ſo imperfect and *infirm*, both in reſpect of the *teſtifier* and the *matter* of the *teſtimony*, will be very unfit to *bear ſway* with any *rational* man.

14. And ſo the whole weight of this argument preſt with ſo much *confidence*, is reſolved into the bare *authority* of the *Speaker*, this *Gentleman*, who ſaith it, that ever ſince the *converſion* of the *Engliſh Nation*, the *Romaniſts* have had *poſſeſſion* of this *belief*, that the *Pope*, as *ſucceſſor* to S. *Peter*, is *Governour* of the *Univerſal Church*.

15. And that I may apply ſome anſwer yet more *particularly* to this, I ſhall premiſe one thing, that if indeed this were granted, which is *ſuggeſted*, it would not be of any great force toward the inducing of this *concluſion*, that the *Pope* really was and is *Univerſal Paſtor*. For ſuppoſing the *Pope* to have aſſumed that *authority*, at the time of *Auguſtine* the *Monk* his coming into *England* and making his *plantation*, and ſuppoſing him to have *preacht* this to *King Ethelbert*, and the reſt of his *Proſelytes*, with the ſame *gravity* and *confidence*, that he uſed in imparting all the *Doctrines* of *Chriſtian Faith* (in the ſame manner as *Xaverius* the *Apoſtle* of the *Indies*, imparted to them *two Goſpels*, the one of *Chriſt*, the other of S. *Peter*) I ſhall not doubt but upon theſe grounds it would be very *conſequent*, that all, that willingly *imbraced* the *preaching* of *Auguſtine*, and had no other *Doctrine* to compare it with, or *examine* it by, ſhould probably receive this branch of *belief*, and ſo all others *from* and *after* them, that inſiſted firmly and punctually on *Auguſtine*'s way; and thus 'tis poſſible the *poſſeſſion* of that *belief* might be *continued* till the days of *Henry* VIII.

16. But then this is no *proof*, that what in this *particular Auguſtine* affirmed, was true, or that the *belief* of it had *poſſeſſion* in the whole *Church* before; Nay, the contrary will be moſt evident, that at that very time the *Britiſh Biſhops* acknowledged not any ſuch *power* over them in the *Pope* or any other, as is cited from the *Abbot* of *Bangor*, *Cap.* 16. *Sect.* 5. and much more to the ſame purpoſe.

17. And 'tis no news to remind him out of their own *Canon Law*, that ſome of their *Popes* have diſclaimed (and that not without great *averſation* and *deteſtation* of the *arrogance* of it) the title of *Univerſal Biſhop* or *Paſtor*, and acknowledged it as a very *ominous Symptom* in any that ſhall aſſume it; and conſidering the *prejudices* that lye againſt it, from the *firſt œcumenical Councils*, all the *Ordinances* whereof, the *Popes* at their *creations* vow to maintain *inviolably*, and againſt which to conſtitute or *innovate* any thing, *ne hujus quidem ſedis poteſt authoritas*, *it is not in the power of this See*, ſaith *Pope Zoſimus*, 25. *qu.* 1. c. *Contra.* I may juſtly conclude that all are *obliged* to do the like.

18. But then *ſecondly*, what *truth* there is in it *in theſi*, that from S. *Auguſtine*'s *plantation* to this time of *Henry* VIII. the *Romaniſts* have been in *poſſeſſion* of this *belief* of the *Popes Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, muſt be conteſted by evidences. And 1. for *Auguſtine* himſelf, it appears not by the *ſtory* in *Bede*, that he did at all *preach* this *doctrine* to the *nation*; nay, as upon *Auguſtine*'s demand concerning *ceremonies*, *Pope Gregory* binds him not to *conform* all to the *Canons* or *practice* of *Rome*, but bids him * *freely chooſe that which may moſt pleaſe God, whereſoever he finds it, ſive in Galliarum, ſive in qualibet Eccleſiâ, whether in* France, *or in any other Church, & hæc quaſi in Faſciculum collecta apud Anglorum mentes in conſuetudinem deponere*, make up a *Book* of ſuch *Canons* to be obſerved in *England* (which clearly ſhews that the *Romiſh Canons* were not to be in power in *England*) ſo when the difference betwixt him and the *Britiſh Biſhops* (of whom it hath been ſhewed that they *acknowledged* not the *Pope* to have any *power* over them) came to be compoſed, he required compliance and *obedience* from them but in *three* things, the † *obſervation* of *Eaſter* according to the order of the *Church* of *Rome* (and the *Nicene Canon*) the *Miniſtration* of *Baptiſm*, and joyning with him to *preach* to the *Engliſh*; Which is ſome prejudice to the *founding* of this *belief* in *Auguſtine*'s preaching.

* *Eccl. Hiſt.* l. 1. c. 27.

† *Ib.* l. 2. c. 2.

19. Nay when *Bede* comes to ſpeak of *Gregory* then *Pope*, by way of *Encomium* at his death, the utmoſt he ſaith of him is, that *cùm primum in toto orbe gereret Pontificatum, & converſis jamdudum Eccleſiis prælatus eſſet, &c. being Biſhop of the Prime Church in the whole world, and ſet over thoſe Churches which had been long ſince converted*, and having now taken care to propagate that *faith* to *England*, he might juſtly be called *our Apoſtle*, and ſaith as S. *Paul* did, that *if to others he were not an Apoſtle, yet he was to us.*

20. As for that of *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, certainly we may take *Gregory*'s own word, that no ſuch thing was then thought to belong to him, in his *Epiſtle* to *Eulogius Biſhop* of *Alexandria*, viſible among his works, and inſerted in the * *body* of their *Canon Law*. *Nam dixi*, &c, *I told you that you were not to write to me or any other in that ſtyle, and behold in the Preface of that Epiſtle directed to me who thus prohibited, you have ſet this proud appellation, calling me univerſal Pope or Father, which I deſire you will do no more, for it is a derogating from you, to beſtow on another more than reaſon requires; I count it not my honour, wherein I know my brethren loſe their honour; My honour is the honour of the univerſal Church, My honour is, that my brethren ſhould enjoy what fully belongs to them* (ſo I render *fratrum meorum ſolidus vigor*) *then am I truly honoured, when the honour, which is due to all, is denied to none. For if you call me univerſal Pope, you deny that to your ſelf which you attribute all to me*; And farther tells him, with expreſſions of *averſation*, *Abſit* and *recedant*— that this honour had by a *Council* been offered to his *Predeceſſors*, in the *Council* of *Chalcedon* (that gave it *equally* to him and the *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople*, which is in effect to give to neither the *power* or ſenſe, but only the *title* of it) but no one of them would ever uſe this title. This ſure is evidence enough, that if at that time any ſuch *belief* of the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* of the *Pope* entred this *Nation*, it muſt needs be the *belief* of a known acknowledged *falſity*, and ſo far from a *bonæ fidei poſſeſſio.*

* *B. Greg. Ep. ex regiſt.* l. 7. *Indict.* 1. c. 30. * *Par.* 1 *diſt.* 99. *Eccl.*

After

After this, what *poſſeſſion* this *belief* had among us, may be judged by ſome of thoſe many * *inſtances* put together by the *Biſhops* in *Henry* VIII. his days, as the *premiſes* whereon that *King* built his *concluſion* of ejecting that *Power* which was then *uſurped* by the *Pope*. 21.

* *l. de diff. Reg. & Eccl. Poteſt.*

Firſt, a *ſtatute*, that for *Eccleſiaſtical Appeals*, they ſhall in the laſt reſort lye from the *Archbiſhop* to the *King*, ſo as not to proceed any farther without the *King*'s aſſent. 22.

Secondly, That *Turſtan Archbiſhop* elect of *York*, asking leave of the *King* to go to a *Council* deſigned by *Calixtus*, had it granted with this *reſerve*, that he ſhould not receive *Epiſcopal benediction* from the *Pope*. 23.

Thirdly, That the *Kings* of *England* from time to time, had and *exerciſed* authority of making *Laws* in *Eccleſiaſtical* matters; Eight ſuch *Laws* are there recited of *Canutus*'s making, the like of *King Ethelred*, *Edgar*, *Edmund*, *Æthelſtane*, *Ina King* of the *Weſt Saxons*, and *King Alfred*. 24.

Fourthly, That *William* the *Conquerour inſtituting* and *endowing* the *Abby* of *Battel*, gave the *Abbot exemption* from all *juriſdiction* of any *Biſhops*, *aut quarumlibet perſonarum denominatione*, *from all dominion* or *rule of any perſons whatſoever*, *ſicut Eccleſiæ Chriſti Cantuarienſis*, *in like manner as the Church of* Canterbury; Which imports *two* things, 1. that the *Church* of *Canterbury* had no ſuch *Ruler* over him (but the *King*) and 2. that the *Abbot* of *Battel* was by *regal power* inveſted with the ſame *privileges*. 25.

But I ſuppoſe all theſe, and many the like inſtances, which might be brought, *derogatory* enough to the *poſſeſſion* in this *belief* here pretended, will but add one more to the *number* of ſuch *Arguments*, of which this *Gentleman* ſaith, that they have *forty* times had *replies* made to them; And truly this is a good eaſie *compendious* way, which as it ſecures him againſt all that can be *produced*, ſo it doth not *encourage* me to ſpend time in *collecting* and *producing* more, and therefore this ſhall ſuffice to have added now concerning this matter, being apt to *flatter* my ſelf, that theſe Arguments are demonſtrative and clear enough to men of *common* ſenſe, to *diſprove*, and ſo to *overthrow* this *Poſſeſſion*. 26.

SECT. II.

Queen Mary's *retaining the Supremacy. Power of refuſing Legates, unreconcileable with the Popes Supremacy.*

THE next *Paragraph* is an account of a Paſſage cited by me from the *Story* of *Queen Mary*, Thus, *Numb.* 1.

Queen Mary's *titular retaining of the Supremacy, until She could diſpoſe the diſordered hearts of her Subjects to get it peaceably revoked, is no authority for the Doctor; She never pretending it to be lawfully done, but that She could not do otherwiſe; no more is her refuſing of a Legate, which in all Catholick times and Countries hath been practiſed and thought lawful.* 2.

What *civil* or *ſecular motives* they were, which kept that *Queen* ſo long from rejecting the title of *ſupreme* in her own *Kingdom*, I ſhall not need to enquire; If it were no unpardonable ſin in her to continue the *title*, and exerciſe of that *power*, which was incompetible with the *Pope*'s *univerſal Paſtorſhip*, then why ſhould it be ſo heinous in her *Father* to aſſume it? Her never pretending that it was *lawfully* done, ſignifies very little, as long as She pretends not the *contrary*, that it was *unlawful*; The truth may well lye in the *middle*, that She thought it *lawful* to retain it, yet *lawful* alſo to beſtow it on the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, and upon the ſtrength of the former *perſwaſion*, my *charity* obligeth me to think, that She did the *former*, and in force of the *latter* it is poſſible alſo, that She did the *latter*, though *poſſible* too, that She did it upon reaſon of *State*, the *validity* of her *Mother*'s *Marriage*, and conſequently her *legitimation* depending upon the acknowledgment of the *Pope*'s *abſolute power* in this *Nation*. 3.

But the truth is, her *opinion* or *practice* is of no more force one way, than the other, and therefore was taken in as a *ſupernumerary* Obſervation, and not ſuch as on that alone to found any *grand Argument*. 4.

As for the *power* of *refuſing* a *Legate* from the *Pope*, I cannot diſcern how that is reconcileable with the *Popes* pretenſions to *ſupreme* power in this Kingdom; Can it be lawful for any *Province* to refuſe a *Procurator*, or *Prætor*, or *Proconſul*, ſent ſolemnly commiſſionated by the *lawful Prince*? Was it lawful for the *Tenants* or *Dreſſers* of the *Vineyard*, to deny entrance to the *King*'s Son, or but *Servant*? Is not this a derogation to *ſupreme power* and *domination*? If this be *practiſed* and counted *lawful in all Catholick times and Countries*, this is to me an *indication*, that in no *time* or *Country* there hath been *poſſeſſion* of this *belief*, that the *Pope* is the *ſupreme Paſtor* of all; for ſure if he were, his *Legate* which is his Image, might in power of the *Original*, require *admiſſion*, and he that is πεμπόμενος ἀπ' αὐτῆς thus *ſent* and *commiſſionated by him*, muſt by S. *Peter*'s Precept, be allowed *obedience* from all his *Subjects*, and ſo from that *Queen*, if ſuch She were, and ſuch She *muſt* be, ſo far as he had the *Supremacy*. 5.

So again, when *Cardinal Petou* was ſent to be *Biſhop* of *Sariſbury*, the denying him that *Biſhoprick*, was a check to the *Pope*'s abſolute *ſupremacy*; but of that, this *Gentleman* was in prudence to take no notice. 6.

SECT. III.

King Edward's *Reformation. The Duke of* Somerſet. *The Duke of* Northumberland, *his Treaſon no prejudice to the Reformation under that King.*

HIS next Exception is to the Paſſages concerning *King Edward* VI. *King Henry*'s immediate Succeſſor, Thus, *Numb.* 1.

King Edward *a Child of nine years old fell into the hands of wicked and ambitious Traytors, who knowing* 2.

the Kingdom affected for Religion-ſake to Queen Mary, *to cut off her Succeſſion, and introduce their own, thought fit to ſtrengthen their faction, which beſide what they might hope from abroad, conſiſted of many Lutherans and Calviniſts at home: thoſe two Sects having by opportunity of that rupture in* Henry *VIII. his time, ſpread and neſtled themſelves in many parts of* England.

3. What is here ſaid hath little of *truth* in it, and as little of *Argument*, if it were *truth*. That the *youth* of the *Prince* can be no *foundation* of *Argument* againſt the *legality* of what was done by the *Duke* of *Somerſet* his *Uncle*, the *Protector*, in his *nonage*, was ſufficiently ſhewed before, and might be exemplified through all *times* and *places*. That this *Protector* ſhould at this time, when the young *King* legally *fell* into his *hands*, be ſtyled a *wicked ambitious Traytor*, hath not any *degree* of *truth* in it, the *crime* for which he afterward loſt his *life*, being far from any *diſloyalty* to his *Sovereign*.

4. As for the *Duke* of *Northumberland*, who obtained the *King*'s conſent to ſettle the *inheritance* on *Jane Grey*, and accordingly, after the *King*'s death, proclaimed her *Queen*, and ſuffered as a *Traytor* for ſo doing, all that I ſhall need to ſay is this, 1. That this *act* of his, how *trayterous* ſoever, cannot juſtifie what is here ſaid, that the *King* at *nine years old fell into the hands of Traytors*, for that *one Duke* cannot truly be called *Traytors* in the *plural*, and the *King* at that *age* did not *fall* into his *hands*, but into the hands of *Edward Seymour Duke* of *Somerſet*, under whom the *ſix Articles*, and other *Acts* of *ſeverity* againſt the *Proteſtants*, were called in, and the *Acts* againſt the *Papal authority confirmed*, the *Romiſh Maſs abrogated*, the *Bible tranſlated*, and publiſhed in the *Engliſh tongue*, the *Liturgy reformed*, and the publick *Offices* performed in *Engliſh*, the *Sacrament* of the *Lord*'s *Supper* adminiſtred in *both kinds*, &c. And ſo whatſoever was afterward done (were it never ſo *trayterouſly*) by the *Duke* of *Northumberland*, could have no *influence* on this change, and is therefore very *impertinently* here inſerted, after the manner of the *Orator*, not the *Hiſtorian*, to raiſe *paſſions*, inflame *diſlikes* and *averſions* in the *Reader*, and not to give him any exact view of the *truth* of the *Story*.

5. *Secondly*, That the deſign of the *Duke* of *Northumberland* not ſucceeding, but coſting him ſo dear, the loſs of his own *life*, and hers, whom he ſet up to be *Queen*, and the *Succeſſion* regularly deſcending on *Queen Mary*, there can be no reaſonable account given, why this *treaſon* of that *Duke* ſhould here be propoſed as the one *conſiderable*, it being evident in the *Story*, that all things were compoſed to the full *ſatisfaction* of *Queen Mary*, and juſt as they ſhould have been, in Caſe that *trayterous* attempt had never been made by that *Duke*.

6. To which I might add, that this *treaſon* of his, was founded on that very *act*, which in the next *Paragraph* this *Gentleman* thinks fit to vouch as *authentick*, and if it were ſo, that could be no *treaſon* in that *Duke*, *viz.* the *act* whereby *Mary* as well as *Elizabeth* were adjudged *illegitimate*, and ſo *uncapable* of the *Succeſſion*. But theſe are *conſiderations* very *extrinſecal* and *remote* from the matter, as it lies here in the *conteſt* between us.

7. I ſhall only, for concluſion, obſerve, that if, as he ſaith, the *Kingdom* were for *Religion's* ſake affected to *Queen Mary*, it could not certainly be skilful, or *popular*, or any way *Politick* in them that thus deſired to ſtrengthen themſelves, to introduce this *change* in *Religion*. For whatſoever *aid* they might hope for, either from *Lutherans* or *Calviniſts* at home or abroad, ſure they might have *hoped* for *more* by the other way, if it be true what he affirms of the *Kingdom* indefinitely, that it was *affected* to *Queen Mary*'s *Religion*. For that other *Kingdoms* of *Europe* generally were ſo at that time, there is ſmall *Queſtion*.

SECT. III.

Queen Elizabeth's *illegitimacy anſwered. The unpolitickneß of her Counſels of Reforming.*

Numb. 1. NOW follows his *Exceptions* to that part of the *ſtory* which concern *Queen Elizabeth*; The *firſt* by the bye, Thus,

2. *Queen* Elizabeth *being by Act of Parliament recorded a Baſtard, and ſo pronounced by two Popes, and therefore miſtruſting all her Catholick Subjects, who She feared did adhere to the Queen of* Scots *title, in which She was then likely to be ſupported by the King of* France *Her Huſband, was by the advice of men partly infected with Calvaniſm or Lutheraniſm, partly ambitious of making their fortunes, caſt upon that deſperate counſel of changing Religion; deſperate I ſay, for ſee amongſt what a number of Rocks She was, in conſequence of that Counſel forced to ſail, witneß her adhering to the Rebels of all her Neighbour Kings, ſo provoking them thereby, as if the* French *King had not been taken out of this World, and wind and weather fought againſt the* Spaniſh Armado, *in all likelihood She had been ruined, eſpecially her Catholick Subjects being ſo provoked as they were, by moſt cruel and bloody Laws: but this by the bye: though from hence the Reader may judge of reaſon of changing Religion in her time, and what a ſolid foundation the Church of* England *hath.*

3. That *Queen Elizabeth* was by *Act* of *Parliament recorded a Baſtard*, hath no farther truth in it, than is of force againſt *Queen Mary* alſo, The ſame *Act* of *Parliament* affirming the *Marriages* with *Queen Katharine*, and *Ann* of *Bullen* void, and their *Children Mary* and *Elizabeth illegitimate*, and ſo involving them *equally* under the ſame *cenſure*.

4. Nay, if there were any force in this (as this *Gentleman* by mentioning it, is obliged to think there is) it muſt be much more to *Queen Maries* diſadvantage; for 'tis certain that upon the *birth* of *Queen Elizabeth*, 'twas enacted by *Parliament*, that the *marriage* with *Katharine* was *null*, becauſe *inceſtuous*, and ſo this with *Ann* lawful (which certainly it was, if the former was *inceſtuous*; and the *reſolution* of the *Univerſities* and moſt *learned* men, not only in *England*, but at *Paris*, and elſewhere was, that it was of ſuch a *nature*, as it could not by the *Pope*'s *power* be *diſpenſed* with, being ſo contrary to the *Law* of *God*) and by the ſame *Act*, *Elizabeth* is declared *Heir* of the *Kingdom*, in Caſe the *King* ſhould have no Heir *male*, and *Oath* of *Allegiance* taken to the *King* and to his *Heirs* by *Ann* the *Mother* of *Elizabeth*. And to conclude, the ſubſequent *Act*, that decreed the *Succeſſion*, and eſtabliſh'd it

firſt in *Edward*, then in *Mary*, then in *Elizabeth*, by which it was that *Mary* did actually aſcend to the *throne*, was equally favourable to both of them.

And ſo ſtill if any thing were to be *concluded* from this *Gentleman*'s *proœmial* conſideration, it ſtill 6. lies more againſt *Queen Mary*, than againſt *Queen Elizabeth*, if not in reſpect of the *merit* of the cauſe (on which this *Gentleman* will give me leave to ſuppoſe it was, that our *ſtories* tell us, that the *Pope* had given *Cardinal Campegius* his *Legate* a *private Bull*, much in favour of the *King*'s *pretenſions*, but kept it under ſome *reſtraint* till he ſaw how the *Emperor*'s affairs in *Italy* would ſucceed) yet in reſpect of the *ſeveral declarations* againſt the *one*, and but *one* only againſt the *other*, and that how well founded, is eaſie to diſcern, if this were a place for ſuch *diſputes*.

But it is not ſo, much leſs for the other *Politick* conſiderations that here follow, whether the *coun-* 7. *ſel* of re-excluding the *Papacy*, and proceeding to a farther *Reformation* in her *Kingdoms*, were a *deſperate Counſel* or no; For if to this *Gentleman*'s *Arguments* I ſhall grant it were ſo, the *concluſion* will be only this, that her *action* was *unskilful* in *ſecular* conſiderations, from which it is no way conſequent, that it was more than, as *Princes* ſhe had power to do, or *impious* in the ſight of *God*, or that that, which being built on ſo feeble a *foundation*, proved yet competently *ſucceſsful*, is by this means concluſible to have been *unlawful* and *null*, for in that alone can be founded the truth of the *ſuggeſtion* here, that we that *adhere* to her *Reformation*, muſt be adjudged *Schiſmaticks*.

SECT. IV.

The Ordination of Biſhops in Queen Elizabeth*'s time. Mr.* Maſon*'s Record. Introducing of Turciſm.*

WHAT remains on this Head of *Queen Elizabeth*, as the *Narration* after this long *Proœm*, the *Numb.* 1. ἔργον, after an acknowledged (yet larger) πάρεργον, will be ſoon diſpatch'd; It is thus,

How far Maſter Maſon *can juſtifie the Ordination of Queen* Elizabeth*'s Biſhops, I will not now exa-* 2. *mine; but certain it is, that the Record (if there be ſuch a one) hath a great prejudice of being forged, ſince it lay ſome fifty years unknown amongſt the Clamors againſt the flagrant Act, and no permiſſion given to Catholicks to examine the ingenuity of it; but howſoever, it is nothing to our purpoſe, for whatſoever material miſſion they had by an external conſecration, thoſe Biſhops, who are ſaid to have conſecrated them, are not ſo much as pretended to have given them order to preach the Doctrine, or exerciſe the Religion they after did, which is the true meaning and effect of miſſion. I cannot end without noting in his 24. Parag. the foundation upon what he himſelf ſays his whole deſign relies; which is, that becauſe the receſſion from the Roman Church was done by thoſe, by whom, and to whom only the power of right belonged legally,* viz. *the King and Biſhops of this Nation, therefore it is no Schiſm, that is, whatſoever the reaſon of dividing hath been, even to turn Turks, or for violating never ſo fundamental points of Religion, yet it had not been Schiſm.*

What Mr. *Maſons Records* are, and of how good and unqueſtionable *authority*, I leave to the *view* 3. of his *Book*, which ſets down all ſo *particularly*, and irrefragably, that nothing can be more *contrary* to the *Gentlemans* intereſts, than the moſt ſtrict *examination* of that whole matter, in order to the *vindicating* and *juſtifying* this truth, that the *ſucceſſion* of *Biſhops*, and *order Eccleſiaſtical* hath been regularly preſerved in our *Church*, at that time, when alone the *Romaniſt* accuſeth us for the *interruption* of it, *i. e.* in *Queen Elizabeth*'s *Reformation*. (To which head of diſcourſe it is not amiſs to add the *reſolution* of *Cudſemius* the *Jeſuit*, *de deſper. Calvini causâ*, *Cap.* 11. that the *Engliſh Nation* are not *Hereticks*, becauſe they *remain in a perpetual ſucceſſion of Biſhops*.)

Which being the only thing that in that *Sect.* 16. I purpoſed to conclude from Mr. *Maſons* work, 4. and the *Records* by him produced, it lyes not on me to prove that they which ordained thoſe *Queen-Elizabeth-Biſhops*, gave them *order* to *preach the Doctrine they after did*, or to examine the truth of his *ſuggeſtion*, that this is the true *meaning* and *effect* of *Miſſion*. It may ſuffice that they which *conſecrated* them, gave them the ſame *power* which themſelves derived by *ſucceſſion* from the *Apoſtles*, and that was ſufficient to *authorize* them to preach all *Apoſtolical* doctrine; and if they preacht any other, let it appear, and I ſhall never juſtifie their *preaching*. But that is not attempted here, and therefore I have herein no farther matter, that exacts *reply* from me.

For as to his parting blow, which he *cannot omit*, in *reply* to *Sect.* 20. certainly it hath little *impreſ-* 5. *ſion* on my diſcourſe in that place, which doth not inquire what is *unlawful* or *criminous Univerſally*, for then ſure I ſhould have acknowledged that the bringing in *Turciſm*, or *violating fundamental points of Religion* had been ſuch, but peculiarly and *preciſely* this, what is *Schiſm*, in that one notion of *Schiſm*, as that is a *voluntary ſeparation* from our *Eccleſiaſtical Superiors*; of which that we are not, or cannot be guilty, when we act in perfect *concord*, compliance and ſubordination to all thoſe to whom the *right* of *ſuperiority* legally belong'd, is I ſuppoſe, ſo manifeſt, that it can need no farther *proof*.

As for any ſuch act of *lawful Superiors* in bringing in *Turciſm*, or *violating fundamental points*, I 6. ſhould not be apt to ſtyle that *Schiſm* (any more than I would call *perjury*, *lying*, or *inceſt*, ſimple *fornication*) it being in the firſt part of the inſtance, *Apoſtaſie* and *total* defection from *Chriſt*, which I hope is a little more than denying the *Popes Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, or *Infallibility* of the *Church* (in which conſiſts his grand *ſpecies* of *Schiſm*) and in the *ſecond*, *Hereſie*, and the groſſeſt ſort of *Schiſm* together, that of *departing* from the *unity* of the *Faith*, which being by me *Chap.* 8. diſtinctly handled, as a ſecond *ſpecies* of *Schiſm*, all that I need here ſay to this *Gentleman*'s exception, is, that I indeavoured to ſpeak as *diſtinctly*, and not as *confuſedly* as I could, and therefore did not mix things that were *diſtant*, and therefore did not ſpeak of that ſecond *kind* of *Schiſm* at the ſame time when I propoſed to ſpeak of the *firſt* only, and upon this account only ſaid nothing to it in that *Chapter*. And I hope this was but my duty to do, agreeably to all rules of *method*, and ſo that he might very well have ſpared that *animadverſion* which he ſaith he could *not end without noting*.

CHAP. VIII.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the eighth Chapter.

SECT. I.

The Division of Schism. An Answer to many Questions about Schism. A retortion.

Numb. 1. IN proceeding to the view of the *eighth Chapter*, this *Gentleman*, without any cause, is pleased to change the *division* of the *second sort* of *Schism* there handled, into another, which it seems was more suitable to his *understanding*, and then to make two light *skirmishes* against the discourse of that *Chapter*. He begins thus,

2. *In this eighth Chapter, as far as I understand, he divideth Schism into formal, that is, breach of unity; and material, that is, breach of Doctrine or Customs, in which the Church was united; the former he*
Sect. 4. *brancheth into subordination to the Pope, of which enough hath been said; and breach of the way provided by Christ for maintaining the unity of faith, the which he puts in many subordinations without any ef-*
Sect. 5. *fect; For let us ask, if inferior Clergy-men dissent from their own Bishops, but not from their Metropolitan, in matter of faith, is it Schism? he will answer, No: If a Metropolitan dissent from his Primate, but agree with the rest of the Patriarchs, is it Schism? I think he must say, No: If a Patriarch dissent from the first, but agree with the rest, is it Schism? No: If a Nation or a Bishop dissent from the rest of the General Council, is it Schism? still I believe he will answer, No: Where then is Schism provided against? or where truly is there any subordination in Faith? if none of these are subject, and bound to their Superiors or Universals in matters of Faith?*

3. What my *division* there is, will be obvious enough to any man's *understanding*. In the *third Chapter* the *foundation* had been laid in the *opposition* betwixt *Schism* and *Ecclesiastical Unity*, and as the *unity* was the conserving of all due *relations*, whether of *subordination*, or *equality*, wherein each member of *Christ's Church* is concerned one toward another, so there were two *prime* branches of *Schism*, the one against the *subordination* which *Christ* setled in his *Church*, the second against the *mutual charity*, which he left as his *Legacy* among *Christians*. And the former of these being discussed at large in order to the *present* debate, in the *eighth Chapter*, the method led me to the latter of them, to consider *Schism*, as it is an *offence* against the *mutual unity*, Peace, and Charity, which *Christ* left, and prescribed among *Christians*; And that I might be sure not to *straiten* the bounds of this sort of *Schism*, or omit any thing, that can, by any rule of *discourse*, be placed in the *borders* or *confines* of it, by this means either to lay *charge* on us, or render our *Vindication* the clearer, I distributed it into as many parts, as in my opinion the matter could by any be thought to bear, *i. e.* into *three species*,

1. A *breach* in the *Doctrines* or *Traditions* (together with the *institutions* of *Christ*, his *Apostles*, and the *Primitive Church*, whether in *government*, or *observances*.)
2. An *offence* against *external peace* or *Communion Ecclesiastical*.
3. The *want* of that *Charity* which is due from every *Christian* to every *Christian*.

The first of these again *subdivided* and *considered*, 1. in the *gross*, as it is a *departing* from the *rules* appointed by *Christ* for the *founding* and upholding *unity* of *Doctrine*, &c. 2. in *particular*, the asserting of any *particular* doctrine, contrary to *Christ's* and the *Apostolical* pure *Churches* establishment.

4. The *Scheme* being thus laid as *regular*, and as *comprehensive*, as I could devise. 1. here is not one word said to express any cause of *dislike* or *exception* to it; and yet 2. it is quite laid aside, and another of *formal* and *material* Schism, *&c.* substituted instead of it, upon what *temptation* or *design*, save only a *willingness* to gain somewhat by the *shuffle* and *confusion*, more than the *distinctness* of *discourse* could yield him, I cannot divine.

5. As it is, I yet discern not the *particular advantages* he had in his *intuition*, but suppose them *latent* and *reserved*; For to his special *discovery* that he means to make by *asking* (and supposing answers to) many *questions* proportionable to the several links in the *subordination*, the account will be easie enough, that as long as any *particular Bishop* remains in the due *subordination* to his *Canonical Superiors*, so long the departure of any *Clergy*-man that is under his *jurisdiction*, from that *obedience* which *Canonically* he ows him, is in him that is thus guilty of it, an act of *Schism*.

6. But then *first*, when instead of *departure* he puts *dissent* (which may belong to *light* matters, wherein liberty of *dissent* from *Superiors*, is yielded to all men; or to *greater* matters, without departing from *obedience* or *Commmunion*) this is not fairly done, this difference having a visible influence on the matter.

7. *Secondly*, When of the *inferior Clergy-man's dissent* from his own *Bishop*, he makes me answer that it is not *Schism*, if it be not from his *Metropolitan*, I never gave him my Letter of *Proxy* to do so: But on the other side, if the *dissent* be supposed to be improved into a *departure* (which alone makes *Schism*) I shall not doubt to pronounce it *Schism*, unless he have first made his *appeal* from his *Bishop* to his *Metropolitan*, and by him and his *Council* of *Bishops* be adjudged to be in the *right*; and then, if his *Bishop* by that *judgment* be reduced to order, he may not, he cannot again without *Schism depart* from him.

8. *Thirdly*, When from *Primates* he ascends to *Patriarchs*, as if that *latter* had a *power superior* to the *former*, and again from the *Patriarchs* to the *first Patriarch*, *i. e.* the *Bishop* of *Rome*, this he knows hath no place with us, who acknowledge no power of any *Patriarch* above a *Primate*, no *supremacy* over all in the *Bishop* of *Rome*, but yet allow them and him (proportionably to the Πρῶτος Σίμων, if that will content him) that *Primacy* of *order*, which by the *Antient Canons* is allowed them.

Fourthly,

Fourthly, Whatsoever concerning these several steps from the *lowest Clergy-man* to the *first* of *Patriarchs*, he phansies to be answered by us, and from thence concludes, that then *Schism is no way provided against*, is visibly much more true of any *Romanist*; For certainly if he *dissent* not from the *Bishop* of *Rome*, it must be no *Schism* in him, though he *dissent* from his own *Bishop*, his own *Archbishop*, *Primate*, and *Patriarch*; and if he do *dissent* from him, 'tis not his consenting with all his *inferior Governours*, that will stand him in stead for his *vindication*. 9.

And therefore if what he hath formed against me, by his making *Answer* himself to his own *Questions*, be found really to conclude (as he saith it doth) against all *subordination*, 'tis now evident, who is most blameable for it, he doubtless, that hath divolved all into the *Monarchick supremacy* of the *Pope*, and permits us not to consider what any other our *immediate Superiors* require of us. 10.

Lastly, What he puts into my mouth by way of *Answer*, concerning *subordination* to a *General Council*, that if a *Nation* or *Bishop dissent from the rest of a General Council*, *still it is not schism*; unless, as I said, there be deceit in substituting the word *Dissent*, for *Departure* or *Recession*, I shall no way acknowledge the *Answer* which he *believes* I will make: For certainly I acknowledge, as much as he, or any man, the *authority* of a *General Council* against the *dissents* of a *Nation*, much more of a particular *Bishop*. And these were *misadventures* enough to be noted in one *Paragraph*. 11.

SECT. II.

The sufficiency of the few Heads resolved on by the Apostles. The Notion of Fundamentals. The Canon of Ephesus *concerning it. The definition of the Council of* Florence. *Many Churches have not betrayed this trust. Christian practice to be superadded. The few things preserved by Tradition.*

NEXT he proceeds to another part of the *Discourse* of that *Chapter*, concerning the *Heads* resolved on by the *Apostles*, in order to *planting Christian* life; and to that he thus offers his *Exceptions*, *Numb.* 1.

But, saith the Doctor, the Apostles resolved upon some few Heads of special force and efficacy to the planting of Christian life through the World, and preaching and depositing them in every Church of their plantation. Truly I do not know what a Catholick professeth more, so that by the word few, *he meaneth enough to form a Religion, and Christian life, and will shew us a Church which hath not betrayed the trust deposited; for if there be none, what availeth this depositing? if there be any, clear it is that it preserveth it by Tradition; if there be a Question whether it hath or no, again I demand to what purpose was the depositing? so that if the Doctor would speak aloud, I doubt he would be subject to as much jealousie, as he saith* Grotius *was.* 2.

That what I affirm, as he confesseth, *conformably* to the *Catholicks profession*, may be as full and *explicite* as he can desire, I doubt not to express my meaning to be, that the *few Heads*, that the *Apostles* resolved on, were sufficient both for *number* and *efficacy*, or in * *Athanasius*'s language, ὡταρκης πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν πάσης ἀσεβείας, σύστασιν δ' εὐσεβείας ἐν Χριστῷ, *sufficient for the averting all impiety, and establishment of all piety in Christ*; And for his satisfaction therein, I refer him to the *Treatise* of *Fundamentals*, printed since that of *Schism*, of which the *only* design was to insist on this, as the *grand* Notion of *Fundamentals*, such as were by the *Apostles* and *Christ* himself, deemed most proper and *effectual* to plant *Christian* life in a World of *Jews*, and *Gentiles*, and briefly to set down and enumerate all those that the *Apostles* thought *thus* necessary. 3. * *Epist. ad Epict.*

To which I shall now add one *observation*, that this *sufficiency* of the *foundation* by them laid, and somewhat explained (on occasion of *Heretical* Opposers) by the *Council* of *Nice*, &c. was such, that the *Ephesine Council* following that of *Nice*, a hundred and six years, made a Decree, ἑτέραν πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν ἤγουν συγγράφειν, ἢ συντιθέναι παρὰ τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν, &c. *that it should not be lawful for any man to produce, write, or compose any belief beside that which was established by the Fathers at* Nice, *and that they which should dare to compose or offer any such to any that would from Gentilism, Judaism, or whatever Heresie, convert to the acknowledgment of the truth, if they were Bishops, should be deposed from their Bishopricks, if Laymen, anathematised*, &c. *Can.* 7. 4.

And this *authority* being prest by the *Greeks* to the *Latines*, in the *Council* of * *Florence*, and that with this *smart expression*, οὐδεὶς ἐγκαλέσει ἀτέλειαν πίστεως, εἰ μή τις εἴη μαινόμενος, *No man will accuse the Faith* (that which those *Fathers* had profest) or *charge it of imperfection, unless he be mad*, *Concil. l.* 7. *p.* 642. *A.* The *Latines* Answer is but this, that that *Canon* did not *forbid*, ἑτέραν ἔκθεσιν σύμφωνον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐν τῇ πίστει, *another explication agreeable to the truth contained in that Creed*, acknowledging that it did forbid διαφορὰν καὶ ἐναντίωσιν, *difference* as well as *contrariety* (pag. 644. b) and even for such a *bare explication* they counted not *that* lawful for any but the *Fathers convened* in *O Ecumenical Synods*, citing it from *Aquinas*, 2a. 2æ. *qu.* 1. *ar.* 10. and adding that he spake, περὶ ὁτινοσοῦν συμβόλου, ὅπερ ἦν κοινὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *of any Creed whatsoever which was common to the* whole *Church*. 5. * *Sess.* 10. *Ib. p.* 641. *D.* 6.

And accordingly there follows out of the *Epistle* of *Celestine* to *Nestorius*, ἡ πίστις ἡ παραδοθεῖσα παρὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ὅτε προσθήκῃ ὅτε μείωσιν ἀπαιτεῖ, *The belief delivered by the Apostles requires neither addition nor diminution.* So in the *seventh Council*, which hath full authority with the *Romanist*, that *second* at *Nice*, *Act.* vi. *Concil.* t. 5. *p.* 734. A. speaking of the six Councils foregoing, we have these words; Πάντα τὰ παραδοθέντα ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐγγράφως καὶ ἀγράφως ἐκ τῆς ἀρχῆθεν χρόνων αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐβεβαίωσαν καὶ ἐστήριξαν, *they have confirmed and established all that from the first times have been delivered to the Catholick Church written or unwritten.* *Ib. p.* 644. *D.*

In all which, how they are concerned, who *impose* so many *new Articles* of *belief* upon their own *Churches*, and upon all that desire *Communion* with them, I leave to each *Romanist* to consider, and shall only add the words of the *Catechism* taken out of the works of *Costerus*, *Petrus de Soto*, and others, and set out by the command of the *Archbishop of Triers*, *resp. ad* 2. *qu. Neque ulla unquam extitit hæresis, quæ non hoc symbolo damnari potuerit, There was never any Heresie which might not be condemned by the Apostles Creed.* It were well we might be allowed the *benefit* of this *tryal*. 7.

And

8. And now having given this *pledge* of my *readineſs* to anſwer his *Queſtions*, though I diſcern not any *obligation*, ariſing from my *former* Diſcourſe, to lye upon me, yet I ſhall not be ſo *nice* or ſparing of my pains, as to deny him a clear account alſo of his ſubſequent demands, but ſhall ſpeak as *loud* as he would wiſh, and tell him firſt to the *firſt* demand, that as to thoſe *few* Heads I ſpoke of, I can, bleſſed be *God*, ſhew him *Churches* enough, which have not *betrayed* the *truſt depoſited*; The *Church* of *England*, even now, under the *ſaddeſt* perſecution, hath not been *tempted* to *betray* that *truſt*; the *Church* of *Rome*, through all the *Proſperity* and *Splendor*, and *Grandeur*, which it hath long enjoyed, and which, the *Hiſtorian* tells us, *acrioribus ſtimulis animum explorant*, hath as yet held out *thus far*; I mean hath retained thoſe *few Heads*, and in that reſpect is not accuſed by us to have *betrayed* that *truſt* (I wiſh it were as *blameleſs* in all things elſe, particularly in that wherein our preſent Debate is moſt concerned, in impoſing *new Articles* of *Faith* on all *Chriſtians*, and her own *infallibility* for the firſt of them.)

9. The ſame I can as freely affirm of all other *National Churches*, that I know of, confining my Diſcourſe ſtill to the ſmall (yet in the *Apoſtles* opinions *ſufficient*) number of *Heads* of *ſpecial* force to the *planting* of *Chriſtian life* through the World.

10. And ſo as this *Gentleman* is much diſappointed in his expectation, that I ſhould not be able to name any *Church* that hath not *betrayed* the truſt *depoſited*, ſo I muſt profeſs to him, I think it as reaſonable, that they that agree in *believing* and *conſerving* thoſe few *precious* Heads of truth, deſigned to ſo *glorious* an end, as is the *peopling* a World with a *peculiar Colony* of Inhabitants, all uniformly *zealous of good works*, ſhould all join *hands* and *hearts*, to add that ſuperſtructure to the *foundation*, pure, immaculate, *Elevated*, *Heroical*, i. e. *Chriſtian* practice, to the *untainted* belief of theſe few things.

11. And then how much blame (by force of that *Canon* of *Epheſus*) moſt juſtly belongs unto them that make it their great intereſt to *quarrel*, divide from, and *anathematize*, all others, who cannot *believe* all other things which they chance to *believe*, though they know they *agree* with them in all that the *Apoſtles* thus thought neceſſary to be *agreed* in; and indeed how contrary this is, and deſtructive to *this ſuperſtructure*, of which *Charity* is one principal *ingredient*, and ſo to the *deſign* of laying the *foundation*, though not to the *foundation* it ſelf, I ſhall leave this *Gentleman* and every ſober *Chriſtian* to conſider; and if he judge not as I do, yet I ſhall not ξενίζεσθαι number it among the *prodigies* of the *Age*, or indeed think *ſtranger* of it, than I have long done of the great *diſtance* betwixt *Reaſon* and *Paſſion* in the ſame ſort of Creatures, *Man*, and (*God* knows too oft) in the ſame *individual* Creature, the ſame *Man* and *Chriſtian*.

12. Having gone thus far in ready obedience to this *Gentlemans* lighteſt intimation of his pleaſure, in *ſatisfaction* to his *firſt* demand, I ſhall in the ſame humour proceed without all reſerve to the next, doubting as little as he, but that theſe *few* things (all *juſtice* muſt allow our Diſcourſe to be *coherent*, and ſo to adhere to the ſame *Subject* with which we began) *have been preſerved in each Church by Tradition*; and then to the third, that there is no place of *doubt* concerning the *fact*, and ſo of *Queſtion*, whether they have or no; and if by thus *ſpeaking aloud* to every of his demands, I render my ſelf *ſubject to as much jealouſie as I ſay* Grotius *was*, I ſhall not accuſe him as my *Tempter*, but only ſupport and *comfort* my ſelf, that I have retained as much innocence as I always thought *Grotius* had done, and by declaring my meaning thus *clearly*, and *profeſſing* that I mean no whit more than I ſay, I ſee no place for *jealouſie* remaining to any.

13. If to *believe* the *Apoſtles Creed* to be conveyed down to us by *tradition* in every *National Church* from the *Apoſtles* time to this, be any *Hereſie*, I am viſibly guilty of it, and need not have my words put upon the *rack* (as *Grotius*'s have been) to *extort* a more explicite *confeſſion* from them.

SECT. III.

Submiſſion without opinion of infallibility. The Appeal to the Fathers of the firſt three hundred years, and the four General Councils, to what it belongs. The ſilence of the firſt times no advantage to the Romaniſt. Two Queſtions of Additaments to Faith; The way of debating each of them.

Numb. 1. HIS laſt *Exception* to this *Chapter* is to our *profeſſion* of *humility* and *temper*, which it ſeems thoſe of our *Religion* muſt not be permitted to *aſſume* to themſelves (and which I was no farther ſo *inſolent* to *aſſume*, than as it is obſervable in the peculiarity of the *frame* of the *Church* of *England*'s *Reformation*) Thus,

2. *I cannot but admire indeed the great temper he profeſſeth men of his Religion have, in chuſing of Doctrines, to wit, their ſubmiſſion to the three firſt Ages, and the four firſt Councils; but I confeſs it is a humility I underſtand not, firſt to profeſs they know not whether their Teachers ſay true or no (that is, that they are fallible) and then to hold under pain of damnation what they ſay. Another piece of their humility is in ſubmitting to Ages, where very few Witneſſes can be found; in regard of the rarity of the Authors, and the little occaſion they had to ſpeak of preſent Controverſies. A third note of humility is, that whereas the fourth Council was held about the midſt of the fifth Age, theſe Lovers of truth will ſtand to it, but not to the fourth Age precedent, or that very Age in which it was held; ſo humble they are to ſubmit to any authority, that toucheth not the Queſtions in preſent Controverſie; but where do they find Chriſt's Church ſhall be judge in three Ages, and fail in the fourth, or that the Councils in the fifth Age ſhall be ſound, but not the Fathers.*

3. It is very hard, it ſeems, to pleaſe this *Gentleman*. Our *humility* is one while by him cenſured as really *too great*, another while the *want* of it is our *crime*, and we equally to be *ſcoffed* at on both accounts.

4. It is a *criminous* exceſs of *humility* forſooth, to *ſubmit* to thoſe of whom we firſt profeſs not to *know* that they are *infallible*. But as long as we do verily believe they do actually *affirm* truth, why may we not *ſubmit* to them, though we *know* not that they are *infallible*? For certainly I may *ſubmit* to my

natural

natural, or *civil parent* in this manner, *obey* him in all his *commands*, (supposing, as now I do, that none of his *commands* are by me apprehended to be *unlawful*, as none of these *Councils definitions*, are by us believed to be contrary to the Word and Will of *God*) though yet I neither account him *inerrable* nor *impeccable*. But of this I have spoken already, *Chap.* I. *Sect.* 3.

What he adds of *holding under pain of damnation what they say*, is in this place an *insertion* of this 5.
Gentleman's, no word being said of it in that *Section*, to which his words are confronted, and having elsewhere spoken to that, I abstain from *adding* more at this time.

In the next place it seems our *humility* is too *scanty*; for when I have *submitted* to be judged by 6.
the *Scriptures*, the *consent* of the *first three hundred* years, or the *four General Councils*, whether we have departed from the *Apostolical doctrine* or *traditions*, this, saith he, is *submitting to Ages where very few witnesses can be found*, &c. But I desire it may be remembred, what there I speak of, (for perhaps this *Gentleman*'s haste hath not permitted him to advert to it) the *contesting* our *innocence* in this, that we of the *Church* of *England* have not *departed* from the *Apostolick doctrine* and *traditions*; And for this, whither could the *appeal* more properly be directed, than to the *Scriptures*, the *Conservatory* of the *Apostles written* doctrine and the *three* first *Centuries*, the *conservatory* of their *traditions?* It being unimaginable that any thing should be so *per saltum* conveyed to us from the *Apostles*, as to *leap* over those three *Centuries* next to them, without leaving any footstep *discernable* among them.

For let the *witnesses* of those times, the *authors* that remain to us, be never so *few*, yet unless by 7.
some of their *hands* we be directed what the *Apostles* delivered to them, how can we know what was *delivered?* It being all one in this respect not to *be*, as not to *appear*; *Tradition*, even *Apostolical*, being no more than an *empty* name, unless we suppose our selves able to *avouch* some competent *testifiers* of the *Tradition*.

And if to these two, I have added the *four General Councils*, because they were held against the 8.
great *disturbers* of the *unity* of the *Faith*, and they maintained the *true* faith by these *two* special *weapons*, the *Scriptures* and *Tradition*, testified by the *first Writers*, and our *Church* hath taken in their *Creeds* into our *Liturgies*, and their *definitions* into our *Articles* of *Religion*, and so I have by that *appeal* so far testified our *non-departure* from the *Faith*, I hope there is no *offence* in this, no degree of *defect* in our *humility*.

As for the *little occasion* these *first* had to *speak* of the *present Controversies*, that sure cannot be *ob-* 9.
jected against our *procedure* (any more than the *paucity* of the *Authors* could) for if the *Romanist* do but grant this one thing, it will be found a *real prejudice* to his *pretensions*, if (which was the point in hand) the *question* be, whether the *Church* of *England* have *departed* from the *unity* of the *Apostolick Faith*, denied any *Apostolick Doctrine* or *Tradition*.

For in this *Controversie* how shall it be proved, that we have *departed*, unless that *Doctrine* or *Tra-* 10.
dition being specified what it is, it be evidenced also, that it was *delivered* by the *Apostles?* and how can that be evidenced, but by those which within some competent distance of their time, affirm that from them? and how can they be pretended to *affirm* that, if it be granted of them that they had no *occasion* to *speak* of it; and so are utterly *silent* in it?

To his last note of *humility*, *i. e.* the next expression of his *sceptical* humor, there can be no need 11.
of applying any answer, it being no where intimated in that *Treatise* that we are not ready to stand to the *fourth Age*, or that wherein the *fourth Council* was held; All that was said, was, that the three *first Ages*, and the *four General Councils* were *competent* witnesses of the *Apostolical doctrines* and *traditions*; and I desire any man to name any other, that were more *competent* to this purpose *i. e.* to *testifie* what the *Apostles* taught; It being certain that whosoever doth (not by *inspiration*) tell us any thing of that kind, must assume to tell it from them, and as *evident*, that all those things (that even now were spoken of) which the *Apostles* resolved on, as *heads* of *special* force to form *Religion* and *Christian* life, were by this means conveyed to us.

Mean while other *matters* there are, which we look on as *additaments* to the *doctrines* of *Faith*, and 12.
so are the *subject* of a *double question*, 1. whether they be parts of that *faith* which was *once*, or *at once delivered to the Saints*; 2. whether not appearing to be so, there be any other just *reason* to *believe*, though but by an *humane* Faith, that they have any *truth* in them.

Now of these two *questions*, as the *resolution* of the *former* depends upon those Ages, which alone 13.
can convey *Tradition* to the *succeeding*, and so still for that, we refer our selves to the former *Umpirage*; so of the *second*, I did not then, because I had not *occasion* to speak in that place.

And if my *answer* be required now, I shall readily give it, that in matters of this nature the *Opini-* 14.
ons of the *Fathers* of the *Church* in the most *flourishing Ages* of it, wherein their *writings* are most *voluminous*, and their *Learning* in *Theology* most *venerable*, are with us of great *weight* and *consideration*; we do (and shall upon all occasions demonstrate our selves to) allow them as full an *authority*, pay as great and true a *reverence* to their *judgments*, indeavour as uniformly to *conform* our selves to the *declarations* of their sense, as any sober *Romanists* are by us discerned to do, or as it can be their interest to do, in respect of the *controversies* that lie between us. And so still I discern not, wherein our *humility* can be judged to fail, by those, with whom I now *dispute*, being content that it should by *others* be judged *excessive*.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the ninth Chapter.

SECT. I.

The hinderances of Communion imputable to the Romanist, not to us. Siquis Ecclesiam non audierit, *one of our grounds. What is meant by* Ecclesia.

Numb. 1. THE *Exceptions* to this *Chapter* are not very great, whether we respect their *weight* or *number*; yet upon the same account that the former have been our *exercise*, these may for a while detain us also.

2. *In his ninth Chapter*, saith he, *he pretended the Roman Catholick Church is cause of this division, because they desire Communion, and cannot be admitted, but under the belief and practice of things contrary to their consciences; of which two propositions, if the second be not proved, the first is vain, and is as if a subject should plead he is unjustly outlawed, because he doth not desire it: Now to prove the latter, he assumeth that the Protestant is ready to contest his Negatives, by grounds that all good Christians ought to be concluded by; what he means by that, I know not, for that they will convince their Negatives by any ground, a good Christian ought to be concluded by, I see nothing less.*

What then will they contest it by? all grounds a good orthodox Christian ought to be concluded by? If they answer in the affirmative, we shall ask them whether siquis Ecclesiam non audierit *be one of their grounds, and if they say no, we shall clearly disprove their Major; but then their defence is, if any ground, or rule of it self firm and good, speaketh nothing clearly of a point in question, they will contest that point by those grounds; and is not this a goodly excuse?*

3. The design of *Chap.* IX. of the *Treatise* of *Schism*, is to vindicate us from all guilt of *Schism*, as that signifies *offence* against *external peace* and *communion Ecclesiastical*; and it being certain, that we exclude none from our *Communion*, that acknowledge the *foundation*, and that we desire to be admitted to the like *freedom* of *external communion*, with all members of all other *Christian Churches*, the result is visible, that the hinderances, that obstruct this *freedom*, are wholly imputable to the *Romanist*, such are their *excommunicating* us, and imposing *conditions* on their *communion*, such as we cannot admit of without *sin*, or *scandal*, acting contrary to *Conscience*, or making an *unsound confession*.

4. To this, all that is *answered* is, that unless this second be proved, *viz.* that such *conditions* are by them imposed on their *communion*, the *first*, that of our *desire* of *Communion*, is *vain*; And to this I make no doubt to yield; for if we may with a *good Conscience* be admitted to their *Communion*, and yet wilfully withdraw our selves from it, then I confess there is no place for this plea of ours; But for the *contesting* of this there was not then, neither will there now be any place, without *descending* to the *severals* in *difference* between us, (which was beyond the design either of those, or these *Papers*) and therefore for that, all that can be said is, that we are ready to maintain our *Negatives*, by *grounds* that all *good Christians* ought to be *concluded* by; And because it is here askt, whether *siquis Ecclesiam non audierit* be one of those *grounds*, I answer without *question* it is, and so is every other *affirmation* of *Christ*, or the *Apostles*, however made known to us to be such. And I cannot sufficiently admire, why, when it is known to all *Romanists*, that we are ready to be *judged* by *Scripture*, and when it is certain that *siquis Ecclesiam non audierit*] are the words of *Scripture*, he should suppose (as here he doth) that we will say, *No: i. e.* that we will *refuse* to be *tried* or *concluded* by that.

5. Here I must suppose that by *Ecclesiam* he understands the *Roman* (which he calls *Catholick*) *Church*; but then this interpretation or understanding of his, is one thing, and those words of *Christ* are another; for they belonging to the *Church* indefinitely, under which any man, that hath offended, is regularly placed; do to a member of the particular *Roman Church*, signifie that, as to an *Englishman*, the *Church* wherein he lives, and that, is not the *Roman*, or the *Universal Church* of *God*, and that is more than the *Roman*.

6. And so by acknowledging that ground of *Scripture*, we are no way *obliged* to *believe* all that that particular *Church* of *Rome*, to which we owe no *obedience* (and are as ready to *contest* that by the same means also) exacts of us.

7. As for our *contesting* any *point* by that *ground* or *rule* which *speaketh nothing clearly* of it, I gave him no *occasion* to make any such *objection* against us, and withal have said what was *sufficient* to it *Chapter* VIII. *Sect.* 3. n. 7. and so need not here farther attend to it.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the tenth Chapter.

SECT. I.

The Romanists want of charity, wherein it consists.

IN his view of *Chap.* X. he takes notice of two *Charges* by us brought in against them, 1. *judging*, 2. *despising* their *Brethren*, but contents himself with a very brief Reply, and that only to one of them, Thus, *Numb.* 1.

In his tenth Chapter, he saith, *we judge them and despise them: as to the first, I have often wondred, and do now, that men, pretending to learning and reason, should therein charge us with want of charity, for if our judgment be false, it is errour, not malice, and whether true or false, we press it upon them out of love and kindness, to keep them from the harm, that according to our belief, may come upon them; but since they deny they are Schismaticks, and offer to prove it, we must not say it: yet I think we ought, until we have cause to believe them, since our highest Tribunal, the Churches voice, from which we have no appeal, hath passed judgment against them.* 2.

The want of *charity*, with which we charge the *Romanist* in this matter, is not their *warning* us of our *danger*, which may reasonably be interpreted *love*, and *kindness*, and *care* to keep us from *harm*, and if they erre in *admonishing*, when there is no *need* of it, there is nothing still but *charity* in this; but it is their *casting* us out of their *Communion* on this score, that we consent not to all their *Dictates*, that we withdraw our *obedience* from those, who without *right* usurped it over us, their *anathematizing* and *damning* us, and being no way perswadable to withdraw these *sanguinary censures*, unless we will *change* or *dissemble* our *beliefs*; and as there cannot be *charity* in this, any thing that can tend to the *mending* of any; for how can it be deemed any *act* of *reformation* in any, to forsake his present *perswasions*, whilst he is not convinced of any *errour* in them? and surely the bare *damning* of us is not any such matter of *conviction*; so there is a double *uncharitableness*, 1. of being *angry* without *cause*, and expressing that *anger* in very *ill language*, of which that of *Heretick* and *Schismatick* is the mildest, and each of those *causless* too, if they be affix'd to any *particular* man, much more to a *whole Church*, before either of them be sufficiently *proved* against us; For certainly as the *Romanist*'s *judgment* concerning us, if it be *false*, may yet be but *error* not *malice* (by which this *Gentleman* here justifies himself from want of *charity*) so our *opinions* and *perswasions* of the *erroneousness* of their *Doctrines* and *sinfulness* of their *practices*, if possibly they be not *true* also, are still as *justly* and equitably capable of the same excuse, that they are *involuntary* errors, and then by their own Rule, cannot justly fall under such their *rigid censures*, which belong to none but *voluntary* Offenders. 3.

Secondly, The *endeavouring* to *insnare* and *pervert fearful* or *feeble* minds, using these *terrors*, as the *Lion* doth his *roaring*, to intimidate the *Prey*, and make it not *rationally* but astonish'dly, *fall* down before them. And as the offering due *grounds* of *conviction* to him that is in errour, may justly be deemed *charity*, so this tender of nothing but *frights*, without offer of such *grounds* of *conviction*, is but leading men into *temptation* to sin against *conscience*, to *dissimulation*, &c. and so the *hating the Brother in the heart*, Lev. 19. the more than *suffering* sin upon him. 4.

To these might be, not unseasonably, added a farther consideration, which hath carried *weight* with the *Fathers* of the *Church* in all times, that seeing the *censures* of the *Church* were left there, πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν & πρὸς καθαίρεσιν, *for edification not for destruction*, and are only designed to *charitative* ends (must never be used to any *other* purpose) therefore when *obedience* is utterly *cast off*, the band, be it of *subordination* or *co-ordination* so broken, that the issuing out of *censures* cannot expect to *compose*, but only to *widen* the *breach*, not to *mollifie* but *exasperate*, there *Christian prudence* is to endeavour by *milder* ways, what *severity* is not likely to effect, and so the *Thunderbolts* to be laid up, till there may be some probability of *doing good* by them. 5.

But this is not the Case, as it really lyes betwixt *Rome* and us, save only as *à majori* it may be *accommodated* to us; we have cast off neither *obedience* to any, to whom it was *due*, nor *charity* to those, who have least to us, nor *truth*, to the utmost of our *understandings*, and yet we must be cast out and *anathematized*, and after all that, *condemned* as *wilful Schismaticks*, i. e. αὐτοκαλύκελοι, *Dividers* and *Condemners* of *our selves*, because we quietly *submit* to that *fate*, which will cost us too dear, the *wounding* and *disquiet* of our *conscience*, to qualifie our selves for a *capacity* of getting out of it. 6.

What he adds of their *highest Tribunal*, the *Churches voice*, which hath passed this *judgment* against us, belongs I suppose to those *Bishops* of *Rome*, which have sent out their *Bulls* against us, and therefore I must in reason add, that those are principally guilty of this *Schism*, and so their *Successors* principally obliged to *retract* and *reform* the *sin* of it, and after them, all others in the *order* and *measure*, that they have partaked in this *guilt* with them. 7.

And there can be no greater *charity*, than to beseech all in the *bowels* of *Christ*, to return to the *practice* of that *charity*, which hath too long been exiled from among *Christian* Professors. 8.

CHAP. XI.

An Answer to the Exceptions made to the last Chapter.

SECT. I.

Of the present state of the Church of England. *The Catholicks promise for eternity to his Church.* Roma æterna. *Particular Churches perishable. Mr.* Hooker's *Prediction of this Church. The power of the secular Magistrate to remove Bishops Sees, not to make Bishops. The Council of* Florence *concerning the Popes supremacy,* &c. Marcus's *opinion of it.* Joseph. Methonens. *his Answer briefly examined.*

Numb. 1. THE last part of this *Gentleman*'s endeavours to perswade men that the *Church* of *England* is not only *persecuted* but *destroyed*, and of that he means to make his advantage to fetch in *Proselytes*, being out of his great *charity* very sensible of their *estate*, unwilling they should sit any longer in the *vault* or *charnel-house* to communicate with *shades*, when they are invited to a fairer *sunshine*, in a *vital* and very *flourishing Society*. Thus then he begins his Reply to the *eleventh Chapter*.

2. *In the last Chapter he complaineth of the Catholicks for reproaching them with the loss of their Church, and arguing with their Disciples in this sort: Communion in some Church, even externally, is necessary, but you cannot now communicate with your late Church, for that hath no subsistence, therefore you ought to return to the Church from whence you went out; truly in this Case I think they ought to pardon the Catholick, who hath, or undoubtedly is perswaded he hath a promise for eternity to his Church, and experience in the execution of that promise for sixteen Ages, in which none other can compare with him, and sees another Church judged* Hooker's *Eccl. Polit.* *by one of the learnedst and most prudent persons confessedly that ever was among them, to be a Building likely to last but fourscore years, and to be now torn up by the roots, and this done by the same means by which it was setled; I say, if this Catholick believe his eyes, he is at least to be excused; and though I know the Doctor will reply, his Church is still in Being, preserved in Bishops and Presbyters rightly ordained, yet let him remember how inconsequent this is, to what he hath said before, for ask him how it doth remain in Being, if there be no such Bishops or Presbyters among them, for his defence against the Church of* Rome *is, that the secular Authority hath power to make and change Bishops and Presbyters: from whence it will follow, that as they were set up by a secular Authority, so are they pulled down, and unbishoped by another secular Authority; if it be said the Parliament that pulled them down, had not the three Bodies requisite to make a Parliament, no more had that which set them up, for the Lords Spiritual were wanting both in Parliament and Convocation, so that there was as much authority to pull them down as to set them up: but it will be replied, that though they are pulled down, yet are they still Bishops,* viz. *the character remains upon them.*

Alas, what is their Character, if their mission of Preaching and Teaching be extinguished, which follows their jurisdiction, which jurisdiction the Doctor makes subject to the secular authority, so that whatsoever Characters their Bishops and Presbyters pretend to have, they have according to his Principles, no power over the Laity, and so no character can be made of any Bishop as Head and Pastor, and of the People as body and flock, and consequently their Church is gone.

But we account our selves Bishops and Priests, not from an authority dependent upon Princes, or inherited from Augustus *or* Nero, *but from* Peter *and* Paul, *and so shall stand and continue, whatsoever Princes or secular Powers decree; when they according to their Doctrines and Arguments, are not to wonder if they be thrown down by the same authority that set them up; and as the Synagogue was a Church to have an end, so is this, with this difference, that the Synagogue was a true Church in reference to a better, but this is a counterfeit and tyrannical one to punish a better. As concerning the Doctors Prayer for peace and communion, all good people will join with him, if he produce* Fructus dignos pœnitentiæ, *especially if he acknowledge the infallibility of the Church, and the Supremacy of the Pope; the former is explicated sufficiently in divers Books, the latter is expressed in the Council of* Florence *in these words,* viz. *we define that the Holy Apostolical See, and the Bishop of* Rome *have the primacy over all the World, and that the Bishop of* Rome *is Successor to S.* Peter, *the Prince of the Apostles, and truly Christ's Vicar, and Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians, and that there was given him in Saint* Peter *from Christ a full power to feed, direct and govern the Catholick Church: So far the Council. Without obeying this, the Doctor is a Schismatick; and without confessing the other, an Heretick; but let him join with us in these, all the rest will follow.*

3. I shall not here repeat my *complaint* (if it were indeed such, and not rather a bare *proposing* of a last foreseen *objection* against us) knowing how little *compassion* any *sufferings* of ours may expect to receive from this *Gentleman*, I shall only join issue with his tenders of *proof*, that our *Church* hath now no *subsistence*; but yet before I do so, take notice of one part of his *arguing*, viz. that the *Catholick hath, or is undoubtedly perswaded he hath a promise for eternity to his Church.* Where certainly the *fallacy* is very visible, and sufficient to supersede (if he shall *advert* to it) his undoubted *perswasion*. For what *promise* of *eternity* can this *Gentleman* here reflect on? undoubtedly that of the *Church* of *Christ* indefinitely, that the *Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*, *Matth.* 16. 18.

4. What is the full importance of that *Phrase*, is * elsewhere largely shewed, and need not be here any farther *repeated*, than that the *promise infallibly* belongs not to any *particular Church*, of any one *denomination*, but to the whole *Body*, *Christ* will preserve to himself a *Church* in this *World*, as long as this *World* lasteth, in despight of all the *malice*, *cunning*, or *force* of *men*, and *Devils*.

* *Annot. on the p. last.*

5. Now that this is no *security*, or promise of *eternity* to any *particular Church*, whether of *Rome* or *England*, any more than of *Thyatira* or *Laodicea* (which contrary to any such *promise*, is threatned to be *spued* out, *Rev.* 3. 16.) is in it self most evident, because the destroying any *one* particular *Church* is reconcileable with *Christ*'s preserving some other, as the *Species* of Mankind is preserved, though the *Gentleman* and I should be supposed to *perish*, and because the Ἐκκλησία μου, *my Church*, which is there

there the *ſubject* of the *diſcourſe*, is not the *Romaniſt* (or in that ſenſe the *Catholick*) his *Church*, as is here ſuggeſted, but the *Church* of *Chriſt* built upon the *foundation* of the *Apoſtles*, of which *Simon* is there ſaid to be one Πέτρος, i. e. *ſtone* or *foundation-ſtone*, ſo as he was of other *Churches*, beſide that of *Rome*, and ſo as others were of other *Churches*, which he never came near, and even of this of *Rome*, Saint *Paul* as well as he.

From hence therefore, by force of this *promiſe* (which as truly belongs to every *Church* as it doth to *Rome*, but indeed belongs to no *particular*, but to the *Chriſtian Church*, to conclude that the *Church* of *Rome* is *eternal*, is a firſt ungrounded *perſwaſion* in this *Gentleman*, the very ſame, as to conclude a *particular* is an *univerſal*, or that the *deſtruction* of one *part* is the utter *diſſolution* of the *whole*; and the proof from *experience* of *ſixteen ages*, which is here added, is a ſtrange way of *argumentation*, ſuch as that *Methuſalem* might have uſed the very day *before* his death, to prove that he ſhould *never dye*, and the very ſame that *Heathen Rome* did uſe, at the time of their *approaching* deſtruction, calling her ſelf * *Urbem æternam*, the *eternal City*, and † ἀϊδιόπολιν Ῥωμὴν, *Rome the Heaven-City*, and * Ῥωμὴν θεὰν, *Rome a Goddeſs*, which accordingly had by *Adrian* a Temple erected to it, and the *Emperors* thereof, and the very *name* of the place *worſhipt* as a *deity* (*More Dea, nomenque loci ſeu numen adorant*) and all this upon this one *ſcore*, that it had *ſtood* and *proſpered* ſo long. 6.

* *Hieron. qu.* 115 *ad Algas.*
† *Athenæus*, l. 12.
* *Golizius in Theſau. Dio in Adriano. Prudentius.*

The like may be affirmed of the *Church* of the *Jews*, built upon a *promiſe*, which had more of *peculiarity* to the *ſeed* of *Abraham*, than this of *Matt.* 16. can be imagined to have to the *Church* of *Rome*, and yet that *Church* was deſtroyed, and nothing more contributed to the *provocation*, and merit of that *deſtruction*, than their own *confidence* of being *unperiſhable*. The beſt admonition in this reſpect, is that of the *Apoſtle*, *Be ye not high minded, but fear*, and, *If God ſpared not the Natural branches, take heed alſo leſt he ſpare not you*; and this *Gentleman* cannot be ignorant what * *Church* it was, that was then capaple of this *exhortation*. And the very making this matter of *argument*, and in this reſpect (not of *purity*, but of *duration*) exalting the *Romaniſt*'s *Church*, above all other *Churches* in theſe words [*none other can compare with him*,] as it is one character which determines the ſpeech to the *particular Church* of *Rome*, (for elſe how can he ſpeak of *others*, and affirm that they *cannot compare*) ſo it is no very *humble*, or conſequently *Chriſtian* expreſſion in this *Gentleman*. 7.

* Rom. 11. 2.

What he adds out of Maſter *Hooker*, and applies as the *judgment* of that *learned* man concerning the *Church* of *England*, yields us theſe farther obſervations, 1. That in all reaſon this *Gentleman* muſt in his former words ſpeak of his *Church* of *Rome*, as that is a *particular Church*, for elſe how can he after his *Church*, name *another Church*, meaning this of *England*, of which ſaith he, Mr. *Hooker* ſpeaks? and that will conclude the evident *falſity* of his *aſſumption*, that by *Chriſt*'s *promiſe*, *eternity* belonged to it, for that it cannot do to any *particular Church*, becauſe the *Univerſal* may be preſerved, when that is deſtroyed, and the *promiſe* being made indefinitely to the *Church*, may be performed in any *part* of it. 8.

Secondly, That a very ſmall matter will ſerve turn with this *Gentleman*, to ſupport a *concluſion*, which he hath a mind to infer; otherwiſe Maſter *Hookers Teſtimony* had never been produced to this matter. The words of that (truly) moſt *learned* and *prudent* perſon, are to be found in his *fifth Book*, *Num.* 79. in the *Concluſion*. The *ſubject* of that whole *Paragraph*, beginning *pag.* 424. is of *Oblations*, *Foundations*, *Endowments*, *Tithes*, all intended for the *perpetuity* of *Religion*, which was in his opinion ſure to be *fruſtrated*, by *alienation* of *Church Livings*; and this being largely handled by him throughout that *Paragraph*, at length he obſerves, 1. what waſte *Covetouſneſs* had made in the *Church* by ſuch *commutations*, as were proportionable to *Glaucus*'s *change*, giving the *Church*, *Flanel* for *Gold*: and 2. how *Religion* it ſelf was made a *Sollicitor* and perſwader of *Sacrilege*, ſignifying, that to *give to God*, is *errour*, and to take it away again, *Reformation of errour*, concluding in theſe words, *By theſe or the like ſuggeſtions received with all joy, and with like ſedulity practiſed in certain parts of the Chriſtian world, they have brought to paſs, that as* David *doth ſay of Man, ſo it is in danger to be verified concerning the whole Religion and ſervice of God, the time thereof may peradventure fall out to be threeſcore and ten years, or if ſtrength do ſerve unto fourſcore, what followeth, is likely to be ſmall joy for them, whoſoever they be that behold it. Thus have the beſt things been overthrown, not ſo much by puiſſance and might of adverſaries, as through defect of Counſel in them that ſhould have upheld and defended the ſame.* 9.

This is the full importance of that place, which the *Gentleman* hath ſo diſguiſed in his *abbreviation*. Mr. *Hooker* foretells what a deſtructive *influence*, *Sacrilege* may have on the *whole Religion* and *Service* of *God*, obſerves in *certain parts* of the *Chriſtian world* (without naming any) that *ſacrilegious ſuggeſtions* are *received with all joy*, and putting theſe two together, *preſaged ſad* events to the *whole Religion*, and *Service* of *God*, within *threeſcore* and *ten*, or *fourſcore* years, and from hence this *Gentleman* concludes it Maſter *Hooker*'s *judgment*, that the *Church* of *England* was a *building likely to laſt but fourſcore years*. 10.

In what *mode* and *figure* this *concluſion* is thus made from the *premiſſes*, he leaves us to divine, who have not *ſagacity* enough to diſcern it; The *concluſion* to all mens underſtanding will moſt regularly follow thus, that the *Church* of *England* was ſo *conſtituted*, that all the *enemies* thereof on either ſide were never likely to *deſtroy* it by *arguments*, and *conſequently*, that the moſt probable way remaining to *Satan* to accompliſh his *deſign* was, by *ſacrilegious violations* to *impoveriſh* and ſubdue the maintainers of it, which as he foreſaw very likely to come to paſs within the *age* of a *man*, ſo it would be no *joyful ſight* when it ſhould come, he was not ſo *unkind* to any part of the *Church* of *God*, as to be willing to *live* to ſee it. 11.

And if this *Gentleman*'s *inclinations* have qualified him for the *receiving pleaſure* or *joy* in ſuch a *ſpectacle*, I ſhall as little envy him the *proſperity* which hath thus *petrified* his *bowels*, as he ſhall think fit to envy me the *honour* of being a *member* of the *pureſt* (being withal the moſt *perſecuted*) *Church*. 12.

Thirdly, That theſe words of Mr. *Hooker* thus pitifully diſtorted, are the only proof he hath for his *aſſertion*, that this *Church* of ours hath now no *ſubſiſtence*, and that it is now torn up by the *roots*; A way of arguing very conformable to his *characters* of a true *Church*, of which *external glory* and proſperity muſt never miſs to be one, but very unlike the *image* of *Chriſt* the *head*, to which his *Church* the *body* may be allowed to hold ſome *proportion* of *conformity*, for of him we can give no *livelier portraiture*, 13.

traicture, than as we find him *crucified* between *two thieves*, whilst the *souldiers* divide his *garments*, though they were not *over sumptuous*, and *cast lots* who shall have his *vesture*.

14. What next follows is an answer to a supposed *objection* of ours (and that is a farther evidence of what I said, that Mr. *Hooker*'s *distorted* speech is the only proof of his *proposition*) The *objection* is, that our *Church is still in being preserved in Bishops and Presbyters rightly ordained*; and to this *objection* he will make some *answer* from our own *principles*, of which he supposeth this to be one, *that the secular authority hath power to make and change Bishops and Presbyters*, and saith without any regrets, that this is my *defence against the Bishop of* Rome.

15. Many replies might be made to take off all appearance of force from this *answer*. As 1. that this, to which the *answer* is accommodated, is not my *objection*. The truth is, I took not on me the *objectors* part in that place, but evidenced it by clear *demonstration*, that if *twenty years* ago the *Church* of *England* was a *Church*, it must needs be so now, being the very same that then it was, *except these bands*, as the *Apostle* once said, who I hope did not cease to be an *Apostle* by being *imprisoned*. And when I mentioned the *Church* of *Englands* being *preserved* in *Bishops* and *Presbyters rightly ordained*, together with *multitudes* rightly *baptized* (which sure are all the necessary *ingredients* in *constituting* a *visible Church*) I added, *none of which have fallen off from their profession*, and then foreseeing the only possible *objection* to infer the *Church* guilty of *Schism*, I answered that by remembring the *Primitive persecutions* and *night-meetings*, and the very manner of the *Romanists* serving *God* in this *Kingdom* for these many years.

16. And all this is pulled off from the *clue*, and *fumbled* together into an *objection* of mine, supposed to be made against that which the *Romanist*, without either tender of *proof*, or *reason*, had crudely affirmed. But truly I may be believed, that I meant not that *affirmation* so much respect, as to offer *objection* against it: And then that is one speedy way of *concluding* this matter.

17. But then, *secondly*, for that saying of mine, on which he will form his *answer* to this imaginary *objection*, 'tis certain I never said any such thing, as is here suggested: That the *supreme Magistrate* hath *power* to *erect* and *translate Patriarchates*, and the like, I had *affirmed* indeed, *i. e.* to make that a *Patriarchal See*, which had not formerly been such, so to ennoble a *Town* or *City*, that according to the *Canons* of the *Church* it should become an *Episcopal*, or *Archiepiscopal*, or *Chief*, or *Patriarchal See*, and my meaning is evident, and not possible to be mistaken by any that understands the *Language*, and adverts to what he reads.

18. But sure I never said, that the *secular authority hath power to make Bishops and Presbyters*, and there is no *question* but this *Gentleman* knows, if he hath read what he *answers*, that in the *Tract* of *Schism* I never said it.

19. So again, it is of daily *practice* in this *Church*, as in all others, for the *supreme power* to *change*, as that *signifies* to *remove Bishops* from one *See* to another, and so for every *Lay-Patron* in the same sense to *change Presbyters*: But what is that to the *making* of *Bishops* or *Presbyters*? did ever *King* or *Lay-Patron* pretend to that? This is too visible to need insisting on.

20. *Thirdly*, When he saith, there *was as much authority to pull down Bishops* and *Presbyters* in this *nation*, *as to set them up*, I might demand, 1. Whether he hath any reason to pretend that *Presbyters* are now *pulled down* in this *nation*, for this is by him supposed, who inquires by what *authority* they are *pull'd down*: 2. Whether he can, either upon mine or his own principles, assume with any colour of truth, that none had any hand in *setting up* the *Bishops* in this *Kingdom*, but those whom here he affirms to have consented to the *pulling* them *down*, and consequently affirm, that there was as much *authority* to *pull* them *down*, as to *set* them up? 3. Whether it have any truth in it, (whether he speak of what was done in *Parliament* in *King Henry*'s, or *King Edward*'s, or *Queen Elizabeth*'s daies) that the *Lords Spiritual were wanting both in Parliament and Convocation?* 4. What he hath said to make it in the least degree *probable*, that the *Bishops* and *Presbyters mission* of *preaching* and *teaching* is *extinguished* among us, any more than it was in the *Primitive Church*, when the *Emperor* was not *favourable* to the *profession*, and when the *Jews* called it *Heresie*: And *lastly*, Whether, if no one of these can with any degree of *verity* be answered in the *affirmative*, this be not very immoderate liberty, which this *Gentleman* hath given himself in *affirming* or *supposing* all these, and then adding, that our *portion* is to be lookt for with the *Jewish Synagogue*, as one, so the other, to have an *end*; not considering that he hath as little skill in *revealing secrets*, as even now in *interpreting* Mr. *Hooker*'s *Prophecy*, that he cannot yet tell, what *God* hath within his *veil* decreed concerning our *Church*, and which may yet make the greatest speed to follow the *Synagogue*'s *fate*, they which are *cast down*, *but not destroyed*, or they which (to say no worse) *stand* by, and *rejoyce* at it.

21. The *Treatise* of *Schism* concludes with a *Prayer* for *Peace* and *Communion*, and for the matter of it, we have his seeming *confession* that *all good people will joyn* in it. But even in such a *Prayer*, wherein *all good people will joyn*, this *Gentleman* will not *joyn* with me, but upon such *terms*, which I shall not undertake, to *qualifie* me for his *favour*; I mean not the *fructus dignos pœnitentiæ*, such as *John Baptist* would *prescribe*, but the *penances* of this *severer* confessor, to acknowledge the *Infallibility* of the *Church* in his notion of the *Church*, *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, *&c.*

22. And all that I shall need to *reply* is, to beseech him that he will then, without *joyning* with me, pray in *secret*, what I began to him, and endeavour to qualifie himself with *charity* and other *graces*, which may *wing* his *prayers* unto that holy place, where all *humble Christians supplications* daily meet, and then I shall again *pray God*, that I may be found in the number of *those*, that so I may be secured to *meet* and *joyn* with him, at that *common* throne of *grace*.

23. He is pleased to shut up all with an expression of the *Council* of *Florence*, to the business of the *Popes Supremacy*. To this I might reply that this *definition* is there visibly subscribed, as the *act* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, *Eugenius* IV. (who was a *liberal* carver and *definer* for himself) as may be seen in that very * *page*, where the words cited will be found, both by the *Seal* of his *Pontificate* there *impress*, Saint *Peter* on the *left hand*, Saint *Paul* on the *right*, and *Eugenius Pp.* IV. under it; and by the last part of the *date* in these words, τῆς ἀχειροτονίας ἡμῶν ἔτει ἐνάτῳ, *in the ninth year of our Pontificate*; which though I shall suppose to be the *mode*, the *Pope* to *pronounce* the *definition* of the *Council*,

* *Concil. t. 7. p. 858. Edit. Paris.*

cil, yet this was much varied from the *old* form, and the *Council* being dated at *Florence*, in the year of our *Lord* 1439. so near *Rome*, and so far from the *first* times, where more *simplicity* and just *distribution* of *Rights* might be expected, this might be a competent *Answer* to this *testimony*, and a *vindicating* my self from all *Schism* or *Heresie*, that my want of the *obedience* or *confession*, which he requires, might *fix* on me.

24. But I shall for this once, chuse somewhat the *longer* way, and transcribe part of *Marcus* the *Metropolitan* of *Ephesus* his *Answer*, wherein he expresseth his *opinion*, and others, of that *definition* of the *Council*, as it lies in the * *Apology* of *Joseph Methonensis* for that *Council*, Καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ Πάππαν ὡς ἕνα τῶν Πατριαρχῶν λογιζόμεθα, ἤτοι δὲ βικάριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ πατέρα καὶ διδάσκαλον πάντων Χριστιανῶν ἀπάντων μάλα σεμνῶς ἀποφαίνονται, *We also account the Pope as one of the Patriarchs, But these do with great gravity pronounce him Vicar of Christ, and Father and Teacher of all Christians:* and this both to them and us is matter of some wonder, how (μάλα σεμνῶς) with so much *gravity*, they could thus *pronounce*, what had so little of *truth* in it. * *Joseph. Methon. pro Concil. Florent.* p. 1023.

25. And it is worth recounting here, what for the *justifying* of that *definition*, *Joseph Methonensis* was able to reply there to that *Bishop* (and that *Reply* thought worthy to be inserted into the *Acts* of the *Council*) 1. That he doth not say *that the Pope is two or three, but only one of the Patriarchs*, ὃν δὴ ὁμολογήσει τὶς πρωτεύειν, *having preheminence among those of the same Order with him.*

26. For this he hath, 1. *Chrysostom*'s authority in his seventeenth *Homily* on the *Acts*, where, he saith, *that among the seven there was one*, περιεστῶ καὶ τὰ πρωτεῖα ἔχων, *one above the rest* (and the *seven* there, were the *seven Deacons*, and the same *preheminence* that *Stephen* then had over them, and all the *rest* of the *World*, we shall not deny the *Bishop* of *Rome*; especially if, as it follows there, he have the πλείονα χάριν *more grace* than all the *other Bishops*, and will acknowledge, as it is there also, the χειροτονίαν κοινὴν, the *same ordination* of him and all other *Bishops*.)

27. *Secondly*, The Saying of *Christ*, that, *He that heareth you, heareth me*, and the common *Maxime* πάντα ἀρχιερέα διάδοχον Χριστοῦ εἶναι, *that every Bishop is the Successor of Christ* (But then how came the *Bishop* of *Rome* to impropriate that *title*, to be the *only* one that all are obliged to *hear*, when, as he confesses there, καὶ ταῦτα μὲν κοινῶς πρὸς πάντας, *This was said in common to them all.)*

28. *Thirdly*, The words of *Theodorus Studita* (one, by the way, that had been *imprisoned* for *opposing* the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, and who did not *communicate* with that *Church*, see *Zonaras tom.* 3. *p.* 9. & 102.) to the *Emperor Michael*, that if he *doubted* of, or *disbelieved* any thing that had been there *resolved*, he should command a διασάφησις *declaration* or *explication* to be sent him from *old Rome*, ὡς ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς παραδόθη, *how from of old, and from the beginning it had been delivered by tradition of Fathers*, adding, that that was κορυφαιοτάτη τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν *the uppermost of the Churches* of *God*, of which *Peter* was πρωτόθρονος, the *first* that *sate Bishop* there, unto whom *Christ* said, *Thou art Peter*, &c. (But all this still amounts to no more, but that *Rome* was the *prime Apostolick See*, that might very probably *explicate* a difficulty to the *Emperor*, by telling what had been from time to time *delivered*, and *believed* in that *Church*.)

29. *Fourthly*, The words of the same *Theodorus Studita* again, in his *Epistle* to *Naucratius*, which speaks of some that had *broken off themselves from the Body of Christ*, from the *chief See*, in which *Christ* placed the *Keys* of that *Faith*, against which the *Gates* of *Hell*, the *mouths* of *Heretick*s, had not, should not prevail, (But then still, supposing his *testimony* were *authentick*, this is no more, but that, they which divided from the true *Doctrin*, which he supposed to be at *Rome*, did in his opinion *break* off themselves from the *Body* of *Christ*, that *Rome* again was the *prime See*, that it had the *Keys* of *knowledg* and *faith* entrusted to it by *Christ* at the *Apostles founding* a *Church* there, but this not *exclusively* to other *Churches*, which doubtless had those *Keys*, as well as She, and that the *faith* of *Christ* should never be utterly destroyed by *Heretick*s.)

30. *Fifthly*, The words of *Arcadius* a *Bishop* in the *third Council*, that of *Ephesus*, proposing that the words of *Cœlestine* the *Pope*, who was to be *named with all reverence*, *Bishop* of the *Apostolical See*, should be read, that they might see *what care he had of all Churches* (and why might not the like be said of any other *truly Christian Bishop?*) And so the like speech again of *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, that the *Letter* of *Cœlestine*, the *most holy Bishop* of the *holy Apostolick Church* (a title which belonged, and was ordinarily given to *other Sees*, besides that of *Rome*) μετὰ τῆς πρεσφόρου τιμῆς ἀναγινωσκέσθω, *might be read with due honour* or *respect* (but sure that doth not prove his *supreme power* over all the *Churches* of *God*.)

31. *Lastly*, The words of the *Emperor*'s *Letter* (called θεῖον γράμμα *divine Letter*) in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, that the *most blessed Bishop of the City of* Rome, to whom *antiquity* hath given ἱερωσύνῃ καὶ πάντων, *Priesthood over all*, χωρὶς δὲ ὑποσείας ἔχη τὸ πίστεως καὶ ἱερέων ἀνακείνειν, *may have a place and power to judge of faith and of Priests*, from whence he roundly concludes, Ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ πίστεως, &c. *Seeing then he hath power to judge of Faith and Priests, he is justly defined by the Council of* Florence διδάσκαλον πάντων Χριστιανῶν ἀπάντων, *the Teacher of all Christians.*

32. This being the *last* and most *probable*, and indeed *only Testimony*, to *justifie* with any *colour* of *reason* the *definition* of that *Council*, it is not amiss to consider it a *little*, and with that to conclude also the *debate* with this *Gentleman*, as *Joseph Methonensis* there did with the *Bishop* of *Ephesus*. And if we turn to the *Acts* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, we shall soon discern the full *weight* of it.

33. There in the * first part, *numb.* 25. we shall find this Letter styled θεῖον γράμμα, sent by *Valentinian* the *Emperour* to *Theodosius*, ὡς ἐκελεῦσας ἐν τοῖς μέρεσι τῆς Ἰταλίας συνοδον ἐπιτελεσθῆναι, *that he would command a Synod to be called in the Parts of* Italy. This then was the *Subject* of the Letter, and this the *occasion*; A *second Synod* had lately been held at *Ephesus*, in which the *Heresie* of *Eutyches* had received some *assistance*; Upon this, *Pope Leo*, and his *Synod* of *Bishops* met at *Rome*, † writes earnestly to the *Emperour Valentinian*, that he will κελεύειν *command* γενικὴν συνοδον a *General Council to be called in the parts of* Italy, that may *remove* and *mollifie* all *offences*. The same he * again proposes to the *Emperour Theodosius* there, desiring ἰδικὴν συνοδον a *Special Council* to be convened in the parts of *Italy*. Hereupon soon follows a *Letter* of *Valentinian* to *Theodosius* to the same purpose, in condescension to *Leo*'s Request, and in it those very words (recited by *Joseph Methonensis* in defence of the *Council* of *Florence*) * *concil. tom.* 3. *p.* 25. † *Ibid. n.* 19. *p.* 19. * *Ibid. n.* 20. *p.* 20.

Florence) to no other sense but this, that such a *Council* might be *convened in* Italy, to *review* and *reform* what had been done amiss in that *second Council* of *Ephesus*.

34. This therefore is the meaning of the ἵνα χωρὸν καὶ συντοκίαν ἔχῃ, *that he may have a place and power*] that some *place* may be assigned him and the *Bishops*, to meet in *Council*, that he may have *power*, or *faculty*, or *commission* to sit (not he by himself, but he and the *Bishops* in *Council*) and when they sit, πίστεως καὶ ἱερέων κρίνῃ, *to judge of Faith and Priests*, as in all *Councils* it is done, to *define* what is the *true faith*, opposed by *Heretick*s, and what *persons*, *Bishops* or others, are fit to be *censured* for any thing done or taught by them.

35. This is the plain and only importance of the place, to which all the rest of the *Epistle* accords, that an *Universal Council* should be called in *Italy*, wherein the *Pope* was doubtless to *preside*, and he συναχθέντων ἐκ πάσης οἰκουμένης καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἱερέων, *all other Bishops also being convened from the whole World*, should consider and *define*, what the *true faith* required. And so this is a fair *testimony* to prove that the *Pope* is the *Vicar* of *Christ*, the *Father* and *Teacher* of all *Christians*.

The CONCLUSION.

Numb. 1. I AM now come to the *close* of this *Gentleman*'s *Answer* in these words, *Thus, Sir, you have my sense of Doctor* Hammond's *Book in all the Particulars, which, I think, to the purpose; my time, nor the brevity fit for a Letter, not permitting I should be more methodical, and do rest*

Bruxels, March 30, 1654.

Your Friend, and

Humble Servant,

B. P.

2. Here he is pleased largely enough to assume the Office of an *Aristarchus*, and to involve under no light *censure*, of *impertinency* at the least, the far greatest part of that *Treatise* of *Schism*; for certainly that which he hath not offered any *Answer* to, is such; and yet he here undertakes to have given his *sense in all the Particulars, which he thinks to the purpose*, which must conclude it his *opinion*, that all other *Particulars* are not to the *purpose*. This indeed is a *performance* somewhat above the *promise* of the *Title-page*, which obliged him to an *Answer of the most material parts* of that *Treatise*; And it were very easie to shew that there is no degree of truth in either of these; that on the contrary, he hath not offered any word of *Reply* to the most *material*, which I hope are not the *least pertinent* parts of that *Treatise*. But instead of this larger *reflection* it may suffice, that whatsoever he hath thought fit to take *notice* of, and thereby hath expressed his *judgment* of it, that it is *most material* in *comparison* of the rest, hath here been very *particularly* considered, and his *Answers* manifested to have no *force* in them. And so I very friendly take my leave of him.

The God of all Grace and Peace bind up the wounds of his bleeding Church.

An

An Account of *H. T.* his

APPENDIX

TO HIS

Manual of Controverſies,

CONCERNING

The Abbot of Bangor's *Anſwer to* Auguſtine.

HAVING concluded the foregoing *Reply* to the *Catholick Gentleman*, I received news of a *Manual* of *Controverſies* in the Preſs, wherein I was ſaid to be particularly concerned; and having ſoon gotten a ſight of it, I found that the matter was of no greater *bulk* or *weight*, than might receive an *account* in few words, and thoſe moſt proper to be here *annext*, by way of *Appendix*. *Numb.* 1.

At the folding up of that *Manual*, the *Author* of it is pleaſed to take notice of (no more than) *one teſtimony*, which I had cited out of Sir *Henry Spelman*'s *Anglicane Councils*, containing an *Anſwer* of the *Abbot* of *Bangor* to *Auguſtine* the *Monk*, when he demanded of the *Britains* an acknowledgment of *ſubmiſſion* to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*. 2.

The paſſage is to be ſeen at large, in *Welſh*, *Engliſh*, and *Latine*, in that *tome* of the *Councils*, *p.* 108. and is recited in the *Treatiſe* of *Schiſm*, *p.* 111. and the ſum of it is, that he and the reſt of the *Britiſh Church* were under the *government* of the *Archbiſhop* of *Caerleon* upon *Uske*, and owed no *obedience* (or reſpect, ſave that of *fraternal charity*) to the *Pope* of *Rome*. 3.

This *Anſwer* of that *Abbot*, the *Author* hath thought good to *cenſure* (by way of *Appendix* to the *Article* concerning the *Pope*'s *Supremacy*) 1. As *unapt* to conclude againſt the *Romaniſt*'s pretenſions concerning *the Papal power over the whole Church*. 2. As *unworthily alledged by perſons of any ordinary judgment or erudition*. 3. As that which may eaſily be *convicted to be a ſimple impoſture*, and the ways of *demonſtrating* it *clearly*, promiſed in that inſuing *diſcourſe*. 4.

What thoſe ways are, and how far ſhort of the *force* or *evidence* of *demonſtration*, I ſhall, with the *Reader*'s good leave, examine anon, after I have premiſed this one *conſideration*, That the only thing, which is by us conteſted, and concluded againſt the *Romaniſt* from this *teſtimony*, is a matter of *fact* of *known* truth, and ſuch as the *Romaniſts* themſelves (yea and this *Author H. T.* who hath thought fit to arraign this *teſtimony*) acknowledge to be ſuch; and therefore, as in caſe this *one teſtimony* ſhould be *demonſtrated* to be a *ſimple impoſture*, we can very *unconcernedly* and eaſily part with it, ſtanding in no manner of need of this *auxiliary*; ſo it is a little ſtrange, that this *Author* ſhould think it worth his *ſolemn pains*, to wreſt it out of our hands, and dedicate this whole *Appendix* to that *one* work, when if he were *ſucceſsful* to his wiſh, his *acquiſitions* hereby, and proportionably our *loſſes*, muſt be ſo *unconſiderable*. 5.

That which we conclude from hence againſt the *Romaniſt*, is no more but this, that the *Britains*, particularly thoſe of *Bangor*, denied to yield *obedience* to the *Pope*, upon *Auguſtine*'s demand of it. And for this, we have the *notoriouſneſs* of the *fact*, as it is ſet down by the *Authors* which are of *credit*, and are vouched in this matter by the *Romaniſt*, particularly by *Bede*, in the ſecond Book of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, c. 2. where the whole ſtory may be read at large, and out of which I ſhall collect, and, in paſſing, clear theſe few things. 6.

Firſt, That *Auguſtine* and the *Britiſh Biſhops* met in *Council* at *Auguſtine*'s *Oake* in *Worceſterſhire*; This paſſage lyes very corruptly in the *Latine Bede*, *in loco ubi uſque hodie linguâ Anglorum Augiſtineʒat*, *id eſt*, *robur Auguſtini in confinio Vectiorum & Occidentalium Saxonum appellatur*. Three *corruptions* I ſuppoſe there will ſoon appear to be in theſe words, which I ſhall briefly remove for the clearing of our entrance, and diſabuſing the *Author* of this *Manual* in one of them. 7.

The *firſt*, and chief of them is, that *Auguſtineʒat* is a σφάλμα γεαφικὸν, miſtaken for *Auguſtines-ac*, i. e. *Auguſtines Oak*, whether that were the name of a *Tree*, or a *Village*, moſt probably the former, after the manner of that *Council*, which was held againſt S. *Chryſoſtome*, called ordinarily the *Synod ad quercum*, *at*, or *under the Oak*. 8.

Secondly, that [*ubi*] ſhould be read [*qui*] which is an eaſie miſtake, and ſo the *conſtruction* will be *facile*, which now is *rough*, *in loco qui uſque hodie Auguſtines-ac appellatur*, *in the place which even to this day is called Auguſtine's-ac*, and accordingly the *Saxon* reads, on þære ſtope þe mon nemneð Aguſtinuſ ac, *in the place ſtill named Auguſtine's Oak*. 9.

Thirdly, that *Vectiorum* (which the *Author* of this *Appendix* renders *Vectians*, and interprets to be the *Iſle* of *Wight*, quite againſt all probable *conjecture*, for how can it be believ'd that the *Britains* ſhould give him a meeting ſo far from the place of their own preſent habitation?) ſhould be *Wicciorum* (ſo * *Huntington* reads it, and the *Saxon Bede* Hpicna) meaning *Worceſterſhire* by that ſtyle, and accordingly this *Synod* is by *Authors* oft called *Wigornienſis Synodus*, the *Worceſterſhire Synod*; and among the *Britiſh Biſhops*, who are recorded to be preſent at the *ſecond Seſſion*, *Wiccenſis*, the *Biſhop* 10.

* *l.* 3 *p.* 325.

of

of *Worceſter* is one. In what part of that County it was that that *Synod* convened, I ſee it is uncertain among our later *Writers*, and ſo there may be place for *conjecture*; Sir *Henry Spelman* from the *Map* propoſeth *Auſtric*, as a probable contraction from *Auſtinſric*, *Auguſtini ditio*, as that which *may give ſome light in a doubtful matter*; but upon inquiry I hear that that *village* is called *Aufric* or *Alfric*, not *Auſtric*; and therefore I ſhall take confidence to mention, what ſeems to me far more probable, that it was in the *pariſh* of *Merton*, which hath the *agnomen* of *Uſſentree*, or *Oſſentree*, in old *Rolls*, *Merton juxta Oſſentree*, *Merton cloſe by Oſſentree*, an eaſie variation from, and contraction of *Auſtin-tree*, and is three miles from *Worceſter*, near the rode to *Droitwich*, where the *Hill-Church* is *Auguſtine*'s *Church*.

11. *Secondly*, That the buſineſs of this *convention*, deſigned to draw the *Britiſh* to *obedience* to *Auguſtine* and the *See* of *Rome*, began with a *propoſition* only of *conformity* in the *obſervation* of *Eaſter*, in the *Ceremonies* of *Baptiſm*, *&c.* But this in vain; for, ſaith *Bede*, after a long *diſputation* they would give no *aſſent to the intreaties, and exhortations and chidings of* Auguſtine, *but preferred their own tradition before all the Churches through the world, which accorded with* Rome *in the particular of Eaſter*, &c.

12. *Thirdly*, That for the convincing of them, *Auguſtine* challenged them to do *miracles*, and by *prayer* to *God*, cured a *blind* man, and was much cried up for ſo doing; the *Britiſh* ſtill *adhering* to their way, and *anſwering* him, that *abſque conſenſu & licentiâ ſuorum, without conſent and licence of their* whether *Rulers* of *Church*, or whatſoever other *ſuperiors* alſo (their *Metropolitan*, I ſuppoſe, which cannot be thought to have been with them at this, being certainly none of the *ſeven Biſhops*, which are affirmed to have been *preſent* at the later convention) they could not *forſake their antient cuſtoms*.

13. *Fourthly*, That upon propoſal, it was agreed that they ſhould have a ſecond meeting, at which were preſent *ſeven Britiſh Biſhops* (which other Writers expreſs to have been the *Biſhop* of *Hereford*, *Landaff*, *Bangor*, S. *Aſaph*, *Worceſter*, *Paternenſis*, *Morganenſis*) and many other *learned* men, eſpecially *de nobiliſſimo eorum Monaſterio, quod vocatur lingua Anglorum Bancornaburg, cui tempore illo Dinooth Abbas præfuiſſe narratur, of the famous Monaſtery of* Bangor, *of which* Dinooth *was Abbot at that time*.

14. *Fifthly*, That before they went to this Meeting, they were adviſed by a *religious* perſon, whoſe directions they asked, to obſerve diligently the *behaviour* of *Auguſtine*, when they came, whether he were *meek* and *lowly in heart*, a mark by which they might know whether he had taken *Chriſt*'s *yoke* upon him, and conſequently whether it were the *yoke* of *Chriſt*, which he now deſired to impoſe upon them, and upon *Auguſtine*'s ſitting ſtill upon his ſtool or ſeat, and never riſing up with any *civility* or *humility*, at their approach, they were ſo *diſpleaſed*, ſaith *Bede*, that they *contradicted all the propoſals that he made to them*.

15. *Sixthly*, That upon his making *three Propoſitions* to them, concerning *Eaſter*, *Baptiſm*, and *preaching to the Engliſh*, and promiſing to *bear with them in all other differences*, (of which ſort, ſaid he, there were *many wherein their practice was contrary conſuetudini noſtræ, imò Univerſalis Eccleſiæ, to the cuſtom of the Roman, yea the Univerſal Church*) they anſwered, *nihil horum ſe facturos, nec illum pro Archiepiſcopo habituros, that they would not comply with him in any of them, nor acknowledge him for their Archbiſhop*; Upon which follows that rough *ſanguinary* anſwer of *Auguſtine*'s, *quod ſi pacem cum fratribus accipere nollent, bellum ab hoſtibus forent accepturi, that if they would not accept of peace with brethren they ſhould have war from enemies*; and, as it follows in very plain language, *per Anglorum manus ultionem mortis eſſent paſſuri, the hands of the Engliſh ſhould act a bloody revenge upon them*.

16. Which, it ſeems, ſoon after followed, and fell in an eminent manner on the *Monks* of *Bangor*, of which order there were at that time above *two thouſand*, who *lived all by the labour of their own hands*. For, ſaith he, *King Edilfred* of *Northumberland*, coming with a great *Army* to *Caerleon*, made his firſt *onſet* on their *Prieſts*, who were *aſſembled* by themſelves *to faſt* and *pray* for their *brethren*, (as *Moſes* holding up his *hands* in *prayer*, whileſt *Joſhua* held up his in *fighting*) and upon no other provocation (taken notice of by the *Hiſtorian*) but this, that they *fought againſt him with their prayers* (*contra nos pugnant qui adverſus nos in precationibus proſequuntur*) he firſt ſet upon them, *killed twelve hundred* of them, and then *deſtroyed* the *whole Army*. *Sicque completum eſt præſagium ſancti Pontificis Auguſtini, and ſo the preſage of the holy Biſhop* St. Auguſtine *was fulfilled upon them*.

17. Theſe particulars of the *ſtory* I have thus punctually ſet down in *obedience* to the *rebuke* of this *Author*, who *p.* 412. chargeth it upon Sir *Henry Spelman*, *and thoſe others that borrow out of him*, as a *want* of *willingneſs to ſee the truth*, and of *fidelity* to *communicate it to others*, that they *have* choſen to *reflect on that teſtimony* (which he is pleaſed to call *upſtart*, and) *which appeared not till within theſe fifteen years*, and not *upon that true antiquity, which having indured the ſhock of almoſt a thouſand years*, Sir *Henry* had a little before *tranſcribed* out of *Bede*, *wherein*, ſaith he *every one may read*, firſt that *miracle in giving ſight to the blind man*, then that *divine vengeance prophetically foretold* by *Auguſtine*, which (in his opinion) *more than ſufficiently prove, that S.* Auguſtine, *ſent by the Pope, came in the name of God, from a lawful authority, and that his demands of conformity to the Church of* Rome *in the points ſpecified, were good, and to be yielded to by the Britains*.

p. 413.

18. In this matter I might now fitly *inlarge*, and examine the force of this *two-fold Argument*, that of the *miraculous cure*, and that of the *predicted vengeance*, and offer many things to conſideration concerning each head.

19. For the former, *Firſt*, the no great *credit* that hath been given to the relations of *Bede* on this head of *miracles* (of which his *Story* is ſo richly furniſhed) together with the great *deceit* that ſuch pretenſions have been *experimented* to ſubject men to: *Secondly*, the confeſſion of *Bede*, that the *Britains* were * *unwilling to yield* to this tryal of their cauſe; and accordingly when he ſaith that the † *blind man being offered to the Prieſts of the Britains, he received no cure or benefit by them*, he doth not ſo much as pretend that the *Britains* attempted to do the *miracle*, and failed in it, but leaves us to reſolve that they wholly *waved* this *tryal*: *Thirdly*, that if the *miracle* were granted to be a true *miracle*, and a *teſtimony* of *Gods* aſſerting the *doctrines* then *conteſted* between them, yet this would not be any concludent *teſtimony* for the *Pope*'s *Supremacy*, but only for thoſe things which were then the

* *Quod cum adverſarii, inviti licèt concederent.*

† *Cum oblatus Britonum ſacerdotibus, nil curationis horum miniſterio cepit.*

the matter of the *Queſtion*, the *time* of the obſervation of *Eaſter*, the *Rites* of *Baptiſm*, accuſtomed in the *Roman Church*, and at the moſt ſome ſuch like *traditions*, wherein the *Britiſh* cuſtom varied from that of *Rome*, for this was the form of the *propoſed tryal*, *quæ ſequenda traditio*, *quibus ſit viis ad ingreſſum Regni illius properandum*, *what tradition was to be followed* (in the *celebration* of *Eaſter*; that which the *Britains* had received and retained from their firſt *converſion*, imputed to an *Apoſtle* or *Apoſtolical* perſon, *Simon Zelotes* or *Joſeph* of *Arimathea*, or that which the *Romans* deduced from S. *Peter*) *by what ways they were to haſten to entrance into that Kingdom* (referring, I ſuppoſe, to the *Rites* of *Baptiſm*, the *ſecond* Head of *Debate* between them) And in both theſe, (as alſo in refuſing to join with *Auguſtine* in the *common* work of *preaching* to the *Gentiles*) it may eaſily be granted by us, that the *truth* was on the *Romaniſts* ſide, and not on the *Britains*, without yielding a *ſupremacy* of the *Church* of *Rome* over the *Britiſh Churches*. *Fourthly*, That the *Britains* by *Bede*'s confeſſion, acknowledged themſelves *convinced* by that *miracle*, that the *way of righteouſneſs* which *Auguſtine preached*, was the *true way*, yet added, that they could not *renounce their antient cuſtoms without the conſent and licence of their own Superiors*) which evidently *confines* and *determines* the *miracle* and all the ſuppoſed *Vertue* thereof to the confirming the *Traditions* which *Auguſtine delivered*, without farther extending it to the aſſerting the *Papal power* (to which the *Abbot* of *Bangor*'s Anſwer was particularly confronted) for had they once acknowledged themſelves *convinced* of that, there had been no place left for the *licentia ſuorum*, no need of the *conſent* or *licence* of any other Superiors, which yet they reſolutely adhere to. *Laſtly*, That at their *ſecond meeting* the *Britains* deemed *Auguſtine*'s *pride* a more *valid* convincing Argument, that the *yoke* which he deſigned to *impoſe* on them, was not the *yoke* of *Chriſt*, than the ſuppoſed *miracle*, that it was.

And for the latter, that of the *ſlaughter*, firſt * *threatned* and then *fulfilled* upon them. 1. If that were indeed a *miracle*, it was not of the *complexion*, which is generally obſerved in *Chriſt*'s *miracles*, uſed for the *working* of *Faith*, but proportionable to the *Spirit* of the *Boanerges*, which would have the *fire from Heaven* called down upon the *Samaritans*, and were anſwered by *Chriſt*, that this was not agreeable to the *Spirit* of the *Goſpel*; And if the *example* of S. *Peter* on *Ananias* and *Saphira*, or of S. *Paul* on *Elymas*, be made uſe of as a *precedent* for this *ſeverity*, yet ſure the Anſwer of *Pope Gregory* to *Auguſtine* at that time, ſuppoſing different *Churches* to enjoy *different* cuſtoms, and not *impoſing* the *Roman* upon *all*, might have directed him to greater *moderation*. See *Bed.* l. 1. c. 27. in his *Anſwer* to the *third Interrogation*. *Secondly*, It is no very great *miracle*, that a *grand Army* falling firſt upon unarmed *Monks*, ſhould obtain the *Victory* againſt them, and afterward againſt all other their Oppoſers; nor conſequently is it any whit ſtrange that *Auguſtine*, that was ſo *provoked*, and meant to uſe this *bloody revengeful* courſe, ſhould thus *threaten* what he then *deſigned* to ſee performed, for that is the full meaning of his foretelling it. 20.

* *Fertur minitans prædixiſſe.* Bede. *Terruit eos vaticinio futuræ ſuper eos calamitatis.* Sigebert.

It is true indeed that either *Bede*, or ſome *Interpolator*, that copied out the *original Latine* of that *Hiſtory*, hath thought good to inſert ſome words in the end of that Story, l. 2. c. 2. *in fine*, (*quamvis ipſo jam multo ante tempore ad cœleſtia Regna ſublato*) which might delude men into a perſwaſion, that this *bloody* act was a *long time* after *Auguſtine*'s *death*; But for this, *Firſt*, it is obſervable that *King Alfred*'s *Saxon Tranſlation* or *Paraphraſe* of *Bede*, wholly omits that *Parentheſis*, and reads it only thus, ⁊ ſpa pær ȝefylled ſe pitedom ſær Dalȝan B. Aȝuſtinuſ ƿ Dſceolsan, &c. *and ſo was fulfilled the prediction of S.* Auguſtine, *that they ſhould feel the revenge of temporal deſtruction*. *Secondly*, That the *ſeries* of the *Story* in *Bede* gives juſt *prejudice* to that *Parentheſis*, for this of the *ſlaughter* of the *Britains* being ſet down in the end of the *ſecond* Chapter, the *third* begins with *Auguſtine*'s ordaining two *Biſhops*, *Mellitus* and *Juſtus*, which ſure was not after his *death*; and, as the *Saxon paraphraſe* of *King Alfred* begins that *Chapter* with this form of reference to the *former* paſſage Dæ pær æfter ƿiſſum — *It was after this* — which plainly defines *Auguſtine* to have *ſurvived* that *bloudy* fact; ſo the *Latine Bede*, which ſets down the *time* of *Auguſtine*'s ordaining thoſe two *Biſhops*, *Anno Dominicæ incarnationis ſexcenteſimo quarto*, *In the year* 604. doth yet more incline us to ſuſpect that *Parentheſis*, for though *Bede*, who ſets down the *month* and *day* of *Auguſtine*'s *death*, ſets not down the *year* of it, but leaves it in a latitude to be between the year 596. in which he came to *England*, and the year 613. (or, as the *Saxon* reads 616.) in which *King Ethelbert* died, yet others commonly affirm that he continued *Biſhop* fifteen or ſixteen years, and ſo died about 612 or 613. whereas *Chronologers* affirm the *ſlaughter* of the *Monks* of *Bangor*, &c. to have been in the year 603, and ſo the year immediately precedent to *Auguſtine*'s *ordaining* thoſe two *Biſhops*. *Thirdly*, When in the relation of this *ſlaughter*, the *Latine Bede* begins, *Siquidem poſthæc ipſe*, *de quo diximus*, *Rex Anglorum* — *For after this*, *i. e.* after *Auguſtine*'s *threatining* deſtruction to the *Britiſh*, the *forenamed King of the Angles gathered an Army* — the *Saxon Paraphraſe* reads and ſona Dnaƿe æfter ðiſſum, *and ſoon rath*, i. e. *very ſoon after this*, which again perſwades that it was before *Auguſtine*'s death, at leaſt that the *jam multo ante* in the *Parentheſis* (that *Auguſtine* died *long before*) could have no *truth* in it. *Laſtly*, as ſome Writers of theſe dark times have made a ſhift to affirm with the *Latine Bede*, that *Auguſtine* was firſt dead, ſo it is known alſo that others charge it on him, that he was not only the *Inciter* to it, but that he *met* the *Kings* when they were ready for the *fight*, and was preſent with them; And *Trivet* in his *French Chronicle*, that ſaith it was done after *Auguſtine*'s death, yet adds that *Ethelbert King* of *Kent*, who ſtirred up *Ethelfred King* of *Northumberland* and his *Saxons* againſt the *Britains*, and by name againſt *Dinoth Abbot* of *Bangor* formentioned, was *highly diſpleaſed* and *inflamed*, that he had *deſpiſed Auguſtine*. All which being conſidered, it is certain, that this was no very *Chriſtian* action, whether in *Auguſtine* or in *Ethelbert*, and the *threats* of the one, and *performances* of the other, as they bear an exact proportion, ſo are they equally *argumentative*, not *for*, but *againſt* that Cauſe which was willing thus *unchriſtianly* to ſupport it ſelf. 21.

Thirdly, if the *ſlaughter* of theſe poor *Monks* ſhall yet be thought a ſolid *probation*, as an act of *Divine vengeance* upon them (juſt ſuch as the *falling* of the *Tower* of *Siloe* was, from which none but a *Jew*, or *Turk*, or the *Barbarians*, *Act* 28. or thoſe that make *proſperity* the ſpecial mark of a *true Church*, will think fit to *conclude* any thing) there is one part of the *Story* yet behind, which will *refute* and *retort* that *Argument*; for when *Edilfrid* had uſed them ſo *bloodily*, and in the heat of his *rage* 22.

and *victory* proceeded to deſtroy the *remainder* of thoſe *Monks*, and their *Monaſtery* together, the *Avengers* of *blood* met him, three *Britiſh Commanders*, with their *Forces*, *routed* his *Army*, killed *ten thouſand* and *ſixty* of them, *wounded* the *King*, and put him and the remainder of his *Army* to *flight*; which certainly is an *Argument* of as much *validity* to infer that *God* maintained the *Cauſe* of thoſe *innocent Monks* againſt the *Saxons* and *Auguſtine*, as the former was *argumentative* on their ſide againſt the *Britiſh*.

23. But it is not needful, that I inſiſt on either of theſe; the one thing that from this *view* of the *Story* in *Bede*, was to be concluded, is only this, that upon the *Relations*, as in him they lye, and are by this *Author H. T.* vouched againſt us, there can be no doubt of our *Concluſion*, that the *Abbot* and *Monks* of *Bangor* oppoſed *Auguſtine*, yielded him no *obedience*, referred themſelves only to their own *Governours*, without any *acknowledgment* of *obedience* to the *Pope*; And this is generally the reſult of other *Authors* Narrations of this matter.

24. So * *Balæus*, ſpeaking of that *Convention*, *Dinotus omnium primus graviter & doctè de non approbandâ apud eos Romanorum authoritate diſputabat*, Dinoth *in the firſt place gravely and learnedly diſputed againſt the Authority of the Biſhops of* Rome *among them*; adding, *Fortiter præterea tuebatur Menevenſis Archiepiſcopi in Eccleſiarum ſuarum rebus ratam juriſdictionem, that he moreover ſtrongly and couragiouſly defended* the *validity* of the *juriſdiction of the Archbiſhop of S.* David's (the ſame that in the *Abbot*'s *Anſwer* is called the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*) *in the affairs of his own Churches.*

* In *Dinoth.*

25. So *Geffrey* of *Monmouth*, *Edelbertus Rex Kantiorum, ut vidit Britones dedignantes ſubjectionem Auguſtino facere, Northumbrorum & cæteros Saxonum regulos inſtimulavit ut collecto grandi exercitu in Civitatem Bangor, Abbatem Dinoth & cæteros Clericos, qui eos ſpreverunt, perditum irent. King* Ethelbert *ſeeing the Britains diſdain to yield their ſubjection to* Auguſtine, *ſtirred up the King of* Northumberland *and other Saxon Kings to gather a great Army againſt the City* Bangor, *to deſtroy* Dinoth *the Abbot and the other Clerks of that Monaſtery, who had ſcorned* Auguſtine *and the Saxons.*

26. So *Sigebert* in *Anno* 602. *Auguſtinus —— habita Synodo cum Britonum & Scotorum Epiſcopis, qua Sacerdotes & Monachos invenit Adverſarios æquitatis ——* Auguſtine *had a meeting with the Britiſh and Scotiſh Biſhops, and there found an oppoſition from the Prieſts and Monks, and terrified them by prediction of a calamity that ſhould fall on them.* Other evidences to the ſame purpoſe are ſet down in the *Collection* of the *Anglicane Councils*, and Mr *Whelock*'s *Notes* on his *Edition* of the *Saxon Bede*, p. 115. if there could now remain any *Queſtion* of it.

27. And that this was diſcerned by the *Author* of this *Appendix*, if it had been for his *Intereſt* to have taken notice of it, is evident by his mention of the *miracle* and *Divine vengeance*, as of proofs that *Auguſtine* was in the right againſt theſe *Refuſers*, who yet continued, ſaith he, ſtill *refractory* to his *Propoſals*. And this was all I concluded from the *Abbot*'s *Anſwer*, and this ſtands firm in this *Romaniſt*'s own *confeſſion*, though the words of the *Abbot*'s *Anſwer* had not been preſerved to us.

28. And therefore being now wholly unconcerned in the *validity* of this *teſtimony*, and ſo ſecured from all danger of being *bribed* by *intereſts* to judge more favourably of it than the matter requires, I ſhall now proceed calmly to conſider, whether there be that *clearneſs* and *evidence* in this *Author*'s *Arguments* for the *invalidating* this *teſtimony*, which he aſſures us we ſhall find in them.

29. His firſt *Argument* is *negative* from the [*not leaſt ſcrap of Antiquity ſo much as pretended to prove that*
p. 405. *the Cambrian* (i. e. *Welch*) *lines cited, were the Abbot of* Bangor's *Anſwer to* Auguſtine *upon the occaſion ſpecified, nor that the renowned* Dinoth *was that Abbot, nor that the old Manuſcript whence Sir* Henry Spelman *extracts the teſtimony, was copied out of any more ancient.*

30. What other *proof* from *antiquity* ſhould be expected from Sir *Henry Spelman*, to give *authority* to theſe *lines*, than what readily offers it ſelf in this matter, I do not underſtand; That the *Britiſh*, particularly thoſe of *Bangor*, and yet more peculiarly *Dinoth* the famous *Abbot* of that *Monaſtery*, diſputed againſt *Auguſtin*'s pretenſions for the *authority* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, and aſſerted their own ſubjection to their *Metropolitan*, hath already appeared to be the *affirmation* of thoſe, who are moſt competent *Witneſſes* of it; and the *Manuſcript* paſſage in *Welch* and *Engliſh*, which Sir *Henry Spelman* had tranſcribed from Mr. *Moſton*'s *Copy* (and directs the Reader to Sir *Robert Cotton*'s *Library* to ſatisfie himſelf in that matter) is directly agreeable to this, for the matter of it, and ſo gave that very *judicious Knight* juſt reaſon both to ſet ſome *value* on it himſelf, and to *communicate* it to others, as that which might gratifie their *curioſity*, and approve it ſelf by its own light to any *judicious Reader*, to be, if not the very words of that *Abbot*'s *Anſwer*, yet the *ſenſe* and *ſubſtance* of it, and whether of theſe it ſhould be judged to be, it matters not.

31. Had the *Contents* of this *Teſtimony* been any way *contrary* to other undoubted *Records* of thoſe times, or indeed any *diſparate* new relation, that had not formerly been taken notice of, and was now to owe the whole *credit* and *ſupport* to this *Teſtimony*, ſome reaſon there might have been for an *Ariſtarchus* to proceed with more *caution* than here was uſed, and to yield nothing to bare *groundleſs conjectures* (and the *Romaniſt* hath as much reaſon as any man to lay this to heart, to act with this *caution* in other *Teſtimonies* (but when the matter is agreed on among the *Antients*, and an *old Record* offers it ſelf to our view, in *perfect* concord with that which we had formerly all reaſon to *believe*, and only affirms that more *legibly* and *diſtinctly*, which was in *ſubſtance* before, but not ſo *punctually* delivered to us, I cannot think the *ſevereſt Critick*, ſuppoſing him *unconcerned* and *impartial*, without any *Hypotheſis* of his own to be *defended* or *tended* by him, would have any *averſion* or diſlike to a *teſtimony* thus produced, though for ſome *circumſtances* of it, ſuch as are here mentioned, the Producer have nothing of *authority* to back his own *conjectures*.

32. This one thing I am ſure is moſt *unjuſt*, not to give *credit* to a *Manuſcript*, that it is what it pretends to be, unleſs I have ſome expreſs *affirmation* of *Antiquity* concerning that *particular Manuſcript*; ſhould ſuch Rules of ſeverity be now impoſed on the *Preſs*, the *Vatican* muſt never bring forth more *rarities*, the wealth of all the *Archives* in the World muſt lye *dead*, like a *Miſer*'s *treaſure*, no one *Volume* being able to teſtifie for the *veracity* of its *Neighbour*, or if it were, it ſelf muſt alſo bring its *Voucher* along with it, and ſo on *in infinitum*, or elſe it would not be ἰση μαρτυρια, a *competent teſtification* in this matter; and when it is remembred, that all, which is now made *publick* by the help of *Printing*, lay

once

once in *ſingle Manuſcripts*, and thoſe multipliable only by *tranſcribing*, and neither the *Originals* nor *Copies* any other way teſtified to be what they *pretended* to be, than as theſe *Cambrian* Lines are delivered to us by Sir *Henry*, I hope this will be deemed a *competent* proof, that this firſt *Argument* is not ſo *clearly demonſtrative* as was promiſed.

Another Branch there is of this *firſt Argument*, in theſe words, *And certainly if his Manuſcript be no* 33.
elder than the interlined Engliſh, he hath groſsly wronged himſelf and his Reader, by honouring it with the p. 405.
Style of Antient: For as every one ſees, the Engliſh is purely modern, and cannot be ſo old by many years as Henry *VIII's caſhiering the Pope's Authority, and arrogating the ſupremacy in Eccleſiaſtical matters to himſelf, for maintenance whereof it is alledged, and was certainly forged.*

To this I *anſwer* briefly, that it is not pretended by Sir *Henry*, that the *Engliſh* is as antient as the 34.
times of *Dinoth*, no nor the *Welſh* neither, but that thoſe two *Languages* were made uſe of by ſome, whoſe *Ages* he pretends not to *know*, to conveigh to us intelligibly the *Anſwer* of that *Abbot*, in what *language* ſoever it were delivered by him; And if it ſhall now be granted to this *Author*, that the *Engliſh idiom* evidenceth it to be written within theſe laſt hundred years, this can be no *prejudice* or ground of *ſuſpicion*, much leſs a proof of *forgery* againſt this *Manuſcript*, as long as the *Welch* is allowed to be more *antient*, to which the *Engliſh* may upon a latter tranſcribing have been annext, as fitly as *old Greek MSS.* are daily printed with the *Latine tranſlations* of a later date, in the *ſame* or ſeveral *pages*.

His *ſecond Argument* is deduced from the *Cambrian Lines*, in which he pretends to diſcover many 35.
un-Cambrian mixtures of *Engliſh words*, *helpio* and *gleimio*, for *help* and *claim*, want of *Orthography*, p. 406, 7, 8.
and the like; To which being utterly unskilful in the *Welch language*, I acknowledge my ſelf *incompetent* to give any very *particular* reply, yet ſhall give my *reaſon*, why I cannot think that this *ſecond argument* of his is any more *demonſtrative* againſt the *validity* of the *teſtimony* than the former; For, *firſt*, ſuppoſing this *Copy* of Mr. *Moſton*'s to be a *tranſcript*, not the *original* (as it is evident Sir *Henry Spelman* ſuppoſeth) what difficulty is there to imagine, that that *Copy* was *tranſcribed* by one unskilful in the *Orthography* of that *language*, eſpecially when it is known, how ordinary this is to be found, not only among the *vulgar*, but among learned *Church-men* of that nation, who are fain by ſtudy to *acquire* skill of reading before they can *officiate* in that *language*. *Secondly*, I ſhall readily *grant*, or, if he pleaſe, *yield* to the force of his *arguments*, that the *Welch Lines* are not the *words*, or *language* wherein *Dinoth* delivered his *anſwer*, but (as this *Gentleman* after contends) that *Dinoth*, a *writer* of *Latine Books*, being to ſpeak to *Auguſtine*, that underſtood not the *Britiſh language*, gave his *anſwer* in *Latine*; What hinders now, but that this *Latine anſwer* being conſerved among the *Britains*, might in *later* times (before *Henry* the VIII.) in any *age* to which the *idiom* of the *Welch lines* ſhall direct a *Critick* in that language to affix them, be tranſlated into *imperfect* (I mean more *modern*) yet *intelligible Welch*, either by a *native* of that *Country*, or by any other, who had *acquired* ſo much of that *language*, as was ſufficient for no weightier an *enterpriſe*? I diſcern not what *diſadvantage* I can receive by this *conceſſion*; and ſure there will be ſmall *difficulty* in *vindicating* Sir *Henry*'s integrity, if this ſhall be ſuppoſed; For he no where pretends, that the *Cambrian Lines*, in the *form* here preſented, were the *language*, or *words* of the *anſwer* of *Dinoth*, but that the *matter* of his *anſwer*, in what *language* ſoever delivered by him, is *communicated* to us by that *MS.* And that it was not, here is no word of ſo much as *probable argument*, much leſs of *clear demonſtration* tendred by the *Author* of this *Appendix*.

Laſtly, for the two words which occaſioned his charge of the *Engliſh mixtures*, I am, by thoſe which 36.
have skill in the language, enabled to return him ſome *anſwer*, that the word *help*, from whence is the *infinitive helpio* or *helpu*, is found uſed by *Tudor Aled*, who wrote *An.* 1490. and by *Lluellyn*, who is thought to be more *antient*, and that *gleimio*, or *cleimio* is by the *Latine* and *Welch Dictionary* ſet down in the word *vendico*, in the *firſt* place, (and after that *holi*) as the moſt proper *Welch word* for it, not borrowed from the *Engliſh*; From whence as I ſhall not conclude, that theſe *Welch lines*, were the *original* of *Dinoth*'s anſwer, (that were to *retract* my former *conceſſion*) ſo I may ſafely aſſume, that theſe *two* words (his only inſtances of *Engliſh mixtures*) do no way demonſtrate this *Welch tranſlation* to be later than *Henry the* VIII. *his caſhiering the Pope's authority* (as of the *Engliſh* it was granted) nor conſequently leave it under *ſuſpicion* of being *forged* by any *Proteſtant*.

His *third Argument* is of more ſeeming force, taken from the mention of this *Abbot*'s *ſubjection* to 37.
the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon* upon *Uske*, in which he finds two *abſurdities*, 1. ſaith he, *Bangor is very near*, p. 409.
if not in the Dioceſe of Lhan Elwy, *now commonly called S.* Aſaph: 2. *all Hiſtories teſtifie that the Archiepiſcopal Seat was removed from* Caerleon *to S.* David's *in King* Arthur's *time, who died about the year* 544. i. e. *fifty years before* Auguſtine's *firſt entrance into* Britain.

To theſe two branches of *probation*, certainly the *anſwer* is very obvious to the firſt, that acknow- 38.
ledging and *ſuppoſing* that the *Monaſtery* of *Banchor*, ſituate in *Flintſhire*, though within the *confines* of *Cheſtſhire*, was under the *Dioceſan Biſhop* either of S. *Aſaph*, or of *Cheſter*, (the *Epiſcopal See* of *Bangor* lying in the *County* of *Caernarvan*) yet this can be of no manner of force againſt this *teſtimony*; for he that was under the *Biſhop* of S. *Aſaph*, as his *immediate ſuperior*, or *Dioceſan*, may yet be under the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*, as his *Metropolitan*, as he that is under the *Biſhop* of *Rocheſter* in one reſpect, is under the *Biſhop* of *Canterbury* in another. And ſo that is a full *anſwer* to his firſt *difficulty*.

For the *ſecond*, it is acknowledged that before this time of *Dinoth*'s anſwer to *Auguſtine*, the 39.
Archiepiſcopal See had been by *authority* of *Synod* removed firſt from *Caerleon* to *Landaff* by *Dubritius*, *Anno* 512. and ſo it is affirmed by Sir *Henry Spelman* in his *Apparat.* p. 25. (where by the way, *lin.* 5. the *Printer* hath miſtaken *ad Meneviam* for *ad Landaviam*) and in like manner by his ſucceſſor S. *David*, *Anno* 516. by *licence* from *King Arthur*, from *Landaff* to *Menevia*, which from that *eminent Biſhop*, under whom that *change* was made, was after called S. *Davids*. But this removal of the *Metropolitical See* from one City to another was not of ſuch *weight*, or *conſideration*, but that the *Metropolitical dignity*, having been ſo long fixt at *Caerleon*, might ſtill retain that *title* after the *tranſlation*.

Beſides, the *Abbot* of *Bangor* making anſwer to *Auguſtine*'s claim, which was founded in ſome 40.
old

old right, which he pretended the *Pope* to have over *all Churches*, it was moſt proper to *conteſt* this by *former* practice, not only how it ſtood at that *preſent*, but eſpecially how it had been ἄνωθεν ἢ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, of *old*, or from the *beginning*, by *cuſtom immemorial*, and herein not to conſider ſuch *immaterial changes*, as were the removing of the *Primate's See* from one *City* to another, but to look on it, as it had always lain, in *oppoſition* to all *foreign juriſdiction*: And it being certain that *Caerleon* was antiently this *Prime See*, nothing was more agreeable to this *conteſt*, as it is ſuppoſed to be managed by that *Abbot*, than thus to refer to the ἀρχαῖα ἔθη (as the *Councils* of *Nice*, and *Antioch*, and *Chalcedon*, and *Epheſus* had done, in the like *controverſies*) to tell *Auguſtine* that the *Britiſh Chriſtians* had always, from their firſt *plantation*, been under a *Britiſh Primate*, and to call the *Britiſh Primate* by that title, which had moſt antiently belonged to him, *i. e. Biſhop* of *Caerleon*, and not by the later of *Landaff*, or the yet later of S. *Davids*.

41. What this *Author* here objects againſt the *former* of theſe *anſwers*, ſaying, 1. That this is not *proved*: And 2. That *it implies a contradiction, to ſay, the See was tranſlated, and the former title ſtill retained, Tranſlation importing* the *taking a new, and deſertion of the old title*,] is no way applicable to this *ſecond anſwer* (which conſequently remains in full force) and therefore I need not farther *attend* to it; And in *relation* to the former *anſwer*, It is far from the promiſed *clearneſs* of *demonſtration*.

42. For as to the *firſt* part of it, the thing may be *true*, though it be not *proved*; the *contrary* muſt be *proved* by him that promiſeth *clear* or *demonſtrative* confutations: And for the *ſecond*, it muſt be founded in ſome *new* notion of *Contradiction*, which my *Logick* hath not acquainted me with; for ſure he that ſaith the *See* was *tranſlated*, and the *former title retained*, doth neither ſay that the *See* was *tranſlated* and *not tranſlated* (which is the only *form* of a *Logical contradiction*) nor that the *former title* was *retained* and *not retained*; Nor *conſequently* can I diſcern the leaſt *inconvenience*, much leſs *contradiction*, either *direct*, or by way of *implication*, that the *Metropolitical See* being *tranſlated* from *Caerleon* to another *City*, the *Metropolitan* ſhould ſtill retain his *original* title, that of *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*.

43. Other *Exceptions* he proceeds to add, but thoſe ſo far again from being, according to *promiſe*, *demonſtrative evidences* againſt this *teſtimony*, that they are no way *worthy* to be attended to.
p. 410.

44. *Firſt*, That *Dinoth* would *probably* have *anſwered* in *Latine*; and to that I have already replied, that I may well grant he did ſo, and conſequently that both the *Welch* and *Engliſh* in Mr. *Moſton's MS.* were *tranſlations* of that *Latine*.

45. *Secondly*, That the words in *Welch* rendred [*whom you name to be Pope*--] are not *rightly tranſlated*; In this again I cannot contend, having no *knowledge* in that *language*, but as before I followed Sir *Henry's tranſlation*, and finding it not very *clear*, did endeavour to expreſs his meaning by a juſt *Paraphraſe*, and thereby happily rendred the *true* ſenſe of the place, ſo if I ſhould now believe my *teacher* again, this *Author*, that undertakes to correct Sir *Henry's tranſlation*, it would not be impoſſible ſo to *render* the *words*, as ſhould bear a very *commodious* ſenſe, and perfectly agreeable to the notion I formerly had of them.

46. But being not ſecure that my leader *H. T.* (whom now I diſcern to be no *Welch-man*) hath *really* the skill in that *language*, which his *animadverſions* pretend to, I thought it more reaſonable to conſult ſome other more knowing *guide*, and am now from a *judicious* hand aſſured, that there is an *errour* in the *diſtinction* between *Daad*: and *yw gleimio*, which being taken away, the true *rendring* of the whole is this, *Et aliam obedientiam, quam iſtam, non agnoſco ego cujuſquam eſſe, quem vos nominatis Papam, vel patrem patrum, vendicare & poſtulare, And any other obedience than that, I acknowledge not to be any mans* (or to *belong* to any man) *whom ye name Pope, or Father of Fathers, to challenge and require.* This is *plain* ſenſe, and ſtill perfectly agreeable to the *underſtanding* I formerly had of the *words*, and I doubt not but upon the moſt *Critical* examination, it will be found to be the moſt *literal* rendring of them

47. The *third*, of the no good ſenſe of the *Engliſh*. is already anſwered alſo, by adhering to that better *tranſlation*, which is as perfectly fit for our turns, as the other was *imagined* to be, and much more *intelligible* and clear, as appeared in the *laſt number*.

48. The *fourth* is, that the words uſed of the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon* [*who is to overſee under God over us*] *makes againſt the aim of the Prelatick reformers*, and particularly againſt *me*, who *labour to ſupport* the *King's Supremacy* againſt the *Pope*, whereas theſe words *exclude the King as well as the Pope.*] But certainly there is no *force* in this, for *Auguſtine's* demand, or *queſtion* being only of that *obedience* and *ſubordination* which belonged to the *ſupreme Biſhop*, whether that were the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, or the *Biſhop* of *Caerleon*, and not at all inquiring into the *nature* or *extent* of the *regal* or *imperial* power (there being no *occaſion* to ſuggeſt any ſuch *inquiry*) the *Abbot's anſwer* can in no probability be *extended* any farther than the *queſtion* extended, *i. e.* to the aſſerting the *Prime Epiſcopal power* to belong to the *Metropolitan* of *Caerleon* or S. *Davids*, without any *ſubordination* to the *Pope* of *Rome*.

49. As for that which in the *fifth* place he adds of the *miracle* and *divine vengeance*, in *Bede*, and ſo
* n. 19, 20 concludes his *Appendix*, to that I have ſpoken * already, in that which I thought meet to *premiſe* to this debate, and ſo I have no more to add by way of *anſwer* to his *exceptions*, but that I cannot ſufficiently wonder, that this *Author* (ſo recommended to the Reader by his *learned* Friend in the front of his Book) ſhould make it his ſolemn buſineſs to invalidate this one *ſupernumerary teſtimony*, being withal no better provided with *arguments* to promiſe him *ſucceſs* in it.

THE

THE Disarmers Dexterities EXAMINED, In a Second DEFENCE Of the *TREATISE* of SCHISM.

CHAP. I.

An Introduction and Answer to S. W. *his Epistle to the Reader.*

SECT. I.

Of the Disarmers stile and contumelies. The Scriptures judgments and sentence on Λοιδορίας. *Other parts of the Character belonging thereto.*

SOME months have now past, since I made my joynt *Reply* both to the *Catholick* Gentleman his Answer to the *Tract of Schism*, and to Mr. *H. T.* his *Appendix* to his *Manual of Controversies*; and thereon I had grounded some just hope, that either I should receive a fair Christian *Rejoynder* to that *Reply*, or else being permitted to retire from these *agonies*, be allowed some respite for thoughts and *offerings* of *peace*: But before some other importunities had permitted me to enter on the least injoyment of this *calm*, this φυσικωτάτη κατάστασις (to me I am sure) *most natural*, as * *Epicurus* call'd his γαλήνη, I find my self again ingaged (by one who hath chosen to be so *reserved*, as to give me but two Letters, *S. W.* to know him by, and so little to take notice of these *lower* transactions, as not to own the having heard of that *Reply*) and there under the title of *Disarmed Schism*, I meet with as copious a Collection of *scoffs*, and *contumelies*, as I ever remember to have seen contrived within so *narrow* a compass. To these the *Romish Factor* hath, in the name of the *Stationer*, pleased to give the stile of *Drollery*, and *Piquant sauce*; but the *Author* himself, who was fittest to have the *naming* of his *own births*, hath in his *Epistle* to the *Reader*, allowed them the plainer titles of *Rude blows*, and *twitchings by the beard*: now because the one business of that *Epistle* is not to *excuse*, but to *justifie* this dealing, to avow and defend the *Authors* just title to the *scorners chair*, and professly to plead to it, producing such evidences, as he is *confident* may secure his *possession*; and agreeably, the *Publishers* care and wit hath so particularly conformed, that to the *syllabus* of the *Chapters*, he hath solemnly annext a list of the *contumelies*, three and thirty pickt out by *specialty* out of the far greater number, (as if *Goliah*'s *cursing* of *David*, had been the *disarming* and *discomfiting* him; as if the language that the *King* of *Moab* would have bribed *Balaam* to use, had been a certain *inchantment against Israel*; as if every *reproach* wherewith *Rabshakeh* adorned his challenge to *Hezekiah*, were indeed a several *victory* over him) It is therefore reasonable that I should thus far *comply* with my *disarmers* method, as to begin with an examination of that *spirit* which hath suggested, of those *reasons*, which are thought competent to *defend* this manner of managing controversies in *Religion*.

* *Nonnus* συναγ. ἰσρεα. p. 137.

And herein the matter under examination being already as *notorious*, and *confest*, as the *flagrant fact*, and the *Authors justifying* thereof can render it, the sentence is long ago pronounced by the *Apostle*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. and 6. 10. I shall need only to recite it; In the former place, ἐάν τις ἀδελφὸς ὀνομαζόμενος ἢ λοίδορος, *If any that is called a brother*, by name or profession a *Christian*, *be a railer or reviler*, τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν, *with such an one no not to eat*; the *Christians* of *Corinth* must have

no *society* with him, ὄνομα μόνον ἀδελφῷ ἔχει, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, saith the *Scholiast*, *He hath only the name, not the reality of a Christian*, and βδέλυγμά ἐστι διὰ τὴν κακίαν, *he is for this fault a detestable person*, and as such, falls under the *censures* of the *Church*, *v.* 12. and he that is thus *ipso jure excommunicate*, is no very competent *Juror* or *witness* in a question of *Schism*, such as that which we have now before us. In the latter, the λοίδοροι, *railers*, *revilers*, *contumelious* persons again, are reckoned as a special sort of ἄδικοι, *unrighteous*, which continuing such *unreformed*, *shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven*, and do but flatter, and deceive themselves, if they hope they may; and such sure are not qualified to *condemn* others, and exclude them from *heaven*, being none of those *Saints*, who, *clave non errante*, shall *judge the world*.

3. Beside these, which alone might have *discouraged* any sober *Christian* from this adventure, many other unhappy *characters* are ready to fall upon it. 1. That it is by our *Saviour* noted to be the very *Dialect*, which the obstinate *Jews* used toward the true *Prophets* of *God*, ἐνειδισμοὶ, and πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα, *reproachings*, *and every evil word*, *Mat.* 5. 11. and such withal as will to the sufferer be matter of *triumph* (χαρὰ and ἀγαλλίασις *v.* 12. amounts to that) in case it shall finally prove, that *causelesly* or *falsely*, and for *defence* of the truth, it hath fallen upon him.

4. 2. That in case it should not in fine prove thus, yet it is that, which an *Angel*, the most *highly dignified*, and most *importunely provoked* (so was *Michael*, *Jude* 9.) would not make use of against the *Devil* himself, when ingaged in the most *malicious* dispute against the true *Church* of *God* (for such I suppose I have elsewhere shewed was meant, in that place, by *the body of Moses*) And that it should now adays against all *laws* of *Religion*, be admitted to an office (such I think should be a *dispute*) of *Religion*, what is it but the imitation of *Hercules*'s *sacrifices* at *Lyndus*, which were celebrated by *execrations* and *maledictions*, any εὐφημία or word of *civility*, though unwarily let fall, being deemed the *violation* of the *festival*.

Μάλιστα δὲ τὸν μαχόμενον δυμεῖν ὁ χρὴ. *Chrys.* t. 4. p. 709. l. 33.

5. 3. That as nothing hath a more direct and particular *opposition*, and unreconcileableness to that *spirit* of *meekness* wherein we are commanded by *Saint Paul*, to * *instruct*, to ‖ *chastise*, to * *reduce opposers*, to that *supernal wisdom* in S. *James*, which being *first pure*, is next *peaceable*, then *gentle* and εὐπειθὴς; so it cannot proceed from that *divine Spirit*, whose *fruits* among others are reckoned to be *love*, *peace*, *long-suffering*, *gentleness*, *meekness*, in opposition to *hatred*, *variance*, *emulations*, *wrath*, *strife*, *envyings*, and such like, *Gal.* 5. and *the biting one another*, *v.* 16. all *characters* of the *Gnostick heresie* at that time.

* 2 Tim. 2. 25.
‖ 1 Cor. 4. 21.
* Gal. 6. 1.

6. *Lastly*, that as this is a most *unskilful* deviation from all rules of *art*, aswell as *civility*, and S. *Hierom* notes it as a great error in *Helvidius*, that he took *railing* for *eloquence*, so it is not imaginable how so much *learning* and *abilities*, as this *Disarmer* is believed to have, should admit so great a mixture of *rudeness* and *scurrility*, had it not appeared *necessary* to assist in the *counterpoise*, to supply some other *defects*, and been useful, as *Hierocles* saith of *oaths*, πρὸς ἀναπλήρωσιν λόγου, *to fill up the chasms* or *vacuities* in the *discourse*, that fame prudent *Philosopher* having given us this *Aphorism*, that *confidence* of *skill* conduces much to the infusing *meekness* into our *debates*: And *Plutarch* πε. ἀοργησ. much to the same purpose, ἀνδρεία χολῆς οὐ δεῖται, *fortitude needs no anger*, βέβαπται γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ· and *Cicero*, *Tusc. Qu. l.* 4. *non desiderat fortitudo advocatam iracundiam; satis est instructa, armata, parata per se. Annon vir fortis nisi stomachari cœperit, non potest esse fortis? Gladiatorum id quidem est.* And *Seneca de Ira*, l. 1. c. 16. *Nil aliis instrumentis opus est. Satis nos instruxit ratione natura. Hac dedit telum firmum, perpetuum, obsequens, nec anceps, nec quod in dominum remitti possit.* Thus * *Pliny* and ‖ *Aetius* tell us of the *Grecian Serpents*, that have no *killing* faculty of their own, born with them, they are fain to *feed* on *noxious herbs* (δανάλωφορυς ῥίζας ἐσθίουσι) or else they are able to *hurt* no body. And thus is *S. W.* put to it, to *heighten* his *confuting* powers; he submits to a *sad* diet, and then * βεβρωκὼς κακὰ φάρμακα, having *armed* himself with these *strengthning plants*, he becomes, ‖ ὀρίτερος ἀνδρὶ μάχησι, very *triumphant* at least, if not *victorious* over his *adversary*.

* *Nat. Hist.* l. 29. c. 4.
‖ *Tetrab.* 4. sec. 1. c. 34.
* *Ælian.* l. 6. c. 4.
‖ *Hom. Iliad.* χ. v. 93.

This therefore is no excellent indication of *S. W.* his *perswasions* of his own performances in this *combat*, that he deemed it *necessary* * ---- *geminare venenis vulnera*, thus to *anoint his shafts*, as the *Ethiopians* do their ‖ *little arrows*, which having thus imbibed *high* vertues, ὑπὸ δραμόντων περφαγμένα, ὀξὺν τινὰ καὶ ἀπότομον θάνατον ἐπιφέρουσι, make very *quick* work, are very *killing*, or in my *Disarmers* phrase, *beyond all possible confute*; For (besides this *conscience* of his own wants) what *rational* account can be assigned, that such a last *reserve* should be drawn out so *soon*? that τὸ πλῆξαι which the *Orator* makes the effect of the *disputants* being *nonpluss*, and cannot be more commodiously rendred than in the *Authors* stile, of *rude blows*, should be the refuge so *early*, and so *constantly*? that this *ultimus conatus*, *last plunge* of a *gasping* cause (as when art is at an end, *Hypocrates* puts off his desperate patient to the φύσεις ἴντεαι) should so long forestal the κρίσις, and *dishearten* his *friends* and *servants* (in which number, if but upon that one score of having received *injuries* from him, I am by *Christs Law* obliged to include my self) and shut out all *hope* of receiving benefit from any future applications? The Divine being allowed to have that *skill* in *symptomes*, which *Irenæus*, as well as *Galen* hath taught us, that the *profusest laughter* is the worst *indication* in the *affections* of the *spleen*, ᾧ πλέον γελῶσι, ταύτῃ μᾶλλον κακῶς ἔχουσι.

* *Claud. paneg.* 1.
‖ μικρὰ βέλη. *Heliod Æthiop.*

SECT. II.

An Answer to his two Questions concerning contumelies. The Christian method of answering such.

HAving from that *Obligation* of *Charity*, which is most particularly required of me by *Christ* to the despightfullest *enemy*, *Mat.* 5. 44. said thus much to my unknown *Disarmer*, It is a second necessary *method* of the same *Charity*, to endeavour his *conviction*, by examining that one *account*, which he gives, of the *rudeness* of his *blows*, by exacting an *answer* from his *Reader* to this *question*, *How*

he

he would take it, if one should spit in his face, and justifie the affront, because his breath is sweet; or what he would say to him that ruines his estate by perjury, and defends himself, that he held up his eyes to heaven, and swore demurely] adding, that *whatsoever answer he gives, it will perfectly clear S. W. his behaviour towards the Doctor.*]

Herein all the Reply that can be expected from me, is to answer his *double* Question, and to do it according to the *certain* rules of *Christs* Divine *Precepts*, and not the *uncertain*, mutable *practices*, or humours of the *passionate* world. To the first, which mentions *spitting in the face*, be the *breath* that accompanies it either *sweet*, or otherwise, my answer is, That this I should look on as a contumely of the nature of that which *Christ* mentions, *Mat.* 5. 39. ὅστις σε ῥαπίσει, *Whosoever shall strike thee on the right cheek*, which, supposing no *wound*, or permanent pain to the body, was a fit instance to express *reproaches*, and *contumelies*, and such like *supportable* injuries of all sorts, parallel to which are all the *scoffings* and *revilings*, which were thought necessary by *S. W.* for the *Disarming* of *Schism*; And if the Tract to which he replies had any such in it, either toward the *Church* of *Rome*, or any particular member of it (as I know there is not one in the whole Book, and the very confession of the *sweet breath*, the *courteous stile*, the *civil adversary*, makes it needless to contest it) the duty, in respect of the *sufferer*, is evident in *Christs* Sermon, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην, *turn to him the other also*, rather adventure more of the like *injuries*, than ever think of acting *revenge* on that. There is but one farther care beyond this, which can be seasonable, προσεύχεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων, *To pray for them that thus despightfully use you*; and that it may not be ἀνενέργητος ἐυχὴ, a *sluggish*, *unactive*, and so *uneffectual sacrifice*, (that πυρὸς τροφὴ καὶ ἱεροσύλοις χορηγία, in *Himerius*) the assistant *endeavour*, and diligence of *fraternal* admonition, and *reproof*, is to go along with our *Prayer*, *Mat.* 18. 15. and this is all the *revenge* that is allowed to any private *Christian* in this case. And so that must serve for *answer* to his first question; Let him now consider what arts will avail to make up the *parallel* betwixt this *duty*, and his *practice*, when he that gave the *Law*, shall come to exact *account* of the *performance* of it. 2.

The other Question, founded in the more unsupportable *injury* of *ruining the estate by perjury*, must have another *answer*, that in that case, it is very lawful to use all *lawful* means to discover the *perjury*, and to defend the *estate*: What those lawful means are, I shall not need to enumerate, but only assure him, that *rude blows*, which avail nothing to either of these ends, *twitchings* by the *beard*, *declamation* and *satyr*, (before any attempt of *proof*) are none of these justifiable lawful means, but are on the contrary, that most *unjust*, *unskilful*, as well as *unchristian* revenge, the ἐξομοίωσις in the *Stoick*, the doing the most we can to be *like* him, whom we most *dislike*. Mean while, to bring this home to the case before us, 'tis certain and visible, that as the *defending* the *Church* of *England* from *Schism*, bears no proportion to the *ruining S. W. his estate* (if he hath no other tenure in his *earthly*, or *heavenly* possessions, but the worlds believing, that we are *Schismaticks*, he hath been very negligent of his deeds, and a little charity were his much better way to mend his *assurances*;) so surely, neither is there any *oath* incumbent on us, which can be *pretended* to be *violated* by casting off the *Romish yoke*, neither hath there been any the least *perjurious* tampering discoverable in any part of my defence; (he might as truly have said, that I offered *sacrifice to Idols*, that I consulted with *Necromancers*, to rob him of his *Christian* patience) and if he mark, his stile, which was *robust* in the *mention* of *perjury*, is grown much *fainter*, when he comes to the ἀνταπόδοσις, pretends to no more than *perverse meaning* and *abusive treating matters of religion*; But I trust it shall appear that this was but the language of *interest*, or *passion* also, and that there is not one single *falsity* in that whole *Tract* of *Schism*; If there be, I shall, when it appears, be content to deliver it up to the force of his *proofs*, but not till then, to the *charm* of his *scoffs*. If I must be humbled for my *misfortune*, as he stileth it, *in handling controversies so meanly*, 'tis not yet, I suppose, the *season* for it, till I have *lost* my own, or felt the *keenness* of his *weapons*, in whom it is (in the *interim*) a transgression of the rules of *Art*, as well as *Justice*, no other than the meanest begging the *question*, to *suppose* that guilt, which he was to *prove*, to assume so *early*, in the *Epistle* to the *Reader*, what he must (but hath not yet so much as *attempted* to) *demonstrate*. 3.

I have done with *S. W.* his *Epistle* to the *Reader*, his very uneffectual *defence* of a very *great*, ond evidently the *principal* part of his Book, that which comprehends all the *scoffs* and *revilings* in it, and having said so much in this place, shall not add one word more on that subject, how oft soever it *solicite* me, in the future debates.

SECT. III.

The affinity betwixt Schism Disarmed and the Catholick Gentlemans Letter. The design of this Answer.

AND when I shall have subjoyned *two* considerations more, I shall have rid my self, and the Reader of a great part of the task, which seems incumbent on both of us, and so *shorten* our work, by *inlarging* our *procinctus* or *entrance* to it.

First then it is manifest, that *Schism Disarmed* is in a great part of it, nothing else but the *inlarging* on those briefer animadversions, which had been given by the *Letter* from *Bruxels*, or the *Catholick Gentlemans answer to the most material parts of the Book of Schism*; For which purpose I refer the *Reader* to p. 24. of *Schism Disarmed*: where after some preludory lighter *skirmishes*, he thus begins. *These grounds laid, it were not amiss to insert here what the Author of that Epistle which was written from* Bruxels *in Answer to* Dr. Ha. *saith upon this place*] adding his judgment of that *Letter*, that *had it not been strangled in the birth, and miscarried in the Printers hand, it might have saved the labour of this larger confute*, *and being exactly short, might justly be stiled* Dr. Ha. *his Iliads in a Nutshel, since the force of it was so united, the reason in it so firmly connected, as might* pag. 25. 2.

have cost the Dr. *a full ten years siege, ere he could make a breach into it by his brown Paper bullets.*] This passage of kindness and reference to that *Epistle*, with many other *characters* of *affinity* betwixt that, and *Schism disarm'd*, especially the *first* of the *three* parts of it, perswade me that the *Author* of that *Epistle* was the Penman of at least the *first* part of *Schism Disarmed:* And agreeably the *answers* there drawn in *little*, have here a *larger* pourtraicture, but remain in *substance*, the same, with the advantage only of some *growth* of *limbs*, and such like accidental *improvements*. Now whereas it is certain, that I have punctually made *reply* to that whole *letter*, and every *period* in it, setting it down and attending it κατὰ πόδα, and having first, to the utmost of my skill, rescued it from all the *Printers miscarriages*, (which is all the *strangling* in the *birth* he speaks of) and then improved every *Answer* in it, as far as I could foresee it improveable, never taking the least advantage either of the conciseness of its *natural frame*, or the *misadventures* it had casually met with; It were now not only *superfluous* for me, but *unjust*, equally *impertinent*, and *unconscionable*, to make the *Reader* pay twice for the same *Answers*, and therefore no other than duty thus far to comply with his *ease*, and *thrift*, as to refer him to that *Reply* for all that is there competently *vindicated*, without any further repetition, which I therefore here mind him of, once for all, and accordingly design this view of *Schism Disarm'd*, to be an *Appendix* only to that *Reply* to the *Catholick Gentleman*, to *glean* after the *rake*, to consider only those *Answers* in it, which had not been insisted on, in the haste of that briefer *letter*, but are now taken in by these δεύτεραι φροντίδες. Had my *Disarmer* taken notice of my *Reply*, (as he had time to have done, and I cannot apprehend his *retirement*, or *imployment* so strict, that he should not hear of it) he might possibly have given me a sight of some *infirmities* in it; But as it is, I discern no need of giving it any farther *assistance*, as far as respects those answers, which it undertook to consider: And so I have no more *incumbent* on me at this time, but to survey, and *muster* all the *fresh* forces, which now *first* appear in the field, and not to increase the *roll* with the new *names* and *dresses*, that the old stagers appear in, the *second* time.

3. *Secondly*, There are some parts of the *Tract* of *Schism*, which my *Disarmer* excepts against, as *superfluous* to the debate betwixt us, as that intire branch entred on, Ch. 6. of the *Romanists plea* from the *Bishop of Romes* having *planted Christianity* among us. Which being disclaim'd to be any *plea* of theirs, It is perfectly needless that I should vindicate the *arguments*, that are framed to refute that *plea*, any farther, than as he which grants my *conclusion*, will yet make some specious *objections* against my way of inferring it.

4. Some other things there are of this kind, to all which I shall not need to give any *attention*, especially when I have done it once in the *Reply*; And then that which remains, my present *necessary* charge or *province*, being thus refined, and separated from these *three* parts of it, the *declamation*, the *repetition*, and what hangs *loose*, and may by consent be spared from the *controversie* before us; it will not retain so *formidable* a bulk, as it first appeared to have, and may by *Gods blessing* be dispatcht without much *labour*, and presented to the *Readers* use with some degree of that *compendium*, which *Philo* speaks of, τῶν Κολοσσιαίων μεγέθων τὰς ἐμφάσεις ἐν ἠ βραχυλάτῃ σφραγὶς τυπωθεῖσα δέχεται, the *largest* proportions may be carved in *little*, and contrived into a *signet*, and so might, if the *hand* were *fine* enough, the *pourtraicture* of my *Disarmer*.

CHAP. II.

A Reply to his Introduction.

SECT. I.

The writers that have ingaged against the main body, and authority of the Church of Rome. *The reasonableness of insisting on that rather than particular controversies, especially at this time.*

IN his *Introduction* these few things seem to expect some *Reply*. 1 His pretended *admiration*, *Why the Protestant party, who heretofore seem'd still more willing to skirmish in particular controversies, than bid battel to the main body of the Church, or any thing which concern'd her authority, should now print Books by pairs, in defence of this disunion from her, and subducing themselves from her Government*] annexing afterward his *conjecture* of the *reason*, to allay this *admiration*. Now of this, as far as concerns *one* of the pair, I am able to give him the one just *account*, and need not attend to his *conjectures*, who was not of my *Counsel* in the designment.

And 1. *S. W.* must be a very great *stranger* to his own country, or willingly dissemble his *knowledge*, if it were any news to him, that the *Fathers* or *Sons* of the *Church* of *England*, write Books against the *main body and authority of the Church of Rome:* 'Tis pity I should be set to prove this: He cannot but have heard of the *Tract de vera differentia Regiæ & Ecclesiasticæ potestatis*, set out by the *Prelates in Henry* VIII. his days (and may if he please now view it, under the title of *Opus eximium* in *Goldastus's Monarchia*) as also *The Institution of a Christian Man*, 1537. and, *The necessary Doctrine and Erudition*, 1543. under the head of the *Sacrament of Orders*, I. These certainly were as early, and as punctual, as he could wish, to the *main body* of their *Pretensions*; and to omit innumerable others, What was Dr. *Reynolds's conference* with Mr. *Hart* in *Queen Elizabeth's* reign? and of later times, *Bishop Bilson's* discourse of the *true difference betwixt Christian subjection, and unchristian Rebellion*, *Bishop Davenant de judice & norma Fidei*, The *Volumes* of *Antonius de Dominis*, when he was a member of our *Church*, and yet later, Dr. *White*, Mr. *Chillingworth*, and *my Lord of Canterbury*, and many others, which are fresh in every mans memory; And it is much juster matter of wonder to me, that *S. W.* would chuse to set out so *unauspicionsly*, as to begin with an *observation*

founded

founded in a *viſible* contrariety to a plain matter of *fact*, that every man that thinks of, muſt diſcern to be ſo.

2. If his obſervation had all *truth* in it, *viz.* That formerly we were more willing to *skirmiſh* in *particular* controverſies, yet 'twere obvious to every man, what might now ſuggeſt the *change* of that *courſe*, and ſo could be no real matter of *admiration* to *S. W.* For when the particular controverſies have been competently *debated*, why ſhould more pains and time be ſpent on them? And when the more general *fundamental* queſtions of *Romes* infallibility, and *univerſal paſtorſhip* (on which the caſe of *Schiſm* depends) comprehend all *leſſer* debates, what more compendious way can be invented, to the ending of *diſputes*, which are not ſuch excellent *imployments*, that they ſhould be *perpetuated*, as this, to ſet the *axe* to the *root* of the *tree*, which when it is *ſtockt* up, the branches by *neceſſity* of conſequence, without any new *execution*, will ſoon wither away, but till this be done effectually, the root will ſtill propagate its *life* and *juice*, and controverſies will within few years ſprout out, and flouriſh afreſh, and ſo the *circle* be endleſs betwixt *growth* and *lopping*, and new *growth* again, when the *axe* and *mattock*, brought out together, might ſoon make a gainful *concluſion*, transform and improve the *barren weald* and *bosk* into a *fruitful Campania*. But beſide *prudent* conſideration, there was ſome kind of *neceſſity* which inſtead of directing, *challenged* and *exacted* this method at this time. It was viſible to all, what *induſtry* was uſed by the *Romiſh Miſſaries*, by pretence of our being in *ſchiſm*, to defame (and ſo fright us out of) a *perſecuted profeſſion*. And if we may believe their own *boaſts*, it hath ſucceeded with them very *proſperouſly*; and how could we, without the greateſt *uncharitableneſs*, permit the temptations of our preſent *preſſures* to be thus *inhaunced* to any weak ſeducible *Chriſtian*, when a little pains would lay it *viſible* before him, that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* never had from *Chriſt* or *Saint Peter*, or from any other title juſtly pleadable, any *ſupreme authority*, or *juriſdiction* over this *Iſland*. And ſo, unleſs an act of due and *ſeaſonable Charity* be the great unheard of *news*, or *prodigie*; I diſcern not what could ſuggeſt to *S. W.* the leaſt *admiration* in this matter. 2.

SECT. II.

No reaſonableneß of Schiſm pleaded. The Cenſures of the Church not always ſeaſonable againſt Schiſmaticks.

THE *ſecond* thing that exacts *Reply*, is his *advertiſement*, that it were *more ſeaſonable for the Church of* England, *to denounce to thoſe many minute ſects gone out from their communion, the unreaſonableneß of their ſchiſm, than plead the reaſonableneß of their own, and to threaten them with the ſpiritual rod of excommunication, unleß they return, than cry ſo loud not guilty--*] 1.

To this I *anſwer*, 1. That *S. W.* cannot be imagined to have read the *firſt* Chapter of the ſhort *tract*, to which he aſſumes to give *anſwer*, if he can believe himſelf, when he ſaith, that we *plead the reaſonableneß of our own ſchiſm:* 'Tis there moſt evident, that I grant all *ſchiſm* in any that are found guilty of it, to be *uncapable* of all *excuſe*, or *plea* of *reaſonableneß*, and that I maintain our *innocence* by denying the *fact*, and not by defending the *juſtice* of it. This then is another δεξις what truſt is due to *S. W.* in his *affirmations*.

2. It muſt be a *miſunderſtanding* of the *nature*, and *aim* of the *cenſures* of the *Church*, if he could in earneſt think this a fit *ſeaſon*, to inflict or *menace them*, on thoſe ſons of this *Church*, which have at this time *divided* from us. 'Tis certain that a *prevailing* evil, a *ſchiſm* arm'd with *might*, is not either in *prudence* or *charity* to be *contended* with. They that have caſt out the *Governors* of the *Church*, and trod down their *power*, are not, till the *paroxyſm* aſſwage, or ſome good *criſis* appear, qualified for this kind of *application*. Our *prayers* are the ſpecial means, from which we hope *ſucceß*, and thoſe we ceaſe not to *pour* out for them, and for all that have *erred*, and are *deceived*. All other *fraternal* means both for *cure* and for *prevention*, we take in alſo in their *ſeaſons:* and I had thought the ſo large and punctual *repreſentation* of the *danger* and *ſin* of *Schiſm*, *ch.* 1. the *definition* and *ſpecification* of the ſorts of it, in the following *Chapters* of the *Tract* of *Schiſm*, had been in ſome part the *denouncing* againſt all that are *guilty* of it, the more than *unreaſonableneß* of their *ſchiſm:* And I need not mind him of many other *treatiſes*, very particularly *addreſt*, and largely deſigned to the ſame *end*. 3.

As for any more ſolemn judicial proceſs of νουθεσία & ἐπιτιμία, *admonition*, *exhortation*, *diſcipline*, they are not at all times, and ſo not at this, the proper choſen *weapons* of our *warfare*, which being deſigned to none but *charitative* ends, *for edification*, *not for deſtruction*, to *reduce* ſuch as are within reach of that *hope*, not to riot in the *ruine*, to *ſeal* up, or increaſe the *damnation* of any; and being, as the *Apoſtle* ſaith, σ' Σαρκικὰ, *not carnal*, they muſt conſequently be far removed from that one (as from all other kinds of) *carnality*, the expreſſing *impotent paſſion* or *revenge*, or *heaping* any other *coles of fire on* the *Oppoſers* heads, but thoſe that are apt and *probable* to *melt* them. And had the *Romaniſts* uſed this method, inſtead of their other more *ſanguinary*, with *meekneß inſtructing*, and not with *rage fulminating* againſt thoſe, that *oppoſe themſelves*, the *Chriſtian world* had not now probably been ingaged in ſuch irreparable *ruptures*, as with *rivers* of *tears* of *blood* will not be *proportionably* lamented. 4.

SECT. III.

The Romaniſts urging falſe fundamentals. Our acknowledging them a true Church. No proof that we think their Errors tolerable. The gravity of the matter makes not errors fitter to be preſt than rituals. Tediouſneß in things acknowledged, unjuſtly charged.

A Third thing there yet remains, ſet down in theſe words [*that we preſt them to believe falſe Fundamentals, Dr.* Ham. *and his Friends will not ſay, ſince they acknowledge ours a true Church, which is inconſiſtent with ſuch a lapſe, they were therefore in their opinion things tolerable, which were upon them;* 1.

and

and if not in the same rank, yet more deserving the Church should command their observance, than copes or surplices, or the Book of Common-prayer, the allowance whereof they prest upon their Quondam brethren.

2. In these words there are so many *variations* from the rules of *sober* discourse, so many *indications* of *S. W.* his *temper*, that it will not be easie to enumerate them; I shall make tender of some few, πρὸς δεῖξιν.

3. And 1. when he undertakes for *me* and my *friends*, that we *will not say, that the Romanists have prest us to believe false Fundamentals*, either his words are not *intelligible* sense, or else they have visibly no degree of *truth* in them. That any *Fundamentals* should be *false*, is a *contradiction* in *adjecto*, and is not *sense*, or *intelligible*: The meaning therefore, I suppose, is, that some things may be said to be *fundamental*, which are not *truly* such, and that they that *press* others to believe such *doctrines*, and to *believe* them *fundamental*, *press them to believe false Fundamentals*, and then *S. W.* his *affirmation* must be, that I and my friends will not say that the *Romanists* do thus. But herein certainly he knows the *contrary*, *viz.* that we affirm them to press many things on us for *fundamentals* of *belief*, which are not *Fundamentals* (by name that of the *infallibility* of their *Church*) and that this is of all others the greatest *objection*, which we have to their dealing with us, as that which renders our *reunion* most *impossible*. That we hold nothing *de fide*, as *fundamental*, which they do not also hold, we oft *affirm*, and it is most *manifest*; but that they have not made more things *necessary* to be *believed*, and so *de fide*, and *fundamental*, than we do, or can *acknowledge* to be such, is affirmed without the least *ground*, or *shew* of *truth*; and that was no very fair play in my *Disarmer*.

4. 2. For his *proof* of this his affirmation, *viz. because we acknowledge theirs to be a true Church*; either it is assisted by a *gross*, and *discernable* equivocation in the word [*true*]; and then again it hath no *truth* in it; or else it is far from all *probability* of *concluding*, what he *infers* from it. If by [*true*] he means to exclude *erroneous*, even in this degree, as to *press* for *fundamental*, that which is *not* such, nay nor *truth* neither; then he knows we yield not the present *Church of Rome* a *true Church*, but charge it guilty of many *errors* in *belief* and *practice*, and particularly of this, that they *define* many things *de fide*, and press them to be so received by us, which we acknowledge not to be such; and so he hath gained little by this our *confession*. But if by *true*, he means *veritatem entis*, which alone we acknowledge of it, that it hath the *true nature* of a *Church*, but that overcharged with many *errors*, 'tis impossible he should ever infer from thence, that we say *they press us not to believe any thing for fundamental, which is not such*. This sure they may do, and be foully *culpable* for doing it, and yet not *unchurch* themselves by so doing. They that hold the *true foundation* laid by *Christ*, but offend by enlarging it beyond the due *limits*, who add more than *Christ* or his *Apostles* deposited in the *Church*, do not by this *superaddition* either *renounce*, or *forfeit* all that before they had, the *dross* doth corrupt the *gold*, but not *annihilate* it.

5. 3. His affirmation, that *they were, in our opinion, things tolerable which were urged upon us*, is of the same *quality* with the former. 'Tis certain we have oft expreſt our opinion, that they are such as without *hypocrisie*, or *gross sin* against *conscience*, we cannot admit, and no weight is more *unsupportable* than that. Another visible lapse you see in relating a matter of *fact* (for such it is to affirm us to *opine*, what we *opine* not) but then that which follows in the fourth place, is still more *transcendent*. *The things which they press upon us* (and we cannot *submit* to) *are*, saith he, *more deserving the Church should command their observance, than copes.*--- I grant that *articles de Fide* are, or should be of far *greater importance*, than *ornaments*, or *rituals*: But what if *articles* are imposed *de Fide*, which have no *truth in them*, will the *gravity* of the matter in that case plead for the *imposing* them? or can it thence follow, that all that the *Church* of *Rome* hath *defined* to be *de fide*, do *better deserve to be commanded, than Copes? Copes* are by us, and the *Romanist* joyntly acknowledged to be things *indifferent*, and so *lawful* to be prudently *prescribed* by a competent *authority*; and the *lighter* they are in the nature of them, the greater *obstinacy* it is, to resist such *commands*, and *causlesly* to depart from the *Church*, rather than do what is thus *indifferent*. But the *weightier* the importance of the other is, the more *intolerable* is the pressure, and the greater the *tyranny* of imposing them. So beyond all measure *improbable* are all *S. W.* his present offers of *probation*. 'Tis pity thus *unnecessarily* to insist on it.

6. What he adds of my *tediousness in things acknowledged by both parties*, is with no shew of *justice* suggested (the whole *treatise* being very *short*, and in my opinion every branch of it *necessary* to vindicate our *innocence*, or to prejudge theirs) especially when the less he hath to oppose, the sooner he might, if he pleased, be at an *end* of his journey, were it not that he finds as fair *colours* of *answers* to reply, and as fair a *field* to *expatiate*, when the matter is most *grosly* true, and granted by him, as he doth, when it is most his *interest* to *oppugn* it. I shall propose to my self, not to transcribe this *copy* from him, but permit him peaceably to speak as much *truth*, as he will, be it direct, or never so much out of the way, and never *disturb* him in his course, unless I shall discern some part of my *arguing* concerned, which the former *Reply* to the *Catholick Gentleman* had not opportunity to *vindicate*. And so much for his *Introduction*.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

A View of the first part of Schism disarmed.

SECT. I.

No cause can justifie Schism. The reasons of my setting down the sin of Schism so largely. The state of the question, which the Schismaticks, the Romanists, or we. The case of the Romish Recusant. Of the Pope excommunicating us, against Canons Ephesine, and Apostolick, &c. A difference between the Court of Rome with their abettors, and the charitable subjects of the Papacy. The fundamental question, the right of the Popes power. My modifying the Fathers words.

IN the first *Section* of his first part, two things *S. W.* is much to seek in, and to those it will be act of *charity* to afford some *satisfaction*. *First*, why *I took pains to set so ill a character upon schism (as is done in the 6, 7, and 8. Sect. of Chap. 1.)* to *gather*, as he saith, *such a bundle of severe rods out of the Sacred Scriptures and best Fathers, to whip Schismaticks:*] 2. *Why I think the cause or occasion of any mans schism not worth the producing or heeding in this Controversie.* 1.

Of the *latter* of these I have already spoken in the *Reply*, *Chap.* 1. *Sect.* 1. and shall now only add another very ancient testimony from *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, in his *Epistle* to *Novatus*, ἔδει πᾶν ὁτιοῦν παθεῖν ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ διακόψαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ θεοῦ. *A Christian ought to endure any thing in that* (humble *Charitative*) *cause of not dividing the Church of Christ*, rather than really to *divide* upon what ever *cause*. And because it is now suggested that this is but a *fetch, the prettiest that ever* S. W. *met with, to wave the whole question, or what soever is material in it*, I shall in *answering* of his *first* wonderment, give a clear account of this second *misunderstanding* also. 2. *Ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib.* 6. *cap.* 44.

The evident reason of my *premising* so largely, and so early that bloody *pourtraicture* of the *danger*, and *sin* of *schism*, as far as it respects the *Romanist* and us (for it had a more *comprehensive* influence than so, as hath been already said) was no other but the intire *desire* to speak the full *truth* of *God*, and to lay all guilt, where I was fully perswaded the *All-just searcher of hearts*, and *Judge* of *actions* had laid it, *i. e.* on those, whosoever they were, that were truly *guilty* of it, who had either divided from the *Catholick Church* of *Christ*, truly so called, or in special from any *particular National Church*, such as the *Church* of *Rome* is on one side, and the *Church* of *England* on the other. And this was so pertinent in both these respects, to the *Romanists* present case (as many especially, as have forsaken that *Communion* of ours, in which they sometimes *lived* obediently) that if ever I had been really willing to *alleviate* the *Fathers* censures of the crime of *schism*, (as twice, or thrice my *Disarmer* pretends me inclinable to do, he shall see anon with how little *reason*) I might most justly say, that it had been from a *tenderness* to our *enemies* (and not from any *jealousie* of our *selves*) an effect of which it really was, that I chose not to proceed to *fasten* this crime on any, to assume the *office* either of an *accuser*, or a *Judge*, but contain my self within the meekest *bounds*, that *humility* and *charity* could advise, of *vindicating* our own *integrity*, without *recriminating* or retorting the *charge* on our *adversaries*. Of this I shall now speak a little more *expresly*, upon this *occasion*. 3. *Tr. of Schism, p.* 11.

That it is in this debate, concerning *Schism*, a matter of *question* betwixt the *Romanists* and us, whether the *Bishop* of *Rome* had before, and at the time of the *Reformation*, any *supreme legal power*, and *authority* over the *Church* of *England*, I willingly acknowledge (and by the way, it is strange that *S. W.* can think fit to affirm, that * *none doubts it*) and till that *question* be decided on one side, it cannot with any reason be *defined*, on which side the *schism* doth truly lye. And therefore I deemed it absolutely necessary to examine all the *Romanists* pleas imaginable, their *weightier*, or *lightest* colours of *pretensions* to that *authority*. And I think no man can, or doth say that I have omitted any head of them; but on the other side, that I was over careful to *prevent* some which they now choose not to *plead*. From hence it is inevitably *consequent*, that as on the *tryal* of this *question* of the *papal supremacy*, the *Crisis* of this other of *Schism* so depends, that when the one is *determined*, the other must *follow* it, it being evident, that actually there is a *schism* or *partition* betwixt us, and by both of us granted, that no *cause* can excuse them, who shall be found *guilty* of it: So whilst the former, that of the *papal authority*, is under *contest*; the *question* is not *barely* this, Whether the *Church* of *England* be *schismatical*, or no, (for a *Romanist* may *cheaply* debate that, and keep himself safe, whatsoever becomes of the *umpirage*) but indifferently, and equally, whether *we*, or the *Romanist* be thus guilty, or which is the *Schismatick*, that lies under all those severe *censures* of the *Scriptures* and *Fathers*. Those of the *English Reformation* on the one side, or the *English Revolters* on the other side, not *excluding* (but *involving* also under the same condemnation, in case they have no due *authority* over us, which now is the *question*, and must not be *begg'd* on either side) the *Governours* in the *Romish* See, that have against all *Christian* methods of *charity*, and duty of *Communion*, cast us out of their *societies*, as without *authority* (in case they are not our *lawful Superiors*) so without all *cause*, and continue their *severity* without all *remorse* or *relenting* for the space of many years, and this not only toward us, but toward many other *Churches*, *East* and *West*, *North* and *South*, in all parts of the *habitable* world. 4. * *That our Church had authority to do it (to cast you out and deny you Communion) if you be found to deserve it, being then her subjects and children, none doubts, p.* 4

For if the *Church of England* be really ἀυτοκέφαλος, duly subject to no *foreign jurisdiction*, which I must yet suppose to be made good in that *tract* of *schism*, then the *lay Papist*, baptized a member, and *son* of this *National Church* under the *authority* of our *Ecclesiastical Superiors*, as he was born a subject under the civil *Governors* of this *Realm*, hath *revolted*, and *separated* from his immediate *Superiors*, and for his sake, among others, it was, that the *Discourse* was so punctual, and so large, *c.* 3. concerning the *unity* of *subjection* of all *inferiours* to all their *lawful Superiors*, and the *schism* that arose from the *breach* of that *unity*, the casting off that *Obedience*; It were to be wished, the *English Revolters*, that are so neerly concern'd, and the unsetled *doubters*, that are in most danger to be *seduced* by the confi- 5.

dence

dence of a supposed *safety*, which is promised them in their *departure* from us, and affirmed to be *granted* on all hands, would timely be *admonished* to take notice of it.

6. So again, if the *Bishop* of *Rome* had really no more *power* and *authority* over this *Church*, than the *Bishop* of *Antioch* in the time of the *Ephesine Council*, was found to have over *Cyprus*, then his pretending this *supereminent* authority, and proceeding with us, as with his *legal subjects*, sending out his *Bulls* of *Excommunication* against us, what is it but a *schism* formally on his part, which makes the *rupture* between the *sister Churches*, and a most express *violation* of the *ancient Canons*, which so distinctly, and precisely command the *contrary*. I shall best give you their sense in the very words of the great *Council* of *Ephesus*, *Can. ult.* μηδένα τῶν θεοφιλεστάτων ἐπισκόπων ἐπαρχίαν ἑτέραν ἐκ ἔσαν ὥρωθεν καὶ ἐξαρχῆς ὑπὸ τὴν αὐτὸν, ἦγεν τῶν πρὸ αὐτῶ, χεῖρα, καταλαμβάνειν, ἀλλὰ εἰ καί τις κατέλαβεν, καὶ ὑφ' ἑαυτῷ πεποίηται βιασάμενος, τοῦτον ἀποδιδόναι, ἵνα μὴ τῶν πατέρων οἱ κανόνες παραβαίνωνται. μηδὲ ἐν ἱερωσύνης προσχήματι ἐξουσίας κοσμικῆς τύφος παρεισδύνηται, μηδὲ λάθωμεν ἢ ἐλευθερίαν κατὰ μικρὸν ἀπολέσαντες, ἣν ἡμῖν ἐδωρήσατο τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ὁ πάντων ἀνθρώπων ἐλευθερώτης, *that no Bishop* (be he never so dignified) *shall invade another Province, which hath not been from the beginning under his*, i. e. *his Predecessors hand or power. But in case any have thus invaded, and by violence brought it under him, he shall then make restitution, that the Canons of the Fathers be not transgressed, and under pretence of sacred office, the pride of secular power secretly steal in, and so we by degrees lose indiscernibly the liberty which our Lord Jesus Christ the Redeemer of all Men hath given us by his own blood.* This is yet more distinctly set down in the *genuine Apostolick Canons*, where, as the due observance of the *Primate* in every Nation is prescribed, *Can.* 34. and his power thus limited in the *exercise* of it, that he shall do nothing in the *Inferior Bishops Dioceses*, ἄνευ τῆς πάντων γνώμης, *without the good liking of them all* (and if he do otherwise, he *abuses his dignity*, saith the *Scholiast*, and * *converts it into* δυναστεία and ἀυθεντία, which is no better than *tyranny*) so *Can.* 35. they proceed to define ἐπίσκοπον μὴ τολμᾶν ἔξω τῶν ἀυτῦ ὅρων χειροτονίας ποιεῖσθαι, εἰς τὰς μὴ ὑποκειμένας ἀυτῷ πόλεις καὶ χώρας------ *that no Bishop shall dare to ordain any without his own bounds, in Cities or Regions not subject to him; or if he be convinced to have done so, without the good liking of those that have the rule of those Cities or Regions, he is to be deposed for that default.*

* ἀλλὰ τῷ πρώτῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ παρεχωρεῖ τῇ ἰδίᾳ καταχρώμενον, εἰς δυναστείαν αὐτὸν ἀμείβειν, καὶ ἐναυθεντεῖν, καὶ χωρὶς κοινῆς γνώμης τῶν ὁικείων συλλειτουργῶν ποιεῖν τὰ τῶν εἰρημένων, ἢ τῶν ὁμοίων αὐτοῖς. Zon. p. 17. D.

7. And what they thus define about *Ordination*, the *Council* of *Constantinople* extend to all other *Ecclesiastical* affairs, *Can.* 6. ἀκλήτους ἐπισκόπους ὑπὲρ διοίκησιν μὴ ἐπιβαίνειν (as before τὰις ὑπερορίοις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἐπιέναι) ἐπὶ χειροτονίᾳ, ἢ τισιν ἄλλαις οἰκονομίαις ἐκκλησιαστικαῖς, *that no Bishops must, unless they be called or intreated, meddle beyond their Dioces, or with Churches without their bounds, either for ordination, or any other Ecclesiastical œconomies*; and the *Scholiast* tells us, that the word ἐπιβαίνειν signifies it to be ληστρικὴν καὶ ἄτακτον ἔφοδον, a *robbery*, and a *tumultuous* disorderly *invasion* in them that are guilty of it. The same doth the 13*th. Canon* of *Antioch* define of any *Bishop*, in reference both to * *ordination* and to *constituting* of what ever *Ecclesiastical* affairs that belong not to him, decreeing a plain *nullity* of all that he shall thus constitute, and so again, *Can.* 12. of that *Council*.

Zon. p. 70. A.

* ἐπὶ χειροθεσίᾳ τινῶν καὶ καταστάσει τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν πραγμάτων μὴ προσηκόντων αὐτῷ, ἄκυρα εἶναι τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῦ πεπραγμένα συγχώρειν,

And this being the *Bishop* of *Rome* his condition in respect of us, in case he have no *legal authority* over us, and be not *intreated* by the *Governours* of our *Church* to exercise any; or in case he were our *Primate*, yet still if he act without the *Council*, and against the *consent* of our *Bishops*, as he must be supposed to do, when he *excommunicates* them, and their *Flocks* together; 'tis all this while, as was shewed, *usurpation* and *invasion*, and by force of these *Canons*, ἄτακτον and ἄκυρον, *irregular*, *invalid*, and *null*, and in the consequence of it, most evidently destructive of that ὁμόνοια that *concord* and *unity*, as of *brethren*, which is to be preserved between *several Churches*, and so a most culpable act of *schism* in the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and in all them that are guilty of it in so high a way, as to *anathematize* and *disclaim* all *Communion* with others: and this is all this while visibly *antecedent* to, and *abstracted* from the *cause* of his *doing* it, which alone *S. W.* will allow to be *considered*, accusing me for *waving the question*, when he *swallows* it down at one *haust*, pretending that *none doubt of their Churches authority to do it*, which I profess to be the one *fundamental question* of all, to which this other, who they are that are *guilty* of the *schism*, or whether the charge of *schism* be sufficiently proved against us of the *Church* of *England*, is but *appendent*, and *consequent*, the *usurping* of an undue *power* over those that are not his *Ecclesiastical subjects*, being no *Judicial* act, but a most visible *Tyranny* in him that *exercises it* so bloodily, on whatsoever pretended *misbehaviours*, and that which alone, without any other *branch* of plea, justifies us from the guilt of *schism*, in vindicating our just *liberties*, by casting him out of that *power*, who was so unduly *possest* of it, and so devolves (unless he can clear his *title* to the *power*) the whole *guilt* of the *crime* on the *accuser*.

9. How highly the *Court* of *Rome*, and all that abet her *grandeur* and contempt of their *brethren*, are to be judg'd *criminous* herein, this is no place to define: I willingly acknowledge a wide difference between them, and the humble *charitable* members of the *Roman Communion*, who living quietly under their *Superiors*, endeavour and pray for the peace of the *Catholick Church*, and contribute not *actively* or *willingly* to the *ruptures* of it: Of which number because our *charity* bids us hope there are great *multitudes*, we are still free from any *necessity* of prejudging the *Church* of *Rome* from being a *true Church*, and so still retain that *favourable* opinion of *salvation* being attainable amongst them, which we always allow'd, yet cannot absolve from the guilt of the most culpable *schism* those that have set up, and maintained that more than γεῖσον or ὄριγγον or μεσότοιχον τῆς φραγμοῦ, that *impregnable fortress*, rather than *wall* of *partition* betwixt us, nor yet those that against all rules of *subjection* and *subordination*, have renounced their lot in the *Church* of *England*, wherein they were *planted*, and given themselves up to a *foreign obedience*.

10. My *Disarmer* will, I suppose, by this discern the satisfaction which he is likely to receive to his two *scruples*; I have that confidence of his *capacity*, as to leave him to pick it out of the *premisses*, and apply it to his best advantage, as I do also this open *acknowledgment*, that if by the process of this debate it shall appear, that the *Bishop* of *Rome* is, or was by the *Institution* of *Christ*, from whom he pretends, *our legal Superior, possessor bonæ fidei* of the *supreme power* over us, we are then unquestionably the *Schismaticks*; and if not, then are they such, which have *revolted* from us. And this, as it will shorten the *method*, and make it still reasonable to wave the consideration of the *occasion* and *causes* of the *schism* (of which they that are guilty, are not *excusable* by any *motive* or cause of their *action*) so it is most distant

from

from *declining* the very *point of the difficulty*, as *S. W.* without all colour of truth, or argument, pretends, the *right* of the *power* being the one great *requisite* to the *validity* of any *exercise* of it.

Wherein as we have no reason to dread the *Romanists*, or to misdoubt our *plea*, so I assure *S. W.* 11. no fear, or *jealous* apprehension of any possible *danger*, inclined me to modifie any sharp expression of the *Fathers* against *schism*, as he twice or thrice without any justice suggests me to do. The clearing whereof is all that I have any obligation to add to this *Section*.

His first whisper of *suggestion* is, that in rendring S. *Augustines* words, *Non esse quicquam gravius* 12. *schismate*, I say there is *scarce any crime so great as schism*. [There saith he, *I mince it with scarce, when the place cited is absolute, that there is not any*] But certainly *S. W.* sees amiss, The place in that *Father* is not *absolute*, that there is *not any so great*, but only that there is not any *gravius heavier* or *greater*; now there may possibly be many *crimes as great*, though no one were supposed *greater*, and so my rendring it [*there is scarce any so great*] i.e. *scarce any equal to schism*, is fully as much, as the *original* contained: and if it differ at all from it, 'tis that 'tis more *comprehensive*, than that which 'twas set to *interpret*. And yet also the other *expressions* of the *Fathers*, produced in that place, gave me *authority* to set it in that *amplitude*, not *idolatry*, not *sacriledge*, not *parricide* (say they) *is so great*, and therefore I conclude, *scarce any crime can come* in competition with it, not knowing any that was qualified for it by being *greater* than these, and yet not assuming to *affirm* more than my *authorities* did induce, that there was *none greater*. Herein 'tis visible my *Disarmers haste* was too great, and that I could not have rendred either the *words* more fully, or the sense of the *testimonies* more punctually, than I did render them: 'Twere, I doubt, his dearest *interest*, that some *softer* expression did truly belong to that *sin*, than that which I was forced to *allot* to it.

The other rendring which he blames, is on occasion of these words of *Irenaus*, *Nulla ab eis tanta* 13. *fieri potest correptio, quanta est schismatis pernicies*, whence, not as translating to a word, but as deducing a *conclusion*, I infer, that it is in the opinion of the *Fathers very hard, if not impossible to receive such an injury or provocation from the Governors of the Church, as may make a separation excusable* [here, saith he, *the Doctor mitigates the dangerous expression with, very hard, if not impossible.*] But why did he not say, I did not exactly *render schismatis pernicies?* For it is evident, I varied that more, than the *nulla fieri potest correptio*. The short is, I set down the *latine* punctually, and so left it not possible for me to impose on any that understood that: Thence I inferred what I supposed the *testimonies* would be sure to bear, and was careful not to go *beyond* those limits; and knowing that both in *Scripture* oft, and not seldom in other *Authors*, ἀδύνατον, which is literally *impossible*, was in sense to be rendred *hard* or *difficult*, I took that *cautious* expression to be best, that in their *opinion* 'twas *very hard, if not impossible*.

A *third* whisper there is still behind in this §. that *in stead of the words of S. Augustine, separate from* 14. *the Catholick Church, the Dr. full of jealousies and fears, puts the Church truly Catholick, as if*, saith he, *there were much danger lest any perhaps should imagine Christs Church* (of which he conceives S. *Austin meant it*) *to be untruly Catholick*] But this will be soon dispatcht. *S Austines* words are, *Communionem separent à communione Orbis terrarum*, I expres't this [*and by separating from the universal or truly Catholick Church of Christ*] the reason is visible, because the *Church* of *Rome* is by her *Advocates* stiled the *Catholick Church*, being certainly not such in the notion, wherein S. *Austin* speaks, that of the *Communion* of the *whole world*, or as *Catholick*, if truly so, must signifie *Universal*.

These are the acts of *charineß*, whereof I am accused as of *dexterities*, that I found necessary, lest 15. I might too directly prejudice my *future* work; with what truth suggested, the *Reader* will now judg, yea and *S. W.* also (if 'twere possible he should believe himself in this part of his *accusation*) whom I have now made my *Confessor* of my *secretest* and deepest *reservations*; I wish he would not oft put me to such necessities, till he be better *qualified* for that office.

SECT. II.

The notation of the word σχίσμα, *from the passive reciprocal. The Hebrew conjugations.* Σώζεσθαι. Ἀφορίζεσθαι. Ἀποσχίζεσθαι. *Self-division. Begging the principal questions. The cause considerable in Excommunication, though not in Schism.*

IN the *second Section* what he premises concerning *heresie*, and forms into a kind of *exception* 1. against my proceeding, had been intimated by the *Catholick Gentleman*, and is in the *Reply*, *c.* 2. §. 1. evidenced to be his *misunderstanding*.

What follows at large in a *triumphant* manner, on occasion of the *critical* notation of the word 2. σχίσμα, from σχίζομαι, in the notation of the *Hebrew Hithpael*, is perfectly *new*, and an excellent taste of *S. W.* his *Grammatical* skill, but shall no longer detain me, than whilest I clear the *truth*, and give reply to his *objections*.

The truth is evidently this, the word *Schism* comes from the *passive* σχίζομαι, which regularly sig- 3. nifies being *cut*, or *divided*, but yet the sin of *Schism* being an *action* upon *himself*, not a *passion* from any other, it was, I conceived, of the nature of those *passives*, which note *reciprocal action*, or *passion*, which S. *Jude* fully expresses by ἀποδιορίζοντες ἑαυτούς, the title which he gives the grand *Gnostick Schismaticks*, that they *cut off*, or divide *themselves* from the *Church*; and *Justinian* in his *Novels*, διαταξ. ρϑ. εἰ ἑαυτὰς χωρίζουσι τῶν τῆς θεᾶς δωρεῶν, *if they divide themselves from the gifts of God*. This being evident, and yet not regularly the notation of *Greek passives*, I said it was of the nature of the *Hebrew Hithpael*, which denoting *reciprocal action*, is by some reckoned the *fourth*, by others the *seventh conjugation*, constantly known among all by that name of *conjugation*, and I was content to speak as other men constantly speak, and therefore said, that for want of *conjugations* (such as the *Hebrew Grammars* call thus) the *passive* was designed to supply the place of the *Hebrew Hithpael*, and so noted the *reciprocal*, where the *passion* is from, and on *himself*, and is fully expres't by the *latine Neutral*, a *separating*, or receding of any member from the *unity* of the *Church*. This is as plain sense, and as strictly according to the rules of *Grammar*, & ordinary use of words, as I could possibly speak; & withal, very useful, in my conceit,

to set down the true notion of *Schism*, as it differs from all other things that border on it (and though they are not, may yet be *mistaken* for the same) particularly from *excommunication*, which is the *cutting* off *others* from the *Church*, whereas S. *Paul* speaking of the *heretical Gnosticks* which were *Schismaticks* too, saith that they were αὐτοκατάκριτοι, such as *condemned* and *excommunicated themselves*, which is as perfect an evidence of the *reciprocal action* or *passion*, as could be.

4. This renders him answer to his first *scruple* [*How I know it must necessarily be taken in that notion here, since*, saith he, *coming from a verb active, it must in the first place have a signification perfectly passive.*] The account is given already, because the *Schismaticks* in S. *Jude* are defined by him not such as are *divided*, in a *passive* sense, but ἀποδιορίζοντες ἑαυτὲς, *those that separate* or *divide themselves*, and the same men are by S. *Paul* said to be αὐτοκατάκριτοι, such as inflict the *censure* of *condemnation* or *excommunication*, αὐτοὶ καθ' ἑαυτὲς, in the *African Council*, *themselves upon themselves*. This evidences the *Schismatick* to be a *reciprocal agent* and *patient*, and that, the *Greek passive* denotes not, but as it supplies the place of the *Hebrew Hithpael*, therefore thus it *must* be taken in this word.

Cod. Afr. can. 22.

5. 2. This renders him *answer*, with what propriety I say, this is *for want of conjugations, viz.* for want of such *flexions* and *variations* both of the *signification*, and of the *first syllables*, as the *Hebricians* call *conjugations*, whose language it was fit I should use, when I spake of the *Hebrew idiom*, communicated to the *Greek*.

6. That *voices* and *conjugations* are, as he saith, *jumbled in this* language, is neither *granted* by *all Grammarians*, nor at all tends to *S. W.* his *advantage*, if it were granted to him. Those *Grammarians* that make but *four conjugations*, do certainly not *mix*, or *jumble* them, for of those *four*, each of the three former are divided into their *Actives* and *Passives*, such as the *Latines* and *Greeks* call *voices*, and the *fourth* is not capable of that *division*, but is *reciprocal*. And though others style these, *eight conjugations*, as *David Kimchi* in his מכלל, *Moses Kimchi* in his *Grammar*, and *Elias Levita*, yet they have taken care to *sever* them, into the *parents*, as they call the *Actives*, and the *off-spring*, the *passives* that have *issued* from them, and the *reciprocal*, which is *parent* and *daughter* too; and so still the *distinction* is preserved clear, and not the least *impropriety* imaginable in my speech, that the *Greek* which had neither *voice* nor *conjugation* of the *reciprocal* form, used the *passive voice* in stead of it, for want of *conjugations*, i. e. for want of something answerable to that, which the *Hebrews*, both they which make but *four*, and they that make *eight*, do uniformly style *conjugation*.

7. In this place it is not conceivable how *S. W.* should come to call them *eight votes*, and to affirm that the *Grammarians* so style them. That any one *Grammarian* hath styled them *eight Votes*, is more than by any enquiry I can discover: and if any have, I am too dull, I acknowledge, to understand him, unless because *Votes* signifie *voices*, when they are used for *suffrages*, he means to give law to *language*, and appoint *votes* to signifie *Grammatical voices* also. And yet if that were his mistake, or if the *Printer* substituted *votes* in stead of *voices*, there must be in it another *mistake* also, for no *Grammarian*, I suppose, could ever think there were *eight* such *voices*, and therefore still I am to be informed by some *Diviner*, what *S. W.* his *eight votes* signified.

8. So again, when having disliked my *multiplied conjugations* in *Hebrew*, he yet adds, that there are *more in the Greek than in the Hebrew*, 'twill not be easie to discern upon what account *Grammatical*, or *rational*, he could do so; For it being certain, that the different *conjugations* in *Greek*, are not *varied* in the *flexion*, as the *Latines* are, but only in the *Characteristick*, (and so the best *Grammarians* have resolved, that though such Κλίσεις *are called* * *conjugations*, yet they are *improperly* so *called*) it is evident also, that the same *strict laws*, that are of force against the *multiplying* the *conjugations* in *Hebrew*, are of *equal*, if not *greater* force against the bestowing that title of *conjugation* upon all the *variations* of the *verbs* in *Greek*. The *variations* in all those, which the *Hebrew* call *conjugations*, being discernible both in the *signification*, and in the *first syllable*, which may well outweigh the *variation* of the *characteristick* in the *Greek*; And besides, it is most evident, that *one* and the *same verb* goes through all the *conjugations* in *Hebrew*, but doth not so in *Greek*, and accordingly there is no such thing in the *Greek* language, as the *variation* of *frequentative*, *transitive*, and *reciprocal*, which are in the *Hebrew Piel*, *Hiphil*, and *Hithpael*, the only ground of my affirming, that the *Greek wanted conjugations*, which were found among the *Hebrews*. Such *misadventures* as these, his descending to such *niceties* hath cost him, and truly some more; witness his *neutropassive* taken by him for a *passive* in the *reciprocal* or *neutral sense*, when every *school-boy* knows, that all *neutropassives* are of the *active* voice; so again his instancing in *sto*, as a word partaking of a *passive* sense, because it may be rendred, *I am standing*, and others the like, through every stage of this his voyage, if it were not too great *levity*, and somewhat unreconcileable with common *compassion* to enumerate them.

* ἃς καὶ συζυγίας καλοῦμεν, Theodor. γραμματ. εἰσαγ. βιβ β. p. 39.

9. In stead of so doing, I shall only add an *answer* to his one *principal* scruple, when having mentioned the notion of *Hithpael*, to signifie an express *action upon it self*, he demands, *where the Doctor among all his critical observations, can shew him one word in all the Latine and Greek language to parallel it, or that is (as the Doctor expresseth it) of the nature of Hithpael.* I answer σώζεσθαι is such a *Greek* word of the nature of *Hithpael*, signifying sometimes *saving* and *delivering himself*, and in rendring expressed by the *neutral*, *escaping*, *Gen.* 19. 19. and 22. 1 *Sam.* 19. 12. *Joel* 2. 32. and so 'tis used by S. *Luke* in the same sense, *Acts* 2. 40. σώζεσθε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς σκολιᾶς ταύτης, *be ye saved, literally*, but in sense, *rescue*, or as the *English* renders it, *save your selves*, or *escape*, or *get out of this wicked generation*. So yet neerer to the word we have in hand, ἀφορίζεσθαι, literally, to be *separated*, is sometimes to *separate themselves*, without any *action* of, or *passion* received from any other, as 2 *Cor.* 6. 17. where by way of *exhortation* the *Apostle* bespeaks them, ἐξέλθετε καὶ ἀφορίσθητε, *Come out and be ye separate*, i. e. *separate your selves*, not, be ye *separated*, or *cast out* by *others*. The foregoing *neutral* sense of *coming out*, expresseth this to be the importance of it. And for the very word which hath occasioned this debate, see *Num.* 16. 20. where when the *Hebrew* hath הבדלו in *Hithpael*, *separate your selves*, the *Greek* reads ἀποσχίσθητε, *be ye cut off*, or *divided* from them, the very same that is varied, *v.* 24. into העלו ἀναχωρήσατε *get you up from them*; and *v.* 26. סורו *depart*, again rendred by the *Gr.* ἀποσχίσθητε, *be ye separated*. These are sufficient to answer his *question*: And for variety of other the like examples (I never affirmed it of *all*, as he is pleased to infer, *p.* 9. but only of this and some others) if he have, either *skill*, or

conver-

conversation in the *original* languages of the *Scripture*, he will be soon able upon this *memento*, with a little observation, to furnish himself.

As for his ways of disproving it, p. 10. [*that if it signifie a reciprocal action or passion, it must signifie an act of dividing exercised on himself, who therefore is the thing divided: and since division is a progress or motion from unity to plurality, its proper and formal effect is to make that, which it works on, more of one; but that which it works upon, saith the Doctor, is himself the Schismatick, therefore it cuts the Schismatick in two*] this is indeed a deep *subtilty*, which will soon be avoided by remembring him, what *self-division* it is, of which he knows we speak, not that of *hewing*, or *mutilating* his body, but *cutting* himself off from the *body* of the *Church*, with which he was *united* (the *Church* being a *body* as well as *S. W.*) and sure such a *division* is *motus ab unitate ad pluralitatem, a progress from unity to plurality*, when he *cuts* himself off from the *Church*, as well as when he *cuts* himself *in pieces*. If these be the *rigorous*, by which he saith he means *solid*, *pregnant*, *convincing discourses*, to which *S. W.* so pretends, I have no reason to be ill pleased, that he likes not my way of *arguing*: I should be sorry to have approved my self to him. 10.

But it seems all this debate might have been *spared*, for after all this *sollicitude* (which hath brought in but *slender* advantages to *S. W.*) he willingly grants all that this *Criticism* demanded, *viz.* that the *sin of schism*, must be the *voluntary recession*, as that differs from the *passive*, *excommunication*, which therefore he acknowledges not to be *schism*. Which as plain a truth as it is, I desire to take *witness* of it, that it is granted me by him, and then I shall be the more perfectly *secure* from the guilt of *schism*, till by some other *argument* than the *Popes* having *excommunicated* us (*viz.* by our *voluntary recession* from them, or from some members at least of the true *Church* of *God*) he shall prove that we are truly *Schismaticks*. 11.

What he adds farther in this *Sect.* p. 12. of the *no immunity from error in the Governed, fit to counterpoise the liableness to error in the Governors*, which I had mentioned; and p. 13. of the *voluntary continuance in a just excommunication, which makes the thus excommunicated Schismaticks*] hath in both parts perfect *truth* in it, but is no ways applicable to the business * there in hand, nor can pretend to be so, without a *begging* of the *principal questions*, or matters in *controversie* betwixt the *Romanist* and us: *First*, that the *Bishop* of *Rome* was the *Governor*, and we the *governed*, at the time when he first *excommunicated* this Nation; whereas at the time of those *Censures* coming, in Q. *Elizabeths* days, he neither *de facto* was then owned as such, nor *de jure* had title to it: And at the time when this *Nation first* did that, for which he *first excommunicated* them, *i. e.* in King *Henries* days, *de jure* he had no title to it, and by *Papists*, continuing such in all other points, the *Government*, which he held *de facto*, was first cast off, and that by those, to whom the *supreme power*, under *Christ*, did belong, *viz.* by the *King* concurring with the *Bishops*, and by the *Bishops* with the *King*. 2. That the *excommunication* sent out against us, was founded in a *just* cause; which it could not be, if we did nothing toward the *Bishop* and *Church* of *Rome* (*viz.* in that one act of casting out his *usurped* power, and *reforming* our selves) which was not perfectly *lawful* for us to do. For though, as I said, in a *voluntary recession*, which alone is *schism*, it is not *worth heeding* what the *cause* or *occasion* is, because none, how weighty soever, can be sufficient to *justifie* that; yet in *excommunication*, which is not *schism*, it is not so; the *justice* or *injustice* of that, whether in respect of the *power* (the *legality* thereof) or of the *cause*, is that which gives it *validity*, or renders it *invalid*, and *null* to all effects: and this being in part granted by *S. W. viz.* that *unjust excommunication hurts no man*; and the other part being as *evident*, that an *unjust power* is no *power*, and the acts *null*; we are perfectly safe from all the suggestions of the 2*d. Sect.* till he make it appear, what here he attempts not to do, that their *excommunicating* of us, had neither of these *injustices* and *nullities* in it. 12.

* *Tr. of Schism. c. 2. Sect. 3, 4.*

SECT. III.

The pretence of weak consciences against lawful authority in just commands, misrepresented. Fallibility of all but God, and Saints and Angels. S. W. *his arguments for infallibility answered. The infallibility of the Apostles stated. Of the Church to the end of the World. Of the means to know the Books of Scripture. Of matters of fact of our certain knowledge.*

THE third *Section* is by my *Disarmer* strangely misspent, Declamation poured out on the air, like *Xerxes* his stripes on the *Sea*, a perfect *Romance-combate* with a *Windmill* of his own *erecting*, toward which I never contributed the least *stone* or *timber*; 'Tis upon a *fancy*, or *fiction*, that I favour the pretence of such a *weak conscience, as makes a man think he ought not to communicate with the Church, and this even though the truth be on the Churches side.*] How much I favour such a *weak conscience*, which apprehends that *unlawful*, which is *duty*, and so thinks to be excused from performing it, is visible to any that shall but view the place, to which this *Section* is confronted, where first I affirm of him, that he is in *several respects criminous*, and particularly in this, that he *communicates not with those*, the *condition* of whose *communion contains nothing really erroneous* or *sinful*. 2. I add, that such an *one is in the worst and most unhappy kind of straight, remains in error and schism on the one side* (is this in favour of such *weak consciences*, or an affirming (as *S. W.* suggests) that he may do it *lawfully?* or is it interpretable to have any *kindness* to a bare *pretence* of it, which comes short even of that?) *and if to avoid that, he communicate, in this case he advances to lying and hypocrisie*; and in plain terms, that *which way soever he turn*, till he *really* convert from his *erroneous* conscience, and *weak mis-perswasion*, *he is sure to sin*. What could be more plain, or free from my *Disarmers* calumny? from *pleading for seditious offenders ears* (of which the wit of the *Romish* factor hath made a special *service* in his *Bill of fare*) or what *Apologie* can *S. W.* ever make to *God* or his own *conscience*, for so manifest a *perversion*, and slander of the most *innocent* expressions. *Of Schism, c. 2. Sect. 8.*

Having given the Reader a few such *Scenes* of this *Disputer*, I shall get, as soon as I may, out of this close *converse* with him.

3. In the latter part of this *Sect.* I am chid for not apprehending *any but Saints and Angels in heaven, and God himself to be infallible and impeccable:* and as this last word is stiled a *disgraceful addition of a forged calumny on the Romanists*, and noted as a *custom of ours, whensoever we speak of their tenets*; so for the *former* part, he pretends to shew the great *absurdity* of it, 1. by mentioning the *Apostles* as those that were *infallibly assisted*, and so 2. the *succeeding Church*, and 3. that *there is some means to be infallibly certain that such and such books were Gods word and genuine Scripture:* and *lastly*, that the *Dr. himself will acknowledge it impossible that all the Protestants in* England *should be fallible, or mistake in witnessing whether twenty years ago there were Protestant Bishops or no.*

4. To these *objections* I answer briefly, 1. by recounting the occasion of those words of mine, to which his animadversion belongs. It is a saying of Mr. *Knots*, that we may *forsake the Churches communion, in case she be fallible, or subject to error*, which seemed to me very strange, because then 'tis not only lawful to forsake the *Communion* of every *erroneous Church*, but of all that are *fallible*, though they be not in *error*, and such I conceived all *humane* societies to be, and consequently that there would be no possibility for any on earth to be guilty of the sin of *Schism:* Now as this is plain in it self, so it is very far from ingaging me in the *question* concerning the *Infallibility* of the *Church* (on that subject I had spoken at large elsewhere) any farther, than to take notice how strange an *argument* this was to conclude it by.

5. 2. By assuring him, that I was far from *calumniating*, or affixing any *disgraceful* word on the *Romanist* in that place. I conceived *humane* nature to be in it self equally liable to *sin* and *error*, and so no more *infallible* than *impeccable*; and again, that no society of men on *earth* hath *now* the *priviledge* of *immunity* from either, and if any had the former of impossibility to be *deceived*, yet unless it also had the latter, and so could not *teach contrary* to their *belief*, it were still the same to all *effects:* He that *knows* the *truth* himself, and yet may be so wicked as to *teach* contrary to his *knowledge* (and he that can *act* contrary to his *knowledge*, and so *sin*, may do so) may *lead* others into the most ruinous *errors*, without *erring* himself: and therefore I said, that none but *Saints* and *Angels*, and *God in heaven*, had the priviledge of *impeccable* and *infallible*, never conceiving that any man would hence conclude me to think, that the *Romanists* pretended to both of them, whose actions so openly, and acknowledgedly *disclaim* the one, and I think the *other* also Mean while it may not be amiss to remember, what *Hildebrand*, the advancer of the Papacy to its present greatness, hath resolved and defined concerning the *sanctified* as well as *infallible* state of those that Canonically ascend that Throne, in *sententia* 22. *Romanus Pontifex, si Canonicè fuerit ordinatus, meritis Beati Petri indubitanter efficitur sanctus.* And if by S. *Peter*'s *merits* he be made such, I hope it will not be doubted, but by the same tenure the grace of Perseverance, and not falling into any unsanctified estate, and consequently, into any sin which is apt to waste the Soul, and cast it into such a state, is secured to him also; and then that will amount to the full of that ἀναμαρτησία, *impeccability*, which I spake of. But I need not these succours, to defend my discourse. The utmost was, that I thought it as possible that the *Pope* might *erre*, as *sin*, having no more *promise* from Christ of his *security* from *one*, than the *other*, and so might any other *single* man in the world, and in proportion any *multitude*, or assembly might (the *major* and so *prevalent* part of them) consent in an *error*, as well as in a *vice*; and as this was far from *calumniating* any, so is it to my apprehension, as *evident* a truth, in reference to any *society* of men *now* in the world, as could have been mentioned by me, but this is no place to inlarge on it, farther than the remaining *objections* exact from me.

6. To them therefore I proceed; and to the mention of the *Apostles*, I reply, 1. That sure they are comprehended in the number of *Saints in heaven*, for there undoubtedly they are; 2. That supposing *S. W.* to speak of them, when they were here *on earth*, as his following words interpret him; I *answer*, that it is most true, that they were *assisted* by *Christ*, so as they did not, and could not *erre* in the discharge of their *office*, in penning the *sacred writ*, and preaching the *Gospel*. In this work they were, according to *Christs promise*, *led* by the *Spirit into all truth*; But that this *promise* had an *unlimited* extent, or consequently, that they were in all sorts of things made *infallible*, appeareth not; nay the *differences* that were between them, in lesser things, prejudge that.

7. I shall lay down this a little more *distinctly*. Of the *Apostles* 'tis evident, that as they were men here on *earth*, they were *fallible*, and oft *deceived*, even after they were employed by *Christ*; Of *ignorances*, and *slowness*, and *hardness* of *heart*, and *littleness of faith*, they are by their *Master* frequently affirmed to be guilty. And so all the *infallibility* that ever they had above other men, proceeded from *Christs special promise* of *assistance*, made unto them; some degree of this *assistance* was promised them, in order to some *particulars*, at their going out to *preach*, *Mat.* 10. 19. and after more largely, at his *departure* from them, *Mat.* 28. 20. Now that *promise*, *Mat.* 10. 19. was evidently confined within such *limits*, as left them subject to the many great *errors*, which after they proved guilty of, so far as (to omit many other of an *inferior* degree) to *doubt* whether he were the *Redeemer*, or no, *Luke* 24. 21. one to *apostatize* finally and *betray* him, another *not* to *believe* him *risen* for some time, and all, as to be *scandalized* and *forsake* him at his apprehension, so to *disbelieve* the relation of his *resurrection*, *Luke* 24. 11. and to take the *appearance* of him, *ver.* 37. for a *phasm.*

8. From such *grand fallibilities*, and *failings* as these, I suppose them perfectly *secured* by that *second* promise, and the descent of the *Holy Ghost*, and to be from thence-forth *infallibly assisted* to their whole *office*, but yet to be liable still to some *frailties* and *ignorances* in other things, whereunto the *promised assistance* extended not in that *degree*, as should make them thus wholly *infallible*; which appears, as I said, by the *lesser differences*, which are recorded between the *Apostles* themselves, in their *Ministry.*

9. Now to bring this home to the *particular* in hand; It is not only a speaking *truth*, a not being *actually* in *error*, which will infer such an *infallibility*, as there I speak of, and conceive not to be met with on *earth* (for my words are expresly, to *forsake all that are fallible, though they be not actually in error*) but it must be a *security* founded in some *promise* of *God*, that they shall not be liable to any *error*, and though *naturally* they are so, that yet they shall undoubtedly be preserved from *falling* into

to

to it, and that not only from *this*, or *that* sort of *errors*, but *indefinitely* from all (for so Mr. *Knots* words are [*infallible and not subject to error.*] And neither of these being proved to be comprehended in the *promise* made to the *Apostles*, it is evident, that this *first* instance or example of the *Apostles* could not pertinently be opposed to my affirmation.

2. For the ensuing, or *succeeding Church till the end of the world*] 'tis certain that that degree of *assistance* which was afforded the *Apostles*, was not either *promised*, or afforded to that. By the *succeeding Church*, the *Governors* must necessarily be meant, speaking as he doth, of that *promise* of *remaining with them always to the end of the world.* For the ὑμεῖς *you*] there, being *primarily* the *Apostles* themselves, and *secondarily* the *successors* of the *Apostles*, 'tis evident and acknowledged generally by the *Fathers*, that the *Bishops* in every *Church*, were those, the *Apostles* successors: And therefore this *promise* in the *secondary* sence belonging unto them. 1. It belongs no otherwise to the *Church*, than as that signifies the *Governors* of the *Church*. 2. It belongs to the *Governors* of the *Church* of *Ephesus*, *Laodicea*, &c. and to all other *Bishops*, as well as the *Bishop* of *Rome*. And belonging to all these indifferently, it is yet evident, and *confest* on all hands, that *all* these *Governors* have not been *infallible*. Many of them have notoriously fallen into *error*, and even in the time of *Scripture*, witness the *Epistle* to the *Churches*, *Rev.* 2. 3. and so sure the same *priviledge*, that the *Apostles* personally had, was not thus communicated to the *succeeding Church*, i. e. to their *Successors*, the *Governors* of that; 10.

Nor indeed was it *needful* it should; All things which were deemed *needful* for the ensuing *Plantations*, were agreed on by the *Apostles*, and deposited in each *Church*, as their *Rule* of *Faith*; and if they would adhere to that, there was no need of any *superadded infallibility* to other things, because these, already provided, were *sufficient*; but if they would not *adhere* to that, this were an evidence of their *fallibility*: As for the *promise* here mentioned, that *Christ* would *remain* with the *succeeding Church*; that, and the *prediction* that the *gates of hell should not prevail against it*, are assurances, that he will so *support* the *Church* by his *presential* providence, that it shall never totally be *destroyed*, or demolished: But not that any particular branch of this *Church*, be it never so *favour'd* by him, shall be thus secured from the utmost either *error*, or *ruine*, in case it shall not walk *worthy* of the *mercies* bestowed on them (the *seven Churches* in the *Revelation* are competent instances of that) nor that even the *universal Church* over all the *world*, in what capacity soever, *diffused*, or *collective*, shall never fall into the *least error*, *Christs personal* presence among his *Apostles* on earth having not thus secured them. 11.

3. For the *infallible* means of *knowing this or that book of Scripture*] it is sufficient, that I answer, that if this were yielded, yet would it not prove any *society* of men on earth to be *infallible*. He that is in *many* things *fallible*, and more than so, actually *erroneous*, may yet *infallibly* know or *believe* some one, or more *other* things, either by his *own senses*, or by the *testimony* of others, founded in their several *sensations*, which being faithfully conveyed to us by *undeniable Tradition*, supply the place of an αὐτοψία, are as *unquestionably certain*, as what we have *seen* our selves. I *know infallibly* I now write, and that the book which I now *answer*, was written before me, and *S. W.* cannot question the *truth* of these affirmations, yet sure 'tis his interest to be so just, as to think me very *fallible*, and actually to *erre* in many other things, else he would have no excuse for having written a *volume* against me. And the same I affirm of all other matters of *fact*, *testified* by my *own* senses, or by *universal unquestionable Tradition*, for that is founded in the *repeated sensations* of so many other men, which being *communicated* and sufficiently *testified* to me, I have no more reason to *doubt* of, than of my *own sensations*. And of this sort is the *Tradition* of the *universal Primitive Church* concerning the *Apostles delivering* some *doctrines*, and *writing* some *books*, the *testifications* of those which *saw* the *miracles*, which the *Apostles* wrought (and whereby *God set his seal* to the truth of their *preachings* and *writings*) that this or that *book* was written by them, and so by those which were *inspired* by *God*. In this *testimony* the *Church* is not considered as a *society* of *believers* indowed with any *inerrable priviledge*, there being nothing in this *question* contested from the *authority* of their *judgment*, be it *errable* or *inerrable*, but as a *number* of *witnesses* (*Heathen* and *Jewish* first, and then *converted* by this *doctrine* thus *miraculously* confirmed) joyntly *testifying* of a thing *done* and *seen* by them, and wherein it cannot be imagined, that they should *agree* to *deceive* and *betray*, and so *destroy* their *posterity*, by *confirming* a *falsehood* to them. And so this being the *means* whereby I am *assured* that such or such *books* are *genuine Scripture*, it follows not from hence, that either I that thus assuredly *believe* this, on these testifications, or even they that have truly *testified* this *one* thing, are in all *other* things, wherein they do not thus *affirm* upon their *own* or *others certain* knowledge, of an *infallible authority*. 12.

To the last I say, that it is a strange shortness of *discourse*, that puts together an *impossibility* of actual mistaking in *witnessing* a matter of *fact* of mens *certain knowledge*, and *an impossibility of being fallible*; for, as 'tis one thing *not* to be *mistaken*, another to be *infallible*, so 'tis not one *act* of *infallible* judging, that makes that person *infallible*, but a *foundation* of *security* for *all* the *acts* of ones life; and so this is a most impertinent *instance* to prove *general infallibility*. For though I no way doubt of the truth of that which all *Protestants in England* affirm in a matter of *fact* twenty years ago, wherein many of them *lived*, and *saw* what they affirm, yet I have no *assurance* that both in that, and in every other *affirmation* of theirs (of which there is no other evidence) 'tis impossible for them to be *fallible*. That they do, or probably can mistake actually in a thing of that nature *visible* before their eyes, I believe not; Yet is that no *proof* that they are any way *infallible*, either in *observing*, and coming to the knowledge of *all* matters of *fact*, without all possible *mixture* of *error*, (humane *weakness* or *inadvertence* may here interpose sometimes) or in *conveighing* and *testifying* to others exactly, what they did observe; *humane frailties* and *passions* also may at other times intermix, and even when neither hath *really* interposed, either *might* have interposed, and so still they are not *infallible*, for that contains more than speaking exactly *true*, an *impossibility* to do otherwise, which was the *priviledge* that I still believe to belong to no barely *humane* society. 13.

Thus have I, *ex abundanti*, given him answer to all his offers of *reason* for *Infallibility*. And if the rest of those *evidences* tendred by the excellent *Apologist*, be of this kind of frame (as methinks *S. W.* 14.

should

should not be so *unskilful* or *unkind*, as to chuse out the *weaker*) I shall not be in danger of that *amazement* that *S. W.* tells me of. Some creatures are pictured on the flag that hangs out, far more *terrible*, than they appear, when you have been at the cost of the *nearer* view of them. And that is all I have to say to his third *Section*.

SECT. IV.

Ἴδιος τόπος, *Act.* 1. Theophylacts, *and* Oecumenius's *Scholion*, &c. *The division of Provinces betwixt S.* Paul *and S.* Peter. Ambroses, *and* Jeroms *testimonies*, *and* Theophylacts. *This by their own agreement, not only by Gods designation. Exclusive of no other of the Apostles.* Peters *singular supremacy at* Jerusalem, *why denied.* Clements *testimony. The principal place belonged to* James *in his own See, and so in the Council.* Ἐγὼ κρίνω, *Acts* 15. 22. Peters *speaking first. S.* Pauls *no dependence on S.* Peter. *A place from S.* Cyprian, *answered. The testimony out of* Anacletus's *Epistle.*

1. THE fourth *Section* is but the spreading a little *thinner* the *Catholick Gentlemans* letter, and hath been fully answered in the *Reply*, c. 2. §. 3. So also the Fifth *Section* is answered in *Reply*, c. 3. 1. and the Sixth *Sect.* c. 3. *Sect.* 2. & 4. So again his Seventh *Sect.* (all but the *calumnies*, and ridiculous *colours*, that without the least cause or ground in the Tract, he affixes to my way of proceeding, as will appear to any one that reads the *Tract* it self) is prevented, *Ch.* 4. *Sect.* 1.

2. After this he hath another Seventh *Sect.* p. 42. but that, nothing but a *detortion* of my words about κλῆρος ἀποστολῆς, *Acts* 1. making that my *evidence*, which was never by me thought on, as such (nor had I need of such, the thing being evident by its own light, that the *Apostles* went not all to one, but *disposed* themselves over all the world to *several Provinces*) yet borrowed from the short notes of the *Catholick Gentleman*, and *answered*, *Reply* c. 4. *Sect.* 2.

3. Of the Eighth *Sect.* three or four pages are spent on the phrase πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, *going to his own place*, *Acts* 1. and is of the same nature exactly with the former, and as largely prevented, *Reply* c. 4. *Sect.* 2. n. 20. &c. and yet upon this he pitches anew, with the greatest career of *declamation*, that he ever let loose to, in the whole book, and spends it all in a passionate *paraenesis* to his *dear country-men*; the effect of which is, that the rendring that phrase of any thing but *Judas*'s *going to hell*, is to *relinquish the sence of the whole Catholick world*. My reasons for the other interpretation of *Matthias* his going to that *Province*, which should otherwise have been assigned *Judas*, I have largely rendred in the *Reply*, and shall now annex a *testimony* perfectly to my sence from *Theophylact*, on *Acts* 1. ἴδιον τόπον, *&c. he calls that his own place, which* Matthias, *so as it was just and fit, should obtain; for as* Judas *was a stranger to it, even before he had fallen from it, ever since he began to be sick of covetousness and treason, so it properly belonged to* Matthias, *even before he obtained it, ever since he shewed himself worthy of so great an office.* The like again we have from * *Oecumenius* on the place, who setting down, as his use is, the most approved *interpretations*, hath these words, τόπον δὲ ἴδιον ἤτοι τὴν ἀσχύνην καλεῖ, ἢ ὅτι τῷ Ἰούδᾳ ἐξαπωσμένῳ, ἄτοπος ἴδιον σχοίη, ἢ ἐκείνῳ λαμβάνων ἐπισκοπὴν, *His own place*] he *calls his suffocation*, &c. *or else that* Judas *being gone, he*, i. e. Matthias, *may have the place to himself, receiving his Episcopacy.* So *Didymus*, the word τόπος *place signifies many things, among the rest an Order, as when we say the place of a Bishop, or of an Elder.* So the *Ordinary gloss*, *ut abiret in locum suum*, i. e. *Sortem Apostolicam, that he might go to his own place*, i. e. *the Apostolical lot.* Would ever any man have thought that all these should have been thus *adventurous* to mention such a *blasphemous interpretation* as this (just the same with the Doctors) or that *Lorinus* and *Salmeron* should take notice of them, without any expression of *detestation*, when *S. W.* had undertaken on his word to his *kind Readers* and *dear country-men*, that it was the *utmost absurdity*, that it *inferred the finding of* Judas *a Diocess in hell, and* Matthias *succeeding him?*

* *Edit. Veron.* 1532.

4. What follows there of the *agreement made between S.* Peter *and S.* Paul, concerning the *division of their Provinces*, the one to the *Jews*, the other to the *Gentiles*, and is matter to *S. W.* of such challenge and *triumph*, is cleared in the same *Chap.* of the *Reply*, *Sect.* 3. and 4. to be a *mistake* in him, and all that I pretend, manifested from Scripture. To which I now add the plain words of S. *Ambrose* on *Gal.* 2. 8. wherein he asserts all that was either my *purpose*, or my *interest* to affirm, in these words, * *Paul* saith he, *nameth* Peter *alone, and compareth him to himself, because he had received the primacy to build the Church, and he likewise is chosen to have the primacy of building the Churches of the Gentiles* (and so *Chrysost.* that S. *Paul* demonstrates himself to be ὁμότιμον, *equal to them*, καὶ τῷ κορυφαίῳ συγκρίνει ἑαυτὸν, *and compares himself with* Peter *the chief of them*; and *Theophylact*, δείκνυσιν ἑαυτὸν ἰσότιμον τῷ Πέτρῳ, *he shews himself equal to* Peter) *ita tamen ut & Petrus prædicaret Gentibus, si causa fuisset, & Paulus Judæis, nam uterque invenitur utrumque fecisse; sed tamen plena authoritas Petro in Judaismi prædicatione data agnoscitur, & Pauli perfecta authoritas in prædicatione gentium invenitur; Yet so that* Peter *preached to the Gentiles also, if there were cause, and* Paul *to the Jews, and so both of them did both: but yet the full authority is acknowledged to be given to* Peter *in the preaching to the Jews, and* Pauls *perfect authority is found in preaching to the Gentiles, from whence also he calls himself the Doctor of the Gentiles*; adding that this *portion* was assigned him, *in respect of his abilities*, it being *harder to attract to the faith, those that were far from God, than those that were near.* And so S. *Hierom* having affirmed, on *Gal.* 1. 22. that the *Churches which were of the Jews, seorsim habebantur, nec his qui erant è Gentibus miscebantur, were severed, and mixed not with the Gentiles*, he adds on this verse of c. 2. That the * *agreement was made, that* Paul *should preach to the Gentiles, and* Peter, *and* James, *and* John *to*

* *Petrum solum nominat, & sibi comparat, quia Primatum ipse acceperat ad fundandam Ecclesiam, se quoq; pari modo electum, ut Primatum habeat in fundandis Gentium Ecclesiis.*

* And that, by decree of the Council, *Acts* 15. See *Baron. Ann.* 51. *n.* 16.

which though he qualifie after, to salve his *hypothesis* concerning *Peter*'s principality, *n.* 26, 27, 28. yet *n.* 29. he makes *Peter*'s Apostleship to the *Jews*, to be proportionable to *Christs* being the *Minister of the Circumcision*, which we know was so far true, as not to preach, by himself or Disciples in his life-time, to any other. See *Clemens* in *Euseb. l.* 6. *cap.* 14. speaking of S *Paul*'s Epistle to the *Hebrews*, and the reasons why he prefixt not his name, *Paul an Apostle*, &c. as in other his Epistles; this for one is rendred from one of the Ancients, ἐπεὶ ὁ Κύριος Ἀπόστολος ὢν τῶν Παντοκράτορος ἀπεστάλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετριότητα ὁ Παῦλος ὡς ἂν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀπεσταλμένος, οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων ἀπόστολον, διά τε τὴν πρὸς τὸν Κύριον τιμὴν, διά τε τὸ ἐκ περισσείας καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν ἔθνων κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ Ἀπόστολον. Where *Paul*'s writing to the *Hebrews* was ἐκ περισσείας, not pertaining to, or *over and above* his office, *præter officium*, saith *Christophorson*. the

the Jews; which ſure was a *ſevering* of their *Provinces*. So S. *Chryſoſtom* in his *Hom.* on *Gal.* 2. 11. τὲς μὲν Ἰουδαίους ἐπέτρεψε τῷ Πέτρῳ, τοῖς δὲ Ἕλλησι τὸν Παῦλον ἐπέστησεν ὁ Χριστὸς, *t.* 5. *p.* 403. *l.* 18. and one of theſe πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν, by way of *contradiſtinction* to the other, *l.* 23. and after the manner of a wiſe King, ſaith he, *l.* 26. which commits the Horſemen to one, and the command of the Foot, στρατιὰν πεζῶν, to another; ſo, ſaith he, *Chriſt* divided his Army into two parts, and committed the *Jews* to *Peter*, and the *Gentiles* to *Paul*: and the reaſon of this Oeconomy he at large renders, *p.* 404. *&c.* So again, *t.* 3. *p.* 729. *l.* 24. ſpeaking of them, ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι διειλόμεθα τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ γὰ μὲν τὲς ἐξ ἐθνων, ἐκεινὸς δὲ τὲς Ἰουδαίους ἔλαχον κατὰ τῷ θεῷ δοκῶν. So *Eucherius Lugdun. in Hom. in Nat. Pet. & Pauli*, *Electi duo præcipui ad duorum populorum ſalutem, Petrus ad Judæorum, Paulus ad Gentium.* And ſo *Theophylact* on *Gal.* 1. 21. ἐπισὰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, πάλιν μεθίσαται ταύτης, διά τε τὸ ἔθνεσιν ἀπέσαλθαι κήρυξ, καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐπ' ἀλλότριον θεμέλιον ἀνέχεσθαι οἰκοδομῶν, *being come to* Judea, *he departed thence, both becauſe he was ſent a preacher to the Gentiles, and becauſe he would not build on anothers foundation.*

Yet one little deceit there is in *S. W.* his diſcourſe, which the *Catholick Gentleman* had not attained to; for on occaſion of the [*for*] *Gal.* 2. 8. his *concluſion* is, *that theſe two Apoſtles were more properly particularized to theſe two parts of the world, by no other deſignation, than the more eſpecial co-operation of Gods efficacious aſſiſtance.* Here the mention of *Gods ſpecial co-operation* hath truth in it, and is fully proved from *verſ.* 8. but the [*no other deſignation*] (wherein all the force of his *anſwer* lyes) is moſt expreſly *contrary* to plain *Scripture*, the *Text* affirming, that beſides that, this *deſignation* of *mutual agreement* intervened, *James*, *Cephas*, and *John*, ſaith *Paul*, *gave me and* Barnabas *the right hands of fellowſhip, that we ſhould go to the Gentiles, and they to the circumciſion.* What can be more evident for this farther *deſignation*, founded in that former? 5.

His Ninth *Section* hath ſomewhat *new* in it (but perfectly agreeable to the *miſtakes* and *detortions* gleaned from the *Catholick Gentleman*) as 1. that he will conclude from my words, that I *will have all the Apoſtles to have ſeveral Provinces limiting their juriſdictions, and excluſive of one anothers right*, and from thence making the *circumciſion*, or *Jewiſh Chriſtians* peculiarly S. *Peters Province*, and the *Gentile Chriſtians* peculiarly S. *Pauls, I have gotten all the reſt of the Apoſtles leave to play.*] And then there is another prime *diſh* for *Mr. Stationer* to add to his *Bill of fare.* 'Tis true, I ſaid the *Apoſtles* by their own act *diſtributed* their *univerſal great Province* (the *whole world*, to which they were to go and *preach*) into *ſeveral diſtributions*, or *lots*, or leſſer *Provinces*, one or more to go one way, and the other another, to proclaim the *faith* of *Chriſt*, and that the *circumciſion* was peculiarly S. *Peters Province*, or *diviſion* aſſigned to him (and thence I concluded it unimaginable, how he ſhould be the *univerſal* or *ſupream Paſtor* or *Biſhop* of the *whole world:*) But what word ſaid I, of concluding *all* the *Jewiſh Chriſtians* under S. *Peters* aſſignation, or *all* the *Gentiles* under *Pauls?* from which alone, his concluſion of the *play-day* for the *reſt* of the *Apoſtles* is inferred? Nay, when he had ſet it down for my *affirmation*, that I will have all the *Apoſtles* have their ſeveral *Provinces*, is it poſſible he ſhould, in the ſame *breath*, conclude me to deprive *eleven* of theſe all of their *ſeveral Provinces?* When I ſay *Peter* was the *Apoſtle* of the *circumciſion*, *excluſively* to the *uncircumciſion* (as when *Euſeb. hiſt.* l. 3. c. 1. ſaith, that *he preacht in divers nations*, τοῖς ἐκ διασπορᾶς Ἰουδαίοις, *to the Jews that were of the diſperſion*) the meaning is evident, that he was ſo the *Apoſtle* of the one, as he was not of the other, or as *Paul* was, and is in *Scripture* ſaid to be, of the other. But can it thence follow, that either no other *Apoſtle* was aſſigned to the *Jews*, but *Peter*, or no other to the *Gentiles*, but *Paul?* Nay is it not expreſly ſhewed §. 6. that the *Jews* in *Judea* were by *Peter*, *James*, and *John* put under *James* the *brother* of the *Lord* and *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem?* And §. 3 that the other *Apoſtles* had their ſeveral κλήρους aſſigned them, and their *travels*, *labours*, and *plantations* proportionable thereto, and that S. *John* was aſſigned the *Jews* for his *Province*, as well as S. *Peter*, and ſo had the *converting* and *governing* of the *Lydian Aſia*, and placing *Biſhops* there? This in both parts he takes notice of, *p.* 57. but never *relents* at the foregoing *calumny*, only *laughs* it out, and deſpiſes the *remainder of the diſperſion of the Jews, as a few pitiful Pariſhes*, unworthy S. *Peter*; but never offers to conſider the *allegations*, by which it was evident, and can never be avoided by him or any man, that the *Jews* in the *Lydian Aſia* were *governed* by S. *John* (and from thence it was, that they had and retained ſeveral *cuſtoms*, different from thoſe which were introduced in the *Weſt* by S. *Peter*) And muſt this be ſtiled the *freeing all the reſt of that task which their Maſter had enjoyned them?* If this be to *conclude*, or *diſpute*, what *contradictories* may not this wonder-working *faculty* reconcile? 6.

Secondly, he excepts againſt my uſe of the word [*ſingular*] when I ſay *Peter had no ſingular ſupremacy at Jeruſalem.* To take away his *wonderment*, *I anſwer*, that by *ſingular*, I mean ſuch an one, as was not *common* to the other two *eminent Apoſtles*, *James* and *John*, who together with *Peter* committed the *Biſhoprick* of *Jeruſalem*, the *Metropolis* then of all *Judea* at leaſt, to the *Lords* brother; What he ſaith in this matter, *p.* 58. that *Peters great authority is not invalidated by his taking the other two with him, any more than is the Archbiſhops, when in conſecrating a Biſhop*, he takes two *other Biſhops with him*] is true, in caſe it any other way appeared, that *Peter* was an *Archbiſhop* in reſpect of theſe two other *Suffragan Biſhops*, *James* and *John:* But this neither doth, nor ever will be made to appear by him; and though I did not then undertake to prove their *equality* by *this* argument, being about another matter, the extent of S. *Peters Province*, yet the words of *Clemens* Ὑποτυπώσ. *l.* 5. might to him, who had this *concluſion* in his eye, have deſerved to be conſidered, when he ſaith of *Peter*, and *James*, and *John*, ὡς ἂν ὑπὸ τῷ κυρίῳ προσελιμμένοι, *as being by our Lord prefer'd or honoured before the reſt*, yet they did not ἐπιδικάζεσθαι δόξης, *contend for dignity, but choſe* James *the firſt Biſhop of Jeruſalem*; where the προτιμία or *precedence* that *Peter* had from *Chriſt*, is common to *James* and *John* alſo, and ſo no *ſingular ſupremacy*, and as ſuch, they *choſe* and *ordain'd* the *brother* of the *Lord*; which ſure is not after the manner of an *Archbiſhop* and his *Suffragan Biſhops*. And ſo alſo in that place to the *Galatians*, c. 2. 9. *James*, and *Cephas*, and *John* are equally dignified by S. *Paul*, and have all three the ſtile of δοκοῦντες στύλοι εἶναι, *ſeeming to be pillars*; and as the *Fathers* even now concluded, that *Paul* was ὁμότιμος *to them*, and particularly to *Peter*, ſo they did alſo, that they were all ἰσότιμοι, *equally dignified.* 7.

Thirdly,

8. *Thirdly*, When I had said of *James* the *Lords* brother, not that he was simply superior to *Peter*, but that being fixt *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, all the *Bishops* of *Judea* were subject to him, and that thereupon in this his *See*, he is named before *Peter* and *John*, *Gal.* 2. 9. and hath the *principal* place in the *Council* (where S. *Peter* is present) and gives the *sentence*, *Acts* 15. 19. on which the *Rescript* is founded, *verse* 22. and from all this, conclude no more, but that the *jurisdiction* in that *Metropolis* belonged to *James* the *Just*, and not to S. *Peter*; All this he is willing to misunderstand, as a proof of mine, to infer S. *James*'s *priority* of *dignity*, or greater *authority*, and to frame some *answer* to the several *branches* of it. But he may know, that as I do not believe S. *Peter* had any greater *authority* than the rest of the *Apostles*, so I do not pretend that any of the other *Apostles* had greater *authority* than he, much less this *James* the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, who, I suppose, was none of the 12. *Apostles*. Only I was to prove, that in *this his See*, *James* was considered as *Bishop*, and so even in *Peters presence*, had the *principal* place (and indeed if he was not there in that *capacity*, how came he there at all, for upon *reasons* elsewhere given, I suppose it competently *established*, that this *James* was none of the *twelve*) and against this what he pretends, is not of any weight: For

9. 1. When he saith, that the *naming him before* Peter, Gal. 2. 9. *is*, *if it were allowed any weight*, *the losing my cause*, *because in most other places of Scripture*, Peter *is constantly named first of all the Apostles*. This I am sure hath no force in it, because this place belonging peculiarly to the *Council of Jerusalem*, the giving *James*, which was none of the *twelve*, the *first place* here, must in all reason signifie thus much, that he was *Bishop* there, and that is all, in effect, that I deduce from it; and not from that alone, but from it in conjuncture with other circumstances.

10. 2. When he saith, *I have not the least pretence of a testimony*, *that* James *had the principal place*,] it is evident that S. *Pauls* naming him first before *Peter*, is a *pretence* at least of a *testimony*, as far as belongs to *Jerusalem*. And if there be not the least *force* in that, this will be somewhat to the *prejudice* of the *Romanists* argument, that is wont to be taken from the πρῶτος Σίμων, concluding his *Primacy* from his being *first* named, which if it would convincingly prove, then must *James* here have it, who yet pretends not to it, any farther than in his own City. But then sure the mention of *James*'s *giving the sentence*, v. 19. was another *pretence* of a *testimony*, and this I still believe the phrase [διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω, *wherefore I judge*, or, *my sentence is*] will be found to signifie, and not only, as he saith, *his opinion or judgment in the matter*. For 1. 'tis * S. *Chrysostoms* observation, that his *speaking last*, was founded in his *being Bishop of Jerusalem*, ἐπίσκοπος ἦν τῆς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκκλησίας ἔτος, διὸ καὶ ὕστερον λέγει, *he was Bishop of the Church of* Jerusalem, *whereupon he speaks last* (according to the customs in *Assemblies*, he that *sits first*, speaks *last*) adding upon 19, 20, 21. of that chapter, εἰκότως ταῦτα ἐπιτάττει ---- *he rightly decrees*, *ordains these things*, making his *sentence* ἐπίταγμα, *a decree*, and yet more expressly, setting down * the εὐταξία, *good order* observed in their *speaking*. *After Peter*, saith he, *Paul speaks*, and Ἰάκωβος ἀνέχεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιπηδᾷ, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἦν ἡ ἀρχὴν ἐγχειρισμένος, James *forbears*, *and interposes not*, *for he was intrusted with the principality*: and * again observing that *Peter spake more earnestly*, *but* James *more mildly*, saith, οὕτω δὲ δεῖ καὶ ἐν μεγάλῃ δυνασείᾳ, τὰ μὲν φορτικὰ ἑτέροις παραχωρεῖν, αὐτὸν δὲ ἀπὸ ἡμερωτέρων διαλέγεσθαι, *for thus it behoves him that is in great power*, *or authority*, *to leave the sharper things to others*, *and himself to draw his arguments from the gentler*, *and milder Topicks*, making *James* here in this *Council* clearly *superior* to *Peter*.

*Tom. 4. p. 795. A.

*P. 796. l. 28.

*lin. 33.

11. As for the *argument* which I had drawn from κρίνω *I judge*] I see not yet any *infirmity* in it. For thus sure the word signifies in the matter of *censures*, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. τί γάρ μοι καὶ τοὺς ἔξω κρίνειν; τοὺς δὲ ἔσω κρίνετε, *judging* or *sentencing* to *excommunication*, ver. 13. and so v. 3. ἤδη κέκρικα, *I have judged* *P. 797. l. 15. *already*, i.e. given *sentence*: and so saith * S. *Chrysostom* here of *James*, κρίνω ἐγὼ, ἀντὶ τοῦ, μετ' ἐξουσίας λέγω, *I judge*, *instead of*, *I say with power*, or, as other copies read, φησὶ καλῶς μετ' ἐξουσίας, τὸ κρίνω ἐγὼ, *he saith with power*, *I judge*. But this I never meant any otherwise, than as a *sentence* pronounced by him, and *agreed* to by the *rest*, and founded, as any *conciliary sentence* ought to be, in the ἔδοξε τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἡμῖν, which supposes the *good liking* of those others, that sate with him together in *Council*, not as depending only on *his vote*. And this is enough to confirm to him the *principal* place in that *Council*.

12. What he adds to *prejudge* the *Rescripts* being founded, *v.* 22. upon S. *James*'s *sentence in particular*, that *'tis but only*, *Then* (i. e. *after* S. Peter, S. Paul, Barnabas, *and* S. James *had spoken*) *it seemed good to the Apostles and Elders* ---] is 1. founded in a *misunderstanding* of my *assertion*, and 2. is it self a farther *mistake*. For when I said *James gave the sentence*, I never imagined that the *sentence* was so his, as not to be the *Councils* also, but that all their *opinions* uniformly inclining the same way, *James* pronounced the *decree*, or δόγμα. But then 2. the thing which there follows in those words, *Then seemed it good to the Apostles and Elders*, *and the whole Church*] was a *subsequent* determination of *sending chosen men to* Antioch *with* Paul *and* Barnabas, and to *write* by them, as follows expressly in that 22. *verse*. And so on which side the *want* either of *wisdom or honesty* hath appeared to lye, *S. W.* may now be better qualified to consider.

13. What he would now conclude in favour of S. *Peters authority*, *from his speaking first*, *or breaking the ice in such a solemn pronounced oration*] will soon be answered by remembring, that S. *Peter* had been *accused* of *preaching* to *Cornelius* a *Gentile*, c. 11. 2. as *Paul* and *Barnabas* had of more than so, and for that *reason* they *begin*, and give *account* of their *actions*, the one *justifying* himself by the *holy Ghosts descent* on those *Gentiles*, before he *baptized* them, and the other by the *miracles* which *God* had enabled them to do among the *Gentiles*.

14. In this *Sect.* treating the business of S. *Paul* set down in *Gal.* 1. 12. 17. he distinguishes of *dependence* on S. *Peter*, and *allowing* Paul *to have had no dependence on him as to the manner of conferring on him the power of Apostle*, he will yet *have this power* (given him) *to depend on S.* Peter, *or to be subject to him as the chief of the Apostles.*] But to this I *answer*, 1. That he ought in any reason to have offered some *proof* for this, which he knows is most *denied* by us; and 2. That unless the same *Christ* that gave him this *power* immediately, subjected it to S. *Peter*, and *appear* to do that, as clearly as he *gave* him the *power* (which 'tis certain appears not) this cannot be said with any *sobriety*. 3. That the place, *Gal.* 1. 17. belongs expressly to the *power*, *after* it was *given*, and yet then he *depended* not on him.

For

For this I appeal to S. *Chrysostom*, affirming of *Paul* distinctly, * μηδὲν Πέτρου δεόμενον, μηδὲ τῆς ἐκείνου φωνῆς, ἀλλ' ἰσότιμον ὢν αὐτῷ, *he had no want of* Peter, *nor of his voice* (as I suppose he must have, if in respect of his *power* he *depended* on, and *were subject* to him) *but was of equal dignity with him*; adding in a parenthesis πλέον δὲ οὐδὲν ἐρῶ τέως, *for I will say no more*, which what it is an *intimation* of, I leave *S. W.* to conjecture. 15. * Tom. 3. p. 723. l. 23.

The last thing that expects *answer* in this *Sect.* is the place out of *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 17. where concerning S. *Pauls* withstanding S. *Peter*, *Gal.* 2. 11. he saith of *Peter*, that *though the Lord chose him first, and built his Church on him, yet he did not insolently challenge any thing to himself, or assume arrogantly so as to say he had the primacy, and so that he should rather be obeyed by newer and later Apostles, nor despised he* Paul, *because he had been a persecuter, but admitted the counsel of truth.*] To which as being the only *testimony* from *antiquity*, I have yet observed to be produced by *S. W.* it is needful to give *answer*, that I never doubted of S. *Peters primacy*, in this sence, as this holy *Father* speaks of it (any more than of *Christs building his Church on him*;) I gave him even now a *testimony* from S. *Ambrose*, which expresly avouched it; I only deny, that this *Primacy* gave him any *power*, either over S. *Paul*, or any other *Apostle* (or that his being a *foundation* on which the *Church* was *built*, gave him *jurisdiction* over the rest of the *Apostles*, who were *foundations* also.) And that I have reason to deny this, he will remember, both by the ὁμοτιμία, and ἰσοτιμία, so lately produced from *Chrysostom* and *Theophylact*, the *equality betwixt Paul* and *him*, and so of *all* other the *Apostles*; and also by the words of S. *Ambrose*, that S. *Paul* had a *primacy among the Gentiles*, as Peter *among the Jews*. And then, if he will review these very words of *Cyprian*, he will find them accord *very* well, which though they affirm him *chosen primùm first by Christ*, yet add, that *non vindicavit sibi aliquid insolenter, aut arroganter assumpsit ut diceret se primatum tenere, & obtemperari sibi à posteris & novellis oportere* ---- leaving us to resolve, that if he had claimed any *obedience* from *Paul* by this *primacy*, he could not have justified it from *arrogance* of *assuming* that which did not belong to him. And to this agree those words set down in the * *Canon law* as from *Anacletus*'s 2 *Epist. ad Episc. Ital.* where, as on one side we find, *post Christum à Petro sacerdotalis cœpit ordo, quia ipsi primo Pontificatus in Ecclesiâ Christi datus est, & potestatem ligandi primus accepit, primusque ad fidem populum adduxit*; *after Christ the sacerdotal order began from* Peter, *because the Pontificate in the Church was first given to him, and he first received the power of binding and loosing, and he first brought the people to the faith by vertue of his preaching*; adding after, *that the Apostles ipsum principem eorum esse voluerunt, would have him to be their Prince*; (where he read this, I know not) so on the other side the words are as clear, *Cæteri verò Apostoli cum eodem pari consortio honorem & potestatem acceperunt*; *but the rest of the Apostles received honour and power in equal fellowship with him*: Which being entred into their *body of law*, will, I hope, be of some force with *S. W.* whatever opinion *others* conceive of it. See *Cassub. contra Baron.* p. 535. 16. * *Decret. par.* 1. *Dist.* 21. c. 2.

SECT. V.

S. W. *his ill memory. The distinction of the Gentile and Jewish* cœtus, Acts 15. 23. *The Bishops at* Rome *a proof of it.*

THE Tenth *Section* begins with the view of two *testimonies* out of *Ignatius*. The very mention whereof, accuses the close of his *former* Section of a *fault*, which even before all others is *predominant* in this *Author*, and *railing* it self is but his *blind*, to keep this from being *descried*. For he had there said, that there was *no testimony at all to confirm my own* [we know] and now being gotten into *another Section* his memory is *frail*, and he hopes others will be so too, and then he *blushes* not to set down *two testimonies* of that, of which he had so lately *denied* any. But then next, he hath *objection* to these; *The testimonies do affirm no more but the founding of the Church of* Antioch *by* Peter *and* Paul, *and that might be by their promiscuous endeavours without distinction, much less exclusion of authority and jurisdiction.*] I *answer*, 'tis true, this was *possible*; and if it had been *true*, had manifestly prejudged *Peters singular jurisdiction*, and clearly joyn'd *Paul socially* with him. *Vid. Baron. Ann.* 45. *n.* 14.

But there was another *testimony* behind (and that, if taken notice of, had removed this, *might be*) from *Acts* 15. 23. where the *distinction* of the *Gentile Cœtus* at *Antioch* from the *Jewish*, is discernible, by the *inscription* of the *Rescript* of the *Council*, τοῖς κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν καὶ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν ἀδελφοῖς, τοῖς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, *to the brethren* (i. e. the *Christian Church*) *which are at Antioch and Syria and Cilicia* (of which *Antioch* was the *Metropolis*) *those of the Gentiles*, and that *separately*, and in *contradistinction* to the *Jews*, as appears, *v.* 28, 29. where the things required of the *Church* in that *decree*, are all proper to the *Gentiles*: And beside more evidence, which there follows to the same matter, the words of * S. *Hierom* even now produced are most clear, *Seorsim qui ex Judæis erant Ecclesia habebantur, nec his qui erant è Gentibus miscebantur*; *the Churches which were of the Jews were held apart or in several, nor were they mixed with those which were of the Gentiles.* * In *Gal.* 1. 12. See *Baron. Ann.* 45. *n.* 14.

The next *Paragraph* concerning *Peters withdrawing from all communion with the Gentiles*, and not only the *Gentile diet*, is prevented in the *Reply*, c. 4. §. 6. and the whole matter of *Evodius* and *Ignatius* being *Bishops* of *Antioch* at once farther cleared, and his *elaborate* misunderstandings forestal'd, *Sect.* 7. And so likewise the other part, wherein *Rome* was concerned, is reviewed, *n.* 6. (and to omit others, 'tis not possible all his *scoffs* can divert the force of the *testimony* of *Epiphanius*, who makes both those *Apostles Bishops*, as well as *Apostles of Rome*, which they could not be at once, without this *distinction* of the *cœtus*, the *Jewish* to be under one, and the *Gentile* under the other) and the testimony of *Prosper* concerning the *Ecclesia Gentium*, the *Church of the nations*, as that is cleared to comprehend the *Jews* and *Gentiles* both, *n.* 10. And that concludes the *calumnies* and *scoffs* of the tenth *Section*.

SECT. VI.

The Popes seals for what produced. S. W. *his misunderstandings.* S. Peters *jurisdiction in* Rome *proved to belong to the Jews only. The Jews solemn departure from* Paul, Acts 28. *yet some of them possibly of his* cœtus. *The differences in story about the first Bishops of* Rome. *Christs favour to* John. *Dignity of his place. Leaning on Christs breast.* Abrahams *bosom. No birth-right.* Ὁλόκληρον ἔθνος. *No pretence for S.* Peters *power in* Asia, 1 Tim. 3. 14, 15. Timothy *and* Titus *were not under S.* Peter.

1. HIS Eleventh *Section* contains new matter, but all in the former dress; I need not say of what kind that is. And first the *seals of the Popes*, which I brought for a *testimony* of the *Church of Romes* being *founded by S.* Paul as well as S. *Peter*, and is so far an *irrefragable testimony*, he must cry out on, as a *most irrational proof of S.* Peters *being Apostle of the Jews only, not of the Gentiles.*

2. The short is this; I have proved out of *Scripture* that *Peter* was by *agreement* to betake himself to the *Jews* (where S. *Paul* and he met) and S. *Paul* to the *Gentiles*, and it was sufficiently manifested, that these were *distinct assemblies*; and in *agreement* with this (not as *proofs* of it) I found express mention of *both* of these, in the *planting* the *Church* of *Rome*, and I affirmed the *Popes seals* to be an *irrefragable* instance of this last. And then all this must be first *shuffled* together, and some appearance of *incoherence* gained; and then the *victory* is gotten, and pursued most *triumphantly*. I again therefore ask, Is not the *Popes seal* an evidence that *Paul* as well as *Peter* had the *planting* the *Church* of *Rome?* and is not that *agreeable* to *Peters* preaching to the *Jews*, and *Pauls* to the *Gentiles*, when they met in a City, where there were *multitudes* of both? and was not that the importance of the *agreement*, *Gal.* 2. 9? And is not that an *argument* that *Peter* was not the *Universal Pastor*, but that the *Gentiles* were S. *Pauls Province*, as the *Jews S. Peters?* If it were, then is all my arguing *regular*, and *concluding*, for 'tis clear as the day, that this was it. And 'tis not the *dazling of his eyes from the distance of the object*, but the resolvedness not to *see* ought to the *prejudice* of his cause, which made *S. W.* so *short-sighted.*

3. Agreeable is his next attempt against the word [*only*] when I said *that the story of Scripture, according to the brevity of the relations there made, only sets down S.* Peter *to be the Apostle of the circumcision.* Where the [*only*] is set clearly in *opposition* to the *Scriptures* making *more* particular *relations* of S. *Peters preaching* to the *Jewish cœtus*, at *Rome*, &c. as is evident by the *consequents*; that *it saith of* Paul, *that he preacht at* Rome, *&c.* And *S. W.* can by no means see that true importance of the word [*only*] but 1. it must note that *Peter is only set down as Apostle of the circumcision exclusively to* James *and* John, which he knows I could not mean, without *contradicting* one branch of my *former* discourse, and that most *impertinently* to my own disadvantage: And 2. that *he was Apostle of the circumcision only*, and great wagers are offered against the truth of my words in *this* sence, which though they belong quite to another matter, as hath been said, yet because his *offers* are so liberal, in *case I shall shew the least syllable either in Scripture or any other testimonies expresly restraining S.* Peters *jurisdiction* (at *Rome* he had said, and must mean) *to the Jews only, and exclusively to the Gentiles, he will yield the laurel, and quit the controversie*; I shall, not for the *laurels* sake (that may belong to him upon *other* scores) but upon so tempting an hope, that I may be at an *end* of *controversie*, offer to his review the *testimony* from S. *Paul*, and from *Epiphanius*, the one affirming the *agreement* made between those *Apostles*, that one should execute their *Apostleship* (for after that or the like manner must the *Ellipsis* be made up, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ----) *among the Gentiles*, the other among the *Jews*; and the other expresly affirming that in *Rome Peter and Paul were the same persons, both Apostles and Bishops.* From hence, and by force of S. *Hieroms* affirmation, that the *Churches* which consisted of the *Jews, seorsim habebantur, were held by themselves apart, and were not mingled with those which were of the Gentiles*, I shall adventure to infer *the conclusion*, that in *Rome* S. *Peters jurisdiction* was restrained to the *Jews only, and exclusively to the Gentiles.* For how could there be *two Bishops* in *one* City (a thing quite contrary to all rule, and *practice*, assoon as the *division* betwixt the *Jews* and the *Gentiles* was taken away) unless there were two such *distinct cœtus?* If there were two such *cœtus*, then they that were of one *cœtus* under one *Bishop*, were not of the other *cœtus* under the other *Bishop*; 1. Because the *cœtus* were kept *apart*, and *impermixti.* And 2. because no *Bishop* was to meddle in another mans *Province*; and withal this was part of the foresaid *agreement*, ἵνα ἡμεῖς εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰς περιτομήν. And if it be pretended, that is true in *co-ordinate Episcopacies*, but holds not betwixt a *Bishop* and his *Primate*, and S. *Peter* be pretended as such, then the former *arguments* return again, that shewed from *Scripture* and *antiquity*, that S. *Paul* was *independent* from S. *Peter*, and that S. *Paul* had the *Primatum, primacy* among the *Gentiles*, as S. *Peter* among the *Jews.* And if against all this, it be again urged that *Peter* preacht to *Cornelius* a *Gentile*, *I answer*, that that was not at *Rome*, but long before this *agreement* between the *Apostles*: and though it may be, he did convert some other such, yet this is not *argumentative* for *S. W.* being nothing to the matter of *jurisdiction*, and withal but a *whimpering* [*may be*] in his language; and till I can foresee some farther *Reply* from *S. W.* this is all I shall offer to him at this *season.*

4. So when I said the *Jews solemnly departed from* S. Paul, *Acts* 28. 29. Whence I conceived it fit to apply his *two years preaching* there, to the *Gentiles* of that City, he is much offended at the word [*solemnly*] as not finding it in the *Text*, nor *any expressions of absolutely relinquishing him; nor pertinacy nor contempt; but rather the contrary, much discourse or debate, a sign of hoveringness*, &c. and finding a *more solemn departure* of his from them, *Acts* 13. 51. *Shaking off the dust of his feet against them, after which yet he oft preached to the Jews*, demanding farther *what became of the Jews, which* v. 28. *were now converted by him?*

But

But I *answer*, that as I cited not the word [*solemnly*] from that *verse*, as any part of the *sacred Text*, so I had *authority* enough to make *use* of the word, in that narration; For sure there were words, that signified a *solemn departure*, when *before* the *dissolution* of the meeting, *Paul said this one one word, Well said the Holy Ghost to our Fathers by the Prophet* Isaiah, *saying, Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand* ---- v. 26. *For the heart of this people is waxen gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes have they closed, lest they should hear, and see, and understand, and be converted*, Verse 27. *Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles, and that they will hear it*, v. 28. Upon which words it is, that the *mention* of their *departure* follows, v. 29. This I thought was a competent ground, on which to found the *solemnity* of their *departure*, for this signified *pertinacity, contempt* and *obduration of heart*, and withal, the *Apostles* resolution to deal with them as such, to *betake* himself to the *Gentiles*; so saith S. *Chrysostom*, Ἀσύμφωνοι ὄντες διελύοντο, πάντες μὴ πιστεύοντες ἀνεχώρουν, *when they agreed not among themselves they departed*, v. 25. *that is, they not believing, forsook him*; that is his notion of their *dispute*, and the *conclusion* thereof, and πρὸς ἐκείνους ταῦτα εἴρηται ἀπιστήσαντας, *those words of Scripture he applied to them upon their unbelief*: and again, *that you may not wonder that they remained unbelievers, he cites that prophecy.* All clear to mine, and *contrary* to *S. W.* his sence. And on *Pauls* part, πρώτους Ἰουδαίους καλεῖ, ἔπειτα δείξας αὐτοῖς τὰ πράγματα, τότε ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἔρχεται, *he calls the chief Jews, then having declared the matter to them, he goes to the Gentiles.* What could be more express? 5.

And what if he did not *shake off the dust of his shoes against them?* That was the *ceremony* of his *departing* from *them*, and that, when he meant to *leave* their *City*, c. 13. 51. but I there spake of the *solemnity of their departing from him*; and beside, he was brought *prisoner to Rome*, and could not *depart* at pleasure; and withal, meant to *stay* there and *preach* to the *Gentiles*; and therefore this *ceremony* was not now *seasonable*, and the others were *sufficient* to render it on both sides a *solemn departure*. 6.

Lastly, for the *Jews* that *believed*, *v.* 24. I *answer*, that if they continued in that *Faith*, which now they received, and were not *scandalized* and *averted*, if they did not *fall off*, upon the mention of his resolution to turn to the *Gentiles* (for many *Jews* which received the *faith*, would no longer *associate* with S. *Paul*, when he did so) yet I say, upon any evidence produced for this, I shall make no doubt to *acknowledge*, that they, though *Jews*, became a part of S. *Pauls cœtus*; and so also can I as willingly yield to the *force* of any *authentick testimony*, that there were some *Gentiles* in S. *Peters cœtus*, such I suppose was *Clemens* a *Roman*: and if we believe * *Eucherius Lugdun. vetustâ prosapiâ senatorum atque etiam ex stirpe Cæsarum*, and yet S. *Peters Disciple*, and *Deacon*, and *Successor* in the *See*. But this is no prejudice still to the *distinct cœtus* of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, in this, as in other Cities, the one under one *Apostle* and *Governor*, the other under *another*, any more than the *admission* of some *Gentile proselytes* among the *Jews* can be an *argument* against the *impaling* of the *Church* of the *Jews*, or their not *associating* with the *Gentiles* before *Christs time*. 7.

* *De contemptu mundi.*

Next he makes a *pompous* mention of a *testimony* from *Ignatius ad Tral.* (which I used only to prove that *Linus* was *Deacon* to S. *Paul*, and *Clemens* to *Peter*) and because it doth say nothing to the *proof* of S. *Peters being only over the Jews*, and *Paul* over the *Gentiles*, he hath great *rejoycings* over it: But I say again, that *conclusion* was proved by *Scripture*, which affirms him by *agreement* to go to the *Jews*, as the other to the *Gentiles*; and this from *Ignatius*, is only a *branch* of *accordance* with it, that *Linus*, who (saith *Ignatius*) was *Deacon* to one, and *Clemens* to the other, *succeeded* them in the *Government* of their *several cœtus*, that, as *Epiphanius* had said, *Peter* and *Paul* were *both Bishops of Rome*, so their two *Deacons* were *Bishops* after them. Whether this was any *unseasonable* advertisement, I desire * *others* to pass their *judgment*, and shall not much consider, what *S. W.* thinks of it. Only he that likes not the *fancy*, should have directed his reader to some other *solid* way to *reconcile* those *repugnancies* of *story*, some making *Linus*, others *Clemens first Bishop of Rome*, after the *Apostles*, and others making *Clemens* but the *third*, which must in truth have some way of *reconciliation*, and for which the course is pointed out in the *Tract* of *Schism*, and needed not have been so fastidiously rejected. 8.

* *See* Baron. Ann. 45. n. 14.

And this being the only *crime* committed against *S. W.* at this time, he is so reserved as not to offer any other means, but what himself justly calls *evasions*, to *salve the difficulty*. There was little *kindness* in this to his (even now) *dear Country-men*. 9.

The *remainder* of the *Section* concerns S. *John*, of whom I had said 1. That in *Christs life* he had the *favour of Christ*, *and dignity of place before S.* Peter *himself*. 2. That being by *agreement assigned the Jews for his Province*, *as well as* Peter *had been*, *he had the converting and governing of all the converted Jews of the* Lydian Asia, *and the placing Bishops over them*; and this proved from *Clemens Alex. Eusebius*, *Prosper*, and *the author* of the *martyrdom of Timothy*. 3. That S. *Paul* had planted *the Faith in the Gentile part of this* Asia, *and placed* Timothy *Bishop there*: Now to all this he hath sundry *exceptions*; 1. That *I bring nothing to prove this*] But that is manifestly evinced by the *testimonies* there annexed, §. 14. Only because they are not put in the *same Section*, in which the *observation* was proposed, he thinks that a very competent *advantage*; upon which to reply to §. 13. that *I say 'tis manifest*, *and yet bring nothing to prove it*. But this is the manner of this *artificer*, and therefore being now grown into some *acquaintance* with him, it must not be taken *amiss* from him. 10.

2. He dislikes my proof for the *dignity* of S. *Johns place*, from the *stile of beloved Disciple*, *and leaning on his breast*, *as if*, saith he, *because* Jacob *loved* Joseph *more than all his other brethren*, *and therefore out of favour he might lean on his breast at supper*, *it must needs mean plainly*, *that young* Joseph *was the highest of his brethren in dignity*, *had due to him the birth-right and inheritance*, &c.] I answer, 1. That having mentioned *two* things of *John*, 1. *Christs favour* to him, 2. The *dignity* of *place* he had *above* others; it was only the *former* of these, which I assumed from his title of the *beloved Disciple*, and that *infallibly* infer'd it. 2. That for the *dignity* of *place*, as the πρωτοκλισία, or *first room* imports that, so that was as *irrefragably* concluded from his *lying in his bosom*, or *leaning* on his *breast* at *supper*, in the *discubitus*; for supposing *Christ first*, he that was in his *bosom*, must needs have, *next Christ*, the *uppermost* place; & accordingly it unavoidably follows, that *Lazarus* being represented *parabolically* 11.

in *Abrahams bosom*, is there described to be in the *next place* to the *father* of the *faithful*, and it being certain, that upon *supposition* of *degrees* of *glory* in Heaven, some *one* or more *Saints* are *next* to *Abraham*, I presume we may believe *Christ*, that such an one as is in that *parable* decyphered by *Lazarus*, is capable of that *place*; and all *S. W.* his *scruples*, which he adds further on this score, have not the least *validity* in them. So *Baronius*, *Ann. Chr.* 34. *n.* 41. *Ratione accubitus Johannis, qui in ea cœna primum locum post Christum obtinuit, suborta esse videtur in eadem cœna, illa inter Apostolos contentionis occasio, quis eorum videretur esse major, dum viderent cæteri in cœna illius accubitu omnibus prælatum esse Johannem.* Adding *n.* 42. a special observation, that the Apostles never contended thus, or took it ill, *Petrum præpositum cæteris esse*; but could not well bear, *Johannem vel Jacobum apud Christum primos haberi, ut Mar.* * 10. *& Lu.* 9. *cum iidem unà cum Petro selecti à cæteris ducti essent à domino in montem Tabor*; *intravit, inquit Lucas, cogitatio in eos, quis eorum major esset.* And for all this, he had laid the foundation, *n.* 40. out of *Fulvius Ursinus*'s observations of the *Romans accubitus*, not only *liberos suos, aut quos caros habebant in conviviis infra se, i. e. in sinu collocasse*, but also *Regem sacrorum, qui apud Romanos maximæ dignationis erat inter Pontifices, summum locum in pontificalibus cœnis occupare solitum, neminemque supra eum accubare:* And applying that to *Christ*, and expressly adding, that as there [were] five lying in each of the other Tables, so there were but three in that where *Christ* was, he and *John* and *Peter*; which sure gave that dignity to *John*. But as for the *birth-right* and *inheritance*, &c. which I suppose must import some real *priviledge*, such as *Reubens birth-right* was, *Gen.* 49. 3. *the excellency of dignity, and the excellency of power*, that is an *addition* of *S. W.* his own *fertile* fancy, and was never dreamt of, or pretended by me (or I think any man living) to belong to that *beloved Disciple*. I affirmed, in passing, that *John* had *Christs favour*, and the *dignity of place before all others*, and so visibly he had; and that was all I thought of, till by *S. W.* his *jealousies* this was converted into *birth-right* and *inheritance*.

Luc. 22. * 9.

12. 3. He will perswade himself, that the words of *Chrysostom* (which I had produced) ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον τὸ τ' Ασίας ἦν ἐμπεπιστευμένος, *a whole intire nation that of* Asia *was intrusted to him, destroys all that I had said of S.* Johns *Jewish Province in the* Lydian Asia; and then, great *rejoycing* there is for this εὕρηκα, and no less than *unpardonable blindness* is become my portion. But what pity it was, that the *blindness* should be on *S. W.* his side, after all this? For to omit that he that is there spoken of, is S. *Timothy* (which a *seeing* person might have discerned from S. *Paul*, when in the line before he had read, *by him S.* Timothy *constituted Bishop* there) the *answer* is obvious, that ὁλόκληρον ἔθνος, *a whole intire nation* in that place of S. *Chrysostom*, is not set to denote *all* the several *sorts* of *cœtus* in *Asia*, but only in *opposition* to the word ἐκκλησία precedent, some one particular *Church* of one *City* and *Territory*, *viz.* that of *Ephesus*. There *Paul* saith, he had *left him Bishop*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. and so the *Author* of the *Martyrdom* of *Timothy*, ὁ Ἀπόστολος Τιμόθεος ὑπὸ τῆς μεγάλης Παύλου χειροτονεῖται τ' Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος, *he was by S.* Paul *ordained Bishop of the Metropolis of* Ephesus: And this being the *chief Metropolis* of all *Asia*, S. *Chrysostom* stiles him *Bishop of the whole nation*. In *Asia* we know there were many *Churches*, of which *Ephesus* was the *prime*; and therefore having said, δῆλον ὅτι ἐκκλησίαν λοιπὸν ἦν ἐμπεπιστευμένος ὁ Τιμόθεος, *'Tis manifest* Timothy *was intrusted with a Church*, he adds (by way of ἐπανόρθωσις) ἢ μᾶλλον ἔθνος ὁλόκληρον, *or rather a whole nation*, τὸ τ' Ασίας, *that of* Asia, which depended (all of it) on this *chief Metropolitical See*. By this interpretation 'tis evident, that what the other *Church writers* say of *John* (and hath in it as clear truth) is soon reconciled with this, *viz.* that he being returned to *Asia*, τὰς αὐτόθι διέπειν ἐκκλησίας, *administred the Churches there, viz.* those of the *Jewish converts*, the portion to which by *agreement* with *Saul*, he was to betake himself, and τ' Ἐφεσίων ἀντιλαμβάνεται μητροπόλεως, *undertook the care of the Metropolis of the* Ephesians, which in this other respect, had, before this, been intrusted to *Timothy*, from whom therefore, as from their *first Bishop*, the *succeeding* reckon themselves, as appears in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, *Acts* 2. ἀπὸ τῆς ἁγίας Τιμοθέου μέχρι νῦν κζ' ἐπίσκοποι ἐγένοντο, *from S.* Timothy *till now, there have been* 27. *Bishops ordained in* Ephesus.

13. This being thus clear, was yet to be *writhed* by *S. W.* to another sence, that he might by that means have some opportunity to *divert* and wave the force of the *instance*, which consisted in this, that those *Churches of Asia* being wholly planted, and administred by other *Apostles*, S. *Peter* could not with any colour be pretended to be *supream Pastor* of them. And this is equally true, whether it were S. *Paul* or S. *John*, that had the managing of them. So little care hath *S. W.* to consider that, wherein the *difficulty* consists.

14. What follows *Sect.* 12. as if the mention of the *early fame of the seven Churches of* Asia, *and of Christs letter to them*, *Rev.* 2. were *designed* by me to contain a *double proof of* Peters *not having the Pastorship over them*, 1. *Because Christ wrote an Epistle to those Churches*, 2. *Because they were early famous*] is a sign that *S. W.* hath an *excellent* faculty in *answering* reasons of his *own* imagining; for 'tis certain I never used them as *reasons*, or *proofs* of any, much less of *that* conclusion. All that I designed was to mention these, as *considerable* parts of the *Universal Church*, desiring any *Romanist* to tell me, what can be said in any degree *probably for S.* Peters *Pastorship* over them, for whom there is not the least pretence, that he should be said ποιμαίνειν, *to feed*, or *govern*, or so much as to have *medled* with the *administration* of these *Churches* of *Asia*.

15. That the *Gentile* part was by S. *Pauls own single power* intrusted to *Timothy*, is there manifested, and here is confest by *S. W.* And for the *administring* it, that S. *Paul* personally gave him *full instructions*, leaving no other *appeal* or place of *application* for other *directions*, save only to *himself*, when he shall *come* unto him, I thought it was conclusible from his words, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14, 15. the words are these: *These things I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I make any stay, that thou mayst know how thou oughtest to behave thy self in the Church of God.* Upon this citation, very *tragical tempests* are raised, and to this hour I cannot discern what it was that *conjured* them up. That I infer'd this whole *conclusion* from the word [*come*] is one of his *arts*, to *divert* and *amuse* the *Reader*; I thought my grounds had been visible enough, being thus laid. The [ταῦτα, *these things*] which S. *Paul* now wrote to him, were a *whole Epistle* of *Instructions*; that it was no *longer*, was because he *hoped to come to him shortly*, when he might give him farther *instructions*, if there were need. In the mean, these

Pag. 82.

told

told him, how he ſhould *behave himſelf* in the *Church*, diſcharge his *Epiſcopal office*; and the *end* of writing it was, that he might *know* this: Thus much is *explicitly* contained in thoſe Verſes. I now demand (and that is all that I then did, as will be ſeen in the place, §. 16.) whether *S. Paul* left any other *appeal*, or place for *farther directions*, ſave only to *himſelf*, when he ſhould *come* to him? Or whether any other *Apoſtle* could, by any *power* given him by *Chriſt*, *countermand*, or interpoſe in them? If any could, let him be *named*, and the *power* ſpecified, and proved, by *vertue* whereof he ſhould thus act: But *S.W.* after all his * acts of *diverſion*, *dares* not, I am ſure *doth* not, affirm this. And if it *cannot* be ſaid (as no doubt it *cannot*) then where was *St. Peters ſupreme paſtorſhip* over *St. Paul* or *St. John*, or (under the former) over *S. Timothy* in the *Churches* of *Aſia*? * arts.

As for the *miſunderſtanding* of the *queſtion*, which next he is willing to *charge* on me, certainly I ſhall not be found *guilty* of it, but he viſibly of *miſunderſtanding* my *proceſs*. I ſpeak not of any *Apoſtolical commiſſion over the whole world* (of which he pretends me to ſpeak, and will *yield it to every* Apoſtle) but *of the peculiar power* that *Timothy* had by *S. Pauls commiſſion in Aſia*, and *Titus in Crete*, under no other *ſuperior juriſdiction*, but of *Chriſt* and *S. Paul*; and if that be granted, as *S.W.* diſputes it not, I am ſure it will prejudge *S. Peters primacy over* (and therefore for once *S.W.* was concerned to be *civil*, and to ſet it only *amongſt*) *the reſt of the Apoſtles*. 16.

The two remaining *ſuggeſtions* of this 12*th. Sect.* 1. concerning *S. Peters preaching to Jews in England*; 2. concerning *Eccleſia Gentium* in *S. Proſper*; were gleaned from the *Catholick Gentleman*, and ſatisfied in the *Reply*, *c.* 4. §. 7. *n.* 9, 10. And ſo much for that *Section*. 17.

SECT. VII.

Evidences againſt an Affirmation, by ſolving of teſtimonies. The reaſon of omitting to inſiſt on Joh. 21. 15, 16, 17. *Mr.* Hart's *confeſſion. The Romaniſts encloſing the Keys to S.* Peter. S. W. *his confeſſion. The contrary charges laid on me.* S. W. *his inference from* John 21. 15. *groundleſs. The infallible interpretation of the* CHURCH. *The particularizing Saint* Peter. *A Steward in every Church. The badge of no vertue without the power. The Keys were no viſible badge to* Peter. *The power as diſtinctly promiſed the reſt as* Peter. *Sitting on* 12. *Thrones. The fire ſitting on each,* Acts 2. *S.* Peter's *having the Holy Ghoſt in a peculiar manner, in an higher degree. The power of Biſhops, an argument that the Keys not peculiar to S.* Peter. *A ſpecimen of* S.W. *his reaſoning. Foundation ſtones.* Θεμέλιοι δώδεκα. *The meaſuring of the Wall,* Apoc. 21. *The Jaſper ſtone.*

THis 13. §. reflects on my view of the *donation* of the *Keys*, and that being touched on by the *Cath. Gent.* received its due anſwer in the *Reply*, *c.* 4. §. 8, 9, 10, 11. yet ſome few paſſages may expect here to be taken notice of, which were not there *tendred*, and ſo came not under conſideration. As when firſt he ſpends a page on the importance of the word *evidence*, I anſwer, I take it in the familiar *vulgar* notion, for a *teſtimony* to prove any *queſtion* of *fact*, either in the *affirmation*, or the *negative*, and ſuch was this, whether S. *Peter* were by *Chriſt* conſtituted *Univerſal Paſtor*: And the one poſſible way to *teſtifie* this (as any other) *negative*, is to take a view of the *places*, wherein he is by the *affirmers* pretended to be thus *conſtituted*, and to ſhew that thoſe places have no ſuch *force* in them. That they *have* ſuch force, is incumbent on the *Defendant* to ſhew, at leaſt to point at the particular *word*, or paſſage, which hath the ſuppoſed *energie* in it: And till that be done, he that undertakes the *Negative*, can only pitch upon thoſe places and *ſpecialties*, which he ſees the learneſt *affirmers* moſt inſiſt on, ſuppoſing it reaſonable to conclude, that thoſe are their moſt *important evidences*. 1.

By this it appears how far I was from *prevaricating againſt my promiſe of evidences*, when I went about to *prove my negative*, *by ſolving the Romaniſts teſtimonies for the affirmative*, which I acknowledge with him to have been my method, and I ſuppoſe no man can by any laws of diſcourſe *oblige*, or *direct* me to any other. 'Tis true (what he ſuggeſts) that *he that undertakes to evidence, ſuſtains the part of the Opponent*. But that he may do, while he oppoſeth the *affirmations* (as well as *negations*) of other men, and that he *muſt* do by *invalidating* their *teſtimonies*, on which they found or defend their *affirmations*; and if he can do ſo, why may not theſe be ſtiled *evidences* on his ſide, *i. e. teſtimonies*, to evince the *reaſonableneſs* of his *negation?* as when by any examination of a *witneſs* produced againſt me, I demonſtrate the *invalidity* of his *teſtimonies*. 2.

Secondly, When upon my *omitting to inſiſt on the words of* Joh. 21. 15, 16, 17. *I am charged with a palpable injuriouſneſs, that in anſwering their teſtimonies out of Scripture, I omit the chiefeſt, the ſtrongeſt, and moſt important place of all*] This is juſt as Dr. *Stapleton* deals with Mr. *Calvin*, *Princip. Doctrin. l.* 6. *c.* 8. when among the *Romaniſts* arguments from *Scripture*, he had made no mention of *Luk.* 22. 31. the *Doctor* ſaith it was *becauſe he well knew, nullo cavillationis fuco tam manifeſta verba eludi potuiſſe, that this was the unavoidable convincing Text*, juſt on the ſame ſcore, on which this muſt now go for the *moſt important place*, becauſe it was not mention'd. 3.

But for this, my *reaſon* was by me with perfect truth rendred, *p.* 93. from my full *perſwaſion*, that it had ſo very little *appearance* of *ſtrength* in it, and had been ſo often *anſwer'd*, that it would not be deemed *uſeful* to any, that I ſhould *deſcend* to it. That herein I have done the *Romaniſt* no injury, I have already given ſome account in the *Reply*, §. 8. *n.* 10, *&c.* and cannot farther ſeaſonably *attempt* it, till I am told, what yet I am perfectly ignorant of, wherein the pretended *ſtrength* lies of this *moſt important place*, and whether there be any farther reſerve of *force* in it, which Mr. *Hart* in the *conference* with Dr. *Reynolds*, fortified with all Dr. *Stapletons* armory, did not take notice of. If there be not any ſuch, yet *inviſible reſerve*, I muſt then remember the iſſue that it was brought to, in that *conference*, as we have it under both the *Diſputers hands*, Mr. *Harts laſt Reply* on this *Text*, being in theſe words, *p.* 102. *This which you have ſaid might ſeem to be ſomewhat, toward the looſing of them* (the *knots of Dr.* Stapleton's *finding out*) *if the Scripture gave not clear evidence for the proof of his ſupremacy as well elſewhere as here*, namely *Luk.* 22. 31. Out of which hold alſo being ſoon *beaten*, by evidence, 4.

that

that no more was there said to *Peter*, than *Christ* performs to every child of *God*, he concludes, *p.* 109. *I cannot deny but that in some respect it may be truly said to all the children of God, if they fall as* Peter *did. Yet (I know not how) methinks I cannot be perswaded but that it maketh somewhat for* Peters *supremacy.*

5. *Thirdly*, When he accuseth me of *manifest calumniating*, in *saying that the Romanist pretends the donation of the Keys as a peculiarity and incloſure of S.* Peter] To this I have answered already, *Reply, Cap.* 4. §. 9. And yet a little farther I shall now desire the *Readers* judgment of it, whether I have *calumniated* the *Romanist*, supposing *S. W.* to be that *Romanist*, whose pretensions in that manner are * set down *gradatim*, thus, 1. *That something was said to* Peter *in particular, and by name; which was not said to any other Apostle particularly, and by name*; That is his *first step.* 2. *That since this saying was a promise, a promise of something was made to S.* Peter *in particular*; That is his *second step.* 3. And by way of *conclusion* from hence, with a [*wherefore*] that *seeing this thing promised was the giving of the Keys of Heaven, it follows that the promise of giving the keys of heaven was made to S.* Peter *in particular.* In this process it is clear, 1. That the *promise* of the *keys* is by *S. W.* affirmed to be *made* in *particular* and by *name to S.* Peter; and 2. that *saying* or *making a promise in particular* and *by name*, is in his sence, so to make it to *one particular*, viz. *to* Peter, *as not to any other Apostle*; and what is that, but to affirm it a *peculiarity*, and *incloſure* of *S. Peters?* If here he fly back to his *refuge* of [*particularly* and *by name*] and say that he affirms no more, but that this *promise* was not *made* to the other *Apostles* in *particular and by name*, then 1. he gain'd nothing at all to *S. Peter* by that process; for as long as that which was *given* to *S.* Peter *by name*, were without naming every of them *particularly*, given to them *all*, so that *each* of them had it, then this will never be able to found *S. Peter's supremacy over them.*

* *P.* 90, 91.

6. But then 2. before he can thus escape, he will find himself *intangled* again; for in the words presently following, he thinks it *most consonant to reason, and worthy our Saviour, to perform his promise according to the tenor and manner in which he promised, and that by a performance in particular* (which therefore he calls his *best and surest testimony*, Joh. 21.) and I who produce a *performance* to them *all* in *general*, am rebuked for *omitting* that *performance in particular*, and in stead of it, producing only a *performance* to them *all* in *general*. Here I demand, am I *rebuked* for *omitting something*, or not? if for *omitting something*, then that *performance in particular to Peter* was something, which was not comprehended in that *performance* to them *all* in *general* (for if it were there comprehended, then I that am acknowledged to have *produced that*, cannot be said to have omitted *this*) and if it were so, then it was *peculiar* to him, and so his *incloſure*: and if the *performance* were so, then the *promise* was so too, by the foregoing *confession* of *S. W.* which will have the *performance* made according to the *tenor* of the *promise*. And so here is as much *affirmed* by *S. W.* (and by and by we shall have it more *expresly* repeated again) as that amounts to, which I suppose to be *asserted* by the *Romanist*; and that I hope will secure me from being like *S. W.* in *calumniating* him, with whom I came to dispute.

7. To *conclude*, was there, or was there not any *thing* here promised *Peter*, which was not *promised* the rest? If there was, then 1. that was *S. Peters incloſure*, and 2. that is contained in the *promise* of the *keys*, for that and the *consequents* thereof, *power* of *binding* and *loosing*, is all that is there *promised* him. And then 'tis vain to say you are *calumniated*, because you allow the *power* of *binding* to *all the Apostles*, for if you do, as indeed you do, and must, you must either shew somewhat else to be *promised* in those words, which *mention* nothing else, or else you must be forced to *confeſs* that either there was *nothing promised* the *rest* of the *Apostles*, or that you will still *affirm* something to have been *promised* him, which was not *promised* him.

8. In this place it is not amiss to note, that at the beginning of this his 13*th. Sect.* I am said to *affirm that no power of the keys was given especially to S.* Peter, and yet the *Cath. Gent.* (*S. W.* his very *good friend*, who might have *saved* him the *labour of this*, as he calls it, his *larger confute*) saith, that I *confeſs the keys were especially promised to* Peter. The truth is, I never said one or other, and if I had said *one*, I must needs not have said the *other*, and yet by these *two Romanists*, or (as seems to me most probable) *two* appearances of the *same Romanist*, I am said to say *both*. What trust shall be given to such *disputers?* I say, the *power* was *given in common and equally to all the Apostles*, and once mention the *making the promise to him peculiarly*, but that only as a *colour*, that the *Romanist* makes some *use* of, and *reply* to it, that in the *repetition* it is given *to all, without any peculiarity of restriction*, and that the *applying*, or *addressing* the words *particularly to* Peter, had a *special energie* in them, noting that the *œconomy* in *Christs houshold belongs to single persons*, the *Bishop* in *each City*, and not only to the *Colledge* or *Consistory*. But still nothing of all this, is to the *giving* the *keys* either *specially* or not *specially to S.* Peter.

9. What follows from *Joh.* 21. 15, 16. where, saith he, *'tis expresly recommended and incharged on S.* Peter *particularly and by name, once, twice, and thrice, with as many repetitions of his name particularizing him over and over, Feed my lambs, feed my sheep, feed my sheep, and asking him, Amas me plus his?*] is a strange way of *arguing*, and yet gives us a view of the *utmost* that *S. W.* can attempt in this cause of *S. Peters universal Pastorship*: For when indeed that is the great *foundation*, on which the whole *dispute* of our *schism* depends, and when, as *S. W.* assures us, the place of *Joh.* 21. 15, 16. is their *chiefest*, and *strongest*, and *most important place of all*, and as it is evident by his *arguing*; the other place of [*I will give thee the keys*, Mat. 16. 19.] must *receive all its force from the comparing it with this*, and the *consonancy* betwixt the *promise*, and this (as he will fansie it) *performance.* Yet after all this, all that he can pretend to from hence, is but a *recommending and incharging of him, Feed my sheep*--- together with a *question, whether he love him more than the rest of the Apostles?* which what is it, but an *exhortation* to perform that *duty*, to which he was before *commissionated*, Joh. 20. 21. and with him *all* the rest of the *Apostles equally*. For as to the other circumstances of *expresness*, *particularizing him by name, frequent repeating of it, asking him whether he love him more than these*] *one or all* of them, they can never work a *change* in the matter. *Christ praying* the *same prayer thrice*, did not make it cease to be a *prayer*, and commence a *precept*; No more will an *inculcated, expres, particularized* (be it never so *vehement* an) *exhortation*, introduced with a *question*, to *quicken*, and *impress* it, be converted

converted by theſe *accumulations*, into a *commiſſion* for *ſupremacy*; eſpecially when the *cauſes*, which viſibly ſuggeſted to our *Saviour* this manner of *queſtioning*, and preſſing his *exhortation*, were more juſtly matter of *humiliation*, than of *exaltation* to *S. Peter*, (and ſo were received, and *interpreted* by him, *Peter was grieved becauſe Chriſt ſaid to him the third time, Loveſt thou me?* ver. 17. and no doubt, deemed it a *reproach* of his *thrice denying* his *Maſter*) a *remembring* him of the *foulneſs* of his *fall*, but not the *inſtating* any *principality* or *dignity* upon him. But of this I have alſo ſpoken diſtinctly, *Reply*, c. 4. §. 8.

Beſides this force of the words, *S. W.* is willing to call in the *interpretation of the Catholick Church* 10.
according to her never erring rule of faith, and that *gives him* and his friends *an infallible certainty that theſe and* (he only ſaith it) *ſome other teſtimonies from Scripture expreſs a primacy in S.* Peter] But here he neither produces any *one interpretation* of either *Fathers*, or *Councils*, or any *ſingle Writer*, thereby to ſignifie what he means by the *Catholick Church*, or what is the way of *interpretation*, that muſt *induce* this. It is therefore left to his *Reader* to *conjecture* his meaning, *viz.* that the *preſent Roman Church* is the *Catholick*, that the *interpretations* of this, are the *never erring rule of Faith*, that *this* hath *interpreted this*, *and ſome other Texts to ſignifie a Primacy* not only of *order* but of *power*, an *univerſality of juriſdiction*, to belong to Saint *Peter*, *over* all the *Apoſtles*, and that this *gives him*, and all that are of his *perſwaſion* in all things *(particularly in the belief of the Infallibility of the Roman Church) an infallible certainty of the truth* of it. And this ſure would *equally* have done it, if our *Saviour* had never asked *St. Peter three times*, *Loveſt thou me more than theſe*----- And ſo all that I can *conclude* from hence is but this, that *S. Peters univerſal paſtorſhip* is as *perfect* a *truth*, as the *Infallibility* of the *Roman Church*; but withal, that it is to as little purpoſe to *diſpute* of that, or any *ſubject*, till the other be either *reſolved*, or *ſet aſide*, as it is to inquire, whether he ſay *true* that *cannot* lye. And therefore I ſhall thus take my leave of my *inchanted adverſary*.

What follows *p.* 93. by way of *new* attempt, and deduction from *my* words, when I mention the *ap-* 11.
plying the words particularly to S. Peter] is a very *ſubtile* reaſoning. By the *applying the promiſe of the keys particularly to Peter*, he will have it *follow*, 1. *That our Saviour told* Peter *in the ſingular, and in a ſingular manner, that he ſhould be Steward of his houſe*; and then *ſeeing all particularizing is a kind of exception from an univerſality, and that univerſality is the other Apoſtles, it muſt follow* (ſaith he) *that St.* Peter *was particularized out of that community for the office of Steward in Chriſts houſe*. And if he were ſo, ſay I, then here the *particularity* and *incloſure of the keys to St. Peter*, is affirmed by *S. W.* (which was a while ago ſuch a *ſlander* of my Pen againſt their *Church*) for ſure ſo 'twas, if *Peter* by this *Donation* was *particularized out of the Community*, *for the office of the Steward* (of which he after tells us *there was none but he*) in *Chriſts houſe*.

But letting that paſs, I ſhall attend to his *reaſoning*, and though very *fine*, without much ado, 12.
this *Fabrick* will ſoon be *demoliſhed*. The ſpeech (I yield) is *addreſt to Peter* in the *ſingular*, but that is a token only, that *Peter*, as a *ſingle* perſon, ſhould have *power*, but not either that no *others* ſhould have it too (or that when they had it, not *ſingle perſons*, but only *Communities* ſhould be inveſted with it) or that the manner, in which *Peter* ſhould have it, ſhould be *ſingular* to him, and ſo, as it was not to each of them. The *particularity* gives him *particularly* the *power*, but *excludes* not others from the ſame *power*, and the ſame *degree* of *power*, to whom it was at any other time *promiſed*, or *given*, and ſo it was to all and every of the *Apoſtles*, *Mat.* 18. *John* 20. And though the office of *Steward* be a *particular office*, yet in every *particular houſe* there may be *one* ſuch *Steward*, and every whether *National*, or *Provincial*, or *Dioceſan Church*, is ſuch an *houſe*, and not only the one *Catholick Church* that comprehends them. If it were otherwiſe, that *power* which *Chriſt* had in *one* perſon by *Commiſſion* from his *Father*, he could never have delegated to the *plural Diſciples*, as 'tis viſible he did, *John* 20. or elſe that muſt not be the *Stewards office*, as it is viſible alſo that it is, by comparing *Mat.* 18. with *Mat.* 16. where the *binding* and *looſing* is an *effect* of the *keys*, and thoſe the *Stewards* enſign of office: And by 1 *Cor.* 4. 1, 2. where the *Apoſtolical office* is ſo deſcribed, which conſequently inſtates every *one* in this *Stewards office*, as well as the *Text*, Mat. 16. doth *S. Peter*.

What is next ſaid of the *keys*, the *badge of the function*, *that they are not read of to be given to any* 13.
but S. Peter] is of the ſame *complexion* with the former *Combatants*. 'Tis ſure the *badge* and the *power* go together, and if they did not, 'tis the *power* and the *Commiſſion* for that, which alone is conſiderable in this matter, and that is apparently and expreſly given to *all* the *Apoſtles*, *Mat.* 18. and *John* 20. and for any more it matters little. The *Commiſſion* being cleared, either *ſuppoſes* the implicite *donation* of the *badge*, or elſe ſtands in no *need* of it.

But then 2. it is yet farther evident, that there were no *material keys* given to *S. Peter* himſelf, 14.
and thoſe only can be called a *badge* (*ſpiritual*, *inviſible keys* are not capable of being ſuch) and *Chriſts commiſſion* and the *power* accompanying it, are the *ſpiritual keys*, which he that hath, may *open* and *ſhut the kingdom of heaven*; and thoſe every *Apoſtle* had as well as *S. Peter*.

His third argument from the *Apoſtles*, being part of *Chriſts houſe*, whence he *infers S.* Peter *Stew-* 15.
ard over them, is anſwered moſt briefly by *retortion*, that if there be any force in it, then it will *equally* hold thus: S. *Peter* was a part of *Chriſts houſe*, and therefore *Paul* that was a *Steward* in *Chriſts houſe*, and is *expreſly* ſo called, 1 *Cor.* 4. 1, 2. was *Steward* over S. *Peter*.

What follows in this matter, introduced by *Fourthly and laſtly*, is only his expreſſion of *diſlike* to 16.
an *argument* of mine concerning *Presbytery*, and ſo is not *pertinent* to the queſtion before us, and beſides it hath not, I ſuppoſe, any ſhew of the leaſt *difficulty* in it.

As for the *next* paſſage on the *ſame* foundation, *pag.* 96. wherein I am ſaid to *affirm moſt ſhameleſly*, 17.
and moſt expreſly againſt Scripture alledged by my ſelf, *that this power was as diſtinctly promiſed*, Mat. 18. 18. *to each ſingle Apoſtle as to S.* Peter.] I leave it to the *Reader* to *judge*, whether it be *calumny* or no, by this *ſyllogiſm*; That which was *promiſed* to *all* the *Apoſtles*, as to *twelve ſingle perſons*, each *ſingly* to *have* and *exerciſe* it, and not all *together* in *common*, was as *diſtinctly* promiſed to *each ſingle Apoſtle*, as it was promiſed to S. *Peter* (I ſpeak not now of its being promiſed *particularly* by *name*, nor were any ſuch words found in this part of my *former* treatiſe; that is willingly allowed

to

to *S. Peter*, and the full *importance* of it before considered) *but* the *power* of *binding* and *loosing*, was *Mat.* 18. promised to *all the Apostles*, as to *twelve single persons*, each *singly* to *have*, and *exercise* it, and not *altogether in common*, *Ergo*. The *major* is cleared by this, because the *distinctness* and *particularity* of the *promise* to S. *Peter* devolved no more on him, but this, that he should singly have and exercise that *power*, and not only in *common*, or in *consistory* with other *Apostles*. If it be said that it devolved any *more*, I desire it may be said what it was, and how it appears to be by these words *devolved* on him, and whatsoever it be feigned to be, if it be less than a *supremacy* over *all* the *Apostles*, it will be nothing to the purpose; and that 'tis sure it was not, because the *supremacy* is not competible to *two*, whether *persons*, or *communities*, and yet this *power* promised S. *Peter*, is acknowledged by *S. W.* to be also made to *all the Apostles in common and in general*, Mat. 18. 18. though not *distinctly to each* of them. The *minor* is in part *confest* by *S. W.* so far as that this *power* was *promised* to *all the Apostles*; and for the other parts, 'tis evidently proved in that Treatise out of S. *Cyprian*, *Theophylact*, and others, and is the interest of *S. W.* as well as of us, to maintain against the *Presbyterians*, who alone can gain by the *questioning* of it.

18. That about the meaning of the *twelve thrones*, was considered in the *Reply*, *Cap.* 4. *Sect.* 10. and there the sense which *S. W. never heard of*, vouched from Saint *Augustine*, to whom I may also add *Hilarius Pictaviensis*, and the *Author imperfecti Operis*. As for the words, that either *judging* should *signifie ruling*, *or presiding*, *as Governors preside*, or that θρόνος *should signifie the Episcopal chair*, 'twill be no *news* to any Man, that hath observed the use of words, either the most *critically*, or the most *slightly*, whatsoever *S W.* would make shew of *believing* to the *contrary*.

19. In the next place, the *dumb negative* (as he calls it) is by him *mutilated*, or else it would speak *articulately* enough, to all that I call'd it out to *testifie*. It is in the *descent* of the *Spirit*, *Acts* 2. the *fires* being *divided*, and *sitting on every one of them*. This *fire* represented the *Holy Ghost*, that *Holy Ghost sealed* that *Commission* to those on whom it fell, which *Christ* had *promised* to S. *Peter*, *Mat.* 16. and to *all* the *Apostles*, *Mat.* 18. Now this *fire* was *divided*, and ἐκάθισε ἐφ' ἕνα ἕκαστον αὐτῶν, *on each*, *and every one of them*, *Acts* 2. 3. And this I suppose an *argument* of some *validity*, that the *promise* being thus *sealed distinctly* to *every one* of them, was meant (in the making of it) *distinctly* to *every one* of them. And when I add, that there was no *peculiar mark allowed S. Peter*, though that be a *negative argument*, and therefore I meant not from that alone to *conclude* any thing, yet I hope by being annext to the *affirmative probation* precedent, it will not be a gagg to make that *dumb* and *negative* also.

20. But in this *paragraph* here is offered a very *doubty* proof to *evidence* on S. *Peter*'s behalf (what I know not, for that is not *expresst*, but left doubtfully betwixt his being *head of the Apostles*, and his having some *peculiar mark allowed* him in the *descent* of the *Holy Ghost*, yet one I suppose designed to *infer* and *conclude* the other.) 1. Saith he, *the Doctor was not there to see, and there is no history that expresses the contrary*. It seems a *Negative* in *S. W.* his *mouth* is perfectly *vocal*, though it be but *dumb* in another Man's. 2. Saith he, *If we may judge by exterior actions, and may believe that out of the abundance of the heart the tongue speaks, then perhaps the Doctor may receive some satisfaction in this point also, that S.* Peter *had in a more peculiar manner the Holy Ghost; for it was he that first burst out into that heavenly Sermon which converted three thousand.* Here was one *honest* word, the [*perhaps*] But even this will fail, for granting the *two postulata*, that we *may judge* (*probably* at least) by *exterior actions*, and that our *Saviour* said perfect *truth*, when he said, *Out of the abundance of the heart*------ Yet the *Doctor* may not be *satisfied from thence*, or *from S.* Peters *first bursting out*, *making the first*, *though so powerful Sermon*, that he had *received the Holy Ghost* in a more *peculiar manner*, or was designed *head of the Apostles*. I shall answer it no farther than by repeating it, hoping that my *silence* will not again have such *efficacy* in it (if it have, *dumb Negatives* may hereafter *deserve* some consideration) as to render this also a *strongest* and *most important place* for the *Romanists pretensions*.

21. What is next represented (according to *S. W.* his meaning) as my *fourth argument*, viz. *That they were all filled with the Holy Ghost*, is sure no *distinct* argument of mine, but only a part of that *Text* before cited, where the *fire sate on every of them*, and this is a consequent of that, *they were all filled with the Holy Ghost*. And that this thus set, was an *argument* of some *validity*, hath already appeared. As for the *possibility*, that they which were *all full* of the *Holy Ghost*, might yet have it *unequally*, I am not concerned to doubt, if by [*unequally*] be meant the *inequality* of *divine indowments*. But though of these there is no certain *ground* of affirming, which of all the *Apostles* had the *highest degree*, Saint *John* excelling in *some* graces, Saint *Peter* in others, and Saint *Paul* that came after, having as rich a proportion as either, for ought we can discern, and *labouring more abundantly than they all*, yet *not he*, *but this grace of God's spirit in him*: Yet our question being only of *power* or *Commission* to *authority*, and *dignity* in the *Church*, and every one having that *sealed* to him by the *Holy Ghosts descent* upon *every one*, there is no remaining *difficulty* in this matter.

22. The *testimonies* which I * brought out of the Ancients to prove that there was *no more promised to* S. Peter, *Mat.* 16. *than was promised*, Mat. 18. and *actually given*, John 20. to *all* and *every* of the *Apostles*, are lookt on by *S. W.* as *pretendings*, that the *Romanists build not the Church upon Bishops in the plural*, *nor allow any authority to them*, *but to the Pope only*; and this, made a piece either of *pitiful ignorance*, or *malicious calumny*. But 'tis apparent they did not inject the least *suspicion* of that. What they were designed to *infer*, was clear by the matter of the *testimonies*, that though the words, *Mat.* 16. were spoken *particularly* to *Peter*, yet the *intire power* there spoken of, was *promised* and given to *all the Apostles*; that from that *donation* it is, that all *Episcopal Power*, which is in the *Church*, flowes; that in S. *Peter*'s receiving the *Keys*, all *Bishops* received them; which is an evidence that either he *received* more than was comprehended in the *Keys* (which he cannot do by those words) or else he *received* no more than all other *Bishops* receive from the rest of the *Apostles*. And then how can his *supremacy* be founded in these words?

* *Tr. of Schism*, p. 89. p. 98.

23. In this paragraph he hath given us a very rare *specimen* of his *reasoning*; for not *contenting* himself to have said, that the *testimonies of Bishops in the plural*, *touch not the Romanists*, there *being no word in them excluding the Pope*, He adds, *Nay rather they make for them*: How fair they bid to *excluding*

cluding the *Pope*, supposing that title to signifie not a *Bishop* only, but a *supreme universal Pastor*, hath been shewed already. Let us now observe how he proves this [*Nay rather they make for us*] for that will be a matter of some *moment*, if performed *successfully*. His way of inferring this his advantage, is, *For the Churches being founded in Apostles, and Bishops, prejudices not S.* Peter *to be the chiefest; and if so, then the Church is built most chiefly and especially upon Saint* Peter, *which is all we Catholicks say.*] Where not to dispute what is meant by *S. Peter being the chiefest*, whether no more than appears to be meant by the πρῶτος Σίμων, which he knows we willingly grant him, without imagining any *supremacy* of *Authority* over the rest of the *Apostles*, instated in him; All that I desire to *observe*, is the manner of his *arguing*, thus, If it *prejudices* not *S. Peter* to be the *chiefest*, then the *Church is built most chiefly upon him:* from those *testimonies not prejudicing*, presently assuming that it is *true*, as if saying *nothing* to hurt it (by not saying any thing to it) were a *clear evidence* on its side; and then the *first* Verse of S. *Matthew* infers it also, for I acknowledge that *prejudices* it not; and then *S. W.* may set up for *immortal disputer*, having as many *reserves* of such *arguments* still behind, as there are *periods* in the *Scriptures*, or *Fathers* which speak of *other* matters; for of each of them 'tis acknowledged, that they *prejudice* not *St. Peters being the chiefest*. Sure *S. W.* when he was so *displeased* with the *dumb negative*, foresaw not he should need to call in such *Auxiliaries* as these.

My answer to the Text of *Tu es Petrus*, is after his constant manner *deformed* by him, yet can- 24.
not miss to have this discernible *efficacy* in it, that there being no more meant by it, than that *Peter* was a *foundation-stone*, and all the *Apostles* being such as well as he, this cannot *constitute* him in any *superiority* over them, *CHRIST* only being the ἀκρογωνιαῖος, *chief corner-stone*, and no other place in the *Foundation* giving any ὑπεροχὴ of *power* to one *Foundation-stone* above another. This might be soon manifested, if it were needful, by the known *position* of *Foundation-stones*, one by, not on the top of *another:* And if *S Peter* were supposed to be the *first*, (as *page* 103. he saith the *Dr. will not deny*) and so next the *chief corner-stone*, and by that *Superior* to all the rest, then it must likewise *follow*, that that stone which was placed *next* to the *stone* that represented *S. Peter*, or in the next place of *honour*, next *CHRIST* on the *other* hand, must be also *Superiour* to all the rest, and the same rules of *subordination* hold *on*, through all the rest, which I suppose will not be *S. W.* his *interest* to affirm, and then I can foresee nothing that will incline him to that way.

Somewhat hath been added on this head in the *Reply*, *Sect.* 11. It remains only that I gather up 25.
some special objections of his against what I have said in the *Tract* of *Schism* of this matter, which were not tendred by the *Cath. Gent.*

And *first*, saith he, the *argument* is only *negative*, *that no distinction is put* (betwixt the *Founda-* 26.
tion-stones in *Scripture*) *therefore there was none.* I *answer*, the *argument* is this, *Simon* is by *Christ* called Πέτρος, *a foundation-stone* in the *building* of the *Church*, and the same title is, in another word, given *every* of the *Apostles*, when they are called δεμέλιοι δώδεκα *twelve foundations*; from whence my *conclusion* (and not my proof) is *negative:* Therefore the words *Tu es Petrus*, neither give, nor affirm *more* of him, than is given and *affirmed* of every of the *other Apostles.*

Next, saith he, it is *a most pitiful piece of reason to perswade the Reader from only a plurality, and na-* 27.
ming twelve Apostles, that all were equal. But this was not my *reasoning*, but that the *rest* of the *Apostles* were *foundation-stones* as *well* as *Simon*, and therefore that that title of *Tu es Petrus* was no *proof* of *inequality.*

Thirdly, *The Doctor*, saith he, *hath quite overthrown his own cause, since granting a foundation-stone,* 28.
and Πέτρος *being the same, and only St.* Peter *having the name of* Πέτρος, *it follows on the Doctor's grounds that he only, and he more particularly should be a foundation-stone.* This would be a *strange syllogism*, if it were put into *form*; but I shall not trouble my self with that; only when it is as certain that Πέτρος and δεμέλιος is the same, sure they that are every one of them δεμέλιοι, shall be, as far as this *argument* can *conclude*, as much and as particularly *foundation-stones*, as he that was called Πέτρος; so far from being inferr'd is his [*only St. Peter*] or [*St. Peter more particularly.*] 'Tis as if I should say, *man* and *Enosh* being the *same*, and *only* the *son* of *Seth* having the name of *Enosh*, it follows on these grounds, that he *only*, and *in good reason that he more particularly should be a man.* I suppose to this proposal of *objection* against *S. W.* his being a *man*, he would find out some *answer* or other to defend himself; perhaps this, that *Isch* and *Enosh* are the same, and *S. W.* is an *Isch*, and therefore as *well* and as *particularly* a *man*, as the *son* of *Seth* can be deemed to be; and then he hath no further need to be shewed the way to make *answer* to this *argument.*

But then fourthly, he must have it noted, that the *Doctor will have all the Apostles called Peter.*] 29.
And now I have helpt him to another quarrel with the *Doctor* as just as that, *viz.* that the *Doctor will have every man call'd Enosh*: But I *answer*, I shall not importune him, that all the *Apostles* may be called *Peter* (and therefore the *eleventh dish* in the *bill of fare*, was but a *brick-bat* put in *paste*, and meant only to fill up *room* at the *table*) δεμέλιος and Πέτρος are all one, and that will serve my turn as well, and therefore I *content* my self with the *Scripture* style, that the *Apostles* were twelve δεμέλιοι, and not *twelve Peters.*

The confirmation of the observations concerning *Tu es Petrus*, from the *measuring* of the *wall* 30.
in the *Apocalypse*, is made matter of much *game* to *S. W.* But a little *seriousness* (in such matters very *decent*) would have taught him, that the *analogie* of some *obscure* things in *vision*, with some most *plain*, may render some parts of *visions* intelligible; and then what more *obvious* than this, that the *wall* being *built* upon the *foundation*, and so *commensurate* with it, and the *foundation* being distinctly made up of *twelve stones*, and the *names* of the *twelve Apostles* expresly interpreting each of them to be the so many *Apostles*, and the *wall* also being *divided* into *twelve equal parts*, the several portions whether of *Province*, of which the *Church* is made up, or else of *power*, with which the *Apostles* were invested, should be thought to be meant by them, and so this *representative mensuration* be exactly *significative* of that, which other plain *Scriptures* had given grounds of *believing*, and *Tu es Petrus* had offered nothing to the *contrary*, *viz.* the *equality* of the *power* given by *Christ* to all the *Apostles.* As for *S. W.* his *subtile* fetch from the *quality* and *lustre* of the *first* of the

twelve Stones in that *vision*, the *Jasper*, I can allow him to make his advantage of it, to that which it is most proper to *signifie*, the *lustre*, of *zeal* and other *gifts*; and if he can find any means to assure himself, 1. That S. *Peter* was signified by that *Jasper Stone*, 2. That the *lustre* of that, exceeded the lustre of every of the other *Stones*, I shall very willingly grant him his *conclusion*, knowing that as the *greatest Potentates* are not always the most zealous persons in their *Kingdoms*, so *Dominion* is not founded in such *graces*, but only in the *Constitutions* and *Commissions* of *Christ*, which *mediately* or *immediately* bestows all *supremacies* on all that are duly possessed of them.

31. And so much for this large 13*th. Section* (which I have attended on *precisely*, and κατὰ πόδα, as being most important to our *business* in hand, the case of our *Schism fundamentally* depending on the *supremacy* of S. *Peter*) and consequently of his first part.

CHAP. IV.

A Survey of the Second Part of Schism Disarm'd.

SECT. I.

S. W. *his one Evidence, Possession in the belief of Infallibility, Examined, in the general result, and the Special branches of it.*

1. BEing now to enter on this *second* part of my *Disarmers dexterities*, I meet with one in the front, which if thought on *timely*, and well *husbanded*, might have superseded, and saved him the *expence* of all the rest both foregoing and subsequent, the one *Evidence* that he pretends to for his whole tenure, *their Churches long and quietly enjoyed possession of the belief of Infallibility. Possideo* saith he, *quia possideo, olim possideo, prior possideo, is all the evidence and all the reason she is bound to give to her Rebel Sons or outlawed Subjects*] p. 106.

2. This indeed might make *short* work, decide and conclude *Controversies*, sixty an hour for an Age together, if there were but this one thing granted, that the *guilty* were not only *innocent* but *infallibly* and *unavoidably* such, or that *S. W.* might be *credited*, when he affirms it.

3. By this we see, to what purpose it had been for me to have *reformed* upon his admonitions (concerning my *omitting his strongest and most important place* of *Pasce Oves-----*) when if I had let loose upon his *direction*, and refuted all Dr. *Stapletons*, and other *Romanists* pretensions from those words, I had been still as far as ever, from moving this *rock*: for when all other pleas fail, he is still as safe as the clearest *Deeds* could make him; he hath an inchanted Castle to retire to, their *Churches Infallibility*; and if any Man will question that, it matters not; the *belief of Infallibility* will serve turn; and if still you will be importunate, and demand some *reason* to found such *belief*, and that for the satisfaction of the *weak* (who would really give all the goods in the world, that they might be *assured* of the truth of it, but cannot arrive to such *heights* of believing, without, and *against* all *grounds* of believing) why then, in stead of *satisfying* those demands of frail fallible reason, here is the great Ἑλέπολις, the *engine* of *battery*, that will subdue in a moment all the *intellectual fortresses*, the *long and quietly enjoyed possession* of this *belief*, and so by these degrees *S. W.* his *grand indenture* is perfected, and all his *evidence* and *reason* summed up in this *Breviate*, *Possideo quia possideo*: Our *Church* is *schismatical*: why? because the *Pope* is *universal Pastor*, and we are *divided* from him. How doth he appear to be so? Why, the *Church* (that must be the *Roman Church*) affirms it, which is *Infallible*: But how is she evidenced to be *Infallible*? why, she *believes she is so*. I beseech him, upon what grounds doth she *believe* so? why, she hath *possession of this belief*. But a *thief* may *possess* that which he should not *possess*, and one may ask (with a desire to learn) how *came* she by this *possession*? Why she hath *long and quietly enjoyed it*: And if you further insist, and be so *ill-natured*, as to ask one *question* more, you are to know, *You are Rebel Sons and outlawed Subjects*, and this is all the *reason S. W.* in her name, is *bound to give you*, and (as he goes on) *'Tis your part, to evidence; hers, to hold and possess her own, (Poor Protestants* are bound to *dispute* and *demonstrate*, to *grind* in the *mill*, or digg in the *quarry*; 'tis enough for them to *possess* the *belief* of *Infallibility*) till *you sufficiently* i. e. *demonstrably evidence her title to be unjust*.] One would think the very reciting of this *arguing* were sufficient *reply* to it.

4. And yet if after all this, it be remembred, either what *title* it is, that we are to *prove* to be *unjust*, or what kind of *possession* it is, that is maintained by this *title*, the *arguing* will yet appear more admirable. 1. 'Tis evident there is no *title* (properly so called) so much as *pretended*; *Possession, long quietly enjoyed, is all that is tendred*; and I hope *possession*, be it never so *long* and *quiet*, is no more than *possession*; a *title* is *præcedaneous*, and somewhat else, in which the *Possession* is, or ought to be *founded*; and if it were not, 'tis not *bonæ fidei Possessio*. For though *prescription* by *humane Laws* may be allowed to *create* a *right*; Yet it hath no such power by the *Laws* of Christ, either *in vertue* and *vice*, or in matters of *true* or *false*. If it had, both *Heathenism* of *old*, and *Turcism* now, would hold by the same *tenure*. But of this I have spoken in the Reply, *p.* 21.

5. So that this indeed proves *S. W.* to be ἀθάνατος πολεμίστης, *an immortal invincible combatant*. He need never *dispute*, or offer one word of *reason* for his *Church*, till we have *demonstrably* evidenced her *title* to be *unjust*; and yet he saith, he is not bound to *produce* any *title at all*; and then how shall it be *possible* for us to *demonstrate it unjust*? And yet this is but *one* less considerable part of his *arguing*. The *possession* which is wont to *supply* the place of a *title*, and to be ingredient in a *plea*, is, we know, the *possession* of some *outward* thing, of *Land*, of *Goods*, *moveable* or *immovable*, of *Power*, and the like: but the *possession*, which *S. W.* speaks of, is the *Possession* of one of our own *operations*,

an

an *internal* act; for such is *Belief*; But of that also, as such, we have spoken already, *Reply, Chap.* 7. *Sect.* 1. *n.* 11. and I need add no more now, but this, that *possession* of *belief*, and the *length* of that *possession*, can signifie no more than that they have *long believed* it; and if that were *sufficient ground* to be rendred to any (whether *Subject* or *Slave*) who should demand a *reason* of the *Faith* that is in them, [they *believe* it, because they do, and have *long believed it*] I would gladly know, what the *Apostle* meant by that *precept*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. that we be ready πρὸς ἀπολογίαν πάντι αἰτοῦντι, to *give an account*, such sure as hath λόγον, reason in it, *i. e.* an *account* of the *cause* and *reason*, as of our hope, so of our *belief*, to *every man* that *demands* such a *reason* from us; or whether the bare having so long *believed it*, without any *offer* of *reason* for it, be yet a *reasonable account* of that *belief*.

Nay when to the *plea* of a *possession*, it is necessary that some competent *testimonies* to prove the *prescription*, be produced, and so *S. W.* might be supposed to have some *reserve* of expedient, to *extricate* him out of this *Labyrinth*; the present specification of the *object* of this *belief* makes this issue yet more *impossible*; For 'tis the *belief* of their *Infallibility*, and not only of their *veracity*, which he speaks of, (and of that I hope I have said enough in the view of the *Romanists exceptions to my Lord of* Falklands *discourse of Infallibility.*) 2. Of their *Infallibility*, *indefinitely* (and that is in effect *universally*) the *impossibility* that their *Church* should *err* in any thing she *affirms*, or *defines*; or shall ever *affirm*, or *define*; A thing, which as they cannot pretend to prove so much as by that way, that *possessions* are evidenced to be *Possessions*, by *Testimonies* of *ancient* Men, for sure never any *Apostle* or *ancient Doctor* of the *Church* did by way of *prophecie* foretel this, that the *Church* of *Rome never* should *err*, or render her self *capable* of *erring*; so after all this, 'tis as necessarily refuted by every particular *dispute* of ours, wherein we have or shall prove her *actually* to have *erred*, and wherein we shall *demonstrate* her to have *varied* from her self (as it is certain we can *demonstrate*) as any title in the World can be evidenced to be *unjust*. 6.

That I descend not here to this way of *perfecting* this *demonstration*, I have many reasons to perswade me. I shall mention but one, that this *digression* of his to the *discourse* of his *one evidence*, the *belief of Infallibility*, pretends to be founded in no more than an *intimation* of mine, that it *belongs* to them to *evidence*. And what had I said to *intimate* this? Forsooth the *Title* of my fifth *Chapter* was, *The evidences from the Bishop of* Rome *succeeding S.* Peter, *examined*] A *foul injury* indeed to *S. W.* to imagine that they use any such *evidence*, or that they are *bound* to use any at all. Well, if I have made such a *dangerous intimation*, I have now more than *intimated* my *reasons* for it; and when my *intimations* are more *expreß* (my *whispers* become vocal) I will endeavour my *demonstrations* shall be so also. In the mean, this may serve to secure my *intimation*, and so the *title* of my *fifth Chapt.* For sure the last *crime* that is laid to it, in relation to the *subsequent* matter of the *Chapter*, *viz.* that the *Doctor is contrary to himself, inscribing the Chapter, an answer to their evidences, yet spending almost the whole Chapter in producing evidences of his own.*] will soon be *pardoned* him. When it's considered, that those *evidences* of his *own* were produced to *refute* and *invalidate* their *evidences*, and so as proper a *method* as could have been used in the *examining* of them. 7. 8.

SECT. II.

Bishops properly Successors of the Apostles, and stiled Apostles. S. W. *his disadvantage from pretending the contrary. The frail grounds of the Bishop of* Romes *supremacy. The place of S.* Peter's *death no means to affix the pretended universal Pastorship to the See of* Rome; Peter's *third coming to* Rome. *The Bishop of* Rome *succeeded him living.*

HIS *Answer* to my *first Paragraph*, is most of it *triumph* for the *victories* of his *former* part (which I suppose have proved no better than those in *Thucydides's story*, the victories vanished, before he hath taken full *possession* of them) yet he cannot take leave of it, without giving us one tast of his *faculty*; I had said that after the *first evidence*, which concerned *S. Peter*, was manifested to be *incompetent* to *infer* the *conclusion*, 'twas *unnecessary to proceed to the other*; and he *recites* this into another *form*, that I *brag I have super-errogated, and said more than needs*, applying it to what I had done in the *former Chapter*, when my words evidently look *forward*, and relate to that which was *next* to be *handled*. 1.

What follows next, concerning the *Succession to S.* Peter *at Antioch*, compared with that *at Rome*, hath been spoken to and *vindicated* against the *Cath. Gentl.* in the *Reply*, *Chap.* 5. *Sect.* 2. and here is little Addition made by *S. W.* save only, 1. His *denying*, that *Peter planted a Church at* Antioch *of Jewish believers only* (whereas, 1. the *contrary* is manifested in the former *chapter*, by the *distinctneß* of the two *cœtus* there; and 2. This is not at all to the matter of our *present argument*, which is founded only in Peter's *planting a Church*, and *leaving* a *Successor Bishop* at *Antioch*, which he *equally* did, were it of *Jews* or *Gentiles*) 2. The recounting the two *divers qualities* of *dignity* in *S. Peter resident* at *Antioch*; the *first* of *particular care* of that *Church*, as *private Bishop* of *that See*; *wherein*, saith he, *he left an improperly so called Successor*, *viz.* a *Bishop*: the *second* of *publick office* of *Head of the Church*, *in which consists his Primacy*, *and in which he only could claim the inheritance*, *who succeeded him dying.*] Herein there be *three* things to be briefly adverted to. 1. That his whole *answer* is founded in a *visible begging* the *question*, *viz.* that *S. Peter* was *head* of the *Church*, and so had the *Primacy*, *i. e.* the *supreme Pastorship* of the *Church*; for as to any other notion of *Primacy*, that *title* will not be *proper*. 2. That in his opinion a *Bishop* was but *improperly a Successor of S.* Peter; whereas 'tis notorious in all *antiquity*, that the *Bishops* were the only (*properly so called*) *Successors* of the *Apostles*, and themselves frequently upon that account, stiled *Apostles*, and the *Successors* of S. *Paul*, and other Apostles in other Cities, equally so stiled, * Απόστολος Τιμοθέος, || Απόστολος Τίτος, * Απόστολος Επαφρόδιτος, || Απόστολος Ιγνάτιος, *the Apostle Timothy*, || *Titus*, var. ιγνω. 2.

* *Anom. ap. Phot. Num.* 254. & *Theodor. in* 1 Tim. 3. 1. & *Theophan.* || *Theod. in Tit.* * Phil. 2. 25. *Theod. in Phil.* 1. 1. & *in c.* 2. *Chrys. ibid.* || *Chrys. Ign.*

* *Clem. Alex. Strom. l. 4.* *Titus, Epaphroditus, Ignatius,* and many the *like,* as the *Successor of S.* Peter *at* Rome * *Apostolus Clemens.* And if it be said, that *Bishops succeeded* not in the *whole Apostolical Power,* that of *preaching* to *all Nations,* and so were but *improperly* their *Successors*; I answer, that is true; but little for *S. W.* his *advantage.* For then the *Bishop* of *Rome* not succeeding *S. Peter* in the *plenitude* of his *power,* can the less be proved to *succeed* in the *Universal Pastorship* of *S. Peter* (which if ever *S. Peter* had been *possest* of, must needs be *founded* in, and *superstructed* on his *commission Apostolick*) his *succession* in the *Episcopal chair* may be *sufficient.*

3. 3. That all the *Bishop* of *Romes supremacy* depends upon these *frail* grounds, and besides upon another *perfect uncertainty*; (even according to *S. W.* his *unproved assumptions*) *viz.* that none could succeed him *dying,* but only the *Bishop* of *Rome*; whereas 1. 'Tis evident, that whatsoever *power S. Peter* was *invested* in, he might at *death,* have delegated to any *other Bishop* constituted by him, as well as to the *Bishop* of *Rome,* to *Euodius* as to *Clemens*; If it be said, he *could* not: I ask what should *hinder* him? sure no *command* of *Christ,* for he had not said a word to this mateer; Nor was *Peters* will subject to any other *authority*; and therefore certainly he might, if he would thus have *delegated* it; and that he would not, is not *pretended,* or attempted to be *proved,* and so it remains a meer *groundless, uncertain assertion,* or *conjecture* of which sort many *millions* might be produced, which yet have *really* no *truth* in them. And whereas here is pretended a *necessity* in the matter, that *where he dyed and was divested, there was necessary a succession into the dignity, which he left, and was wanting by his death to the whole Church*] This is perfectly *vain.* For 1. that *want,* if any such there had been to the *whole Church,* might by any declared *act* of his *will,* by his *delegation* and *institution* have been as well supplied in any *other* City, if he had so pleased, as in that wherein he *dyed*: and without such *expression* of his *will,* the *place* of his *death* would have been utterly *ineffectual*: There is not the least *necessity* consequent to the Archbishop of *Canterbury* his dying at *London,* yea though he were also *Bishop* of *London,* when he *dyed,* to affix the *Archiepiscopal* power to that *See*; nor doth any kind of *inheritance* depend on such *uncertain emergents* as is the *place* of a man's *dying.*

4. Suppose the *Emperour* of the *whole world* were by *particular* title of *Conquest,* or Εμφύτευσις *plantation, King* of *France* first, and afterward of *England,* and before, or at the time of his *death* had assigned one *Successor* in *France* to his *Crown* and Kingdom of *France,* and another in *England* to that *Crown,* and without any *provision* appearing to be made for the *succession* in the *Empire,* he should dye *intestate* in *England,* would there be any *necessity* now from his *dying* there, that the *King* of *England* should *succeed* to the *Empire* of the *World?* His *answer* to this *question,* and his *solid* grounds of *reason,* on which to *found* his *answer,* whatsoever it shall be, will be *useful* to the clearing of this matter.

5. Mean-while, as 'tis *obvious* to any, that he that hath long lived in one City, may upon some *sudden occasion remove,* and *dye* in *another*; so it seems most *probable,* that this *last coming of* S. *Peter* to *Rome,* was after this *manner, not long* before his *death.* For though in *Eusebius Chronicon* there is mention of his *sitting 7. years* at *Antioch,* and then *five and twenty Years* at *Rome, immediately* before his *death,* (which is no way reconcileable with evidence of *History* in many particulars) yet in the third of the *Ecclesiastical History* κεφ. α. the words are *expres.* Πέτρῳ ἐν Πόντῳ καὶ Γαλατίᾳ καὶ Βιθυνίᾳ----κεκηρυχέναι τοῖς ἐκ διασπορᾶς Ιουδαίοις ἔοικεν, ὃς καὶ ἐπὶ τέλει ἐν Ρώμῃ γενόμενος ἀνεσκολοπίσθη. Peter *having preached in* Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia----- *to the Jews, which were of the dispersion, at the end being at* Rome, *he was put to Death,* &c. And accordingly * *Onuphrius,* to *reconcile* the *contrary* appearances, is forced to place this his *third coming,* and *last return* to *Rome,* in the *last year* of the *reign* of *Nero,* under whom he was put to *death.*

* *Annot. in Platin. de vit. Pontif. in Pet. Apost.*

6. Add hereunto the affirmation of * *Epiphanius,* Φημὶ δὲ τῶν περὶ Πέτρον καὶ Παῦλον ἐπισκόπους ἄλλους καθίζεσθαι, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Αποστόλους πολλάκις ἐπὶ τὰς ἄλλας πατρίδας τὴν πορείαν στέλλεσθαι, διὰ τὸ κήρυγμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, μὴ δύνασθαι δὲ τὴν τῶν Ρωμαίων πόλιν ἀνευ ἐπισκόπου εἶναι----that *of those that belonged to* Peter *and* Paul, *there were ordained other Bishops, because they went to other Countreys to preach the faith:* and Rome *might not be without a Bishop*; which is farther *prejudice* to *S. W.* his *argument* for the *Bishop* of Romes *succession* to the *plenitude* of *S. Peters power,* upon that only score of his *dying* there; For thus his *argument* lies.

* *Her. κζ. κατ. καρποκρ.*

7. The *dignity of Primacy annext to S.* Peters *person, went along with him whithersoever he went, and remained with him living, so that he only who succeedeth him dying* (the *Bishop of* Rome) *could claim the inheritance of this sacred dignity*] To this I reply; but if the *Bishop* of *Rome succeeded* him not *dying,* but *living, i. e.* was *constituted Bishop* there in *S. Peters life* time, as *Epiphanius expresly* affirms he was, then all *force* of this *argument* is *vanished.* But of this whole matter I have formerly spoken in the *reply, ch. 5. Sect. 2.* and therefore I add no more of that.

SECT. III.

The Canon of Chalcedon. *What the Bishop of* Romes *Primacy.* ἴσα πρεσβεῖα. Constantinople *equal to* Rome *in all but place.* Ως ἐκείνην, *noting an equality.* Constantinoples *Civil greatness,* Ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς πράγμασι, in *all Ecclesiastical affairs.*

1. IN the *next* place, my *testimony* from the Council of *Chalcedon* is to be *examined* by *S. W.* But that also was largely *vindicated* in the *Reply, c. 5. sect. 3.* But *S. W.* will ask some *posing questions,* which the *Catholick Gentlemans* curiosity did not suggest to him; as 1. *How I know that* ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *signifies the Primacy, asking whether there be no other priviledges besides the Primacy*] The *Pertinence* of this *question,* is first observable. The thing which I had in hand, was to shew the *original* of the *precedence* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*: For this, I cited the *Canon of Chalcedon,* that *Constantinople* should have ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal priviledges* with *Rome* (and be in place *second,* or *next* after *Rome*) upon this *account* particularly, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν, *because is was (at that time) the seat*

2. *of*

of the Empire, affirming that to be the reason (and not any *donation* of *Christs* to S. *Peter*, or *succession* of the *Bishop* of *Rome* from him) that *Rome enjoyed such priviledges*. And upon view of this, *S.W.* very demurely asks, *how I know that ἴσα πρεσβεῖα signifies the Primacy*] What *propriety* or *seasonableness* to the matter in hand, the *original* of *Romes dignity*, is yet discoverable in this *question?*

But then 2. I shall answer this question by this other, Whether the *Bishop* of *Rome* his *Primacy* were any thing else *above* what the *Bishops* of other *Prime Metropoles* enjoyed, save only *Primacy* of *order* or *place?* If it were in his opinion no more, then, as I willingly yield it to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, so it is the *disclaiming* all his *pretended supremacy* of *Jurisdiction* over *all* others, in which alone the charge of our Schism is founded. If it were more, then the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, that confirms to *Constantinople* the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *with Rome*, excepting none but the *precedency* of *place* or *order* (ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς ὡς ἐκείνην μεγαλύνεσθαι πράγμασι, *to be advanced like her*, or *to have the like greatness in Ecclesiastical affairs*, *that* Rome *had*, being δευτέρην μετ' ἐκείνην, *second*, or *next after it*) must needs give *Constantinople* that *Primacy* also. Or in plainer terms; was the *Primacy* that belonged to *old Rome* any *real* priviledge above other *Primates?* If it were, then *Constantinople*, that must have ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal priviledges*, with *old Rome*, and not only some *few equal priviledges* without *others*, must have the *Primacy* also. For when that *Canon* confirms the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, it doth it 1. *Indefinitely*, i.e. *universally*, *equal priviledges*; and 2. That *equality is founded* in having the *same original* of those *priviledges*, which therefore *equally* devolves them all that flow from that *original*; and *Rome* had no other claim by which to hold them, in the *opinion* of that *Council*, and she is judged to have them, with one *exception*, and that only of *place* or *order*, δευτέρην, &c. (and we know an *exception* confirms the *rule* to all things which are not *excepted*) And so sure that gives *grounds* of inferring the *conclusion* in that full *latitude* of all but *place*, and so of *Primacy* in the widest notion (*place only excepted*) in which *Rome* had it. 2.

To his *second question*, *why* [ὡς ἐκείνην,] *which can exact no other interpretation but* [*as she*] *must be* rendred [*as much as she*] *deducing an equality or identity from* ὡς, *which only notes a similitude or likeness*] the *answer* is obvious: 1. Because the *parity*, or *agreement* betwixt them in that place, is specified to be in respect of *greatness*, μεγαλύνεσθαι ὡς ἐκείνην, Constantinople *shall be great in Ecclesiastical affairs as she*; that must conclude it *as great as* she, to any *reality* of *power* or *greatness*. 2. By the only *exception* mentioned, that of *place* as was before said. 3. By the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, which were *expresly* mentioned before, *equal priviledges*, and those, I hope, signifie *equality*, and not *similitude* or *likeness* only. 4. By the ground of these *equal priviledges*, the *dignity* of the *City*, of which we have the sence of *Greg. Nazianz.* in his *Orat.* 27. where he thus addresses himself unto them. Ὑμεῖς ἡ μεγάλη πόλις, οἱ πρῶτοι μετὰ τὴν πρώτην εὐθέως, ἢ μηδὲ τοῦτο παραχωροῦντες, Constantinople *is the great City* (*S. Chrysostom* calls it the *metropolis* ὅλης τῆς κόσμου *of the whole world*) the *first after the first*, *or not yielding so much as this to it*. And then if the *Church* were to keep the *like proportion*, we know what to *conclude* of it. 3.

Thus when * *Sozomen* sets down the passages of the first *Council* of *Constantinople*, where these *priviledges* were conferred, he hath these words; Μετὰ τὴν Ῥώμης τὴν Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπον τὰ πρεσβεῖα ἔχειν, ὡς νέας Ῥώμης τὸν θρόνον ἐπιτροπεύουσα. ἤδη γὰρ ὁ μόνον εἶχε ταύτην προσηγορίαν ἡ πόλις, καὶ γερουσίᾳ καὶ τάγματι δήμων καὶ ἀρχαῖς ὁμοίως ἐχρητο, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ σύμβολα κατὰ τὰ νόμιμα τὰ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ Ῥωμαίων ἐκρίνετο καὶ τὰ δίκαια καὶ τὰ γέρατα περὶ πάντα ἑκατέρα ἰσάζετο. *The Bishop of* Constantinople *shall have priviledges of dignity next after* Rome, *as having the throne* or *chair of New* Rome. *For already* (at that time) *the City had not only that appellation, and a Senate, and orders of the people, and Magistracies, the like to those at* Rome; *but also the ensigns of dignity, according to what was customary to the* Romans *in* Italy, *were adjudged to them, and the rights and dignities in all particulars were equal to them* both. 4. * l. 7. c. 29.

In the third place his *questions* are turned into *chiding the Doctor for Englishing* ἐν τοῖς ἐκκλησιαστικοῖς πράγμασι *in all Ecclesiastical businesses, whereas* (saith he) *there is no such word as* [*All*] *there*;] I answer, that if by *Englishing* he means *translating*, I did not intend to *English* it, and the varying the *letter* is an *evidence* of that. But that I so *concluded* by way of *inference* from those, and the *precedent* words of the *Canon*, I willingly acknowledge; but am not, I conceive, to be *chid* for it. For if *Constantinople* be in *Ecclesiastical affairs advanced* to the *same height* of *power* as *Rome*, if it have *indefinitely* without any *exception*, but only of *precedence* of *place*, *equal priviledges* with *Rome*; and if this it have, upon this *demonstrative account*, because *Constantinople* now is what *Rome* was, and agrees with it in that for which *Rome* had her *priviledges*, συμβασιλεύουσα, saith *Themistius*, *reigning together* with *Rome*, then must this belong to *all Ecclesiastical businesses* (*precedence* of *place* being either *excepted*, or not deemed such a πράγμα) for otherwise if there were any *matter* of the *Church*, to which *Constantinoples power* was not *exalted*, so as to be *magnified* ὡς ἐκείνη, *like* Rome, in that, whatsoever it were, there would be a *real inequality*, and so that *Canon* fail of its design of *confirming* the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, not *this* or *that priviledge* in some particular matters, but *indefinitely*, *priviledges equal* to those which *Rome* had. And therefore sure my *pen* was not herein, as he saith, *too liberal of its ink*; I made no addition to the *real* necessary *importance* of that *testimony*. 5.

SECT. IV.

Πρεσβεῖα *Honorary*, *Pompous*, *Ceremonious priviledges*. *Some such belonged to* Rome *as the first Patriarchate*, *but no supream universal Jurisdiction from S.* Peter. Constantinople *equal to* Rome *in real priviledges*. *The notion of* πρεσβεῖα *in the Glossaries*, *and in the Councils*, *further proved by* Leo's *Epistles*. *Primacy an ambiguous word*.

Fourthly, From *questioning* and *chiding*, he at length comes to some *matter*, and will give *account* why the *Popes Legates might omit to oppose the reason there given for the collation of the* πρεσβεῖα. And for his *ground work* he first lays this *supposition*, that the word πρεσβεῖα *signifies nothing but certain honorary*, 1.

honorary, pompous or ceremonious priviledges: which he *will allow might accrue to ſome Church by the reſidence of the ſupream ſecular power there.*

2. Before I give *anſwer* to this, I muſt firſt ask, what he means by *honorary, pompous or ceremonious priviledges?* If only thoſe that have no *reality* of *juriſdiction* joyned to them more than belonged to that *City before*, or abſtracted from the *collation* of thoſe *honorary priviledges*, then his words may bear this *ſence*, that the *priviledges* of a *Patriarch*, as that *differs* from a *Primate* of a *Dioceſs* in the *Eaſt* or *Weſt* (there being *fourteen* ſuch into which the *Empire* was moſt *anciently* divided) were but *honorary priviledges*, *precedence* in *Councils*, and the like, without any *acceſſion* of *power* or *juriſdiction* above that which belonged to them as *Primates*, and that *theſe* may *accrue* to ſome *Church* by the *reſidence of the ſupream ſecular power there*. And in this ſence, his words are moſt *true*, and applicable to the notion which I have of the *Church* of *Rome* from the *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, *viz.* that the *Church* of *Rome*, being ἀπ' ἀρχῆς *originally* a *Primacy* (proportionable to the *Prefecture* of the *City* of *Rome* in the *diviſion* of the *Empire*) by being the *ſeat* and *firſt City* of the *Empire*, became a *Patriarchate*, and the moſt *honourable* or *firſt* of the *Patriarchates*, and thereby had the *firſt place* in any *Oecumenical Council*, and the like. But this was *nothing* but an *honorary priviledge* without any thing of *juriſdiction* (any further than the *Province* which belonged to her as *Primate*, extended) accruing to her by theſe means. And when the *Canon* of *Chalcedon* ſpeaking of this, ſaith, ſhe hath it *aſſigned* her by the *Fathers*, διὰ τὸ βασιλεύειν τὴν πόλιν, *becauſe ſhe was the Imperial City*, the *Legates* did not, becauſe they *could* not with any *juſtice*, *oppoſe this reaſon*: but *S. W.* I ſuppoſe, will have more to belong to *Rome* than this, and means more by *Romes Primacy*, even a *ſupremacy* of *juriſdiction above all* other *Primates* and *Patriarchs*, and that as coming down to her from S. *Peter*. And againſt both theſe I argued from that *Canon* of *Chalcedon*; And by *Conſtantinoples* having *equal priviledges* with *Rome*, *i. e.* firſt the *power* of a *Primate*, then the *dignity* or *honour* of a *Patriarch*, and the *next* place to *Rome* it ſelf, and this upon this *account* of being the *ſeat* of the *Empire*, as *Rome* was, I conceiv'd, I had *demonſtrated*. 1. That *Rome*, in the *judgment* of that *Council*, had *no* ſuch *ſupremacy* of *juriſdiction*; for that was not *conferred* on *Conſtantinople*; nor indeed could it be competible to any *ſecond*, if *Rome* had been thought to have had it, and ſo was *prejudged* by the *decree* for *Conſtantinoples* having *equal priviledges* with *Rome*. And 2. That what *Rome* had above other *Cities*, *Antioch*, &c. it was not deemed to have by any *right* from *Peter*, but from being the *Imperial See*, and this by way of *interpretation* acknowledged by the *Legates* of *Rome*, by their not *oppoſing* this, when for other *reaſons*, and not for that, they refuſed to *approve* that *Canon*.

3. And this might ſerve for *anſwer* to his *ſuppoſition* of the *bare pompouſneſs* of theſe *Priviledges*. But becauſe he may more *probably* have *another* meaning in his words, that the *Priviledges* here made *equal* and common to *Conſtantinople* with *Rome*, were but ſome *pompous*, *honorary priviledges*, which notwithſtanding, *Conſtantinople* fell much *ſhort* of *Rome* in *real power* and *juriſdiction*; and ſo ſtill *Rome* might have the *univerſal Paſtorſhip*, though *Conſtantinople communicated* with it in the *ceremonious priviledges*: I ſhall therefore now farther examine the truth of this *unproved ſuggeſtion*, which indeed being thus taken out of the *ambiguous* words, and put into *intelligible* ſence, hath not any the leaſt *appearance* of *truth* in it. And having none, we may thence paſs *judgment*, what *S. W.* will adventure on, to maintain his *cauſe*, and what ſupports that *cauſe* ſtands in need of, and cannot *ſubſiſt* without them. What πρεσβεῖα ſignifie (which *Conſtantinople* is adjudged to have ἴσα *equal* to *Rome*) ſeeing it is his intereſt to *queſtion*, it muſt be decided by *competent teſtimonies*. And ſuch (for an ordinary *Greek* word) are the *Greek Gloſſaries*. Of theſe *Heſychius* may be allowed our firſt conſideration. Πρεσβεῖα, ſaith he, κράτη, καὶ ἀρχιερεῖα, καὶ ἀρχεῖα, καὶ ἱερά, it denotes *Government*, *chief Prieſthoods*, *Principalities*, and *holy offices*, or (as I may gueſs the reading ſhould be, without the laſt καὶ) *ſacred Principalities*, proportionably to πρεσβεῖς, which denotes γέροντες, βασιλεῖς, ἄρχοντες, προτιμώμενοι, *Senators*, *Kings*, *Princes*, *thoſe that are dignified above other men*. *Phavorinus* to the ſame purpoſe, Πρεσβεῖον ἢ διὰ γήρας προτίμησις, καὶ τὸ δι' αὐτὸ διδόμενον γέρας διὰ προτίμησιν, τὸ ἕνεκα ἀρετῆς γέρας, καλλεῖον, and πρωτεῖα τὰ τῆς πρώτης τάξεως γέρα, *It ſignifies that preeminence of dignity that belongs to any in reſpect of honour, or the honour it ſelf thus given in reſpect of this preeminence, Honour for eminence, Primacy, the honours that belong to the firſt order*. And *Suidas*, Πρεσβεῖα, τιμαὶ, γέρα, *dignities*; All manifeſtly ſhewing them to be *real dignities*, and *power*, and not only *pompous* and meerly *ceremonious*, which are comprehended under that word.

4. 2. Being a *ſtile* of the *Canons*, the more *ancient Canons* will beſt evidence the importance of it. In the ſixth *Nicene Canon* we find the word, where having defined, according to the *ancient* or *original cuſtoms*, that the Biſhop of *Alexandria* ſhall ἐξουσίαν ἔχει, *have power of all that are under that Patriarchate*, in *proportion* to *what was cuſtomary to the Biſhop* of Rome, it follows, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπαρχίαις, τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, *that in like manner at* Antioch, *and in other Provinces, the* πρεσβεῖα *ſhall be preſerved to the Churches*; There it ſignifies evidently the *power* that any the *greateſt Biſhops*, even of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, had in their *Churches*; and (which may prevail ſomewhat with *S. W.*) Antonius Salmatia *a Doctor of the* Ambroſian *Colledge*, who ſet out *Zonaras*'s *Comments* on that *Canon*, and is approved by *Anton. Olgiat.* the *Preſident* of that *Colledge*, and by *Camillus Olevanus*, *Commiſſary* for the *Inquiſitor*, and others, hath given it us rendred by no leſs than *privilegia*, *dignitates*, & *authoritates*, as if he had (*prophetically*) meant malice to *S. W.* his *affirmation* in this place. Yet more particularly in this matter of *Conſtantinople*, the third *Canon* of the *Conſtantinopolitan Council* hath the word, and there it is πρεσβεῖα τῆς τιμῆς μετὰ τὴν τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, *the priviledges of dignity after* Rome: and the *Scholiaſt* gives us the notion of the word, ἤτοι τὰ πρωτεῖα ἢ τὸ ἐξαίρετον, the *Primacy* (or *principal powers*) and *privilegia ſingularia*, *ſingular priviledges*, ſaith *Salmatia*. And not to be infinite in ſo plain a matter, the *Canon* of *Chalcedon* it ſelf makes it clear enough, where all the *Patriarchal power* (containing the *Primatus* in it) which was certainly conferred before, and there confirmed to the *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople*, and this *equal* to that which *Rome* formerly had *enjoyed* (which I hope was more than bare * *honorary*, *pompous*, *ceremonious priviledges*) and by name the *Ordaining* of *Metropolitans*, which was ſure a *real material priviledge*, are *comprehended* under that *title*.

* ὅτι τὸ τῆς πολιτικῆς ἢ τῆς Ἀναπῆς καὶ τῆς Θεσκικῆς διοικήσεως μητροπολίτας χειροτονεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῆς ——

This

This therefore of *lessening* or rather *annihilating* these πρεσϐεῖα, *subduing them into nothing but honorary, pompous, ceremonious priviledges*] is clearly an *invention* of *S. W.* *contrary* to the *expreß* nature of the word, the *Canonical* use of it, and the evidence of the *fact* in that *Canon*; and yet farther it is *abundantly* refuted by *Pope Leo*'s three long *Epistles*, the 54*th* to *Anatolius* the then *Bishop of Constantinople*, the 55*th*. to the *Emperor Martian*, the 56*th*. to the *Empreß Pulcheria*, and a 4*th*. also, the 62*d*. to *Maximus Bishop* of *Antioch*, all sadly complaining of the *invasion* of the *Primacies* and *rights* of the *Metropolitans* * (*alienum Jus præripere, tot Metropolitanorum impugnare Primatus*) *disturbing the Provinces which had been setled by the Decrees of* Nice; ‖ *desiring other mens rights, robbing the Churches of their priviledges instituted by Canons of Councils*, and a great deal more: which I hope *Pope Leo* would not so *declamatorily* have poured out, if all that was *confirmed* to the *Bishop of Constantinople* in that *Council*, had been nothing but *honorary priviledges*; for those sure might have been *enjoyed* by him, without invading the *rights* of any others: nor indeed can it be *imagined*, that those were the *priviledges* of the *Churches*, which the *Council* of *Nice* had setled, *Can.* 6. 5.

* *Fol.* 120.
‖ *Indebita concupiscit, illicito crescere optat augmento, Privilegia Ecclesiarum, sanctorum Patrum Canonibus instituta convellit* — *fol.* 119.

In the *next* place upon this ground, that πρεσϐεῖα signifies *no more but these honorary priviledges*, he thinks he can give *account* why the *Popes Legates did not oppose the reason there given for the collation of these* πρεσϐεῖα, *whereas*, saith he, *had the word* πρεσϐεῖα *signified Primacy, which was then as strongly and expresly pretended to come from Christs donation to S.* Peter (*as is evident in Pope* Leo's *Epistles, whose Legates presided in this Council*) as it *is now by the present Pope, then we should have heard another story*] *i. e.* then the *Legates* would have opposed the *reason* there given for the *collation* of these πρεσϐεῖα. 6.

By *Primacy* I suppose he here means the *Popes supream power over all*, and then the *whole vertue* of this *argument* lies in this, that *Pope Leo*, at the *time* of the *Council of Chalcedon*, *pretended this primacy of the Bishop of* Rome *to come from Christs donation to S.* Peter. But to this semblance of *proof*, I answer, that *S. W.* having not produced any *testimony of Leo*'s whereby we may discern his notion of *Primacy*, which is an *ambiguous* word, I must first demand the *opinion* of *S. W.* what *Leo* meant by *Primacy?* whether no more than that which belonged to the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and some other *Prime Metropolitans* in their *Provinces?* Thus, 'tis certain he useth the *Phrase* in his *Epistle* to the *Empreß*, *tot Metropolitanorum Primatus* ---- the *Primacies of so many Metropolitans:* and if this were all that he *pretended* to from S. *Peter*, such his *pretensions* were easily *reconcileable* with the *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, which neither *rob'd* him of his *Primacy*, nor prejudged his having it from S. *Peter*, but (yet farther) *supposed* and *yielded* him the *dignity* of a *Patriarch*, and of the *Prime* or *first Patriarch*, and affirmed him to have *ascended* to this *height*, by *Romes* being the *seat* of the *Empire*. But then, not to build on this possible notion of the word *Primacy* (which I must not deem *S. W.* his *notion* of it) nor yet on a *second* thing observable from those *Epistles* of *Leo*, which concerned this matter, *viz.* that he seems to *interpret* all the *injury* that was done in that *Council* of *Chalcedon*, to have been only a *breach* against the *Canon* of *Nice*, and the *dispositions* of *Ecclesiastical affairs* made there (never making the least mention, that I discern of any *other*) I answer 2. That 'tis most plain through those *Epistles* of *Leo*, that in them he neither ever deduces his *Primacy* from S. *Peter*, for the bare mentioning the * authority of the blessed Apostle *Peter*, by which he himself *acted* (and so it is certain that by the *same* Authority the *Bishop* of *Antioch* acted also) or S. *Peters* founding *Christian Doctrine speciali magisterio* in *Antioch* and *Rome* ‖, cannot be deemed the thus deducing it) nor takes *notice* of any the least *injury* done to himself by that *Council*, but only to the *Bishop* of *Alexandria*, and (especially) of *Antioch*, and other *Metropolitanes*; which is a further testimony of the *truth* of what I had said, that the *deducing* the *original* of the *dignity* of the *Roman See* from the *greatneß* of that *Imperial City*, was never so much as *quarrell'd* at by the *Legates* in the *Council*, nor, as now I add, by the *Pope* afterwards, in this whole *contest*. And then still all that I said, hath *perfect truth*, and it matters little what at any other time either *Leo* or any other *Pope* pretended, whether concerning the *universality* of their *jurisdiction*, or the *tenure* by which they assume to hold it from S. *Peter*. For thus they might *pretend*, without such *reality* of *solid* grounds, which would be *sufficient* to *justifie* them in a *Council*. 7.

* *Per authoritatem Beati Petri Apostoli. Ep.* 55.
‖ *Ep.* 62.

SECT. V.

How Constantinople *struck not at the Primacy. The Canon of* Chalcedon *doth more than strike at* Romes *supremacy. No advantage to* Rome, *that the Canon is equally derogatory to* Antioch. *Ἰσα πρεσϐεῖα not noting Supremacy, is no advantage to* S. W. *his unjustice.* Constantinoples *greatneß only confirmed by the Canon of* Chalcedon. *So the second place. The regularity of this Act, and the great force of it to conclude this debate. The* Romanists *collection of Canons.*

HIS *fifth attempt* is contained in these words, *The Dr. grants that* this decree was as *derogatory to the authority of* Antioch *as of* Rome; *but it is evident that* Antioch *pretended to no Primacy over the whole Church; therefore evident it is, that* Ἰσα πρεσϐεῖα *could not signifie Primacy of jurisdiction, nor consequently was that struck at by the tumultuous* Constantinopolitans.] 1.

Here now it is plain what he means by *Primacy*, that of *jurisdiction*, and *over the whole Church*. And this, saith he, *'tis plain the* Constantinopolitans *struck not at*. This is true in some sence. 1. That the *Constantinopolitan See* at that time pretended not to any *such universal jurisdiction* for it self. 2. That it *struck* no *blow at it* in *Rome*, nor indeed could it, not *apprehending* (that is discernable by that whole transaction) any such to be *pretended* to by *Rome*, any more than what properly belonged to it as a *Primacy* (of which there were many other in the *East* and *West*) only with the *honorary* addition of the *Patriarchate* of the *West*, and the *first* or *prime Patriarchate*, and that upon the *score* of being the *seat* of the *Empire*. But then in *another* sence, which alone is to the purpose 2.

in

in hand, it is manifest, that this *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, that confirmed the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα to *Constantinople*, doth more than *strike* at the *universal Pastorship of* Rome, *viz.* by *necessary* consequence of their *decree*; for if *Constantinople* have *equal priviledges*, and so all the *greatness* that *Rome* hath, except only the *dignity* of the *first place*; and if all that *Rome* hath above other *Prime Metropoles*, belonged to her only upon the account of being the *Imperial* City; then sure this not only *strikes* at, but *destroys* all her *pretensions* to the *universal* Pastorship from S. *Peter*.

3. What he here adds from me, as my *concession*, that the *decree* was as *derogatory to the dignity of* Antioch *as of* Rome] will little avail him in this matter. Not only because it is no *affirmation* of mine, but a *conclusion*, inferr'd *ad homines*, from a *suggestion* of the *Romanists* (as is apparent in the * place) but also, and especially, because it is *confest* by me, and *inferred* in this *arguing*, that it was only a *Patriarchal power*, and not a *Primacy over the whole Church*, that was in that *Canon* adjudged to *Constantinople*. The truth is, *Antioch* only suffered *real* diminution by the *exalting Constantinople*, some part of the *Province* thereof being *assigned Constantinople*, and both that and *Alexandria* sunk a little lower in *dignity* of *place*; *Constantinople* being now placed next *Rome*, and consequently *above* each of them. But what doth this avail *S. W.* or how can he with the least *colour* conclude thence for *Romes* either *having*, or *retaining the Primacy*, as that signifies the *supremacy over the whole Church?* Certainly nothing at all.

* *Of Schis. p.* 99.

4. With what truth it is here *suggested*, that the *Constantinopolitans* were *tumultuous*, hath been shewed at large in the *Reply*, *Ch.* 5. *Sect.* 3.

5. To his sixth I *answer*, that I grant most willingly. 1. That the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα meant not the *Primacy* in his sence, for *Supremacy*: and 2. For the *other Primacy* which *really* belonged to *Rome*, to be the *chief* or *first Patriarchate*, I grant also that this was not *concerned* or *taken* from her by the *decree*, but remained *untoucht*. But then what hath *S. W. gained* by both these? and yet these are the *utmost* that all his *endeavour* can bring in to him; for these notwithstanding, the *Council* that gives *Constantinople* ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal priviledges* with *Rome*, prejudges *Romes* having any such *Supremacy*; for that cannot *equally* be had by any *other*; and besides, that *Primacy* that *Rome* is there said to have from being the *Imperial* City, cannot be the *universal Pastorship* which it (had not, but) *pretends* to have from S. *Peter*.

6. His seventh *exception* to me is very *unjust*, in making that my *gross mistake*, and an *evidence* of my *not fetching* this *testimony from the fountains* (the *Canons* I had thought, and *Acts* of the *Council* were the *fountains*, and from thence I fetcht it *immediately*, see *Reply* p. 83, *&c.*) which was only my *inference* from the *Romanists concession*. The *Romanists*, *rejecting* this *Canon*, add, though most *untruly*, that the *Church* of *Antioch rejected* it also, (when it is visible in the *Acts* of the *Council*, that *Maximus Bishop of* Antioch *subscribed* it.) However this is most *true*, that *Leo* then pretended it for his *chief reason* not to *subscribe* it, because it was to the Bishop of *Antiochs prejudice*, and so against the *disposition* of the *Council of Nice*, which he would not see *infringed*, never mentioning any *injury* done to himself by it, or to the *See* of *Rome*. Hence (*i. e.* from this their *concession*) I assumed it was *granted* by *them*, *that* Constantinoples *acquisitions by this decree of* Chalcedon, *were as derogatory to* Antioch *as to* Rome; and from thence again I further *inferred*, 1. *That it* must be confessed of *Antioch*, that it had *equal priviledges* with *Rome* (for else how could it be as *derogatory* to *Antioch*, as to *Rome*, that *Constantinople* had those ἴσα πρεσβεῖα to *Rome*) and so 2. That *Rome* was no more but a *Patriarchate*, because it was certain, that *Antioch* was no more than a *Patriarchate*. 3. That all that *Constantinople* had wanted of *Rome* (I mean ever since it became a *Primates seat*, for of *old* it is acknowledged that *Byzantium* was much lower) was only the *dignity* of a *Patriarchate*, without any *ordinary jurisdiction* over other *Churches*. All this being thus evident, *S. W.* would fain pick some *holes*, and first *suggests* that the *Doctor tells him* ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *signifies a Patriarchate, and the pomps attending it:* I said ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal priviledges with* Rome, *signified the dignity of a Patriarchate*. And so *much* evidently it *must*, and no *more*: So much sure it *must*; for *Rome* was a *Patriarchate*, and none that was *less*, or *under* a *Patriarch*, could have *equal priviledges* with *Rome*. And no more it *could* signifie; for supposing *Rome* to have had more than *Patriarchal power* (that of *universal Pastorship*) none other could have that *equal* to it. If *Rome* were the *universal Ecclesiastick Monarch*, *Constantinople* could not be adjudged to be so also.

7. Secondly, Saith he, *Constantinople was a Patriarchate before, but the fourth, and now pretended to be the second.*] Some *truth* there is in this for the *first* part of it, but that such as is nothing to the *prejudice* of my *pretensions*, or to the *advantage* of my *Disarmer*. 'Tis true *Constantinople* was a *Patriarchate* before this *Council* of *Chalcedon*, first by a *long continued custom*, and then by force of the *Canon* of *Constantinople*; and accordingly I * took not this at *Chalcedon*, to be the *first* conferring of these πρεσβεῖα on *Constantinople*, but only a *confirming* of what formerly was deem'd to belong to that *Church*, and so the *Fathers* of *Chalcedon* expressly tell *Leo* the Pope, in their Epistle sent to him, and that what they now did, was but βεβαίωσις τ῀ τιμῆς, the *confirmation of that dignity* by this *Oecumenical Council*, which before it enjoyed. And thus far *S. W.* said truth; let him make his best advantage of it. But when he adds [*but the fourth*] as if till the time of this *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, *Constantinople* had been but the *fourth Patriarchate*, but now became the *second*, there sure my *Disarmer* struck at *adventure*, and that none of the καλὰς πληγὰς, *luckie blows*, which *Aristotle* says, they that *wink* or are *blind*, *strike* sometimes. For it is evident, that for this *second* place, the foregoing *Canon* of *Constantinople* was *equally* of force, as for the *Patriarchal* power. So the words of that *third Canon* are *expres*, ἔχειν τὰ πρεσβεῖα τ῀ τιμῆς μετὰ τ῀ τ῀ Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπον, διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὴν τ῀ νέαν Ῥώμην, *It shall have the priviledges of dignity after the Bishop of* Rome, *because the City is new* Rome; and so in the *Epistle* of the Fathers at *Chalcedon* to Pope *Leo*, it is voucht ἐβεβαιώσαμεν τ῀ κανόνα τ῀ διαγορεύοντα μετὰ τ῀ ὑμέτερον ἁγιώτατον κ῀ Ἀποστολικὸν, τὰ πρεσβεῖα τ῀ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἔχειν, *we have confirmed the Canon of the* 150 *Fathers, that assembled at* Constantinople *in* Theodosius's *reign, which decrees*, or *declares that after your most holy Apostolick See, the Bishop of* Constantinople *shall have the priviledges* (*of honour or first place.*) So when * *Evagrius* speaks of this *Act*, he doth it exactly after the same manner. *Judgment*, saith he, *was given that the See* of *Constantinople*, ἰσοτίμους μετὰ τ῀ Ῥώμης τετάχθαι,

* *See Repl. p.* 83.

Concil. Tom. 3. *p.* 475. D. F.

* *Lib.* 2. *in fine.*

was

was rightly placed, or ordered *already after the See of* Rome, that surely must be *next after*, and so not *now first* advanced from the *fourth* to this *second place*. And what hath *S. W.* gained by such *adventures* as these, undertaking to *discover* the *gross* mistakes of another?

What follows of the *tumultuousness* and *irregularity* and *want* of *freedom* in this *Act*, had been sug- 8.
gested by the *Cath. Gentl.* (and proved to have no degree of truth in it. *Reply*, p. 82, 83.----) save only that 'tis here *added*, that *it was disavowed and rejected by the Patriarch of* Antioch *and those under him.*] Which is most absolutely *false*, the *Bishop* of *Antioch subscribing*, and *defining* in that *Council*, in the next place after the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*. (Μάξιμῳ ἐπισκόπῳ Ἀντιοχείας Συρίας ὁρίσας ὑπέγραψα) and the *Bishops* of the *Metropolis* of *Asia*, *Pontus* and *Thracia*, being called out in the *Council*, and examined before the *Emperors Proxies* or *Judges*, whether they consented οἰκείᾳ γνώμῃ, *by their own will*, and *subscribing* with *profession* ἐνώπιον θεοῦ, *before God*, that they did it *willingly*, and yet these we know of all others were the most *concerned* in this *matter*. So that we may believe there was some truth in the *Fathers* words, that what they had *decreed* was, πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν μὲν πάσης συγχύσεως, βεβαίωσιν δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησιαστικῆς ταξέως, *for the removing of all confusion, and the setling of Ecclesiastical good order.* *Concil. tom. 3. p. 475. E.*

And so now I hope by what hath here been added, to what is at large set down in the Reply, I 9.
may assume that I have *obeyed S. W.* his charge, laid so heavily upon me, to *vindicate* the *validity of this Canon of* Chalc[illegible] And truly when that is done, there is little *need* of adding more *testimonies* in that matter, [illegible]ing evident by that *Canon*, that all the *Greatness* that *Rome* had above other *Primates*, was, in the opinion of those *Fathers*, by being the *seat* of the *Empire*, not by any title of *succession* from S. *Peter*; and that, beside only the *precedence* of *place*, other *Churches* had *equal priviledges* and *dignities* with it, and so that *Rome* had not the *Universal Pastorship* or *jurisdiction* over all *Churches*.

What he adds concerning the *Power* the *Pope had to reject this Canon, as being head of the Church*, 10.
is on his side a *begging the Question*, that the *Pope* is such, and withal is *answered* at large, *Repl. cap.* 5. *sect.* 4. and the truth of, * *Almaines* resolution cleared, both to the *issue*, and to the *Justice* of it, *meritò Concilium Chalcedonense Leoni resistenti prævaluisse: the Council of* Chalcedon *prevailed against* Leo's *resistance, and that justly.* * *De Author. Eccl.* 7.

* In this place he tells us, this *Act it self was not numbred among the Acts of the Council, till*---- 11.
And truly this was well *remembred* of him; for this is an *indication*, that it hath by *S. W.* his *ancestors*, * p. 113.
been thought to be *really prejudicial* to the *Pope*. (Howsoever he would by many *attempts* now *sooth* over the matter.) 2. It admonisheth us, what care we ought to have in relying on the *Romanists collections*. For it is certain this *Canon* is in all the *Greek copies* both *Printed* and *Manuscript*, and from thence the *copy* of that *Council* must *originally* be fetcht: And many of the *Romanists* confess there was such a *Canon* made, and the *story* of the *fact* is by all the *Ancients* agreed on; and *Leo's Epistles*, and many other *evidences* put it beyond all *dispute*; and indeed *Leo's Legates resisting* and not *consenting* to it, and *complaining* to the Judges, that it was done without them (when yet it was proved, that they *voluntarily* absented themselves) is an *evidence* still of the *fact*, that there was such a *Canon* made, and made by the *Council* (though without the *consent* of the *Legates*) and yet it is left out in *Charanza's Summa Conciliorum*, in the *Codex vetus Ecclesiæ Romanæ*, in *Dionysius Exiguus* his *Codex*, and in *Peter Crabs large Edition of the Councils*. I shall pass no further *censure* on these *collectors*, knowing in whose *interest* it was, that they thus did it.

SECT. VI.

The Ephesine *Canon, what 'twas vouch't to prove.* Cyprus *independent for jurisdiction as well as ordination.* Cedrenus's *mistakes.* Justinianopolis. *The Canon of* Ephesus *extended to all other Primates, as well as* Cyprus. *What influence this hath on* Romes *pretensions. The Abassines. Britains.* Romes *Patriarchy limited. The* Nicene *Canon.*

THE second *Section* begins with a view of the *Testimony*, which I brought from the *Ephesine Ca-* 1.
non, and thus it sets out; *The Doctors next evidence, that the Pope is not head of the Church, is from a Canon in the Council of* Ephesus.

But before I read on, I must take notice of *S. W.* his *constant* art of *deforming* of *arguments*, be- 2.
fore he adventures to *Answer* them, like the *persecutors* of old, that disguised *Christians* in *beasts skins*, and then brought them out to the *Theatre*, to be torn in pieces in those *shapes*. And none more *ordinary* with him than this, *viz.* having recited the *premisse* right, to affix some remote *conclusion* to it, as if it were produced by me for the *inferring* of that, and then to shew that it is *unconcludent*. Thus is it in this place. That which I vouched from that *Canon*, he duly *recited*, *viz.* that the *Independency of* Cyprus *not only from the Patriarch of* Antioch, *but from all others, was contested then, as from the Apostles times*---- But for the *conclusion*, which he pretends me to deduce from thence, he hath wholly *changed* it; for he that will review the *Tr.* of *Schism*, Sect. 6. p. 100. will find that the *conclusion*, for the proving of which the *Ephesine Canon* is produced, is not the *Popes not being head of the Church* (that had been shewed, Sect. 5. by *Antioch* and *Constantinoples* having ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal dignity* with *Rome*, which manifested *Rome* to be no more than a *Patriarchal See*) but the *reconcilableness* of this kind of *eminence* (*Patriarchal*) in *Rome*, with the αὐτοκεφαλία and *independence*, the no *subordination*, or *subjection* of other *Primates*. For 'tis manifest that this was the *last* thing mentioned in the close of Sect. 5. and then Sect. 6. begins thus: *This hath formerly been manifested.* What *this?* Why sure the *immediate Antecedent*, that *that eminence is reconcileable*. And this appears beyond all dispute, by the place to which I refer, where I say it *had been manifested, the discourse of the Original, and power, and dignity, of Primates and Patriarchs, viz.* chap. 3. Sect. 21.

where I had *manifested this very thing* (but did not so early attempt to *manifest* that which I had not then till *chap.* 4. so much as *proposed*, that the *Pope* was not *head of the Church*) And this, and this *only*, is it, which I there say is *put beyond all control by that Canon of* Ephesus. And so certainly it is; for 'tis there determined that the *Bishops of Cyprus* shall δι' ἑαυτῶν χειροτονίας ποιεῖσθαι, *be ordained by themselves* (i. e. by their own *Metropolitan*, the *Bishop* of *Salamis*, or which is all one, *Constantia* (Κωνσταντία ἡ Κύπρε Σάλαμις, saith *Stephanus*) and his *Council of Bishops*) and so in *that* respect be *independent* from *Antioch*, *though Antioch* were the *Patriarchate* of the *Orient* of which *Cyprus* was a *Province.*

3. And whatsoever *S W.* suggests, of a *dependency* of *subjection* to the *Jurisdiction of another*, *though they never received from that other their ordination*] 'tis perfectly *gratis dictum*; and if it had any *truth* in it, 'twere yet a pitiful *refuge*; For though all other *jurisdiction* be not particularly *named* in the *Canon*, yet in all reason it must be *concluded* from the *story*, that *Cyprus* was *exempt* from *Antioch* in that respect, as well as of *ordination*. For this, saith *Severinus Binius*, was the *occasion* of the *Canon*, *Johannes Antiochenus sibi Cyprias Ecclesias subdere moliebatur*, *the Bishop of* Antioch *indeavoured to bring the* Cyprian *Churches under him*; *and*, *Decretum fuit ne Johannes Cyprias Ecclesias neve alii Episcopi alias Ecclesias invaderent*, *It was decreed that* John *should not invade the Churches of* Cyprus, and farther intended, that *other Bishops should not invade other Churches*; and this say both the *Scholiasts* on the *Canon*, by force of the * *Canon* of *Antioch* and the ‖ Apostolick *Canon*, which *forbids Bishops* to *usurp ordination*, εἰς τὰς μὴ ὑποκειμένας αὐτοῖς ἐπαρχίας, *on Provinces which are not subject to them*, supposing *Cyprus* not to be thus *subject* to *Antioch*, and therefore that this was an *invasion* to *require* to *ordain* the *Bishops* there, and accordingly *Balsamon* calls the *Archbishop* of *Cyprus* αὐτοκέφαλον (ἄνευ μόνων τῶν αὐτοκεφάλων Ἀρχιεπισκόπων, τῶν Βλαγαρίας φημὶ, καὶ τῶν Κύπρε) *one that was head to himself*, no more under *Antioch* for *jurisdiction* than for *ordination*. And it visibly appears by some *contests* of this kind, which soon after followed: as when *Dioscurus Deacon of Antioch*, to gratifie *Peter* then *Bishop* there, prest vehemently at *Constantinople*, that the *Bishops* of *Cyprus* should be *subjected* to *Antioch*. (See *Surius die* 11 *Junii*; and *Baronius* c. 6. an. 485. n. 63.) By which it is as evident that all other ἐλευθερίαι, and *independency* from *Antioch*, remained intire to *Cyprus* as well as that of *ordination*, *viz.* that that *Island* having not been *converted* from *Antioch*, but by *Barnabas* his *preaching immediately*, should remain αὐτοκέφαλον under its *own Primate*: And then what was thus defined in respect of *Antioch*, did certainly exclude all imaginable *pretensions* to the like of any other *Patriarch*, no cause being conceivable, why that which was *free* within it self, and so not *dependent* on *Antioch*, the *Patriarchate* of the *Orient*, should fall under the *power* of any other *Patriarch*, which had no more *power* than *Antioch*.

Concil. Tom. 2. p. 670. A.

* *Can.* 3.
‖ *Can.* 35.

Resp. de Patriarch.

4. 'Tis true indeed, *Cedrenus* saith, that *in* Zeno's *time being taken from* Antioch *'twas put under* Constantinople, ἔκλοτε, saith he, γέγονε μητρόπολις ἡ Κύπρος, καὶ τῶν μὴ τελεῖν ὑπὸ Ἀντιόχειαν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ Κωνσταντινούπολιν, *From that time* Cyprus *became a Metropolis*, *and was not under* Antioch, *but* Constantinople. But there are more *errors* than *one* in those few words; one *mistake* there is, in making the *Island* the *Metropolis*; he should have said *Salamis*, or *Constantia* the chief *City* of that *Island*: a second, that in *Zeno's* time it commenced a *Metropolis*; which was so, long before, at the *Council* of *Ephesus*; nay even ἀπ' ἀρχῆς from the *first* conversion: a third, that it now ceased to be *under Antioch*, which as appears both by *ancient custom* and *Canons*, mentioned in the *Council* of *Ephesus* long before *Zeno*, was never under *Antioch*: and a fourth beyond the size of all the former, that being taken from *Antioch*, it now was put under *Constantinople* (which could not have been done without great *injury* both to *Cyprus* and *Antioch* too) whereas it is clear, that it was at that time vindicated to its αὐτοκεφαλία, and so after confirmed by *Justinian* (both which are taken notice of by *Nicephorus*, *Hist.* 16. *c.* 37. though mixt with some other *manifest* mistakes) and when the *Archbishop* of *Cyprus* was driven thence by the *Barbarians*, and betook himself to *Justinianopolis*, he there retained the same *liberty*, that he held by the *Ephesine Canon*, as may appear by the *sixth Council in Trullo*, *Can.* 39. which decrees, τὸ παρὰ τῶν Ἐφέσῳ ---- τῷ θρόνῳ τῷ προγεγραμμένῳ ἀνδρὶ παρασχεθέντα προνόμια ἀκαινοτόμητα παραφυλαχθῆναι, *that the priviledges confirmed to that See by the* Ephesine *Fathers*, *should be preserved to him intire*: ὥστε τὴν νέαν Ἰουστινιανόπολιν τὸ δίκαιον ἔχειν τῆς Κωνσταντινοπόλεως, so that *new Justinianopolis* to which *John Archbishop* of *Constance* was now removed, shall have the *right* of *Constantinople*, i. e. be as *free* and *independent* in his own *Province*, as the *Bishop* of *Constantinople* is in his: unless, as *Phil. Berterius* conjectures, it should be rather read τῆς Κωνσταντίων πόλεως, *that the Bishop being thus removed*, *shall retain the priviledges that belonged to that former City the Metropolis of* Cyprus, Salamis *or* Constantia. But this by the way, as a digression, not to satisfie any *importunities* of *S. W.* but to prevent *mistakes.*

5. Mean while what was thus defined there, in behalf of *Cyprus*, being by that *Canon* expresly affirmed to extend to *all other Churches* in like manner (the thing being lookt on as κοινὸν πάθος, *a common disease*, and τῶν πάντων ἐλευθερίας ἁπλόμενον, *that which concerned the liberty of all*, and proportionably, care taken for the *cure* of all, τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων διοικήσεων, καὶ τῶν ἁπανταχοῦ ἐπαρχιῶν παραφυλαχθήσεται, *the same shall be observed in the other Dioceses* (that was the word that then belonged to the *fourteen divisions* of the *Empire*, of which *Rome* was one) *and all the Provinces every where*) must in all reason be of *equal* and full force to the *vindicating* of the *liberties* of all other *Primates*, as well as of *Cyprus*, and an *evidence* that the *Preeminence* of a few *Patriarchs* is no *prejudice* to the *freedom* and *independency* of the *many Primates* and *Metropolitans* in the world; which being so, it is clear that what I pretended to prove from the *Ephesine Canon*, was really proved from it.

6. In *conclusion* of that 6. Sect. upon mention of that *order* given in that *Canon* indefinitely against all *invasions* for time to come, in *whatsoever Diocese*, that no *Bishop shall usurp a power where from the Apostles times he had not enjoyed it*, I add [*which how directly it prejudges the pretensions of* Rome, *as well as* Antioch, *is so manifest*, *that it cannot need farther demonstrating*. Here saith *S. W. Dr. H. supposes it a first principle evident by the light of Nature*, *or begs it* gratis, *that the Pope hath thus incroached*, *though that be the only thing in controversie*] and there is a *Syllogism* formed to shew the *grosness* of my *arguing*, and on this there is great *rejoycing.*

But

But to this I *answer*, 1. That there be divers things (beside *first principles*, *evident* by the *light of nature*) which *need no farther demonstrating*; such are those that are sufficiently *testified already*, such are *matters of fact*, obvious to every mans *observation*. And of this nature is that which I here speak of, that *Rome* pretends, and so *usurps*, a *power*, *where from the Apostles times she hath not enjoyed it*. The power which *Rome* pretends to, is *universal over all the world* of *Christians*. And is it not visible, that this hath not been *enjoyed* by her through *all time* ἀνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς? The *Abassines* sure are a very considerable part of the *world*, and yet were not from their *first plantation*, ὑπὸ τὴν χεῖρα, *under the hand*, or *power* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, ἢ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ, *or of his predecessors in that See*. The *Histories* of those *Æthiopick Christians* tell us, that they were very *early*, *Primi, vel inter Primos*, *the first or among the first of the Gentiles converted to the faith*, first by *Indica*, the *Eunuch* whom *Philip baptized*, Acts 8. then more fully by *S. Matthew*, *qui distributo Apostolis Orbe Æthiopiam sortito obtinuit*, *who in the division of the world among the Apostles*, *had Æthiopia for his Province*; that by the *Arabick* * *Canons*, their chief *Bishop* is called *Catholicus*, *& loco Patriarchæ*, but hath not the *power* of *Patriarch* for *Ordination*, &c. but is under the *See* of *Alexandria*; that they ‖ use not the *Roman Rites*, but are *averse* from them, * *fast exactly on Wednesdays and Fridays*; and *taste nothing* till *Sun set*, and many the like; ‖ have kept no kind of *Communion* with *Europe*, till by the *Portugueses navigation* thither, *David* their *King* was inclined to desire the friendship of *Emmanuel* King of *Portugal*, and wrote to *Pope Clement* the seventh, that he acknowledged the *Bishop* of *Rome Pastor* of *the Universal Church*: yet when upon this, soon after, *Pope Julius* the third sent *Johannes Nonnius* to be their *Patriarch*, *Claudius* the *successor* of that *David* rejecting him, the design *vanisht*, and came to nought. And so still the power of their *Ecclesiastical* affairs remains in their own *Patriarch*, saith *Damian à Goes*. I shall therefore only ask *S. W.* whether from S. *Matthews* time to this, the *Bishop* of *Rome* hath *enjoyed* a *power* over the *Abassines*? and if not, whether without *breach* of the *Ephesine Canon* he can now pretend to have any such *power*, or whether this *need* any *further demonstrating*? 7.

Codign. de reb. Abass. l. 1. c. 18.
** Nicen. Can. 36.*
‖ Codig. l. 1. c. 22.
** Ib. c. 19.*
‖ Auber. Miræ. Not. Episc. op. l. 1. c. 21.

Or if he be unwilling to go so *far* off, for the *perfecting* this *demonstration*, I shall need draw him no farther than these *Brittish Islands* of ours (the matter of our *present* controversie) and desire him to shew me any *evidences*, which may clear the *Bishop* of *Romes pretensions* to the *supream jurisdiction* over these *Churches* at the time of the *Ephesine Council*, and ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀνωθεν *from the time of planting the Christian faith* here, till then: If he can, I desire he will *produce* them, and shew us, what *Bishops* of *Rome* they were which *exercised* it. If he cannot, then the *Canon* of *Ephesus* defines μὴ καταλαμβάνειν, *that he shall not assume any such power*, or if he have *assumed*, that he shall ἀποδιδόναι, *make restitution*, *quit*, and *disclaim* that *power*. And so this, I hope, *needs no further demonstration*. 8.

Secondly, That what I say, *needs no farther demonstrating*, is not by me *supposed*, or *begged as a Principle*, but as a *conclusion* so far formerly *inferred*, that on this *occasion*, *loco non suo*, it *needed* not be *farther demonstrated*. The *interposition* of the word [*farther*] prevented all this *triumph* of his. For to omit all that had been said in the *former chapter*, which I must be allowed to think, had so far *disproved* the *Popes pretended Universal jurisdiction* in the very *fountain* of it, the *universal Pastorship* of S. *Peter*, that I should not be *bound* under the *pain* of *begging* the *question*, to prove it *anew* in every *Paragraph* of the ensuing *discourse*; to omit this, I say, the *Section* immediately precedent had manifested, that *Rome* was no more than a *Patriarchate*; and then, looking upon it as such, and no more, the *conclusion* was *irrefragable*, that *Romes* present *pretensions* are *incroachments*, and most directly not only *prejudiced*, but destroyed by that *Canon*: For 1. as a *Patriarch*, 'tis not imaginable that the *Bishop* of *Rome* can have any *authority* farther than his own *Patriarchal Province*, and that is not the *whole world*, because there be *other Patriarchs*, and *each* of them hath his distinct *assignation* of *Province*. And 2. A *Patriarch* hath no *jurisdiction* over the *Primates* in his own *Province*, the *Authority* of *Primates* and *Patriarchs* being the same, as hath been shewed out of *Anacletus*, *Tr.* of *Schism*, *p.* 58. And 3. Some *Metropolitans* were *exempt* from the *power* of the *Patriarch*, as is evident by the *Ephesine Canon*. And so still this is *destructive* to *Romes* pretensions to *Universal jurisdiction* upon this account, which had formerly from the *Canon* of *Chalcedon* been proved to belong to it, of its being a *Patriarchy*. And 4. the *Ephesine Canon* referring to *ancient* and *original Canons* and *customs*, it must be supposed to agree to the sixth *Canon* of *Nice*. Now in that *Nicene Canon* 'tis plain, that there are *bounds* and *limits* supposed to belong to every *Patriarchate*, and *order* given that they shall be observed; that *order* expresly given for *Alexandria*, that *Ægypt*, *Lybia*, and *Pentapolis* shall belong to that, and the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, *to have the power of all them*; and the reason given for the observing those *bounds*, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθὲς ἐστιν, *because this also is customary to the Bishop of* Rome. Where unless the *Roman Diocese* were *limited*, it could not possibly be a *copy*, and reason of the *limiting* of the *Alexandrian* (sure 'twould never be deemed reasonable to say, *Alexandria* must have *limits*, because *Rome* hath, if it were possible to affirm that *Rome* had none) which yet that it was (besides the *evidence* of the words themselves) 'tis the expres *affirmation* of one of their own *Popes*, *Nicholas* 1. *Epist.* 8. *Nicena Synodus Romanæ Ecclesiæ nullum contulit incrementum, sed potius ex ejus forma quod Alexandrinæ Ecclesiæ tribueret, particulariter sumpsit exemplum.* *The* Nicene *Synod conferred no increase on* Rome, *but rather took from* Rome *an example particularly*, *what to give to the Church of* Alexandria. And then if at the making of the *Nicene Canon*, *Rome* had *bounds*, it must needs follow by the *Ephesine Canon*, that those *bounds* must be to all time observed, and so that will be most *destructive* to the *Universal* (for that is *boundless*, *unlimited*) *Pastorship* of that See. So that having now joyned the force of the *Nicene* and *Ephesine Canon* into one, I shall flatter my self, that it will not be easily *broken* asunder by *S. W.* And so, though much more might be fitly added to this purpose (and somewhat hath been said in the *Reply*, *Ch.* 5. *Sect.* 5.) this shall suffice at this time, till *S. W.* shall undertake to reconcile a *limited Diocese* with *universal Pastorship*; or shew that by the *Nicene Canon*, the *Roman* was not then *such*; or that being such then, it could commence so afterward, without *violation* of the *Ephesine*. 9.

SECT. VII.

Justiniana, Αὐτοκέφαλ. *Receiving the Pall, no sign of subjection anciently. Since, it hath brought in gain and power to the Papacy. Supremacy in his own Province, not reconcileable with subjection to the Pope. A Manuscript chidden for being old, and of no antiquity. All Primates supream in their Province. The dignity conferr'd by the Emperor, not the Pope.* Locus Apostolicæ sedis. Τόπ, *for dignity,* τόπον ἔχειν φυλάττειν. *All the Popes substitutes are not his subjects. Subjection for Ordination must be subjection. Ordination of Primates by their own Council. Of inferior Bishops by Primates. Few independent Archbishopricks. All Primates such. Independency of Primates is no denying the Catholick Church. The Government whereof is not Monarchick. The Doctrine of the Councils, which the Pope vows to maintain, unreconcileable with universal Pastorship. The* Milevitan *and* Constantinopolitan *Canon. The Canon of* Nice *cited by the Pope, but not found in the Authenticks.*

1. WHat he adds in the latter part of this second Sect. concerning *Justiniana Prima*, hath in part been prevented in the *Reply*, *ch.* 5. *sect.* 6. But some things are said by *S. W.* which were not there tendred, and therefore a *few* words may be thought due to them: *First*, saith he, *Justinian's constitution is no decree of a Council.*] Neither said I it was; yet being the *constitution* of a *Christian Emperor*, and formally inserted into the *body* of the *Law*, and never checked at (that we discern, or is *pretended*) either by any *Council*, or by the *Bishops* of the *Church* then living, or noted as *irregular*, or intrenchment on the *Priviledges* or *Jurisdiction* of the *Church* of *Rome*, or any other, and yet instating on that *City all Ecclesiastical censure, supream Priesthood, supream dignity*, it is a competent *evidence*, that this might *lawfully* be done, and consequently that the *Church* of a *City* and *Province* under it, might be *exempt* from all *foreign Jurisdiction*, αὐτοκέφαλ, within it self. And then that is all that it was produced to *testifie*.

2. *Secondly*, saith he, *Justinians fact* (*in case he had pretended it*) *is not able to invalidate that sacred dignity of head of the Church, had any such been constituted by our Saviour.* But here is a *begging the question*, that the *Pope* was by our *Saviour* constituted *head* of the *Church*; and it matters not what *Justinians constitution* would have done in *that* case, when it is so far from being granted that this was the *case*. It is much more reasonable to assume, that he was not in that age deemed head of the Church, or *universal Pastor*, by *Christs constitution*, when this act of the *Emperor*, which supposes the *contrary*, was yet entred into the *Law*, and stood in full effect, and never appears to be by any in that time lookt on as an *injury* or *innovation*.

3. *Thirdly*, saith he, Justinian *never intended to crop the aspiring growth of* Rome, *as the Dr. imagines, which is manifest by his sending to Pope* Vigilius *to bestow a Pall upon his new Archbishop.*] And truly I never said *Justinian* intended it; he intended only *kindness*, and to express that, *honour* and *power* to the *place* of his own *birth*, *Achrida* a City of *Bulgaria*, making it an *Archiepiscopal* See, and *subjecting* many regions to it, but leaving it *subject* to none, an *image* of his own αὐτοκεφαλία, or *independent power*. And this was no kind of *diminution* of that *Patriarchal* power, which *Rome* then had, the *absoluteness* of *Primates* being, as was shewed, *reconcileable* with that; and this that *Justiniana* now had, being no more than such. And at this time, whilest *Justinian* reigned, the *Bishop* of *Rome* had not ascended to any greater *sublimity* than that of the first *Patriarch*; the title of *universal Bishop*, which signifies that *unlimited* power, and *Pastorship*, which is now pretended to, being the *concession* of *Phocas* to *Boniface*, after the reign of *Justinian*. And therefore it signifies very little, what is here added for an *evidence* on *S. W.* his side, *viz. Pope* Vigilius *his sending him a Pall.* That was an *honorary ornament*, which the *Emperors* first gave the *Patriarchs*, and the *Patriarchs* sent to *Archbishops* and *Metropolitans* (but was in the *East*, common to all *Bishops*) and was then far from what since it hath been taught to be, a sign of *subjection* to him that sends it. The *ancient custom* was for the new *Archbishop* to make his *profession* of the *Christian faith* before his *Patriarch*, and from him to *receive* the *Pall*, as appears by the words of * *Pelagius* in the *Canon Law*; But latter *Popes* have made this, matter of *gain* first, and then of *Power* to themselves: Of *gain*, as appears in || *Gregories Epistle* to *John Bishop* of *Corinth*, where he notes this in his *Predecessors*, but saith an *Act* of *Council* had lately past against it. As for some * *Xenia*, *gifts* or *presents*, though he tells the *Archbishop* of this *Justiniana*, that he would not have *received* such *à prædatis & afflictis fratribus, from pillaged and distrest brethren* (which seems no *rejecting* them from others) yet upon *remonstrance*, that they were sent as an *offering* to God, he *receives* them from him. As for *power* and *gain* both, *Pope Hildebrand* laid the grounds, who required that every *Archbishop* should personally come to *Rome* (bringing *presents* was a consequent to that) and receive the *Pall*, which formerly had used to be *sent*; and *Paschalis* II. that soon followed him, made a *decree* that they that asked the *Pall* should make an *oath* of *fidelity* to him; And so now the receiving the *Pall* may be an argument for *S. W.* to witness *subjection* to the *Papal power*, but signified no such thing in *Vigilius* his time, and so is no prejudice to the αὐτοκεφαλία, and *summum fastigium*, the *independent* power (as of a Primate) which *Justinian* conferr'd upon him.

* *Fidem tuam sanctæ sedi Apostolicæ exponere, usumque Pallii expetere & excipere. Corp. Jur. Decret. part.* 1. *Dist.* 100. *c.* 1.
|| *Ep. ex Regist. l.* 4. *Indict.* 13. *Ep.* 55. *Et Corp. Jur. Decret. par.* 1. *Dist.* 100. *c.* 3.
Novit sanctitas tua quia prius pallium nisi dato commodo non dabatur.
* *Epist.* 15. *ad Corp. Jur. Decret. par.* 1. *Dist.* 63. *Quia.*

4. *Fourthly*, He will hope to get some advantage by our *answer* to this *question*, *Whether all Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, supream Priesthood and supream honour, must mean a supremacy over the whole Church, or only in his own particular Dioceses?* and supposing with reason that the *former* will not be said, he fastens on the *latter*, and then, saith he, *he might be supream there, and yet subject to the Pope too.*] But to this I *answer*, that acknowledging it to belong to him only in his own *Province*, now assigned him by *Justinian*, it must yet necessarily *exclude* the *Popes Jurisdiction* over him. For he that is *supream* within himself, and hath *power finally* to *conclude* all differences, within his own *Province*, so that there shall be no *resort* to any other; is certainly so *supream* in his own *Province*, that he is not *subject* to the *Pope*. And this was the *expres priviledge* of *Justiniana*, in the *Constitution* set out by *Gothofred*,

Gothofred, Dirimant, finem imponant, nec ad alium quemvis eatur; and if other *Primates* may have the ſame *priviledge*, and *exemption* from all foreign *Juriſdiction*, I have little more to ask of *S. W.* for the *gaining* the whole *Controverſie*; for then our *Primates* ſhall have *final*, *concluſive power* within their own *Provinces*, and the *Biſhop* of *Rome* have nothing of juriſdiction here, which was all, (if not ſomewhat more) that by this *inſtance* I deſigned to demonſtrate.

It was therefore but *neceſſary*, that the witneſs that adventured to ſpeak ſo *contrary* to *S. W.* his 5.
intereſt, ſhould in the *next* place, be *defamed*; *The teſtimony*, ſaith he, is *from an old Mouſe-eaten Manuſcript of he knows not what authority*; and yet after he hath called it *old*, *&c.* he adds, it is *of no antiquity nor humanity*, and yet after all this, he ſaith moſt truly, that *he hath not ſeen the Book, and it is hard to be found.*]

I wiſh his *memory* would ſerve him from the *beginning* to the *end* of a *period*, or that he would teach 6.
us the new *art* of *diſcerning*, how that is *old*, which is of *no antiquity*; or how he can *affirm* that to be *Mouſe-eaten*, which he confeſſeth, he *hath not ſeen*. But the ſhort is, the *weakeſt* anſwers may, by being well worded, be much *improved*; and accordingly, the *authority* of an *ancient Manuſcript*, publiſhed by a *learned* Man, and ready for all men to *view*, that can but read, may be *invalidated*, and put off with the bare ſcorn, firſt of *old* (which ſeriouſly ſpoken, were the greateſt *honor* to it; ſure *new Manuſcripts* are not like *new clothes*, but like *new wine*, and *new friends*, the *old* are infinitely *better*) and then of *hard to be found*, *and Mouſe-eaten*, which are equally *pertinent*, and *true*; and for want of more *evaſions*, the *Latine muſt be ſaid to have no humanity nor antiquity in it*; and but one thing really *wanting* all this while, all degree of care that there ſhould be any the leaſt *colour* or *appearance* of truth in all this.

And when his *conſcience* could not but tell him this, and how diſcernible it was, he muſt then ſtill 7.
proceed, and add, that *this teſtimony is ſtill nothing to the purpoſe.*

And can any man imagine him to *think*, what now he ſaith, who would call in, and make uſe of 8.
ſuch *ſtrange preluſory* arts to divert it? Sure if the force of this inſtance had been *avoidable*, and he had heartily thought it ſo, that would have been *earlier* ſaid, he would not have put himſelf upon the ſo much *harder* and leſs *creditable* task of reconciling *contradictions*.

But wherefore is it *not to the purpoſe?* Why, ſaith he, *here is nothing ſaid which was not common to* 9.
the Patriarchs, and ſuch Metropolitans as Cyprus *was, to wit, that they had no ordinary appeal further, which*, ſaith he, *no way hinders but that extraordinary caſes, which could not be ended among themſelves, ſhould be carried to* Rome: *and ſo (he concludes) this leaves this Biſhop as ſubject to the Pope, as any of the Patriarchs, or any out of the Patriarchate of the Weſt was:*] And truly I can grant this concluſion, and yet receive as much *benefit* by this *teſtimony*, find it as much to my *purpoſe*, as I ever deſigned it to be. For I that conceive (and have ſhewed) every *Patriarch* to have ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal power* and *priviledges* with the *Biſhop* of *Rome*: (*place* only excepted, and the *honorary* conſequents of that) and 2. Every *Primates* power to be *equal* to a *Patriarchs*, and to be *abſolute* and *independent* from him; ſhall moſt willingly grant that neither *Juſtiniana* nor *Carthage*, after their exemption, aſcended any *higher* than theſe; and yet am thereby competently ſecured, that *Rome* had no *juriſdiction* over it, either *ordinary* or *extraordinary*; for ſo certainly the *ſummum* ſignifies, and the *finem imponant*, and the *nec ad alium quemvis eatur*, the *ſupreme power*, *concluſive*, and *excluſive* of all others, unleſs either there be *higher* than the *ſupreme*, *poſterior* to the *laſt*, and *ſome-body* who is *no-body*, and the *Biſhop* of *Rome* be all theſe.

There is no other force in this *argument*, but that which is willingly yielded to *S. W.* that what 10.
thus appears to have been the *ſtate* of *Juſtiniana*, is really the *ſtate* of all *Primates*; and then, when it is his own *concluſion*, I hope he will not *chide* me for *aſſuming* it, that in very deed every *Primate*, and ſo the *Biſhop* of *Canterbury* in this *Nation*, hath the *ſupreme Prieſthood*, *Dignity*, *Juriſdiction* belonging to him, within his own *Province*, that he hath *power* of *defining* all *controverſies finally*, without farther *reſort* or *appeal*, *ad alium quemvis*, *to any other*. And that is all *S. W.* hath as yet *acquired* by this *anſwer*.

A *next* Attempt he makes out of my *own Teſtimony* from *Juſtinian*, *Nov.* 131. *c.* 3. which he re- 11.
ſolves, will *determine it for him after all this*.] The words are, he ſhall *have locum Apoſtolicæ ſedis*, which he will render, *he ſhall be in all that Dioceſs the Popes Legate*, and after, *he ſhall have the place or lieu of the Apoſtolical ſeat, or be the Popes ſubſtitute*, asking me where I have *read the Greek* τόπος *explicated for honour or dignity*.] To this I anſwer, 1. That it were to be wiſht that he would provide him ſome *teſtimonies* of his own, and not ſo wholly, and ſo conſtantly rely on the *advantages* which his *arts* and *dexterities* can extract out of thoſe which I have produced againſt him; he muſt be a greater *Maſter* than *S. W.* yet appears to be, that can come thus *weaponleſs* into the *field*, and yet undertake to be a *Diſarmer*: Mean while 'tis viſible where his *confidence* (not his *ſtrength*) lies: it is pure *ſlight* of *hand*, that muſt work his *victories*, and ſupply all his want out of his enemies *Magazin*. How well this *truſt* hath yet ſucceeded to him, hath formerly appeared, as oft as it hath been *depended* on, and now it is as *viſible* as ever. To evidence it, I ſhall but demand, who it was that gave the *Arch-Biſhop* of *Juſtiniana* this *priviledge* (and that not *perſonally* to the *firſt*, but to all that ſhould *ſucceed* in that See) was it the *Pope*, or the *Emperour?* If it had been the *Pope*, there might have been ſome *colour* for *S. W.* his *affirmations*, for then he might reaſonably be yielded to make his own *Legate* or *Subſtitute*; and perhaps, to do it to a *whole ſucceſſion*, to affix that *honour* to a *particular* See. But it is plain, my *Teſtimony* was fetcht out of *Juſtinian's Novel*, not out of *Vigilius's Epiſtle*, an *extract* or *Copy* of the *Emperours* (διάταξις) *conſtitution*, not of the *Popes deputation*. And I hope the *Emperour* is not ſo much *Maſter* of the *Popes* Acts and will, as that he can *decree*, to whom (to all *poſterity*) the *Pope* ſhall give his *Deputations*. If he be, this is as much as I ſhall *demand* at this time; and that, I am ſure the *Novel* will give me, that whatſoever is meant by this *locum Apoſtolicæ ſedis*, the *place of the Apoſtolical See*, it was not by the *Pope*, which ordain'd the *firſt Biſhop* of *Juſtiniana* (yet none of the *ſucceeding*) but by the *Emperour*, who raiſed that See to that *ſummum faſtigium*, *ſupreme* height, conferr'd upon him.

12. In this matter it is possible *S. W.* may have a little *mistaken* my meaning, and therefore to *cure* it in him, or to *prevent* that *possibility* in others, I assure him I mean by the *phrase*, *locum Apostolicæ sedis*, the same that he would have me, the *place of the Apostolick*, as that signifies the *Roman seat*. And though the *particle* [*an*] instead of [*the*] may seem to *prejudice* that sense, yet I never made that use of it, but contrariwise in the *Reply*, added the *Greek* words, which take away all *ambiguity*, τόπον ἐπέχειν αὐτὸν τῆ Αποστολικῆ Ῥώμης θρόνῳ, that he *shall in the Provinces subject to him, hold the place of the Apostolical throne of* Rome; But still this is far enough from *favouring S. W.* his *pretension*, of his being *no more but the Popes substitute*. For as that is already *prejudged*, by the *Emperors* giving him this *place*; so other *circumstances* concur, to *avert* that interpretation. 1. The expres's words of * *Julianus Anteces'sor*, *Nov.* 109. *Archiepiscopum Justinianæ Primæ eadem jura super Episcopos sibi subjectos habere, quæ Papa Romanus habet super Episcopos sibi suppositos, that the Arch-Bishop of Justiniana shall have the same rights over the Bishops that are under him, which the Pope of* Rome *hath over the Bishops that are under him.* This gives him as clear an example of my *interpretation* of τόπον, and as full an *answer* to his *question*, as he could have wisht; He asks *where I met it, for honour and dignity?* And I *answer*, I rendred it *place* or *dignity*, and here it signifies that, yea and *more* added to it, the *power* and *jurisdiction* over those which are under him, *equal*, because the *same*, with those which *Rome* had over her *subjects*. And if he desire more *testimonies* for this notion of τόπος, I shall not omit to *satisfie* his *curiosity* in that also, though it be now very *impertinent*, and *superfluous*. ‖ Of *Alexandria*, *Dion. Chrysostom* hath these words, ἡ δὲ πόλις ὑμῶν τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῷ τόπῳ πλεῖστον ὅσον διαφέρει, καὶ περιφανῶς ἀποδέδεικται δευτέρα τῶν ὑπὸ τὸν ἥλιον, *for your City doth very much excel both in greatness and place* (sure that must be *dignity*, attending that *greatness*) *and is illustriously demonstrated to be the second of all under the Sun*, *i. e.* next unto *Rome* in *dignity*. So when *Josephus* saith of *Antioch*, τρίτον ἀδηρίτως ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις οἰκουμένης ἔχει τόπον, *it hath the third place in the world which is under* Rome, he expresses what he means by τόπον, μεγέθους ἕνεκα καὶ ἄλλης εὐδαιμονίας, such as belongs to it in respect of the *greatness*, and *other felicity*; that, sure, is the *dignity* of that *City*. And what thinks he of the words of *Ausonius*, *Ambarum locus unus*, they *have both of them the same place*; that sure must be the *same dignity*. And if *S. W.* will but have patience to spend a very little *necessary* time in *Books*, I believe he will soon be able to throw in more *examples* under this head.

* *Vid. Phil. Bertr. Pithæ. l. 2. c. 3. Auber. Miræi Not. Episc. l. 1. c 9.*

‖ *Or. 22. ad Alexand.*

De Bell. Jud. l. 5. c. 2.

13. Lastly, *S. W.* must learn a *difference* betwixt τόπον ἔχειν, ἐπέχειν, *to have, to hold a place*, on one side, and τόπον τηρεῖν, φυλάττειν, διέπειν, *to keep, supply, and minister a place*, on the other side. The latter of these indeed doth constantly belong to a *substitute*, as of the *Pope*, &c. his τοποτηρητὴς, or *place-keeper*, which the *Law* deduces ἐκ τῆ τηρεῖν, ὅ ἐστι φυλάσσειν ἤτοι ἀναπληρῶν τὺς τόπυς τῶν κελλόντων αὐτὺς, *from keeping or supplying the places of them who send them*, as is frequently to be met with in the *subscriptions* of *Councils*; But to τόπον ἔχειν or ἐπέχειν, to *have* or *hold* a *place*, (as when they are used of having the *first* or *second* place) that sense of *substitution* or *vicegerency* is not *applicable*, but this other of *having*, or *possessing* such a *dignity*, as one's own, in his *own right*; I shall not need to seek instances of this, the thing being fully *cleared*, as far as concerns the business in hand, by *comparing* the words of *Julianus Antecessor*, even now *vouched*, with these in *Justinian's Novel*, both speaking of the very *same* thing, and one expressing it by τόπον ἐπέχειν, *locum habere*, *to have the place*, and the other by *habere eadem jura*, or δίκαια, *to have the same rights or powers*, which evidently proves the matter in hand, and satisfies his demand, that τόπος *place* doth, and doth in this *Novel*, signifie *dignity*, and that the *place of the Apostolick seat of* Rome, is the same *power* in his, that the *Pope* hath in his *Dioceß*, which was the thing *incumbent* on me to be proved.

Vid. Zonaram in Præf. ad Concil. Carthag. p. 384.

14. And having thus far attended him, One farther *misadventure* there is yet in this *Answer* of *S. W.* (and there could not have been *more* expected in one *paragraph*) For having resolved from the words of the *Novel*, that this *Bishop was the Popes Legate* in all that *Dioceß*; he concludes it *thence clear, that his Dioceß remained, notwithstanding all these priviledges, subject to the Pope.*

15. How clearly this is hence *deducible*, will soon be discerned; That the *Pope* may choose one of his *subjects* to be his *Legates*, I willingly grant; but it follows not from *hence*, nor from any other *medium* here tendred by *S. W.* that this *holds* in *conversion*, that whosoever is his *Legate*, is his *subject*. And yet this is *absolutely* necessary to the *clear inferring* his *conclusion* from this *medium*, it being certain that he which by being the *Popes Legate* is not made *free* from his *subjection*, may yet be upon some other *account*; such is the *Emperors* giving him here the *summum fastigium*, and the *final, conclusive*, and *exclusive power* forementioned.

16. Now that the *Pope* may have a *Legate* or *Substitute*, who is not his *subject*, may 1. appear by the *testimony* of *Balsamon* in his *Preface* to the *Council* in *Trullo*. Where both from the *nature* of a *Legate de latere*, that it is one that must ὅτε δεήσει, παρεσιδεῖν, *represent his person, when it is needful*, and from the *Bishop* of *Thessalonica*, *Athens*, *Corinth*, *Crete*, *Patræ*, and *Ravenna* and others thus *representing* him, over whom, saith he, the *Pope* hath no δίκαιον χειροτονίας, *right of ordination*, he concludes, ἐκείνυς εἶναι τῶ Παπᾶ λεγάτυς ὲς ὁ καθ' ἕνα τύτων ὑρίζατο, ὁ μὲν ἔχειν τοσύτης ὑπεροχῆς ἐπισκόπυς ὑφ' ἑαυτὸν-----*That those are the Popes Legats, whom he hath particularly chosen, but yet that they are not all within his bounds under him, but that this of having Legates was invented because of the length of the way, not as of his subjects*, but as of those that were *neerest* at hand, to *represent* him the more *easily*.

Pag. 359.

17. If *Balsamons* judgment be not here thought fit to be taken, as being no *friend* to the *Roman* greatness (though I know no *obligation* lies on me to rely on no body but *S. W.* his *friends*, as long as he is so careful not to *believe*, or be *concluded* by his *enemies*, that in this, and generally in his *affirmations*, he makes use of no other but his *own testimony*) I shall offer this confirmation of it. A *superior* (or an *equal*) may have the *proxy* of an *inferior*, and be *substituted* by him, as is evident in the *Guardian substituted* by the *Pupil*, and *acting* for him. And so a *Bishop* may in *Council* have the *proxy*, and so *represent* the *person* of another *Bishop* from whom he hath no *dependence*, or *subjection*. *Philippi* was a *Metropolis* of a *Province* of *Macedonia*. Besides the words, *Act.* 16. 12. πρώτη πόλις τῆς μερίδος, a *first* or *prime City of that portion of Macedonia*, ‖ *Photius* is clear in it, ἡ Φιλίππων πόλις τῆς Μακεδόνων ἐπαρχίας μητρόπολις ἔσα, *the City of Philippi the Metropolis of a Province of Macedonia*, and by be-

‖ *Ep. 247.*

ing

ing ſuch, it is ſecured from being under any other (no more than) *Metropolis*. Yet in the great *Council* of *Epheſus*, *Flavianus* of *Philippi* ſupplied the *place* of *Rufus* of *Theſſalonica*, and ſo was his *Legate*, had his τόπον *place*, in *S. W.* his *ſenſe*. And I ſuppoſe nothing is more *ordinary* in *Councils* than this, that one *Metropolitan*, that is *preſent*, ſhall receive the *proxy*, and ſupply the *place* of any other *Metropolitan* indifferently, without loſing his *liberty*, or becoming his *ſubject*, or *inferior*, whoſe place he *ſupplies*: and if in thoſe parts, the *Biſhop* of *Juſtiniana* were by the *Pope* thus *delegated*, and made his *perpetual ſubſtitute* (as by the *Novel* 'tis plain he was *not*, for whatſoever was meant by it, 'tis evident that from the *Emperour* he had it, not from the *Pope*) yet would not that *conclude* him *ſubject* to the *Pope*, when the *Emperour*'s ſo liberal *donations* had explicitely *exempted* him.

His *next anſwer*, or *endeavour* (again, after his old manner) to ſhew me *doing againſt my ſelf*, and 18.
by a *Teſtimony* out of *Nicephorus*, *convincing*, as he ſuggeſts, *all my proceſs of nullity*, was made uſe of before him by the *Cath. Gent.* and is anſwered in the *Reply*, ſect. 5. n. 5, &c.

But we are not yet at *end* of this matter. For beſide that from the *Pope*'s *ordaining* the *firſt Biſhop*, 19.
he will needs *conclude*, that he *conſented to his erection* (which I ſhall willingly *grant*, ſo he mean not *authoritative conſent*, aſſuring my ſelf the *erection* was an act of the *Emperour* only, wherein the *Pope* had nothing to do) and ſo *ſomewhat* again, from his *giving him the Pall*, though he know not well what; *It was*, ſaith he, *a ſign of ſuperiority, and a kind of benediction, and at leaſt an honour, if not a juriſdiction* (and if it were thus, then *perhaps* it was *no juriſdiction*, and I have accounted for this of the *Pall* already) beſide theſe, I ſay, he proceeds in theſe words, *In the next Paragraph the Doctor tells us, that this particularity that his Succeſſors were to be conſecrated by their Council of Metropolitans, is a ſecond inſtance of the point in hand; and* (ſaith he) *I do not deny, but ſometimes to be ſubject for ordination, was a ſign of ſubjection, but not always. The Biſhop of* Oſtia *hath the priviledge to conſecrate the Pope, yet the Pope is not held to be his ſubject.*---]

Here be ſome conſiderable *frailties* diſcernible; firſt, in his *intellective faculty*, which had made this 20.
particularity, that his *Succeſſors were to be conſecrated by their Council*--- to be a *ſecond inſtance of the point in hand*, whereas 'tis moſt *evident* in the place, that the *whole precedent diſcourſe* of the *erection*, and *independency* of *Juſtiniana Prima*, and not only this *branch* of it, was the *ſecond inſtance*, as the *priviledges* of the *Archbiſhop* of *Carthage* had been the *former*, p. 101. but this was but a *ſlip*. What then was the *ſecond*, that to *be ſubject for ordination was ſometimes a ſign of ſubjection, but not always*. In *propriety* of ſpeaking indeed, *being ſubject* cannot be a *ſign of ſubjection*, either *always*, or *ſometimes*; but yielding him that *impropriety* alſo, what ſhall we ſay to this part of the *propoſition*, being *ſubject* for *ordination*, *is not always a ſign of ſubjection*] This is ſomething like the hard headed reſpondent, that ſatisfied himſelf, that a *Gooſe-pie* was not a *Pye*; for none but that ſort of *Logick* can ever conclude, that he that is *ſubject* for *ordination* is not *ſubject*.

But ſure *S. W.* had here ſome good *meaning* alſo, that *ſubjection for ordination* doth not *argue all* 21.
kind of *ſubjection*, or that he may be *ſubject* for *ordination*, that is not *ſubject* for *juriſdiction*: But 1. this is no way *proved*; 2. it can by no means be *aſſiſtant* to *S. W.* unleſs he could prove *è converſo*, that they that are *ſubject* for *juriſdiction*, may yet not be *ſubject* for *ordination*, for that only can *anſwer* my *argument* of *Juſtiniana*'s not being *ſubject* to *Rome*'s *juriſdiction*, becauſe 'twas not *ſubject* to it for *ordination*, the *Biſhop* being to all *ſucceſſion* allow'd by *Juſtinian* to be ordained by his own *Council* of *Biſhops*.

As for that which he ſaith in the *inſtance* of *Oſtia*, *that that Biſhop hath the priviledge to conſecrate* 22.
the Pope, yet the Pope is not held his ſubject] it might eaſily have been ſeen through by *S. W.* his *Optick*. For no doubt the *Pope* may be *conſecrated* by him, without being *ſubject to him for ordination*, as the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* was wont to be *conſecrated* by the *Biſhop* of *Heraclea*, one of his *Suffragans*, or as the *Kings* of *England* have generally been *crowned* by the *Biſhop* of *Canterbury*, without any *ſubjection* on either ſide, either for *ordination*, or *coronation*. And ſo all *Primates* are, I ſuppoſe, to be *conſecrated* by the *Council* of their *own Biſhops*, and there is no ſhew of *ſubjection* in all this, for it being impoſſible that a *Primate* ſhall become ſuch, without being *conſecrated*, it is neceſſarily *conſequent* to his αὐτοκεφαλία or *independence* from all other *Superiors*, that his own *Biſhops* ſhould *conſecrate* him, but this without any note of *ſubjection* herein; But if the caſe be put of a *Biſhop* which is *ſubject* to the *juriſdiction* of ſome *ſuperior Biſhop* (as *S. W.* muſt ſuppoſe the *Biſhop* of *Juſtiniana* to have been) *Metropolitan*, *Primate*, or *Patriarch*, I ſhall then demand, whether *ſubjection* for *ordination* would not be that *Biſhops* portion, as well as any other kind of *ſubjection?* To this caſe he knows his *inſtance* of *Oſtia* belongs not, and as little that other which he brings of the *decree of the Council of Sardica*, that the *next Province ſhall give Biſhops to a Province that wants*, for this is viſibly but an *act* of *charity* to thoſe that *want* that *almes*; And when that *Province* is once *furniſht*, I ſhall ſuppoſe for the *future*, it may lawfully give *Biſhops* to it ſelf.

As for his other two *inſtances* of *Alexandria* giving the *Indians Biſhops*, and *conſecrating* the 23.
Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, 'tis notorious that that *Patriarch* was cuſtomarily conſecrated by his own *Suffragan*, the *Biſhop* of *Heraclea*, and for the *Indians*, all that is pretended is, that the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria gave them Biſhops*, when they wanted, and ſo that falls under the other forementioned head of *mercy*, which is diſtant from all colour of *juriſdiction*; or if it did not, I am no way concern'd to vindicate the *Indians liberties*, or *non-ſubjection* to that *Patriarch*; ſo that ſtill it remains moſt firm, that if *Juſtiniana prima* had been *ſubject* under the *obedience* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, the *Biſhops* of *Rome* would have continued to *ordain* him, as a *Primate*, or *Patriarch ordains* all that are under their *ſubjection*; and this being part of *Juſtiniana*'s *priviledge*, that the *Archbiſhop* be *ordained* by his *own Council*, as all other *independent Archbiſhops* (of which the ſtore is not great) and all *Primates* and *Patriarchs* are, this is a ſtrong *prejudice* to the *Pope*'s having any *juriſdiction* over him.

What here next follows, is by asking, *Who can tell what the Doctor means, when he ſaith the Em-* 24.
perour did all this only by making Juſtiniana *a Primate's or chief Metropolitan's See, and that* Carthage's *being the prime Metropolis of* Africk, *is expreſſed by having the ſame priviledges with* prima Juſtiniana? pretending *that this is nothing elſe, but to mock my Auditory*, and that *as far as he underſtands*,

ſtands, theſe words ſignifie that the Emperour ſaid only, be thou a Metropolis, and in ſo ſaying, gave all thoſe priviledges.] 'Tis much, his *underſtanding* ſhould be rendred ſo *incapable* in an inſtant, which hath ſerved him ſo *faithfully*, and ſure paſſed for very *pregnant* and *piercing* all this while. It is as if a Man ſhould ſay to himſelf, γενέσθω σκότος, καὶ ἐγένετο, Do not *ſee* what is before thine *eyes*, and then let him *look* never ſo *intently*, he ſhall be able to *deſcry* nothing; Otherwiſe ſure the *words* are plain, and the ſenſe as *diſcernible*, as of any period in the *Book*, that *every Primacy* is really thus *independent*, as a *Primacy*, (but that is not all one with a *Metropolis*, as he would ſet it. *Juſtiniana* had *ſix Metropoles* under it, ſaith * *Miræus* from *Nectarius* Biſhop thereof:) and ſo that all *Juſtinians Privileges* beſtowed on *Achridæ*, the place of his birth, are no more than what every *Primate* by right enjoyed, and conſequently that when *Carthage* was raiſed to this *Privilege* of *Independency*, or *Primacy*, being but an *Arch-biſhops* See, and every ſuch not being neceſſarily a *Primacy*, the *compendious* method was, to give it the *Privileges* of *Juſtiniana*, which being but an *Archbiſhops* See, had yet the *Independent exemptions* of a *Primacy*.

* *Not. Epiſc.* l. 1. c. 9.

25. Here is no *ſubtilty* to *torture S.W.* his *underſtanding*, but groſs matter of *right*, and of *fact*; the former of which he might have ſeen *deictically* laid before him, in *chap.* 3. *ſect.* 21, *&c.* if he had not *faſtidiouſly* overlookt it, indeavouring to perſwade his *Reader*, that there were not *five words in that Chapter which could in any way be preparative to the queſtion before us*, whereas indeed nothing can be more to the purpoſe, than the due ſtating the *original* and *rights* of *Primacies*, which was there handled.

26. But perhaps there was ſome *obſtruction* in the way, which thus made *plain* ſenſe ſo *unintelligible* with my otherwiſe *quick-ſighted Diſarmer*, and if we may believe him, 'twas this, that *all the Doctor's labour and the Texts by him cited, wherein every privilege is ſet down ſo particularly*, had infuſed this prejudice into him, *for*, ſaith he, *they make it manifeſt that there were none, or not eminent examples of any ſuch Cities, or Biſhopricks, and therefore ſo many particularities were neceſſary to be expreſſed, and it be made an example to others. Yet upon this relieth the Doctors main evidence, and demonſtration, though if you will believe him, the concluſion of it ſelf is moſt certain, and might otherwiſe be teſtified by innumerable evidences, which he ought to ſuppoſe the Doctor omits for brevity ſake.*

27. If there be now any *ſincerity* in this *Diſputer*, here will be a *trial* of it: for this *prejudice*, and miſapprehenſion of his own, being once removed, the matter will be ſo *clear* before him, that he will not be able to *eſcape* the *apprehending* of it.

28. Firſt then he is to know, that every *Archbiſhop's See* is not *independent*; Nay, that of ſuch there are but few examples, *viz. Juſtiniana*, and *Cyprus*, and *Carthage*, and *Ravenna*, and the *Metropolis* of *Iberians*, now called the *Georgians* in *Aſia* (as * *Miræus* concludes from the *Council* of *Antioch*) and ſo he ſees the reaſon, why *four* the moſt *famous* of theſe, were the *choſen inſtances* to be *inſiſted* on, *viz.* of *Archiepiſcopal Sees*, that were αὐτοκέφαλαι, *heads* to themſelves, ſubject to no other, whether *Primate*, or *Patriarch*, nor conſequently to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*.

* *Not. Ep.* l. 1. c. 9.

29. Secondly, That all *Primates* are of this *independent* nature, no way differing from *Patriarchs*, but in reſpect of *place*, or *order*, having, what *Juſtinian* gave *Achridæ*, *Summum ſacerdotium, ſummum faſtigium, ſummam dignitatem, omnem Eccleſiaſticam Cenſuram, the higheſt Prieſthood and Dignity, all Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, power of deciding all Controverſies within their Province*, and doing this *ultimately*, ſo that it is not *lawful* to *reſort* or *appeal* to any other; and ſo alſo he ſees that there be as many *evidences* againſt the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, as there are *evidences* in *Books*, of the *Independent power* of *Primates*: thoſe I was bold by *S. W.* his good leave, to call *innumerable evidences*, not knowing any certain way to help me or him to the *certain number* of them. And ſo this great *poſing* riddle is explained, I hope, to *S.W.* his *capacity*: and that he may not think my *ungrounded affirmations* have helpt it to this *perſpicuity*, I refer him to the *Council* of *Epheſus*, where what was adjudged to *Conſtantia* is extended to all other διοικήσεις or *Provinces*, that the *Primate* thereof, he that had been ſo ἐξ ἀρχῆς *from the beginning*, ſhould be *independent* from all others; or, if he will, to the *conſtitution* it ſelf, wherein *Juſtiniana's independent* power is ſet down, Νεαρ. Διαλαξ. ρλα. For there, as it follows immediately, καὶ ὅμοιον τρόπον---- that the *Archbiſhop* of *Carthage* ſhall have this δίκαιον ἀρχιερωσύνης, *this priviledge of the Chief Prieſt-hood in the like manner, that Juſtiniana*, ſo it concludes. Καὶ ἄλλαι δὲ πόλεις καὶ τούτων ἐπίσκοποι οἷς ἐν διαφόροις τόποις μετροπολιτικὸν δίκαιον παρεσχέθη, τῇ τοιούτῳ προνομίᾳ εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς ἀπολαυέτωσαν, *And other Cities, and the Biſhops of them who in ſeveral places have Metropolitical juriſdiction allowed them, ſhall for perpetuity enjoy the like prerogative.* The τοιούτῳ *the like*] muſt ſurely refer to the *precedent* examples of *Juſtiniana*, and *Carthage*, and then the *concluſion* is evident, that all *Primacies* ſhall enjoy the ſame (for ſo I conceive 'tis neceſſary the place muſt be interpreted of *Prime Metropoles*, or *Primacies*, and not of every lower *Metropolitical See*, for ſuch had not that *ſupreme Prieſthood*, &c.) which was adjudged to *Juſtiniana*, there being ſix *Metropoles*, as was ſaid, under that, and many under each *Primate*.

30. But there is yet one *reſerve* behind, and that he promiſes, will *make any ſenſible man underſtand my former diſcourſes, that they were all vain and wicked*, viz. that this my *reaſoning* from the *independent power veſted in each Primate, is the denying of the Catholick Church, of which we ought to be members.* And this he thus *infers* from my diſcourſe, *You ſay*, ſaith he, *every chief Metropolitan was independent from all others, they made therefore ſo many abſolute Churches, therefore made not any one Church; where then is the Catholick Church? many houſes to be one houſe, is as fairly contradictory, as many men or horſes to be one man, or one horſe, and ſo of many Churches to be one Church:* Adding from S. *Cyprian*, that a *Church is a People united to their Biſhop: if then*, ſaith he, *there be a Catholick Church, there muſt be a Catholick Biſhop, and taking away the obedience of one Biſhop, you cannot ſave one Church*] What *ſolidity* there is in this *laſt* refuge will be ſoon diſcernible, by going along with him ſtep by ſtep: For, 1. The affirming an *independent* power to be veſted in *each Primate*, is far from denying a *Catholick Church*. All thoſe *Primates* are eminent *Governours* of ſo many διοικήσεις or *diviſions*, of which the World firſt, and now the *Catholick Church* conſiſts.

2. Nothing

2. Nothing here produced by *S. W.* hinders in the least, but that every such *παροικησις dioceß* in the ancient notion of that word, for that which contains many *Provinces* under it, may be an *absolute Church*, *Independent* from any Superior on earth, under no others *jurisdiction*, but that of its own *Primate*. 31.

For thirdly, when from *thence*, i. e. from the *absoluteneß* of all the *Primacies*, he concludes, that *therefore they* make *not one Church*, there is no *consequence* in that; Many *particular*, or *National Churches*, each of them *independent* from any *Superior*, may yet *fraternally* be connected one with another, and make up the *Catholick Church*, as many *Nations* of the World, no one *subjected* to another, but each *independent*, and *αὐτοκέφαλοι*, may make up the *World*, or *Universe*, and yet these, as now 'tis evident, be under no one *Governour* on earth, *Emperour*, or whatever *Monarchical* [illegible] *preme* power. And so still his curiosity is satisfied, he *sees*, where the *Catholick Church* is. 32.

4. Though *many houses* cannot be *one house*, any more than *many horses*, or *men*, can be *one horse*, or *man*, yet *many houses* may be *one City*, many *Cities* one *Province*, many *Provinces* one *Dioceß*, many *Dioceßes* one *World*, or one *Catholick Church*. And the word *Church* being both in *propriety* and *vulgar* use capable of as many significations, as there can be sorts of *Christian cœtus*, or *assemblies* imaginable, is thereupon an *ambiguous* word, and belongs to the *larger*, as well as *narrower Societies*, equally fit to signifie a *Parochial*, *Diocesan*, *Provincial*, *National*, or *Universal Church*, and then many of these in the *narrower*, less *comprehensive* notion, may yet be but one in the *larger*, and more *comprehensive*. Thus we know *many heaps* may be put together, and make *one heap*, *many Rivers* may meet, and make *one River*; And there can be no need of *examples* to illustrate this so obvious visible truth, that many *Parish Churches* among the *Romanists*, as well as us, make one *Diocesan*; many *Diocesan*, one *Provincial*; many *Provincial*, one *National*; and many *National*, one *Catholick Church*. And so still for all his colours of the *house*, the *man*, and the *horse*, we have not lost the *Catholick Church*: such thin *Sophisms* may be seen through by *ordinary* eyes, and so, many particulars be as competent as one could wish, to make up an *Universal*. 33.

5. When S. *Cyprian* saith, a *Church is a People united to their Bishop*, 'tis certain he speaks of a *particular Church*, and so of a *particular Bishop*. The place where S. *Cyprian* saith it, is not referred to by him, but I who had * used the *testimony*, know where to turn to it, *Ep.* 69. where the Church is defined *Plebs Sacerdoti adunata, & pastori suo grex adhærens, a People united to their Priest, a Flock adhering to their Shepherd*: and the circumstances of the *Epistle* make it clear, that the *Bishop* there mentioned, is such as himself, the *Bishop* of *Carthage*, and every of the *Coepiscopi* with him, and consequently the *Church* there spoken of, the *Church* of *Carthage*, the exact *parallel* to the *Church* of *Justiniana*, now before us; and if you would know how that being a *Church*, can joyn with other *Churches*, and remain a *Church* still, he will tell you in that *Epistle*, that *individual concord and charity of all the members of the Church*, is that *vinculum unitatis*, *band of unity*, *by which all Churches over the whole world may conjoyn and become one together*. 34.

* Of Schism, p. 41.

6. When from this one *testimony* of *Cyprian* hastily cast down, he makes such full speed to conclude, that if there be a *Catholick Church*, *there must be a Catholick Bishop*; what is this but to infer, because *Carthage* is governed by *one Bishop*, and every other *Dioceß* by another, therefore the *whole world* is govern'd by one *Bishop*. Because *Spain* is governed by one *King*, and *France* by another, therefore the *whole world* is governed by *one* also; which as it is *de facto*, visibly false, so the *unproved* asserting of it, is founded on two *Hypotheses*, neither of which hath the least truth in it. *First*, that every the *vastest* body (for such is the *Universal Church* all the *world* over) must be under some one *particular government*; and *secondly*, that that *particular government* of the *Church* must needs be *Monarchical*; whereas 1. the whole *managery* of the *world* is certainly transacted without being under any *common governor* on earth; and no doubt the affairs of the *Church* may be so too, a *fraternal union* and *communion* of all *Patriarchs*, or even of all *Primates*, each ruling in their several *Provinces* by the *Laws* of *Christ*, may suffice for all *ordinary* wants of all; *Ecce Roma, ecce Carthago, ecce aliæ & aliæ civitates*, saith S. *Augustine*, in Psal. 44. *filiæ Regum sunt,-----& ex omnibus fit una Regina*; *Behold Rome*, saith he, *behold* Carthage, *behold other, and other Cities, they are daughters of Kings, and of all of them one Queen is made*. And 2. for *extraordinary*, an *universal Council*, or assembly of all these, may by way of *Aristocracy*, provide for, and administer them. And so still the *Catholick Church* is *saved*, and all our *Phænomena* preserved intire, without either *talking* (as he saith, *like a Saint*) of *Christ our head in heaven*, or paying all our *obedience* to any *one supreme Bishop* upon earth, as to him that is by *Christ* thus delegated to *preside* (but will never be able to produce his *commission*) over the *whole* world. 35.

This *fifth* Chapter of the *Tr.* of *Schism* I concluded with some words of our *Bishops*, in *Convocation* 1537. (and the same are recited again in the *Necessary Doctrine*, *Anno* 1543.) and there was great evidence of *reason* in them, two things affirmed, the *truth* of which is to be *contested* by *proofs*, and if *evinced* on our side, the whole *controversie* now depending betwixt us is concluded, 1. That it was many *hundred* years before the *Bishop* of *Rome* could acquire any *power* of a *Primate* over any other *Bishops*, which were not within his *Province* of *Italy*. 2. That the *Pope* now professing at his *consecration*, that he will *inviolably observe all the decrees of the first eight general Councils, among which this is certainly one, that all causes shall be determined within the Province where they be begun, and that by the Bishops of the same Province*; this absolutely excludes all *foreign* and so *papal* power out of this Realm. Now for the *former* of these, I thought I had evidenced it by the proofs preceding in that *Chapter*, the *Canons* of *Chalcedon*, and *Ephesus*, and the *Novel* about *Justiniana*, as that was extended like the *Ephesine Canon*, to all *Primates*; and then it was no hurt, I hope, to *recapitulate* in the words of our *Bishops*. As for the second, it was both built on the same *foundation*, and also a *visible* matter of fact in each branch of it, 1. That such was the *matter* of those *Decrees*, most *unreconcileable* with *Universal primacy*; And 2. That the *Pope professes*, and *vows obedience* to all those *decrees*. And to all this, he hath no least word of *reply*, but 36.

only in lieu of that, is willing to *mistake* my procedure, and so to feign that I *appealed* to our *Bishops* as to *witnesses*, and then to *answer* me with a *proverb* or two. But to this I *reply*, 1. That as, for this purpose, I acknowledge them *incompetent* to be *produced* to *S. W.* or others of his *perswasion*, so I never laid any such weight *on* their *testimony*, but only as what they said, had solidity of *reason*, and somewhat of *evidence* in it, and so would have deserved some *reply* from my *Disarmer*, if it had not been more for his *turn* and *temper*, to gibe than to *discourse*, to *divert* than to *answer arguments*.

38. 2. That what I set down as our *Bishops conclusion*, was by them, if he had pleased to have resorted to the *Book*, inferred by such *reasons*, as *S. W.* will not easily be able to *answer*, and so could not with justice complain of my brief *reference* to their *conclusion*, without setting down their *premisses*, which was *his*, not *mine* advantage. To clear this therefore, and because these *Books* are not commonly to be had, I shall recite but *three* of their many *heads* of *argument*.

39. 1. From the *Milevitan Council*, where S. *Augustine* was present and *subscribed* it, which decreed *excommunicate* any *Clerk* of *Africk*, that should *appeal* to any *Bishop* beyond the *Sea*.

40. 2. From the *General Council* of *Constantinople*, decreeing that every *cause*, or *controversie*, should be determined within the *Province*, where the matter did lye, and that, by the *Bishops* of the same *Province*, and that no *Bishop* should *exercise power* out of his own *Diocese*, or *Province*, this being also the mind of *Cyprian*, and the other *African Fathers*, before the time of any *General Council*.

41. 3. From the *story* of the *sixth Great Council* of *Carthage*, whither the *Bishop* of *Rome* sent his *Legates* to *alledge* and vindicate his *Primacy*, and by that *title* to maintain the receiving of *appeals* made unto him of *controversies* commenced in *Africk*. And when in the debating of this, the *Bishop* of *Rome* alledged a *Canon* of the first *Council* of *Nice*, and the *Bishops* of *Africk* denied there was any such *Canon*; for tryal thereof, *Messengers* were sent to the *Patriarchs* Sees of the *East* (*Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*) to make *search* for the intire *volume* of the *Canons* of *Nice*, and when they were brought from thence, there was no such *Canon* among them, as the *Bishop* of *Rome* had alledged (the truth of all which is now visible to any in the *Acts* of that *Council* of *Carthage*, and particularly in * their *Epistle* to *Cælestine*, *Bishop* of *Rome*.) From this one *instance* they thought they might conclude these *two* things, 1. That the *Bishop* of *Rome* had no challenge of such *Primacy*, by any words of *Scripture*; for if he had, he would then certainly have alledged it on so *important* an occasion; and besides, the *African Fathers* were so *learned* in holy *Scripture*, that they could not have been *ignorant* of it; and so *vertuous*, that if they had known it, they would never have made any *Act* to the contrary, nor after so earnestly have refused it. 2. That the *Bishops* of *Rome* have no such power given them by any *ancient General Council*; or if they had, they would then have *alledged* it, rather than have vouched a *pretensed Canon*, which upon *search*, could never be found in the *Authenticks*. And these *two* conclusions thus deduced, might well set a period to this *controversie*. As it is, I shall, I hope, need add no more *reply* to his *second Section*, for the *vindicating* of my *fifth Chapter*, and refuting the *Romanists second Plea* drawn from the *POPE*'s *succession* to Saint *Peter*.

* *Vide* Zonar. p. 521.

CHAP. V.

A Defence of the sixth Chapter of the Tract of Schism.

SECT. I.

The Romanists *Plea from conversion.* Phil. Scot. *The expressions of our real Gratitude to* Rome. *The Testimony of the Annals of* Gisburne. *The occasion of producing it. The planting of this Church before* Augustine, *and surviving* Diocletian's *persecution. The* Pope's *power in Ordination. The custome of making profession to the See of* Rome. *Receiving the Pall without it.* Caerusk αὐτοκεφαλ⊙. *Independency from* Canterbury, *implied it from* Rome *also.*

1. IN his *third Sect.* of this his *second Part*, he proceeds to a view of my 6. *Chapt.* and the subject of that, being an examination of another *plea* of the *Romanists*, from the *Pope*'s having *planted Christianity* among us, he begins with great displeasure, that I should deem this any *plea* of theirs, and so pronounces this ground of the whole *Chapter* to be absolutely *false*, and *forged upon them*, asking *what Catholick Author ever affirm'd*----

2. 2. That *S. W.* as the *Catholick Gentleman* before, do indeed *renounce* this *plea*, I have no need to repine, or regret, for then their other *only plea* from *Christ's donation to S. Peter*, and the *Pope's succession* to that *legacy*, being, I suppose, competently *invalidated*, there remains no more for me to contend in this matter, save only to render my *account* how I fell into this gainless *misprision*, even by that *charity* that makes me still apt to think men *believe*, and advert to their own *discourses*, and consequently that this was due to the *Romanists* disputings against us, for from thence it was undoubtedly, that I was deceived into a *perswasion*, that they laid some weight on this *plea* from our *conversion*.

3. To omit the *Catalogue* of those *Romanists*, that have insisted on it, I shall only mention the real *occasion* of my taking in this, for one of their *pleas*; A very little while before I set upon that *Treatise* of *Schism*, a little *Book* bearing this *title*, *A Treatise of the Schism of* England *by* Philip Scot, *Permissu Superiorum*] was conveyed to me from what hands I never knew, but had some reasons to think, that it was from a *Romanist*. Of this therefore (after I had read it with no kind of

satisfaction,

satisfaction, and found that Mr. *Hobs*, and another discourse, with which he proposed to combate, were such as I no way inclined to *defend*, or *vindicate*) I resolved so far to serve my self, as to take notice, what *pleas* it chiefly insisted on, to infer what he had undertaken, the *Schism* of this *Church* of ours. To this purpose I found him concluding, *p.* 163. that *the case of the Bulgares, ought to be drawn unto us, to wit, for the title of conversion.* And *p.* 165. speaking of the *subjection* of *England* to *Rome*, it *was acknowledged*, saith he, *ever by our laws even from the conversion of the Country under St.* Gregory: and *p.* 167. *much less this Island ought to separate from the See of* Rome, *by reason of the title of conversion, not only under* Gregory *the first, but long before, under Pope* Eleutherius, *&c.* This I supposed *sufficient* (if I had wanted other motives) to direct me to this branch of my *method*, to consider this title of *conversion*, and so *S. W.* discerns, to whom the *crimen falsi* is due, and I am *only* to ask pardon of *Ph. Scot* and his *superiours*, that I gave so much *heed* to them, as to bring this *rebuke* upon my self.

As it is, I shall most willingly acknowledge my *error*, and now *proclaim* from these greater *authorities* of the *Catholick Gentleman* and *S. W.* that we are manumitted, and, by consent, set *free* from all *obligation* of *subjection* to the *Pope's Primacy*, which we *causlesly feared might come upon us by this title of Conversion*, and are now only to make good our *gratitude* for the *benefits* which we *received from that See:* And that, let me assure him most seriously, we shall indeavour to do, in any way that may be most *proportionable* to very great *obligations*, and never go about to *divert*, or make *quittance*, by putting into the *counterpoise* either the *severity* and *bloody* rigours which the *Brittish inhabitants*, the 1200. devout *Monks* of *Bangor* in the *front*, and then the rest of that *numerous* Army suffered from *Edilfred*, *King of Northumberland*, as the fruit of *Augustine's menaces*, or some other *unkindnesses*, since received, which have not been of the *complexion* of that *paternal* sweetness, which is said to have moved *Gregory's charity* to our *Saxon Ancestors*; but return our ἀχραντα ἀγαθα, our purest and most *uncompounded* offices of all *Christian affection*, our utmost *effusions* of that most *etherial charity*, our *prayers* and our *tears* poured out towards Heaven, that *God* will out of his richest *treasure* supply all their *wants*, and by the power of his *grace*, work those *changes*, which he discerns most *necessary* to be wrought in them, that the *successors* of St. *Peter* may timely imitate the *repentance*, and *faith*, and *zeal* of S. *Peter*, and the eminence of that *See* joyned again at *last*, as at the *first*, with the *purity* of all *Christian profession* and *practice*, become the *real*, *effectual* preserver of *Ecclesiastical unity* and *communion*, and attain that highest title, which can belong to any *Church* on earth, to be στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα *a pillar and stabiliment of* all saving *truth*, without any *allay* or *mixture* of *error*, to abate that *glorious* felicity, which from my *soul* I wish to it; If this be not the short *image* of that *gratitude* which *S. W.* is willing to mind us of, together with the most passionate desire to *minister* to them in the *bowels* of *Christ*, by indeavouring not to *suffer sin upon our brethren*, by *admonishing* them in the *spirit* of *meekness* (and not *vomiting* out, as he saith, *any one venomous spiteful expression*, but heartily and humbly *retracting* all such language, that hath ever *proceeded* from us) by *heaping* none but *such coals* of *fire* upon their heads, which may in *God's* good time, be most effectual to the *melting* of them; If, I say, this be not it, and if any *Romanist* of a more *happy* temper, than my *Disarmer* hath yet expresst, will direct me to any other *method* of discharging this *obligation* of the most exact *refined gratitude*, I shall be most *thankful* for the *advertisement*, presuming that nothing of *injustice*, or *sin* against a duly *instructed conscience*, can ever be ingredient in it, and then hoping for so much *mercy* from *God*, that no true Son of this *Church* of ours, will ever be wanting in any *other* way of *expressing* it. 4.

The rest of this third *Section* concerning *holding by two titles*, and the *conversion* of this *Island* (whether of *Britains* or *Saxons*) was in substance proposed by the *Catholick Gentleman*, and is accordingly superseded in the *Reply*, p. 100, &c. And so likewise the *Abbot* of *Bangors answer* to *Augustine*, was vindicated in the *account* of *H. T.* his *Appendix*. 5.

Only the *testimony* out of the *Annals* of *Gisburn*, which had not formerly been taken notice of, is here a little considered, and the parts of the *testimony* being *two*; 1. That the *Bishop* of S. *Davids* was *consecrated* by his *own Suffragans*; and this 2. without any *profession* or *subjection* to any *other Church*; He is willing to invalidate both these: the *first*, because, saith he, *the Pope may be head of the Church without consecrating all the Bishops in the World*; the second, *because*, saith he, *the custome of making a profession, or exhibiting subjection to the See of* Rome, *when the Bishops were consecrated, was not then in use*; and *besides*, *the words being* alteri Ecclesiæ, *not specifying* Rome *in particular, affords nothing to my purpose, but may bear the interpretation of the Bishop of St.* David's *being independent of any within that continent, or of any private Patriarch, with which may consist a subjection to the Pope, as the Universal Pastor.*] 6.

But here first *S. W.* must be advised to permit *testimonies*, brought to infer a *conclusion*, to connect with the *conclusion*, to which the *producer* applied them, and not still out of *jealousie* of his own *Helena*, to feign every thing that is said on any other *subject*, to be designed to the impugning the *Popes Supremacy*. 'Tis evident to what that whole *fourth Section* belongs, *viz.* to demonstrate the *planting the Faith here long before Augustine the Monk*, and its *surviving the slaughters of Diocletian*. Among other evidences of this (to which I now add the expres words of * *Bede*) comes in the *early* mention of *three Metropolitans*, and among them of the *Bishop* of *Caerusk* (and his *Province Britannia secunda*) afterward in *King Arthurs* time translated to S. *David's* (and this we know, *fifty* Years before *Augustine's* coming) where it continued an *Archbishoprick* 500. Years 7.

* *Ubi turbo persecutionis quievit in publicum, fideles Christi, qui se tempore discriminis silvis ac desertis abditisque speluncis occultaverant, renovant ecclesias ad solum usque destructas, Basilicas sanctorum Martyrum fundant, construunt, perficiunt, ac veluti victricia signa passim propalant, dies festos celebrant, sacra mundo cordo atque ore conficiunt, manſitque hac in Ecclesiis Christi, quæ erant in Britannia pax, usque ad tempora Arianæ vesaniæ.* l. 1. c. 8. What is there added of *infusing* this *poyson*, and every other *Heresie* in this *Nation*, and the great *levity* and *inconstancy* in the *faith*, the Reader may observe to be an *insertion* in the *Latine Copy* of *Bede*, which *Alfrid's Saxon Paraphrase* hath no word of; and as it might be evidently refuted, as far as concerns the *Arian Heresie*, so as to the *Pelagian*, 'tis disclaimed by *Bede*, l. 1. c. 12, 13. the words are set down in the *Reply*, pag. 103.

more, without *dependence* on any, till in the *reign* of *Hen.* I. it was *subjected* to *Canterbury*; which how fit it was to concur with other *evidences*, to prove the point then in hand, I leave any man to consider, and then there is no more required of me for the *vindicating* that *testimony*.

8. Yet secondly, when 'tis remembred, that though the *Pope oblige* not himself to *consecrate* all *the Bishops in the world*, yet as far as his *jurisdiction* extendeth, he takes upon him to *dispose* all *ordinations*, and accordingly (as appears by the expres's words of his *Epistle*) *Pope Gregory* appointed *Augustine* to ordain the *Metropolitans*, of *London* and *York* (though not all the *Bishops* under them) and for the future, *provided* for their *ordinations* by their *own Synods*, by sending each of them a *Pall*, as the same *Epistle* expresseth; it is hence visible, that his first *Answer* hath no force in it, but leaves a *visible difference* betwixt the *Metropolis* of S. *Davids*, and the *two* other *Metropoles* in respect of *ordination*. And

9. Thirdly, *S. W.* his fair *confession*, that the *custom of making profession, or exhibiting subjection to the See of* Rome, *was not then in fashion*] must be lookt on as some degree of *liberality*, which I must suppose he had some *motive* to *extort* from him, and sure concludes, that the *introducing* this *fashion* since, is an *innovation*.

10. Fourthly, That when 'tis remembred, that at this time *Gregory* sent the *Pall* to *Augustine*, and promised the same to the *Bishops* of *London* and *York*, it must be inferred by force of his second *answer*, that the *Pope*'s *sending a Pall*, had not always annexed to it an *exhibition* of *subjection* to his *See*, from him that *received* it, and then how could *Justiniana*'s *subjection* to *Rome*, even now, be *inferred* from the *Pope*'s sending a *Pall* to the *Archbishop* thereof?

11. Fifthly, That S. *Davids* making no such *profession*, exhibiting no such *subjection* for the space of 500 years, and so long after *Augustine*'s coming, *viz.* till the reign of *Hen.* I. and not so much as *receiving* a *Pall* from *Rome*, and yet holding the *dignity* and *power* of an *Independent Archbishop*, consecrated by his own *Suffragans* (as the *Bishop* of *Cyprus* was) and thereby evidenced to be αὐτοκέφαλος, is still, by force of his second *answer*, a farther *proof*, that the *present Romish practices* are *usurpations*, and *innovations*, and a prejudice to the *pretended universal* acknowledgment of his *headship*.

12. Lastly, When 'tis so well known by the forementioned * *Epistle*, that this *whole nation*, and all the *Bishops of Britain*, were by *Gregory* required to be *subject* to the *See* of *Canterbury*, where *Augustine* sat, and yet by this *testimony* of those *Annals*, and by *evidence* of the *fact*, through all *History* of those times, it appears that the *Archbishop* of *Caerusk*, or S. *Davids*, was *independent* from all other *power* (a *Metropolitan* long before *Augustines* coming hither) and never *subjected* to *Canterbury*, nor consequently to *Rome*, for so many *hundred years*, till *Hen.* I. It is from thence most *manifest*, that *S. W.* his *answers*, are of no force even to that, which he doth so *solicitously ward* by them, this of *consecration* by his *own Suffragans*, not held by any *Pall* from *Rome*, and the making no *profession* or *subjection*, *alteri Ecclesiæ*, to *any other Church*, be it but, as *S. W.* would have it, to *any within that Continent*, particularly to *Canterbury*, being as full an *evidence* as could be wished, that he acknowledged no *subjection* to the *Pope*, who had *subjected* all the *Bishops* of this *Island* to *Canterbury*. And this is all that can be due to be *replied* to his third *Section*.

* *Tua fraternitas omnes Britanniæ sacerdotes habeat subjectos.*

SECT. II.

S. W. *his Arts.* S. Paul's *chair at* Ephesus, *&c. Conversion of* Britany *before* Peters *coming to* Rome. *Exemption from the Pope's Jurisdiction, a prejudice to his universal Pastorship.* Carthage's *Contestation before* Justinian's *time.* Justinian's *Act approved, a President to* England. *The questioning it.*

1. HIS *fourth Section* begins with one of his *dexterities*, of which we have had an *instance* or two formerly. To invalidate the *title* from *conversion*, I had regularly proved these two things: 1. That the *Britains were not converted by them.* 2. That for the *Saxons*, which were converted from *Rome*, that *title* of *conversion* was of no *force*; And these two together, were the full *proving* of my *conclusion*, which the *former* single did not pretend to do, yet had enough of *prejudice* to the *pretence* for *universal Primacy*, for *one exception* was destructive to that; and the *Dominions* of *Wales* as much so, as all *England* would have been.

2. Now *S. W.* his *art* was, to *divide* these two *branches*, and to make *answer* to the *former* of them, taken alone, *Sect.* 3. and by that means to gain *opportunity* of *rejoycing*, that I have *left my self and my fellow Englishmen in the suds, and only proved the* Welsh *no Schismaticks* (adding only, that *now the* Welsh *are so subjected to the* English *Bishops, that they must be involved in the same Schism*) and so he *triumphantly* ends that *Section*, beginning this fourth with a *view* of the *branch* which belonged to the *Saxons*, as of a *second part of my text* (as he calls it) by this *imposing* on his *Reader*, who if he had foreseen that there was any thing said to that of the *Saxons*, or could carry it in his *memory* from one *Section* to another, must needs discern, that what was before said of *leaving the English in the suds*, had not the least degree of *truth* in it. For if indeed I equally proved it (though not by the same *medium*) of the *English* and the *Welsh*, how could it ever, with truth, be said, that I proved it of the *Welsh only?* Such *arts* as these, which receive all their force from a *hope*, that the *Readers memory* cannot hold out from the *end* of one *Section* to the *beginning* of *another*, are one of *S. W.* his *Master pieces*, which have rendred him so much a *shrewder* man, than the *Catholick Gentleman*.

3. What follows, 1. of S. *Paul*'s *Plantations*, and the *independency* thereof, both from the *See*, where S. *Paul* sat at the time of *converting* them, and more especially from the *See of Rome:* And 2. of the *independency* and *absoluteness* of *Timothy*, and *Titus* in their several *Provinces*, hath been briefly vindicated in the *Reply*, *cap.* 61. *sect.* 3, 4. only when *S. W.* here asks *what I intend by the chair where S.* Paul *sat*, adding, that it *was meerly a fiction, that S.* Paul *ever sat in any chair, or was first Bishop in any place, but*

but at Rome *only with S.* Peter. I answer, 1. That this ought to have had some offer of *proof* annext to it, and not only be so *magisterially* affirmed by him: 2. By *chair* I mean a place of his *particular residence*, and *ruling* (after he had *planted*) for some time, before he left a *Bishop* in one, and went to some *other* place; And thus 'tis sure he *resided* in many *Cities* and *Provinces* as properly as at *Rome* he can be affirmed to have done. At *Rome*, he so *resided* not, as not to make *excursions* very far from thence, to *plant* and *confirm Churches*, and in the like manner he *resided* at *Antioch* for one season, at *Ephesus*, and in all *Asia*, under that *Prime Metropolis*, for no less than *three years*, and so at *Corinth*, at *Philippi*, and at *Thessalonica*, and all these before ever he saw *Rome*, and to no one of these were all other *Churches* (where at that time he wrought *conversions*, founded and setled *Churches*) *subjected* by him, any farther than this, that the *Churches* of the *Regions* were subjected to the *City-Church*, the *Churches* of *inferior Cities* to the *Metropoles*, and those united again in the *Prime Metropoles* of each διοίκησις. And so this was a competent instance of the point in hand, and *Timothy* and *Titus* clear evidences of it, both those *demonstrated* to be clearly *independent* from *Rome*, whether upon the score of *Peter*'s, or of *Paul*'s presiding there (not by force of my *negative*, *unsufficient proofs*, as he calls them, but) upon this *irrefragable* evidence, that those were placed *Bishops* at *Ephesus*, and *Crete*, before either of these were yet so much as come to that *imperial City*. And the like upon the same account might, if we can believe story, be resolved of this *Island* of ours, where (saith *Gildas Brito*, or *Badonicus*, anciently stiled *Sapiens*, *Gildas Albanicus* in his *book* of the *victory* of *Aurelius Ambrosius*, and the *Vatican M. S.* in *Baronius*) a *Church* was planted before the end of *Tiberius*'s *reign*, and that manifestly before S. *Peter* was come to *Rome*, *secundo Claudii*, as might be shewed by unquestioned *records*, if this were a place for it.

The next particular of the *power* of *Princes* to *erect* or *translate Patriarchs*, hath also been *vindicated*, *Repl. c. 6. sect.* 4. and there it appears how little reason he hath to affirm, that this is the *begging of the question*, *viz.* that the *Popes power* is meerly *Patriarchal*, when that on which my proofs proceed, the *independency* of those *prime Churches*, which have been *erected* by *Emperors*, is as *destructive* to the *Pope's* pretended title of *universal Pastorship*, as to the *immoveableness* of his *Patriarchal power*; while *exempting* any from his *jurisdiction* being as *contradictory* to the *universality* of his *jurisdiction*, as any thing could be supposed to have been. 4.

Next, when of one of my *instances*, *Carthage*, he concludes from my own words, *that all that the Emperor did, was to restore it to its Primacy, after the* Vandals *were driven out, and so only an act of preserving the Canons inviolate, which every good Christian Emperor ought to do*] this is but a catching of any thing that comes, though it be but like *Hierocles*'s *Scholasticus*, that in the *shipwrack* caught hold on, and meant to save himself by the *anchor*, which served only to *discover* his fear, and ascertain his *perishing*. For 'tis certain, that before the *Vandals* inrode, *Carthage*, though within the *Patriarchate* of *Rome*, had refused to *submit* to her *jurisdiction*; or to allow of any *appeal* thither. The contest set down from the *African Council*, in the close of the *fourth Chapter* of this *Reply*, is an evidence of that; and he that knows any thing in *Church story*, cannot be ignorant of it. And if *Justinian*'s *restoring* of that, after the *expulsing* of the *Vandals*, and (which is somewhat more, and yet was there subjoyned) his annexing two *new Provinces*, which had not before been under that *Bishops jurisdiction*, be that, which *every good Emperor*, not *only may*, *but ought to do*, then shall I never desire any more to infer my *conclusion*, 1. that *Hen. VIII.* in restoring that *independency* to the *Church of England*, which it had before *Augustine*'s coming hither, nay, ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, *from the first conversion* of this *nation*, and so ought to retain it by the *Ephesine Canon*, was but the *preserving* the *Acts* of the *Church inviolate*, and no more than *every good Prince may*, *and ought to do*. 2. That by *S. W.* his acknowledgment, *Justinian* in this matter of *Carthage*, did but as a *good Prince ought to do*; and then, doing no more in the *erection* of *Justiniana*, than in the *restitution of Carthage* he had done, it must likewise follow, that herein also he no way *misbehaved* himself; and yet upon the *presumption* that he did, his whole *answer* depends, which next follows to my *instance* of *Justiniana*. 5.

For though upon a *former* mention of this matter, he had never attempted to asperse *Justinian*, but in this *second part*, *sec.* 2. gave *very plausible* answers, that *Justinian never intended to crop the aspiring growth of* Rome, but *sent to the Pope for a Pall for his new Archbishop*, and a great deal more to the same purpose; yet now upon another *incidental* glance on the same *instance*, as if the *Catholick Gentleman* and he had divided the *cup of Lethe* betwixt them, he now questions the *power of Justinian* to do what he did, and the *legality* of the *act*, and compares it with the *Act of the late Parliament in taking away Bishops*, having no *power* to take them away. 6.

Thus every the most *contrary colour* (of *answer*) becomes *S. W.* as well as ever it did *Aristippus*; but this slip having befallen him, by following the *footsteps* of the *Cath. Gent.* I have spoken sufficiently to it there, *Repl. c. 6. sec. 4. n.* 11, 12. and fully manifested the *legality* of *Justinians* action, without any *delegation* from the *Pope* to do what he did, *n.* 13. 7.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Priviledge of Ravenna. *The Authority of it.* Hieron. Rubeus, *no partial Writer against* Rome. Baronius's *Dislikes.* S. W. *his Objections to the Priviledge answered.* In nomine Domini, *a Stile of Donations. Edicts of one Emperor without the name of the other.* Valentinian's *peculiar respect to* Ravenna. Valentinianus Major Imperator. Mediolanense Concilium. Regium, Placentia, *&c.* Brixillis, *not under* Milan. *The* Pall. Cæsareum Paludamentum, *not the Pastoral. The Pope's Consent, not Authoritative. The Pope's Vision about* P. Chrysologus. *The duration of* Ravenna's *αὐτοκεφαλία. The Contest betwixt* P. Gregory, *and* John *of* Ravenna. *The no proof of their Schism.* P. Gregory's *dislike of the Title of Universal Pastor.*

1. HIS next attempt is against the *Instance of Ravenna*, and he sets out with a special piece of *wit*, that when I say, the *Emperor* Valentinian *did by his Rescript constitute* Ravenna *a Patriarchal seat, I quote no Author but Ann. Dom.* 432.] where 1. 'Tis strange, that he that hath yet (to my best remembrance) produced but *one citation* of his own, and withal, hath oft reproacht my *unnecessary* citations, should yet now exact of me the producing of *Authors* for every *period*; and yet more strange, that when I quote the *Emperors Rescript*, wherein it was thus *constituted*, he should yet say I quoted no *Author*: The *Emperor* himself was vouched as my *Author*, and his *Rescript* the *Testimony*; and yet upon the *Catholick Gentleman*'s doubt of this, I produced the *Author*, which conveyed this *record* to us, one very fit for the turn, the *writer* of the *history* of that *City*, *Hieronymus Rubeus*, who sets down the words of this *priviledge* out of a most *ancient record*, which saith [illegible] *in tabulario Ursiano adhuc servatur, is still kept in the Archives of that City.* Of this *Author* who produces it, it may be considered, 1. That his *History* was at a *second publication* of it, seventeen [illegible]s after the former, *dedicated* to the *Pope Sixtus V.* by the *Senate* of *Ravenna* (who testifie that it [illegible] *collected ex tabulariis potissimùm civitatis, out of the Records of the City*;) And 2. that it was by himself *dedicated* to their *Archbishop*, a *Cardinal*, appealing to his knowledge, that he had been *in antiquitate investigandâ satis accuratus, sufficiently accurate in the search of antiquity:* And 3. to remove all suspicion of *partiality to his own City against Rome*, he hath approved himself to be as great an *admirer* of the *Papacy*, as any, calls it in his *Preface*, *sedem de cœlo in terras demissam, a See sent down from Heaven to Earth, for Learning most divine, for Religion most holy, for Empire most sublime.* And in this very matter of *Ravenna*'s contending with *Rome*, *de Principatu*, he is very bitter against his own *Countrymens temerity*, and *perfidiousness*, together with *insolent pride*, affirming the *Popes* to be *Vicars* of *Christ*, *in Ecclesiæ Universalis administratione, in the administration of the Universal Church.* If these be *indications* of the *Preposterous love of his Country*, which *Rubeus* is blamed for by *S. W.* it will be very hard to gain his *favour*; And 4. to conclude, his *authority* with the *Romanists* is such, as *Baronius*, the *principal Author*, that hath questioned this *priviledge*, makes use of his *testimony* with *confidence*, when it is for his turn, (though in a matter much more liable to *mistake*, the relation of a *vis*[illegible] himself also confessing, that the *Rescript* is *very ancient*, and acknowledged by *several writers.*

2. And truly that *Annalist*'s and his *followers* disputing against it by those little *probable* arguments, which *S. W.* hath here *transcribed* (as nothing was ever really done, but some light *colours* might be brought against it) as it signifies no more, but that this act of the *Emperor*'s was repugnant to the *interest* which that learned *Annalist* had professedly espoused, the absolute *Universal Dominion* of the *Romish See*, so is it an evidence *irrefragable*, that that *priviledge* which *Ravenna* is pretended to have had, was not *reconcileable* with the pretensions of *Rome*, which yet was in effect, no *greater*, than those which without doubt were soon after conferred on *Justiniana* and others, by other *Emperors*, before either of these, and to which the *Council* of *Chalcedon* had laid the *foundation*, that the τάξις *order Ecclesiastical* should *follow*, and *bear proportion* with the πολιτικοὶ τύποι *the imperial acts of building*, or *repairing*, or *inlarging*, and *dignifying* of *Cities.*

3. As for the *objections* against the *authentickness* of that *decree*, I shall need say no more, but that they are very *unproportionable* to be put in the *balance* against the *original record* and *testification* of the fact in the plain words of the *Edict. First*, saith he, *it begins in a different manner from the constant tenor of all other Rescripts,*] but he did not think good to tell us *how* it began, lest that might discover the *vanity* of the *exception*; nor to remember what was the subject matter of this *Rescript*, which might fitly occasion and own this *difference.* It was the *Donation* of a *Priviledge* to the *Church*, to the *honour of God*, and accordingly it begins in such a form, as most exactly accords therewith, and is the *ancient*, as well as *modern* stile in such matters, *In Nomine Domini Dei Salvatoris Nostri Jesu Christi, In the name of the Lord God our Saviour Jesus Christ.* This, as it had been less proper for some other *secular* matters, so was most agreeable to the matter of an *Ecclesiastical priviledge*, or *collation.* So in the *Novels* of the *Emperors*, which confer, or confirm *privileges*, to the *Church*, there is nothing more frequent. The first of *Heraclius*, being of this sort, begins so, * ἐν ὀνόματι τῦ δεσπότυ Ἰησῦ Χριστῦ τῦ θεῦ ἡμῶν, Ἡρακλείῳ ---- *In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ our God, Heraclius* --- to *Sergius* --- And so the ‖ *second*, and the * *fourth.* So begins *Justinian*'s *Edict*, *de fide Orthodoxâ*, ‖ ἐν ὀνόματι θεῦ ---- *In the name of God the Father, and of his only begotten Son Jesus Christ our Lord, and of the holy Ghost.* I shall trouble the *Reader* with no more *examples.* And then, what could have been objected more *unseasonably*, or untruly, than that this *manner of beginning*, *differs from the constant tenor of all other Rescripts?*

* *Jus Græco-Rom. l.* 2. *p.* 90.
‖ *P.* 77.
* *P.* 83.
‖ *Ib. l.* 8 *p.* 521.

4. Next, saith he, *The decree is singular, and consequently to be suspected in this; that all the other Rescripts made in the Reign of the two Emperors, though constituted by one of them only, yet were ever authorized by both their names, whereas the name and authority of the Emperor* Theodosius *was wanting to this.*] But there is as little *truth* in this, as in the former *suggestion.* In the *constitutions* of *Heraclius*, the first indeed begins with the *names* of both the *Emperors*, Ἡρακλείῳ, καὶ Ἡρακλείῳ νέῳ Κωνσταντίνῳ,

νῷ, πιστοὶ ἐν Χριστῷ βασιλεῖς; and so the *fourth* after the like manner. But then in the *second* the stile is *singular*, Αὐτοκράτωρ Καισαρ Φλαβιος Ἡράκλειος ---- and the *third* in like manner, ὁ αὐτὸς βασιλεύς, *Heraclius* alone without naming the *other*. 'Tis strange such matters of *ordinary* visible practice, should be so confidently *denied*, to gain a poor, pitiful, *probable* argument against an *Edict*, that is irrefragably testified by the *Records*, and is no way concerned in such *Topicks* as these, if they had (as they have not the least) *truth* in them: But besides, if it were reasonable to conclude a matter of fact by *reason*, 'tis clear there is *reason* of this also. *Valentinian* was born in this City, as before * *Rubeus*, *Marcellinus Comes* delivers, and now resided there (as *Honorius* had long done, ever since *Alaricus*'s coming into *Italy*) and accordingly makes that a special *motive* of giving this *privilege* (*Et maximè ubi serenitatis nostræ præfulget præsentia*) in the words of the *Edict*: And of him particularly 'tis * noted and cited from *Agnellus*, a *grave Author*, that he both *rebuilt*, and *inlarged* the walls of the *City*, and *constituted* it, after *Rome*, the *head of Italy*. All which being peculiar acts of his *kindness* to the *City*, and not common to *Theodosius* with him, as they make it reasonable, that they should bear none but his name in the front of the *Donation*, so without question they no way invalidate the *authority* of it.

* *Rub. Hist. Rav. l. 2. p. 90.*

* *Ibid. p. 98.*

5. The *third objection* is, that *the Inscription*, Imperator Major, *is new, and unheard of, all the rest intitling Valentinian Imperator Maximus.*] But the *Inscription* is, *Valentinianus fidelis Jesu Christi Major Imperator. Aug.* The [*Major*] is not here *subjoyned* to *Imperator*, but to *Valentinian* (as *Augustus* to *Imperator*) and is, I suppose to distinguish him from others of the same *name*, as *Theodosius*, ὁ μικρὸς, the *Little*, that reigned with *Valentinian*, is so called to distinguish him from *Theodosius*, ὁ μέγας the *Great*, *Honorius*'s *Father*. So *Leo* ὁ μέγας, and *Leo* ὁ μικρὸς, and so *Valentinianus Major* to distinguish this from *Valentinianus*, *Gratian*'s *Father*, who in respect of him was *Maximus*. 2. As for the title of *Imperator Maximus* (*Maximus subjoyned* to *Imperator*) it might have been worth his pains to set down some of those *Edicts* (which he calls *all the rest*) that so intitle him. I am sure *Rubeus* affords him none. *Pontifex Maximus* was once an *ordinary* title for the *Emperors*, and *Imperator Clementissimus*, and the like, but sure *Imperator Maximus* was not so; And yet 3. if it were so, it would prove little; for this *Valentinian*, which is here stiled *Major*, is ordinarily known by the title of *Junior*; *Major*, in respect of *Maximus*, being *Junior*, as *Theodosius* μικρὸς *the Little* is ordinarily *Theodosius Junior* in the *Comparative*, and many such like, so that still I have no reason to admire *S. W.* his *Arguments*.

6. He objects from the mention of *Regium*, *Placentia*, *and Brixillis named in the Rescript*, *as under the Jurisdiction of* Ravenna, *which*, *saith* S. W. *is a plain forgery*, *since not long after*, *Pope* Leo *commanding* Eusebius *Bishop of* Milan, *to gather a Provincial Council of the Bishops subject to him*, *those three Bishops met there*, *and subscribed in that Council*, *as appears by the Synods Epistle yet extant.*] Of this suggestion some parts are true, but that on which alone the whole force of the *Objection* against the *Rescript* depends, hath no offer of *proof*, nor yet appearance of *truth* in it. And therefore it was *prudently* done, to cite the *Synodal Epistle* for the *subscription* of these *names*, but neither to direct us where to find that *Synodal Epistle*, nor to offer any *reason* or *testimony*, that all that *subscribed* there, were *subject to Milan*.

7. The truth of the whole matter lies thus; In the year 450. *Pope Leo* sent *four Legates*, *two Bishops*, and *two Presbyters* to *Anatolius*, *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, successor to *Flavianus*, with an *Epistle*, *anathematizing Eutyches* and *Nestorius*, and all their *followers*, which was accordingly read, and fully consented to, and *subscribed* in *Council* by *Anatolius*, and the neighbouring *Bishops*, assembled with him, and sent to all the *Metropolitans* of the *East* to be *subscribed* by them. See *Concil. Tom.* 3. *p.* 701, 702. Upon the return of these *Legates*, *Leo* commands them to go to *Eusebius* the *Bishop* of *Milan* (in the most *ancient Notitiæ*, the *Prime Metropolis* of *Italy*) and treat with him for a meeting of other *Bishops* of *Italy*, which, we know, consisted of *many Provinces*, to *subscribe* and profess the *reception* of the same *doctrine* against those *Hereticks*, to the end that in the meeting of a *General Council*, the *Pope*'s *Legates* might go, in the name of the whole *Western Church*, and inform the *Council* of the *judgment* of those *Bishops*, who should not be able to be *present* there: And accordingly it was done; and upon this meeting (called thence *Mediolanense Concilium* in the *Councils*, *T.* 2. *p.* 702.) the *Bishop* of *Milan*, and *nineteen* other *Bishops* of *Italy*, some of his *Province*, and some of *others*, wrote a *Letter* to *Leo*, and *subscribed* their *consent* to that *confession* of faith, which he had sent into the *East*. The *Epistle* is to be seen among *Leo*'s, with this title, *Eusebii Mediolanensis Episcopi cum aliis Episcopis consentientibus*, and after him the first that are named are the *Bishops* of *Regium*, *Placentia*, and *Brixillis*. But now, that all the *Bishops* that are there named, were of this *particular Province* of *Milan*, and *subject* immediately to that *Bishop*, as it is the only thing of force in the present *objection*, so it hath no offer of *proof*, or that I discern, appearance of *truth* in it. Of the *nineteen Bishops*, which are there named to *subscribe* after *Milan*, *Miræus*, out of the *Ancient Roman Provincial*, sets down but *twelve*, under the *Metropolis* of *Milan*, and two of them with an *Asterisk* for exempts, *Placentinus*, and *Papiensis* (which is all one with *Ticinensis* in these *subscriptions*) so that beside *Placentia*, *Regium*, and *Brixillis*, here named in the *Edict*, the *second* of which he places expresly under *Ravenna*, and the *third* was destroyed *Ann.* 586. saith * *Rubeus*, there remains *Augustana* under the *Archbishop* of *Mentz*, *Comensis* under *Aquileia*, *Curiensis* in *Rhætia Prima*, under the *Archbishop* of *Mentz*, *Genuensis* and *Albingaunensis*, both in *Liguria*, none of which can with any reason be pretended to be under the *particular Province* of *Milan*, and so this is sufficient to evacuate the seeming force of that *argument*.

* *P.* 181.

8. It must be farther *remembred*, that in order to this design of having this *Profession* of *Leo*'s *faith*, subscribed by the *Bishops* of *Italy*, it was as necessary that other *Bishops* consents should be had, as those of the *particular Province* of *Milan*. The *Legates* were sent in like manner to the *Gallia*, and from thence the *subscription* come of * 44 *Bishops*, which sure were not all of *one Province*: In a word, there is little reason to believe, but all *Italy* were as much concerned in this *action*, as those under *Milan*; only the meeting being in that place, as that which had been *anciently* the *prime Metropolis* of the *Diocese* of *Italy*, there were more of *that* present there, than of any other *particular Province*,

* *Leo Ep.* 56.

Province, yet the *three first* of the *subscribers*, the *Bishops* of these *Cities* under *Ravenna*, which was a competent number for that *Exarchate*; so that still this *Edict* may pass for *authentick*, though it put *Regium*, &c. under the *Archbishop* of *Ravenna*, for there still they are, for ought this of the *Mediolanense concilium* proves to the *contrary*.

9. Or if this be not yet sufficient, then I shall oppose the authority of *Blondus* and *Sabellicus*, for the confirming the *Edict*, and invalidating this *pitiful* shew of *objections*. *Blondus*, who had said (from other *evidences*, and not from this *Rescript*) that the *Emperor* subjected *twelve Bishops* to the *See* of *Ravenna*, naming *Regium* and *Placentia* for two of them, and *Sabellicus* in his *Enneads*, and others with him, affirm there were *fourteen*, as the *Edict* doth, and so doth *Miræus*, out of the *ancient Roman Pontifical*, though in specifying the names of them, he differ from this *Edict*.

10. But his last *argument* is that on which he seems to place his *confidence*, as a *Rub which*, saith he *puzled* Rubeus, *that the same Rescript which gives them an Archbishoprick, granted them also the use of the Pall, which*, saith he, *was never used to be given by the Emperors, but by the Popes only, as appears by the Epistle of* Gregory *the Great, to the then Archbishop of* Ravenna; *and this*, saith he, *forced* Rubeus *to explicate that Pall to be* Cæsareum paludamentum, *such an imperial Robe as the* Cæsars *used to wear; whereas besides the unlikelineß of the action, it is contrary to the Rescript it self, which grants them such a Pall*, sicut cæteri sub nostra Christianissima potestate sæpe degentes fruuntur Metropolitæ, *as the rest of the Metropolitans in his Dominions often wore; which*, saith he, *every one who hath but tasted of the study of ancient History, knows to have been another manner of thing than the Emperors robe.*]

11. What solidity of truth there is in all this, will be soon discerned: For 1. that this *rub* is said to have *puzled Rubeus*, and that to *smooth* it, *he was forced to explicate it of the Cæsareum paludamentum*,] hath no kind of *truth* in it: What he saith, is not from any such *necessity*, to avoid the importunity of any *objection*, but as an instance of the *Emperors gratitude* to that *Church*, and *John* the *Archbishop* thereof, *maximum beneficium adjecit, he added this greatest favour*, a *Pall*, but that such an one as *in the City, and in any pomp, or solemnity, the* Cæsars *alone were wont to use, as an universal and perpetual prerogative of him and his successors in that* See.

12. But then 2. if *Constantine*'s *Donation* to *Sylvester*, which is entred into their * *Corpus Juris*, and must not be despised by the *Romanists*, be by *S. W.* believed to have any *truth* in it, or if the *fiction* of it be not founded in gross *absurdity*, and *impossibility*, we cannot but learn this from it, which here *S. W.* will not allow any man to *think that hath but tasted of the study of ancient History*, viz. that the *superhumerale*, the *Pall*, that belongs to *Archbishops*, was the *lorum quod Imperiale circundare solebat collum, the very imperial ornament, that encompast his neck* (and so the *purple robe*, and the *scarlet gown*, and *omnia Imperialia indumenta, all the Imperial vestiments*) communicated from the *Emperor* to the *Pope*, and by him imparted to *Archbishops*. The same we are taught by *Balsamon* from the *Greek Church*, that several *Ensigns* of the *Imperial authority* were communicated to the *Patriarchs*, * μόνοις τοῖς Βασιλεῦσι καὶ τοῖς Πατριάρχαις ἐπιφιλοτιμηθῆναι τὸ δίκαιον, *this priviledge* (speaking of the Λαμπάδες) *was allowed to none but the Kings* and *Patriarchs* (having before said expresly, that the *Archbishop* of *Bulgary*, and some others, had *received* them, ἀπὸ φιλοτιμίας Βασιλικῆς ἰδικῆς, *from the Emperors especial munificence*, and * *Philippus Berterius*, who, I hope, had *tasted of ancient History*, cites it from him, and subjoyns σαυροπήγια ἐπιμανίκια, *Pallia & cætera hujusmodi quæ fere omnia tandem Metropolitanis sunt concessa, almost all kind of habits, particularly the Pall, all which almost were at length allowed to the Metropolitans*, he might have said (as far as belongs to the *East*) to the *Bishops* also. Thus when *Anthimus* of *Constantinople* was deposed, * it is said of him, that when he saw himself *turned out of his See, he restored the Pall which he had, to the Emperors*. And ‖ Pope *Gregory himself* speaking of the return of *Anastasius Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, saith that he had *made* * *earnest request to the Emperors, ut concesso usu Pallii ad Beati Petri limina ---- transmittere debuissent, that they would grant him the use of the Pall, and send him to* Rome *to him, to officiate with him, quatenus mecum in honore suo viveret, and to live and enjoy his Patriarchal honour with him.*

Sure these are more than *obscure indications*, that the *Pall* having this *original* from the *Emperors donation*, was, and consequently *may*, by the *Emperor*, particularly be bestowed upon a *See*, advanced by him to some more than ordinary *eminence*, after the manner of those, whom a *King will honour*, by putting some part of his *royal ornaments* upon them; and it will otherwise be hard to imagine, from whence the *Pope* himself shall *originally* have received it, if not from the *favour* of the *Emperor*; for as to that of the *Sheep* taken upon the *Pastors shoulders*, which may be thought to deduce it from S. *Peter*, it is sure as *Apocryphal*, as *Constantine*'s *donation* can by any be imagined to be, and beside other *Anomalies* in the *Emblem*, 'tis that which must equally belong to every *Bishop*, whose office is as perfectly *Pastoral*, as any *Metropolitan*, *Primate*, *Patriarch*, or the *Pope* himself can be pretended to be, though his *Diocese* be not so *wide*, nor his *power* so *absolute*, and so can by no *Analogie* be the *Ensign* discriminative of an *Archbishop*.

13. But I shall not need to insist farther on this, for if I should grant, that the *Pall* were originally *Ecclesiastical*, and a thing perfectly distant from the *Imperiale lorum*, and so that the *Emperor* could with no propriety confer it, as for himself; this notwithstanding would be very incompetent to *prejudge*, or disparage *Valentinian*'s *Rescript*, in the form, wherein *Hier. Rubeus* hath conveyed it to us; for of it, this may very fitly be the *interpretation*, that the *Archbishop* of *Ravenna* being thus *exalted* by the *Emperor*, the said *Emperor* ordained and decreed, that as other *Metropolitans* in his *Dominions*, have the use of the *Pall*, receiving it from their *Patriarch*, according to *custom*, upon their *consecrating*, so should he receive it from the *Bishop* of *Rome*, the *Patriarch* of the *West*. And this being the only *objection* against the *Rescript*, which hath any shew of *validity* in it, it now appears, I suppose, that this is but a *shew*, and so the *Rescript* may yet stand firm upon the *vanishing* of it.

14. Yet is this argument of such force with *S. W.* that he is resolved (and he *cannot*, he saith, *in reason think other*) *it must* (some way or other) *invalidate this instance of Ravenna*; but which way it shall do it, he is not yet resolved; only he hath pitcht on one of these two ways, *either that the Rescript is false, forged in the time of the Schism, or at least, that it cannot be imagined to have been made without the Popes consent.*]

These

* *Decret par. 1. Dist 96. c. 13. Constantinus.*

* *Melet. p. 445 Jus Græco-Rom. l. 7.*

* *Pithan. l. 2. c. 1.*

* *Liberat. Diac. Breviar. c. 22.*

‖ *Ep. ex Reg. l. 1. indict. 9. Ep. 27.*

* *Suggestionem summis precibus plenam.* ibid *quantis valui precibus postulavi*, ib. *Ep. 7.*

These *conjectures* are distant enough and so prove themselves to be but *conjectures*, for if the *Rescript* were *false*, and *forged in time of the Schism*, then sure the *Pope* never gave *consent* to it, and if he gave *consent* to it, then sure 'twas not *false*, nor *forged in time of the Schism*. And yet he tenders his *proof* for each of these, which fighting thus *unreconcileably* one with another, it were almost pity to *interpose*, it being certain that the leaving them thus *ingaged*, must be the shortest end of the *Controversie*. But I shall not give him the *example* of *despising* tenders of *reason*. 16.

For the *first* then, that the *Rescript* is *false*, and *forged in the time of the Schism*, (besides what hath already been mentioned of the *Pall*, and I suppose removed) he hath no farther offer of *argument*, but this, that *no new Bishop of* Ravenna *could use the Pall without a new concession from the Pope, as (saith he) appears in S.* Gregory, *l. 5. Ep. 8. and therefore it was forged in time of the Schism, that they might have some pretence to retain still the use of the Pall, which they accounted honourable.*] 17.

Whether the *new Bishop* were to receive the *Pall* from the hands of the *Pope*, I shall not need dispute; This might be a *formality* due to him as *Patriarch* of the *West*, and is perfectly *reconcileable* with the *Emperors* conferring this *priviledge* on this *See*, to all *succession* (as the *Edict* declares) without any *active concurrence*, or joynt *authority* of the *Pope*. But he that shall look on that * *Epistle*, will find no more than this, that *Pope Gregory* sends the *Bishop* of *Ravenna* a *Pall* (*provocatus antiquæ consuetudinis ordine, moved thereto by the order of ancient custom*) ‖ *for him to use at the times, and in the manner, as*, he saith, *he doubts not his predecessor had used it*, adding, *Omnia enim privilegia quæ tuæ pridem concessa esse constat Ecclesiæ, nostrâ authoritate firmamus, & illibata decernimus, permanere, for all the priviledges which appear to have been heretofore granted to your Church, we confirm by our authority, and decree that they shall remain untoucht*; and (beside some good *admonitions* to adorn his *office* and *dignity*, with the *probity* of *manners* and *works*) this is all that is to be found in that *Epistle*. 18.

* *Ep. ex Regist. l. 5. Indict. 14. c. 108.*
‖ *Ep. ex Reg. l. 5. indict. 14. c. 108.*

And considering that the *priviledges* which he formally confirmed, were acknowledged by him to be *pridem concessa, granted to the See of* Ravenna *long before*, without mention of their being granted to him by the *Popes*, and so must most probably refer to this act of the *Emperor Valentinian*, which gave it these *priviledges*; all this doth very well agree with the *Edict*, and conclude that it must have been *unjust* in the *Pope* to deny the *Pall* to any new *Bishop* of that *See*; And then the least that can be said, is, that *S. W.* will never be able by any *Engine* to fetch out from this *Epistle* his designed *conclusion*, that this *Rescript was forged in the time of the Schism*; and if it were not then *forged*, I mean while *Ravenna* stood upon her *Independency* from *Rome* (for that, I suppose, he will have deemed a *Schism*, by a *mean begging the question*) there can be no time imaginable for the *forging* it, for while *Ravenna* yielded to *Rome* all that she desired, this cannot sensibly be *suggested*: And so still here is not the least *colour* of pretence for the *forging* of it. 19.

What follows upon the *other* branch of his *conjecture*, to make it probable, that it *was not made without the Pope's consent*, if it have any appearance of *force* in it, it again concludes, that it was not *forged*, nor then lookt on by any (not by the *Pope* himself) as an *Innovation*, for the *Emperor* thus to advance a *Church* to this *independency*; and against this I have no reason to *dispute*, but shall most willingly yield to it *S. W.* his *affirmation*, without the least tender of *proof*, and only resolve from thence, that *Valentinian* herein did nothing *contrary to the duty of a very good Emperor*, nothing but by the very *Bishop* of *Rome*'s very *good liking*, and consequently, that the *Ravennates* that insisted on this their *priviledge*, were far from being *Schismaticks*, or *culpable* in so doing, as my *Disarmer* will have believed to be the *acknowledgment of all the world*. 20.

If any more than such a *consent* as this, a *good liking*, or not *checking* at it, be here meant by *S. W.* as the mention of the *Pope's appointing* and *constituting* (even *those at Ravenna* at first *being unwilling*) *S.* Peter Chrysologus *to succeed in that See, after the decease of* John] seems willing to conclude, *viz.* an *authoritative consent*, or that which hath any thing of *jurisdiction* in it; I shall then answer, that supposing the *Edict* to have been really made (as in thus arguing *S. W. supposes*, for else how could the *Pope* thus *consent* to the making it) it is most evident that the *Pope* had thus nothing to do in the *making* of it. The words are plain, *Imperiali authoritate sancimus, we decree by our imperial authority, that it shall be thus advanced to the Metropolitical dignity: and* constituimus, *the Emperor again by his authority, constitutes, or appoints the disposition of the whole Province of* Æmylia, *under the government of that Church, and the Creations of all those* 14 *Bishops*, &c. adding, *Conferentes ei ob decorem Apostolicæ dignitatis honorem Pallii & omnem Pontificalis decoris usum, conferring on him for the glory of the Apostolick dignity, the honour of the Pall, and all the use of Pontifical glory or splendor, and this*, as was said, *not to the person of the present Bishop* John, *but to the Church, atque Universos posteà Præsules, all Bishops which should succeed in that See.* Which puts the matter beyond dispute, that the *Pope* had neither in the *making* of the *decree*, nor in the *Bishops* succeeding to the *benefit* of it, any *authoritative* consent. It came wholly from the *Imperial munificence*, the same by which it was once resolved in *Honorius*'s time (as *Rubeus* cites it from * *Johannes Baptista Pigna*) that the *seat* of the *Empire* should be translated from *Rome* to *Ravenna*. 21.

* *In hist. Principat. Estens.*

What he saith of the *Pope's appointing* and *constituting* Chrysologus *to succeed in that See, even those of* Ravenna, *at first being unwilling*] lies thus, clearly, in the *story*, That the *Ravennates* sent the *Archbishop* whom they had created, to *Pope Xystus III.* for his *customary confirmation*. The *Pope* had seen a *vision* that night, wherein S. *Peter* and S. *Apollinaris*, the *first Bishop* of that *See*, having a *young man* between them, foretold him, that he *should create him Bishop of Ravenna*, and should not *confirm him whom the Ravennates had chosen*; this therefore he did *obey*, and *rejecting* their *Bishop*, ordain'd *Peter Chrysologus* to that *See*, and the *Ravennates* taking it ill, he told them his *vision*, and then they *acquiesced* in *reverence* to S. *Peter*. If there be *truth* in this story, 'tis little to the *advantage* of the *Pope*'s *authority*, the *vision* being evidently that, which gave *Peter Chrysologus* this *dignity*, which the *Pope* could not have done without the *vision*. If it be not *true*, sure *S. W.* can *conclude* nothing from it, unless it be this, that *Rubeus* is to be believed by a *Romanist* in the *relation* of a *Legend*, which looks a little kindly to the *Romanists* side, but must not be believed in the *vouching* an *ancient Record*, when that should seem against them. 22.

23. He next tells us, the *after-Bishops of* Ravenna *were sometimes Schismaticks, none excusing them, or bringing that action of theirs for a testimony or example, till such as* D. H. *arose, who were involved in the same crime.*] But herein is manifest *injustice*. For wholly to omit the inquiry, whether the *Bishops* of *Ravenna* were afterwards *Schismatical*, or no, I know every thing which seems averse to the *plenitude* of all power in the *Romish See*, shall be sure to be looked on by them as an act of *Schism*, or else we had never lain under that charge: to omit this, I say (though it be but a *begging the main question* in him that suggests it) it is manifest that the *testimony* produced by me was not founded in the actions of those *after-Bishops*, but in the first *collation* of *dignity* on that *Church* by the *Edict* of the *Emperor*, that being the one thing that was *pertinent*, and fully concludent to the matter, which I had then in hand, from *Sect.* 9. the *power of Kings to erect or translate Primacies or Patriarchates:* For if *Valentinian* had that power, and actually made use of it, *Imperiali authoritate sancire, constituere, conferre, to advance* Ravenna *to that honour and power, to assign him such a Province, and to confer such priviledges*, on that *See* for *ever*, and no *check* made against this at that time, either by the *Popes*, or other *Bishops* of the *Church*, as against an *innovation*, or *usurpation* of undue power in the *Emperor*; then sure another *Prince*, which hath the same power in his *Kingdom*, which *Valentinian* had in his *Dominions*, may as lawfully do the same; ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι, which was the only thing which by this *example* of *Ravenna*, and *testimony* of that *Edict*, I attempted to *demonstrate*.

24. But now follows an *intolerable mistake of the Doctor's*, which must needs have some of *S. W.* his *Discipline*. And what is the *mistake?* Why, *That from* Valentinian's *time*, Ravenna *held the Patriarchate without dependence on the Bishop of* Rome, *till the time of* Constantinus Pogonatus.] For this my *Disarmer* hath not yet so approved his *fidelity*, that his own bare *word* should be *concluding:* From his *tribunal* I appeal to *Anastasius*, *in vita Doni. Hujus temporibus*, i. e. *Constantini Pogonati*, saith he, *Ecclesia Ravennatum, quæ se ab Ecclesiâ Romanâ segregaverat causâ autocephaliæ, denuò se pristinæ sedi Apostolicæ subjugavit, In the times of* Constantinus Pogonatus *the Church of* Ravenna *which had separated it self from the Church of* Rome, *upon the account of being independent, and an head to, or within it self, subjected it self again to the former Apostolick See.* What can be more punctual for the full defence of my *intolerable mistake?* And yet, saith he, *every one meanly versed in History, knows 'tis thus.* But I demand whether *Anastasius* were not so, nay, whether there can be produced any one *Historian*, that doubts of it, much less that *affirms* the *contrary?*

25. But, saith he, *'Tis manifest by Pope* Gregory's *Letters to the Bishops of that place, who was made Pope in the year* 590. *whereas* Pogonatus *began his reign in the year* 668.] This is a *manifestation* indeed fit for one who had once spent so many lines to set down the nature of an *evidence*, as the *standard* for future discourse between us. And what if one should put this into *mood* and *figure*, and *exact* of it a *conformity*, with the most *vulgar* of those necessary *rules?* It would then run thus, *Pogonatus began his reign* 78. *years after* Gregory *ascended to the Papacy, and* Gregory *wrote Letters to the Bishops of* Ravenna, *therefore* Ravenna *held not the Patriarchate without dependence from* Rome, *from the reign of* Valentinian *to* Pogonatus. A conclusion very *irrefragably* inferred, and yet there is no possibility to *assist* this *medium* of his, unless it may some way appear from those *Epistles* of *Gregory*, that *Ravenna* was not *independent* in *his* time. But that from *S. W.* his arguing, no way appears, no one passage being by him tendred from thence, unless what was before cited from *Li.* 5. *Ep.* 8. and that hath already been *accounted* for, and cleared to have no such *intimation* in it, but only that he sent him the *Pall*, and confirmed the *priviledges* of his *Church*, which by the *Emperors Rescript* were sufficiently *authorized*, if he had not *confirmed* them.

26. Many other *Epistles* indeed this *Gregory* wrote to the several *Bishops* of *Ravenna*, many to *John*, *l.* 1. and 2. some to *Marinian*, *l.* 4. and 5. and to the *whole Church*, *l.* 5. and in these he oft takes upon him to find *fault*, especially for the *frequent* using the *Pall* in publick processions; but this proves not their *dependence* on him, either *de jure*, or *de facto*, either that it was *really due*, or by them acknowledged, and yielded to him. Nay many *indications* there are to the contrary, *priviledges* pleaded by them, though by him denied to belong to them. And indeed, had he really consulted either the *story*, or *Gregories Epistles*, he must have discerned the truth of mine, and the groundlesness of his *affirmation*. For of *John III.* to whom *Gregory*'s *Epistles* are written, *l.* 1. and 2. it is by the writers for the *most part*, resolved, that he was the *first Archbishop of* Ravenna, *qui palam tentaverit, who made a publick attempt this way*, drawing many of the *Bishops* of *Italy* to his side. See *Hist. Raven. l.* 4. *p.* 181. and 184. where the whole *contest* is set down, *collected* punctually out of *Gregory*'s *Epistles*, (and he that shall compare them, shall find it done *exactly*) together with a *copy* of *John*'s *Epistle* to him, *modest*, but yet standing to his *priviledges*, with a *Nullus ergo contra me Domino meo conetur surripere, quia si vult, Deo custode, non esse potest, quòd à me aliqua novitas fuisset introducta, & adjuro vos per ipsam sedem Apostolicam, ut in nullo, Ravennati Ecclesiæ privilegia, quibus huc usque usa est, minuatis* ---- looking on *Gregory*'s *disputing* his *priviledges*, as an *invasion*, and *intolerable innovation*, and *adjuring* him by the *dignity of his place*, not to be *guilty* of it. And so nothing can with the least shew be inferred from the *Epistles* of *Gregory*, against the truth of what I affirmed from *Anastasius*, concerning the *independence* of this *Church*, held out till *Pogonatus*'s time, *i. e.* till the *necessity* of their *affairs*, (occasioned by the *invasion* of the *Longobards*, and want of relief and support from the *Greek Emperors Vicarii*) drave them to the *Bishop* of *Rome* for aid, who would not give it, but upon this price of giving up their former *liberties*.

27. What he adds again of the *Ravennates* being *Schismaticks as well as we*, (though even now one of his answers was taken from the *Pope consenting* to the *Edict*, and I am sure *Gregory* oft professes to have *confirmed* their *priviledges*) ought not to be of much force with any that knows his Notion of *Schismaticks*, such as yield not *obedience* to the *Universal Pastorship* of the *Pope*, which is evidently the *question* at this time, and should be *gained* and won, not *assumed* and *begged* by him.

28. But at length he is content that *plain reason should judge in this Controversie.* And what *reason* doth he offer to *prove*, that the *Ravennates* pretended ἀυτοκεφαλία *from the time of* Valentinian's *Edict*, *was an act*

act of Schism? Why, saith he, *at the breach of the* Ravennates *from their subjection, the Popes made head against them, and stood upon their authority, as Universal Pastors, which therefore in all likelihood would have been looked on by the rest of the Catholick Bishops, as a proud usurpation, and being against their common interest to let the Pope pretend this, ought in all reason to have ingaged them in the* Ravennates *quarrel, and there being no news of such siding, one may at least conjecture, that they thought the Popes pretence to the Primacy lawful.*

Here is the *plain reason* we were promised, which at the beginning of the *Paragraph* undertook to *judge in the controversie*, and yet when it hath had *audience*, the utmost that *S.W.* that produced this *plain*, decisive (that sure must be *demonstrative*) *reason*, can dare to say of it, is, that it *is able to induce a conjecture*; and in a matter of *fact* contrary to his *interest*, they would indeed be strangely *weak* grounds, on which one, *i.e. S.W.* would not *found a favourable conjecture*. And yet this is the solid pregnant reasoning, beyond all possible confute. 'Tis pity to enter farther into the *secrets* of it. Yet I cannot but mark, 1. that the *Ravennates* ἀυτοκεφαλία, given them by the *Emperors Edict*, was of the same nature exactly with the many other *examples* frequent in the *Church*, of *Primacies* conferred by the *Imperial Constitutions*, which were never *resisted*, or *checkt* at, at the time of their first *donations*. 2. That if *S W.* his way of arguing hold, then it follows as consequently, that what *Valentinian* did, was no *innovation*, or *assuming* of *undue power*. For then in all *likelihood* it would have been *lookt* on by the *Catholick Bishops* as such; and this no way *appearing*, one may as *reasonably conjecture*, that they never deemed it *unlawful*; especially if to this we add, what the *stories* tell us, that *John III.* of *Ravenna*, that contested with *Gregory* about the *Pall*, had gotten many of the *Bishops* of *Italy* to his *side*. See *Hist. Raven. p.* 180. Thirdly, That if the *collation* of this *Independency* be it, which *S.W.* calls the *breach* of the *Ravennates* from their *subjection*, it is in no degree true, that at that *breach*, *i.e.* at the time of their *first* assuming this ἀυτοκεφαλία, the *Popes made head against them.* This I shall assume from what he even now supposed, when it appeared useful to him, *viz.* that the *Edict* was made not without the *Pope's consent*, (and by Pope *Gregorie's confirming their priviledges*) for if so, then sure they did not *make head against it*, for that were strongly to *dissent*, and *expres* their *dissent*, which consequently must have been *visible*, and then he could never have been so *blind*, as to deem them *consenting*. Fourthly, That the *first dissent* that *S. W.* takes notice of, is that of P. *Greg.* who, according to his own just computation *ascended* to the *Papacy*, *An.* 590. and that is 158. years after the date of the *Rescript* of *Valentinian*, and for ought yet appears, the *Independency* was *undisputed* for all that time, a pretty *competent* space for a *proscription*. Fifthly, It is not yet proved by *S.W.* that the *Popes* thus early, no not this *Gregory* himself, which disputed *Ravenna's priviledges*, stood upon their *authority*, as *Universal Pastors* of the *Church* (as he assures me *the Doctor will grant*, and thereby signifies nothing, but that he is not very ready to prove it) I am sure he sadly * complains to *Mauritius* the *Emperor*, of the *proud* and *pompatick stile*, the *name of vanity*, the *new and profane words of Universal Bishop*, which *John Bishop of* Constantinople *had attempted to assume*, adding, *that for all the Elogies and promises made to S.* Peter, *he was not yet called Universal Pastor*, and infers this *horrible absurdity* upon it, that whereas some of his *Predecessor Bishops had been Hereticks*, Nestorius, *and* Macedonius; *if this title had belonged to that See, it must follow, that the Universal Church*, à statu suo corruit, *fell from her state, when he that was thus stiled Universal Bishop fell*; withal assuring the *Emperor*, that he did not *plead his own cause, or avenge his private injury:* which assures my charity, that this *Pope* could never assume this title of *Universal Pastor* of the *Church*, or *make head against* Ravenna, *standing upon this*, (*i.e.* the *Papal*, as that is above, *Patriarchal*) *claim of authority:* And indeed, this was before *Boniface's* time, who was the first, to whom *Phocas* gave that title, and therefore I may with all reason assume, that as yet the *Popes* could not *make head* against *Ravenna*, on that score.

* *Ep. ex Reg. l. 4. Indict. 13. Ep. 32. and l. 7. Ep. 30.*

29. 30.

Sixthly, When this *title* was assumed, and then the *Ravennates Independency* became such an Eye-sore, most *intolerable* to the See of *Rome*, there is no necessity, that all that lookt upon it, as an *usurpation*, should engage in the *Ravennates* quarrel (though, as hath been said, many of the *Bishops* of *Italy sided* with them) *weakness* and *fear*, and many other secular considerations might interpose, and leave the *just* cause to be oppressed by the *unjust*; and there is no consequence to be drawn from *not ingaging* in the cause, to the *not approving* of the *innocence*. The *Greeks* aided the *Ravennates* a while, but the *Longobards* were too hard for them; and the *Papacy* taking this advantage, would either leave them to be *devoured*, or would themselves *prey* upon them; and the *Ravennates* were not the first *examples* of those, that bought their lives at this price of *subjection* to the *Romans*. So perfectly vain, from one end to the other, is all my *Disarmers* discourse in this matter; 'tis a long work to discover most hastily all the *flaws* and *nullities* in this procedure, and *judgment* of his *plain reason*.

31.

Lastly, When he demands *how the Ravennates behaved themselves in the business, did they stick close to, and constantly claim their non-subjection from Canons or Scripture?*] The *answer* is obvious, they stood to it, as long as they were able, and at length they yielded to *necessity*, mean while never vouched either *Scripture* or *Canons*. It is the *Popes singular priviledge* to vouch both those, without all *right* to either: the later, as long ago he did in the *African Council*, from the *Canon* of *Nice*, when no *authentick* of the *Council* sought for, in the *East*, could be found to own any *semblance* of any such *Canon*, the former, as his *Successors* have oft done from *tu es Petrus*, and *Pasce oves* ---- where the *words* being found, cannot be discerned to have any such *importance*. The *Ravennates* pretended, what they had, the *Edict* of the *Emperor*, and long *continued custom*, for the injoying of their *priviledges*, and could not have been refuted in this plea, if their *secular* affairs had not first made it necessary to wave the *insisting* on it, and if afterward the *Pope* had not prevailed with another *Emperor Justinianus* Ῥινότμητος, to *subdue*, and inflict severity on them. And thus I doubt not, the *steadiest*, and best radicated *priviledges* may be extirpated, and if rescinded by the same *power*, that first gave them, I shall after that, no longer plead for the *continuance* of them: and so I was far enough all this while, from falling justly under the *censure* of *resisting*

the decision of those who were lawful Judges in the matter; all that I did was to vouch the *priviledge* when it was given, and before it was judged fit to be taken away again by the *Emperor*, and that *S. W.* cannot but know, is all, that was any way useful for me in this *Testimony*.

SECT. IV.

The Exemptions from Patriarchs in Balsamon. *His Discourse of Patriarchs no way derogatory to* Rome's *Canonical Rights.* S. W. *his unjust exactings. The removal of the Patriarchate of* Aquileia *to* Grado. S. W. *his Exceptions answered.*

1. TO the other *examples* which I had cited out of *Balsamon*, of *Exemptions* held by the *Emperors Charter*, his *answers* are also remarkable. *First*, saith he, *Balsamon seems in this very place and Treatise, to plead for the* Greeks *against the Bishop of* Rome; *and then an enemies saying is no slander.*

2. I *answer*, The thing which I produced from *Balsamon*, was the *exemption*, or *independency* from *Constantinople*, that some *Archbishops* had by the *Emperors Charter*, and then what colour of pretence is there, that this should be a part of a plea in *Balsamon* for the *Greeks* against the Bishop of *Rome*? Certainly, *Constantinople* is not *Rome*, nor the interests of *Constantinople* the interests of *Rome*. 2. That this discourse of *Balsamon*'s, from whence this testimony was cited, lays its *foundation* in the *Synods* of *Nice*, *Constantinople*, and that in *Trullo*, and from thence evidently deduces his *conclusion* for the *number* and *order* of *Patriarchs*, giving *Rome* the first place, and so is no way injurious to the just *Canonical* rights of the *Bishop* of *Rome*; and if being so, it must yet be deemed an *opposition* to his other pretensions, this is little for their *credit*, that they are thus improved beyond what those *Canons* allowed them. But whatsoever *S. W.* will think of that, 'tis most evident that the *testimony* which I voucht out of that *discourse*, had nothing to do with that *controversie*, 'twas only a casual mention in him (on occasion of the λαμπὰς πατριαρχικὴ) of some *Metropolitans*, that had from the *favour* of *Emperors* an ἀυτοκεφαλία with some *honorary priviledges* belonging to it, as of a *known* matter of *fact*, which could no more be questioned, than the ἀυτοκεφαλία and *immunity* of *Cyprus* and *Bulgary*, which he had named immediately before, the one from the pretensions of *Antioch*, the other from the *Metropolitical* power of *Thessalonica*, under which it formerly was.

3. Next, saith he, *If we may trust* Balsamon, *then two things must lie upon the Doctor to prove, ere he can conclude any thing, to wit, that the Emperors did it not with order from the Church, or in case they did not, that it was done lawfully, and next, that the Emperor priviledged them from subjection to the Pope, as head of the Church.* To these I answer, 1. That all I was to prove, was, that the *Emperor*, and so other *Princes*, have power to *erect* and *translate Primacies*, &c. And such *ancient examples* of the *Emperors* practices, never checkt at by them, in whose time they were, is a competent proof of that; and if it should prove, that the *Canons* of the *Church* gave either *general* or *special* order, that thus it *should be*, 'tis so much the better, so much the more unquestionable, that thus it belonged to them. 2. That I can in no reason be required to prove that the *Emperors* exempted them from the *subjection* to the *Pope*, as *head of the Church*, when 1. it is but a *begging the question*, to assume thus, without proof, that the *Pope* is *head of the Church*; and 2. it is manifest that the *Emperors* did not then look on him as *head* of the *Church*, for then they could not have done such *Ecclesiastical* acts, *imperiali authoritate*, and διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν, by *imperial authority*, and *Princely Writs*. And 3. I had my full design in having shewed, that *Princes* may erect *Primacies*, without proceeding in every *period* to demonstrate that anew, which had been the design of the *former Chapters*, that *Primates* were free from all *subjection* to this pretended *head*.

4. His *answer* to the mention of the *erection* of the *Patriarchate* at *Grado*, is still suitable to his former. I had cited out of *Warnfridus*, that this was done *under Phocas*; out of *Eginartus* and *Regino*, that it was done by *Charles the Great*. And he catches presently at the *shadow* of the *word* [*under*] and then saith, *it seems the testimony says not it was done by him, but under him, or while he reigned.*] I answer, 1. That [*under Phocas*] in the first place is to be taken exactly in the same sence, as in the latter is expresst in the words [*by Charles the Great*] the only question among the Writers being, not, whether it were done *by the Emperor*, or no, but only, by *which* of the *Emperors*, or in whose reign it was done. This was the only cause why I cited it in that form, because I was not sure, to which I ought to *adhere* of the two mentioned *authorities*, where yet 'tis visible that it is as much to my purpose, if *Eginartus* say true, as if *Warnfridus*; and from him it was cited, that it was done *by* Charles *the great*, and not only *under him*, or *whilst he reigned*.

5. 2. Saith he, *Since it was not of new erected, but translated thither from* Aquileia, *burnt not long before by the* Longobards, *it was no sign of a presumed jurisdiction, but rather of a pious generosity* (in the *Emperor*) *to bestow a new seat on the destitute Patriarch.*] And I that grant it was not a *new erection*, but *translation* from *Aquileia*, have yet as much by this instance, as I designed, *viz.* that the *Emperor*, and so other *Princes*; in like manner, may *translate*, as well as *erect Patriarchates*; and sure if this might not *lawfully* be done by the *Emperor*, it could never be an *act of pious generosity* in him to do it; *charity* and *piety* (or *pity*) to the *distrest*, and *generosity*, must always be founded in *justice*, and then as *pious generosity* may fitly move one *Prince* to it, so any other *lawful*, much more *necessary* care of the good of his *subjects*, may as reasonably *move* another; and then this was all I contended for by this instance.

6. What he saith he *omits*, and yet *mentions*, *the reading the Epistle of Pope* Pelagius *II. in the Council of* Grado, *granting to* Elias *the place of the Patriarch of* Aquileia.] I may be allowed to *omit* also, it having certainly nothing of force in it, the *Patriarchate* having been there placed, before that *Council* was called, and then the *Pope*'s *grant* signifies no more, but that he had nothing to *object* against

againſt the *lawfulneſs* and *fitneſs* of the *tranſlation*, as it had paſt, or if it were alſo a *confirmation* of it (ſuch acts the *Popes* have been willing to *multiply* above what was neceſſary, to gain *conſideration* and *honour* to themſelves) this may be willingly granted alſo, upon his title of *Weſtern Patriarch*, which I never doubted to yield him, without *diminution* or *prejudice* to any of my *pretenſions*. And ſo at length we are gotten to an end of this his fourth *Section*.

SECT. V.

The Twelfth Canon of Chalcedon *reſcued from miſtakings. Abuſe of Power. The effects of that. Irregular grants of Metropolitical power.* Τιμή. Ὄνομα. *Honour. The Objections anſwered.*

THE Fifth Section enters on the view of the *teſtimonies*, which I had brought for the *erection* of *Metropoles*, by the *power* of *Princes*, out of the *Canons of Councils*; and firſt begins with that from the *twelfth Canon of Chalcedon*, and *Balſamon*'s *note* upon it. And *firſt*, ſaith he, *the Council ſaith only that thoſe Cities were honoured*, τῷ ὀνόματι, *with the name alone, which the Doctor Engliſhes, name and dignity, the latter of which*, ſaith he, *they wanted*; *that which ſhould dignifie them in a degree of a Metropolitan, being abſolutely interdicted them by this very Canon, in theſe words*, μόνης ἀπολαυέτωσαν τῆς τιμῆς, *let them enjoy only the honour: And* ſecondly, *what this honour was*, Balſamon *tells, only* καλεῖσθαι μητρόπολιν, *to be called a Metropolis: And* thirdly, *anſwerable to this are the words of the Council, calling the former Metropolis, in contradiſtinction to this, the true one, ſignifying the other to be meerly titular.*] 1.

Here is a *ſpecious* ſhew indeed, and the *Reader* may be impoſed on, if he do not pleaſe to take this *caution* with him, that there are *two* things conſiderable in that *twelfth Canon*; *one*, the premiſing a mention of the *practice*, or cuſtom of *erecting Metropoles* διὰ πραγματικῶν, *by regal conſtitutions* (as the *latter* part of the *Canon*, the words of the *Scholiaſt*, and the mention of δυναστείας *Potentates*, interprets it) the *ſecond*, a *cenſure*, or ſentence of the *Council* on ſome perſons, who had in an *undue* manner, acquired this *dignity* by that means. Thoſe things, we know, that are in themſelves moſt *lawful*, when *regularly* uſed, may be very fit to be *forbidden*, and *cenſured*, when *irregular*. And thus it was here; a *power Princes* had to *erect Metropoles*: but if it were exerciſed ſo, as to thwart *known Canons*, and *cuſtoms* of the *Church*, this certainly was an *abuſe*: As for example, One *Canon* it was, that there ſhould be but *one Biſhop*, of one *Church*, and one *Metropolitan* of one *Province*. See *Photii nomocanon*, *Tit.* 1. *c.* 20. Another, which is oft repeated, that *Dioceſes* and *Provinces* ſhould be preſerved intire, without one *Biſhops* encroaching on another; If therefore where there is one *Metropolitan* already, to whom the *government* of the *Province* by right belongs, another *ordinary Biſhop* in that *Province* ſhall by *ambition*, baſe *ſolicitation*, *whiſpering*, or falſe *ſuggeſtion*, gain a *pragmatick* from the *Prince*, to make him a *Metropolitan* alſo, ὡς ἐκ τούτου δύο μητροπολίτας εἶναι ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐπαρχίᾳ, ſaith the *Canon*, *ſo that by theſe means there are two Metropolitans in the ſame Province*, (which muſt needs *diſturb* the adminiſtration, and invade the rights of the former *Metropolitan*) here certainly is an *abuſe*, fit for a *great Council* to take cognizance of, and provide againſt, and by *cenſures* to reduce this *irregular Biſhop* to ſome order. And this was exactly the caſe here, and conſequently the *Canon* begins with ἦλθεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, ὡς τινὲς παρὰ τοὺς ἐκκλησιαστικοὺς θεσμοὺς προσραμόντες δυναστείαις διὰ πραγματικῶν ἢ μίαν ἐπαρχίαν εἰς δύο κατέτεμον, *It hath come to our ears, how contrary to the Eccleſiaſtical Canons, ſome men running to the ſecular powers have by Pragmaticks cut one Province into two*, and therefore the *Synod* declares, that no *Biſhop ſhall dare*, or *attempt* any ſuch thing; or if he doth, he ſhall *fall from his own degree*; but thoſe that have formerly been thus *honoured* by the *Kings Writs*, they ſhall *injoy the honour alone*, but the *rights* ſhall be *preſerved* to the *true Metropolitan*: where there is nothing more clear than this, that the *irregularity* of the *particular erection*, in reſpect of theſe *circumſtances* and *conſequences*, of unworthy *ſolicitation* in the *Biſhop*, and the tearing a *Province* into two, to the bringing in of *violence* and *confuſion*, was it that made that *Council* cenſure ſuch *ambitious* perſons: and yet this ſo, as not wholly to *caſſate* the *Princes* act, even when 'twas thus *irregular*; much leſs to intimate in the leaſt, that ſuch *power* belonged not to the *Prince*, or would not ſtand *valid* to all *effects*, if it were *duly exerciſed* by him, without *wrong* to any. The *validity* of ſuch acts is fully cleared by the *ſeventeenth Canon* of that *Council*, and by the thirty ſeventh in *Trullo*, and the way of *reconciling* this ἐναντιοφάνεια, or *ſeeming difference*, is clearly ſet down in that *Treatiſe of Schiſm*, from the *law* of *Alexius Comnenus*, and the *Canon* under him, as is viſible in the latter part of that fourteenth *Sect. viz.* that in caſe the *King* did it ἀνθόρμητος, of *his own incitation*, it ſhould ſtand good, but it ſhould not be *lawful* for any by *baſe ſolicitation*, to ſeek or obtain it, and conſequently, that the *Patriarch* ſuſpending the *confirmation* till he had *remonſtrated* to the *Emperor*, what the *Canons* were in that caſe; if it appeared that the *Emperor* did it οἰκοθεν *of his own motion*, he was preſently to *admit* it. 2.

So that now it will ſoon appear, what *juſtice* there is in all *S. W.* his *ſuggeſtions* in this matter; as 1. when he ſaith, that the *Council ſaith only that thoſe Cities were honoured with the name alone*, charging it as a *fluency of the Doctors expreſſion*, that he *Engliſhes it* [*name and dignity.*] I anſwer, that I well underſtand what is meant by ſuch *fluent*, or *large expreſſions*, and will never once be willingly guilty of any ſuch, and therefore to clear my ſelf in this *particular*, I wiſh it be remembred, 1. that as ὄνομα, *name*, is the word here uſed, ſo τιμὴ, *dignity*, or *honour*, is alſo uſed of the ſame thing in another part of that *Canon*; and even when it is ſaid by way of *cenſure* on them, that *they ſhall enjoy* τιμῆς μόνης, no more but that, yet it is τιμὴ ſtill, and that is ordinarily rendred *honour*, or *dignity*; 2. before this *cenſure* falls on them, when ὀνόματι, *name*, is mentioned alone, yet the *verb* joyned with it is ἐτιμήθησαν, *they were honoured*, i. e. *dignified by that name* (for *honour* * ſay the *Lawyers*, *eſt adminiſtratio provinciæ cum dignitatis gradu*, *an adminiſtration with a degree of dignity*; ſo in the *African* 3.

* *L.* 14. *D. de muner. & honor.*

Can.

Can. 68. ἐν ταῖς ἰδίαις τιμαῖς ἀναδεχθῆναι, *they shall be received in their own honours*, i. e. their *Episcopal powers* and *offices*, and so in *Augustine*, *Ep.* 50. *in suis honoribus suscipiendos*, in the same matter) which they could not be, if that *name* were not a *dignity* to them that had it; 3. ὄνομα, ordinarily signifies *dignity* and *power*, and not only *name*, as when the *name of Christ*, and of *Jesus*, in the sacred style, signifies more than the *bare name*, or *title*, the *power* and *dignity* of his *person*. All which, I suppose, will justifie me for *englishing* ἐνόμασι μητροπόλεως, by *name* and *dignity* of *Metropolis*.

4. But then 2. when he saith, the *Council saith only that they were honoured with the name alone.*] There is no *sincerity* in this, for 1. the word [*alone*] is put in by *S. W.* 'tis ἐνόμασι, *name*, not ἐνόμασι μόνῳ, *name alone*: 2. 'tis in the *second* part of the *Canon* (that which sets down the mulct, or *punishment* of those which had unduly *ascended* to this *dignity*) that that interdict is found in these words, *Let them enjoy only the honour*] and not in the *first* part, where the *name* and *dignity*, which they receiv'd by the *Pragmatick*, is mentioned; and consequently 'tis so far from being hence inferred, that they had from the *Pragmatick* nothing but the *name*, that on the contrary, 'tis clear by the *Canon*, which thus *punisheth* them for their offence (that *they shall enjoy* μόνης τῆς τιμῆς *the honour alone*) that if they were not thus *punisht*, or before they were, i. e. *before* the making of this *Canon*, they should and did *enjoy* more than the *honour alone*, and so more than *only* the *name*.

5. 2. When he saith *Balsamon* tells me what that *honour* meant, *viz.* only to be called a *Metropolis*: This is another *falsification*, for besides that he saith no more than this, that *some asked*, *and heard*, or were told thus, *i. e.* that some thus *interpreted* it, beside this, I say, it is clear, that this of the being *only called Metropolitans*, was the *punishment* inflicted on them by the *Council*, which, as I said, *resists* not, but necessarily *supposes*, that they had further *honour*, than meerly that *titular*, conferred on them by the *Prince*, for otherwise they could not be thus *mulcted* or *punisht* by the *Council* for their *irregular ambition*, by having it taken from them.

6. 3. The *contradistinction between this and the true Metropolis*, is of no force to his, or against my *pretensions*. For that again only signifies, that the *rights* did truly and duly belong to the other *Metropolis*, and that this which was thus unduly *advanced*, though by the *Emperours* constitution, did not acquire any *just* or solid right, which I most willingly grant, in such cases as that which was there mentioned, and can from thence receive no *prejudice* to my *conclusion*, viz. that in the *East* many *Emperours* had erected *Metropolitans*, which was the main thing to which I designed that *testimony*, both from the words of the *Canon*, and from *Balsamon*, who affirms it distinctly of the *Metropolis* of *Lacedæmonia*, of *Madyta*, and *Abydus*, and never gives the least reason to suspect that those *acts* of these were *invalid*. Thus wholly vain are all *S. W.* his ἀντιθέσεις, and consequently his *suggestion*, that the *consequences of this testimony are totally against my self*, though thus indeed they might seem to the *hasty* Reader to be, before his *Arts* of *disguising*, by *confounding* the *distant* parts of the *Canon* were thus discovered. Herein I acknowledge he hath shewed himself a *dexterous* manager, but as it falls out, hath made no *real* advantage of his *artifices*.

7. What he yet farther adds in the fourth place from *Balsamon*, that he shall be ordained and judged by the old *Metropolitan*, is already answered, that this was the *Councils penalty* inflicted on him; as for others that should *after* that *Canon* attempt the like, the *Canon* decrees that they were to be *degraded* from the *power* which they already had.

8. As for the fifth thing, of the *power* given to the *Prince* ἄνωθεν, which he will have rendred *olim*, *by some precedent Council*, it was, upon some occasion, spoken to in the *Reply*, *cap.* 6. *sec.* 4. *n.* 19. and evidenced in whatsoever sense it were taken, to be *favourable*, and not *contrary* to *my* pretensions.

SECT. VI.

Balsamon's words of the Emperour's erecting many Metropoles. Of what times to be understood. Ἄνωθεν. Helenopontus. Paphlagonia. Phrygia Capatiana. Cappadocia prima, secunda, Basil. Anthimus.

1. IN the next place, on a view of a *first observation* of mine, that if *Balsamon say right*, *that at the time of that Council of* Chalcedon, *many Emperours had erected many*, *there must needs be others before* Valentinian, *who was but twenty years before that Council*, he saith, *the observer is fallen into a great mistake*, *Balsamon's* words being to be *interpreted*, saith he, *in his own times*, *in which he lived*, i. e. 600. *years after the Council*, *that then such Metropoles were made.*] To this I *answer*, that *Balsamon's* words lye indifferently, without *notation* of the *particular* time, of which he speaks, only διάφοροι διαφόρως ἐτίμησαν, *divers Kings have honoured divers*, so that neither can I conclude from the bare force of them, that he spake of any *before that Council*, nor he on the *contrary*, that he spake of those of his *own times*; to which it belongs, must be judged by other circumstances, and though the matter be not *great*, which way it be determined, nor at all necessary to *my pretensions*, to be interpreted of the *times before the Council*, yet I shall mention the *reason*, which inclines it that way, and let it be of force, as it shall deserve. Upon the mention of *divers Bishopricks thus dignified by the Emperours into Metropoles*, he mentions his opinion, collected from the 17. *Canon of Chalcedon*, and 38. *in Trullo* (ἔοικεν ἀπὸ τῆς ιε'. κανόν⊙------ *it appears to me from those Canons*) that such ὅρισμοι were made by *Kings*, *according to the power given them*, ἄνωθεν *from above*, or *of old*; Here first I shall gratifie *S. W.* that ἄνωθεν may indeed signifie *olim*, and if it so signifie in that place, then it must in all *probability* refer, not to this *Council of Chalcedon*, and *in Trullo*, which he names, and from which he *concludes* that this *power* was *given them of old*, but to times *before* those *Councils*. And so this very *probability*, if there were no more, will make it *unreasonable* to *confine* his precedent words [διάφοροι ἐτιμήθησαν, *divers have been honoured*] to the times so long

after

after that Council, as those wherein *Balsamon* lived, when the words will bear so much a *greater latitude*, and signifie such grants *before that Council*. Now that it doth thus really refer to some *more ancient times*, I thus farther infer, 1. from the nature of the word ἄνωθεν, which is all one with ἀπ' ἀρχῆς from the *beginning*, and elsewhere frequently notes *an original right*, from the *first*, i.e. the *Apostles* times, or first *plantations*. And agreeably to this, 2. from the *general Aphorism*, which we have in *Origen*, who was before this of *Chalcedon* above 200. years, ἡ ἀρχοῦσα ἐκκλησίας ἑκάστης πόλεως ἀρχούσῃ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει συγκρίσεον, *that the Governour of the Church in each City must be corresponding to the Governour of the inhabitants of the City*, viz. the *civil Governour*; which, supposing what is undoubted, that a *King* may dignifie an *ordinary City*, and make it a *Metropolis*, amounts to the same effect, that he may by consequence thus advance a *Bishop* into a *Metropolitan*; 3. and chiefly from what *Balsamon* here adds, διὰ τοῦτο ὑπερέκλησε----- *for this cause*, i.e. because of this *power*, which was *of old given to Kings*, the *third chapter of the first title of the third book of the Basilica was out of use*, or *obsolete*, continued not of force in the *Church*.

To understand the importance of which words, 'tis necessary to consider what that *chapter* is, 2.
which he saith was by this means *out-dated*, and in what *times* it was so. What that *chapter* was, he tells us expresly, though it be now (as being long disused) left out in the *Basilica*. *It is*, saith he, *to be found in the 20. chap. of the first title of his present work*, i.e. of *Photius*'s *Nomo-canon*. Thither if we turn, we shall find the *first* part of it to be this, that there *must not be two Metropolitans in one Province*; which how it was out of *use*, or *obsolete*, and when or how long it had been so, appears by the κείμενον, or *text* subjoyned, Ἑλενόποντος δύο ἔχει μητροπολίτας, ὡς ἡ κη'. νεαρά----- *Helenopontus hath two Metropolitans, as appears by the* 28. *Novel*, Paphlagonia *divers*, *as the* 29. *Novel witnesseth, and so* Phrygia Capatiana, *and the second* Cappadocia. Now by these *examples* I may assume to prove, what I have in hand, for in what time these *examples* shall appear to fall, of those in any reason *Balsamon*'s words must be interpreted. And for the former of them, those that are mentioned from *Justinians Novels*, the case is pretty clear, they both were evidently thus, long before *Justinian*'s time ὑφ' ἑνὶ πρώτῳ ἄρχοντι, * saith he of one of them, 'twas *in some former Governours time*, not naming whose, that it was *erected*; but of the *other*, that of *Paphlagonia*, he saith expresly, that it was done, ἐπὶ τῶν Ὠνωρίου χρόνων, in *Honorius*'s time, διατ. κϑ'. and that we know was before this *Council of Chalcedon*, and before *Valentinian*, which was all that I attempted to prove from *Balsamon*'s words. As for the instance of *secunda Cappadocia*, 'tis manifest that it was the *act* of *Valens*, collegue to *Valentinian* the *elder*, and so, evidently *before* those times either of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, or the other *Valentinian*.

* διατ. κη'.

This instance is considerable to the main business, and not insisted on formerly, and therefore I 3.
shall a little inlarge on it. *Cæsarea* had at first been the *one Metropolis* of *Cappadocia*, and *Basil* the *Great*, *Bishop* of it, but *Valens* dividing *Cappadocia* into two *Provinces*, the first and *second Cappadocia*, made *Thyana Metropolis* of the *second*, and *Anthimus* was *Metropolitan* of it. Upon this grew a *contention* between *Basil* and *Anthimus*, *Basil* insisting on the *ancient customes* of the *Church*, καὶ τῆς τῶν πατέρων ἄνωθεν διαιρέσεως, *and the original division of the Fathers*. *Anthimus*, *on the* δημόσια, or *civil forms*, or *constitutions* saith *Gregory Nazianzen*, and *Anthimus overcame*, and then *Gregory Nazianzen* himself, *Basil*'s dear friend, that had formerly favoured *Basil*'s pretensions, doth after that expresly acknowledge the *Bishop* * of *Thyana* for his *Metropolitan* (*Nazianzum* being in *Cappadocia secunda*) and implores his aid to set some other *Bishop* in his place, now he was by *sickness* disabled to discharge it, in these words, εἰ μὲν ἄλλην τινὰ κεφαλὴν εἶχεν ἡ ἐπαρχία----- *If the Province had any other head, I should appeal to it*----- τῆς δὲ σῆς εὐλαβείας ὑπερκειμένης, πρός σε βλέπειν ἀναγκαῖον, *but you being advanced to that place, I must necessarily look and seek to you*. And this still continued *valid*, and firm, and *Justinian*, that by *Edict* retrencht those *two* formerly named, *Helenopontus* and *Paphlagonia*, was so far from *retrenching* this of *Cappadocia*, that he made a yet farther change, εἰς τρεῖς ἔτεμε, saith the *Scholiast* of *Nazianzen in Fun. Or. Patris*, *he cut it into three*, erected a *third Cappadocia*, and *Mucissus* the *Metropolis* of that, and the *Ecclesiastical Government* followed, as appears by *Euphranta*, *Bishop of Thyana*, and *Theodosius*, *Bishop of Mucissos*, *in quinta Synod. Collat.* 5. *sub Justinian*.

* Ep. 88.

Having said thus much for this *interpretation* of *Balsamon*'s words, and upon this occasion added 4.
these evidences of the *ancient* practice, and *power* of *Kings* to erect *Metropolitical Churches* (according to the rule of *Demetrius Chomatenus*, *Archbishop of Bulgaria*, βασιλεὺς ἐνάγει ἀπὸ ἐλάττονος τιμῆς εἰς μείζονα, δηλαδὴ ἀπὸ ἐπισκοπῶν εἰς Μητρόπολιν, *the King advances from a lesser to a greater honour*, viz. from *Bishopricks to a Metropolis*) I should be willing to compare and balance with it any *arguments* that *S. W.* could produce for his *opinion*, that *Balsamon* speaks of his *own* times. But he hath been so reserved, as not to offer any such (only *magisterially* to affirm, *that the Doctor is fallen into a great mistake, but 'tis not worth arguing or clearing*) and therefore I have no more to add in this matter.

SECT. VII.

Rights of Kings acknowledged and confirmed by Councils. The Testimony out of Balsamon *on* Conc. Carth. Can. 16. *The grievous mistake, whose it is. The Kings Canonical power, and liberties. Destruction of our Hierarchy no way imputable to the asserting of them.*

WHat now follows for a leaf together, *p.* 147. by way of answer to my second *observation*, 1.
and to the same purpose in another leaf, *p.* 149. in answer to my second *testimony*, doth somewhat *surpass* in its kind, all that hitherto hath been afforded us. The *breviate* of it is this; when I *undertake* that *Kings* have *power* to *erect* or *translate Metropoles*, *Primacies*, and *Patriarchates*, and to prove it, produce (beside known and allowed *practices*) the *decrees* and *Canons* of the *Church*

in

in *Council*, that so it shall be; presently he concludes, that the *Doctor disputes against himself, he is*, saith he, *to prove that it is the Kings proper right, independent of the Church, or her Canons, and he brings for proof a Canon of a Council, and calls that a more expreß attributing this power to the Prince, which is indeed not* attribuere, *but* tribuere, *not an acknowledgment, but a bestowing and conferring it:*] And on he runs a very fair loose in this chase, and clearly carries all before him.

2. Of this I have already spoken to the *Catholick Gentleman, Reply*, p. 112. and I shall need add but this, that the *rights* of *Kings* have been ever since the *Apostles* times preserved inviolate by all *good Christians*, that what without and before *Universal Councils* reasonably belonged to them, hath by *Universal Councils* been *yielded* to them. And this I deemed a fit way of judging of any *particular* right, whether it belonged to them or no, by inquiring what the *Christian Church* hath still yielded to them, meaning thereby, not the *Decrees* of the *Pope*, *S. W.* his pretended *head* of the *Church*, but the *Canons* of the *Oecumenical Councils*, truly so called, and the avowed Doctrine of the *Universal Church*, by which it hath always been yielded *lawful* for *Princes* to dispose of, and *administer* matters of *exteriour order* in the *Church*, and so to *erect* or remove *Patriarchates*, and consequently beyond all dispute, *Princes* still have this *power*, and the *Pope*, that at his *creation* hath vowed to observe all those *ancient Canons* inviolate, cannot without violation of his *oath*, attempt to deny any *Christian Prince* this power in his own *dominions*.

3. To this, all that *S. W.* hath to object, is, *that the Church confers this power on Kings, and so doth* not attribuere, *but* tribuere, *attribute it, but bestow it.*] And I that meant not to dispute of such *niceties* in *Grammar*, or *mysteries* of *State*, *desirous* to unite the *civil* and *ecclesiastical* power, and not to sow seeds of *jealousies* or dissentions betwixt them, finding the same thing assumed by *Kings*, as their right, and yielded them by the *Church* to be injoyed by them (for that sure is all that *Balsamon*'s words can import, which he thinks so much for his advantage, φαμεν ὡς ὑπὸ τῦ παρόν[Θ κανόνΘ ἐνεδόθη τῷ βασιλεῖ ἐπισκοπὰς ποιεῖν ἐκ νεῦ, *we say that by this present Canon (in Trullo) 'tis yielded to the Prince to erect Bishopricks anew*, for 'tis certain that *in Trullo*, being after the *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, it was not by this present *Canon* so given him, that it was not his before; and the other *testimony*, that affirms this *priviledge* given to the *Kingly power*, παρὰ τῶν θείων κανόνων indefinitely, *by the divine Canons*, will stand him in little stead) I thought I might hence conclude this to be unquestionably their *due*, but whether it were from *God immediately* conferred on them, and *independently* from the *Church*, or whether the *Church* in any notion were the *medium* that God used now under the *Gospel* to confer it on them, truly I neither then was, nor now am, inclined either to *inquire*, or to take upon me to *determine*, being sure that this is not the *hinge*, on which the *controversie* betwixt us can depend, when it shall once be granted, that as now things stand in the World, *Kings* have this *power* really vested in them; this being most certain, that they that give the *King* any thing, do not, if he had it before, (nor indeed can be imagined to) take it away by *giving* it him. This *Dilemma* will secure both my pretensions, and my method of *arguing* for them; if this were the *Emperours* right, before the *Church* yielded or gave it to him, then sure the *liberality* of the *Church* is not so much worse than an ἄδωρον δῶρον, as to *betray* and *rob* him of it; If it were not formerly his right, but the *Churches*, then sure it is become so, by that *donation*. And when both these powers concur in the same instance, the *King* doing it of a *presumed* right, and the *Canons* of the *Church* expresly according with it, what doubt can there be of the *conclusion?* Thus the same *Balsamon* tells us in that very place, of *Alexius Comnenus* the *Emperour*, whose *Edict S. W.* here cites, that he made a διάγνωσις βασιλικὴ, *an imperial decree*, κατὰ παρουσίαν καὶ γῆς τότε συνδιαγνωμονήσης συνόδε, *in the presence of the Synod that then was, and with their consent also*, ἐφεμένον εἶναι τῷ βασιλεῖ προεδρίας θρόνον ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις χαρίζεσθαι, καὶ τὰς ἐπισκοπὰς καὶ τὰς ἀρχιεπισκοπὰς εἰς μητροπόλεις ἀνάσειν, *that it was lawful to the Princes to grant to Churches the chair of presidency, and to advance Bishopricks and Archbishopricks into Metropoles*; where, as the *decree* is the *Kings*, and the *Synod* only is *present*, and *consents*, so 'tis not that *decree* that gives the right, but it was by the *Synod* granted to be the *Princes* right before, or else we are to believe that they would not have *consented* to it; and again, in case it were granted to be *first* given to the *Prince* by the *Canons* of the *Church*, i. e. by the *Canons* of some *universal Council*, and that resolved to be the sense of that *Emperors* words in that *Edict*, τὸ παρὰ τῶν θείων κανόνων διδόμενον βασιλικῇ ἐξουσίᾳ προνόμιον, *the priviledge given to the regal Power by the divine Canons*; yet being so *given*, 1. it cannot now be taken away by the *power* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, who is himself obliged to *observe* all such *Canons*; and 2. it cannot want any new act of the *Church* to enable the *Prince* for the *exercise* of it; the *power* which he hath so long enjoyed, is of it self *sufficient* to every particular act comprehended under that *power*, and wants no *authoritative* new *concurrence*, or consent of the *Church* for the *confirming* of it. And truly when in the close of that *Paragraph S. W.* hath fairly confest, *that for the Emperour to erect Metropolitans, is an indulgence or priviledge granted and given him by the Church in her Canons.*] I may well conclude the debate, having my whole *conclusion granted* me, as far as I pretended in that *Section*, and as far as I need ever pretend in order to our present *controversie*.

I now proceed to behold him in the second part of *career* in the same field, the δολιχοδρόμιον, wherein he promises himself such *victories*, having at the very entring on this *stage*, the good fortune, as he thinks, to have left his adversary behind him *irremediably, over head and ears again*, saith he, *in a grievous mistake.*] But the word [*again*] yields me some *comfort* still. For, if I have been once in this condition already, and yet *escaped* that danger, 'tis more than possible I may again meet with the like *deliverance*, of which I shall not *despair* till I have examined what it is, wherein this *grievous mistake* consists. *Why*, saith he, *the Doctor begins thus, And accordingly the same* Balsamon (on Con. Carthag. Can. 16.) *doth upon that Canon professedly found the authority of Princes,* ἐπισκοπὴν εἰς μητρόπολιν ἄγειν, *to advance an Episcopal See into a Metropolis----- whereas*, saith he, *neither doth* Balsamon *found the authority of Princes to execute such acts on that Canon, there being not a word in it to that purpose, nor doth he professedly say any thing as of himself--- and had he said it, I conceive it no such strong argument, that a professed adversary should speak so professedly against one.*]

Among

Among these three heads, I am set to seek out my *grievous mistake*. And for the *last of them*, I hope it will not very heavily *oppress* me, when *S. W.* in his last *paragraph* made use of *Balsamon* against me; and to say no more, I see not why a *learned Patriarch of Antioch*, that had served the *Church of God* so worthily, in his great and *excellent pains* on the *Canons* of the *Ancient Church*, should not be worthy to be named in a *controversie* concerning the *Interests* of the *Church*, or why it should not be as great a *prejudice* to *S. W.* his pretensions, that this *Patriarch* should be a professed *adversary* of them, as it can be to ours, that the *Pope* of *Rome* is not favourable to them.

The like I may resolve of the *second*, for 1. granting that the words made use of, are by *Balsamon* cited from *other* men, yet the opinion of others recited by *Balsamon*, and not disproved by him, but made *use* of, for the removing a difficulty before him, was, as I thought, by *interpretation*, the profession of *Balsamon*: And 2. those others would by their *plurality* be rather of *greater*, than of *lesser* authority than *Balsamon*, to prove that this *Canon* was esteemed in the *Church* a ground, whereon to found the *authority* of *Princes*, which was the only thing I vouch from it. 3. If the *first objection* have indeed truth in it, that there is not a word in the *Canon* to that purpose, then it matters little who 'tis that *founds* this *authority* of the *Prince* on that *Canon*, be it *Balsamon*, or any other, whom he cites, the mistake is equal. The weight then, or *grievousness* of the *mistake* must, I suppose, be laid on the *first* of these, that the *Doctor* cites any, that *professedly found the authority of Princes on that Canon, which*, saith he, *hath not a word in it to that purpose*.] 6.

But now, what if the *mistake* should be on *S. W.* his side after all this? Thus he must certainly be obliged to acknowledge, when I have minded the Reader of one *trope*, I know not whether *involuntarily*, or *industriously* put upon him by *S. W.* When in accord with what had been said in the former part of that 14*th.* §. from the *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, I cite out of *Balsamon* the profest founding the *authority* of *Princes on that Canon* (in a *parentheſis* expressing the place in *Balsamon*, where it is to be found, on *Concil. Carthag. Can.* 16.) he hath made a shift to interpret my words to this sense, that I affirm that the *authority* of *Princes* is professedly founded on the 16*th. Canon* of *Carthage*, which indeed saith not a word of it. Now what a project for *victories* is this? and who would ever submit to such *meannesses*, that could hope for any other way of tolerable *subsistence?* The short is, the 12*th. Canon* of *Chalcedon*, as that is reconciled with, and interpreted by the 17*th. Canon* of that *Council*, and the 38*th. in Trullo*, was the subject matter of that *section*, and upon that *Canon* (that sure is the *Canon* of *Chalcedon*) *Balsamon*, or those in *Balsamon*, found the *authority* of *Princes* to *advance Episcopal Sees into Metropoles*; and though the 16th. *Canon* of *Carthage* have not a *word* to this subject, yet *Balsamon*'s *Scholia* on that *Canon* do thus, though but occasionally, mention it: If there be any question of this, do but turn to the place in *Balsamon*, *in Synod. Carthag.* p. 627. where having recited the very words by me set down, that the *King hath power to do many things, among these,* ἐπισκοπὴν εἰς μητρόπολιν ἄγειν, ἐκ νέα ἐπισκόπες καὶ μητροπολίτας καθιςᾶν, *to advance an Episcopal See to a Metropolis*, and to *constitute Bishops* and *Metropolitans anew*, he adds, χρῶνται δὲ καὶ τῷ ιβ'. καὶ ις'. κανόνι τῆς ἐν Χαλκηδόνι συνόδε, καὶ τῷ λη'. κανόνι τῆς ἐν Τρύλλῳ συνόδε, τὰ αὐτὰ παρακελευομένοις, *they use the* 12. *and* 17. *Canon of Chalcedon, and the* 38. *Canon of the Council in Trullo, which command the same things.* What now can be more evident than this, that 'twas not I, but *S. W.* that was in this *grievous mistake?*

Or if yet he shall insist, that there being mention in the line before, of *Concil. Carthag. Can* 16. [*that Canon*] in the *subsequent* must refer to *that Carth. Canon*. I *answer*, that those words (*on Concil. Carth.* 16.) are in a *parentheſis*, the known nature of which is, that it may be left out without *disturbing* the sense, or connexion of the *insuing* with the *precedent* words: And then the sense must be complete thus, leaving out the *parentheſis*. The same *Balsamon doth upon that Canon professedly found the authority of Princes*--- and then 'tis not possible to feign any *antecedent* for [*that Canon*] to relate to, but the *Chalcedon Canon* in the former part of that *Sect.* 8.

What here he hath gathered up out of that place of *Balsamon*, that the *King is neither under laws nor canons, and therefore he may securely do this*; from whence he *collects*, *that this power of the King to remove Patriarchates, is deduced from no other ground than this, that his will is his law, that he may lawfully do what he lists*, adding, *that these grounds supposed, he blames not the inference, that he should erect, transplant, nay pull down, not only Bishops and Patriarchs, but the whole Hierarchy it self, (your present lot*, saith he, *consequent to these your grounds)* this is still of the same *unsincere* piece, and is visibly so, as soon as ever 'tis remembred, that they that say this of the *King*, χρῶνται τῷ κανόνι---- cite *three Canons of Councils* for their *affirmation*: For sure if the *King* have this *power*, in their opinion, by the *decrees of Councils*, then he hath it upon some other *ground* than this, *that his will is his law.*----- 9.

The short is, the *ancient Canons* have made *prohibitions*, and interdicted *Bishops* some things, which yet the same *Canons* allow them to do, when it is by the *Kings* appointment; they forbid any *Bishop* to meddle with *secular* affairs, to *incroach* on another Man's *Diocese*; so again they forbid any *ordinary Bishop* to take upon him to be a *Metropolitan*, nay to *seek* or *solicite* for such increase of *power* to his See; and yet they allow a *Bishop* to meddle with such *secular* Ministeries, καθ' οἰκονομίαν βασιλικὴν *when the Prince shall thus appoint*, and in that case ὑπὸ τῶν ῥηθέντων κανόνων κωλυθήσεσθαι ἢ βλαβήσεσθαι, *he shall not be hindred or hurt by the forementioned Canons:* so again they allow liberty to the *Prince* to advance a *Bishoprick* into a *Metropolis*, and the like, adding that the *King* ὅτι νόμοις ὅτε κανόσιν ὑπόκεισθαι, *is not subject to Laws and Canons*, i. e. these *Laws* and *Canons* that were made for the *retrenching* other mens enormous *irregular actions*, were never meant to extend to the *restraining* of the *Prince*, as appears by the very words of these *Canons*, which yield this power to the *King*, though they take it away from all others. Thus in *Demetrius Chomatenus* his first answer to *Cabasila*, *Jur. Græco-Rom.* l. 5. p. 317. τοῦτο κανονικὸν οὐκ ἐστὶν, ὅτε μὲν τῆς ἐγγράφε ἢ ἀγράφε παραδόσεως, γίνεται δὲ πολλάκις βασιλέως κελεύοντος, διὰ τινὰ οἰκονομίαν λυσιτελοῦσαν κοινῇ, *this of a Bishop removing from See to See, is not Canonical, neither by any written or unwritten tradition, yet 'tis ordinarily done upon the command of the King for some administration useful to the publick*; adding by the way of *general Aphorism*, τὰ τοιαῦτα κίνησις μόνη βασιλικὴ δύναμιν ἔχει μεταλλάττειν τὰ

καὶ καινολομεῖν, *such things as these the regal Edict alone hath power* (that sure is not a *violent tyrannical presumption*) *to change and innovate*; and by and by after a great deal to this purpose he concludes, ταῦτα πάντα ῥᾴδιόν ἐστι καταμαθεῖν ἀπό γε τῆς τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ θείων κανόνων προλήψεως, *'Tis easie to learn all this from the volumes of sacred and divine Canons*, which it seems allow this. And many the like may be met with in *Ecclesiastick* Writers. And for this there is evident reason; because what would tend to *injustice* and *disorder*, being done by *Bishops* on their *own* heads, or from their own *ambitions*, being yet ordered and *commanded* by *Governours*, whose office it is to judge of *publick commodity*, and accordingly to give rule in it, tends to the most *contrary* ends, *preservation* of *peace*, and *order*, and *justice*, and all that is desirable among Men. 'Twas not possible *S. W.* should be unable to discern this, whether in the *practice* (so frequent) or in the *palpable reasonableness* of it, and therefore the fault is the greater, that he should 1. thus *shuffle* together things that are most distant, the *irregular* wills of *Tyrannes*, and the *Canonical liberties* of *Princes*, and then vouch as *our grounds*, that the *Prince may pull down the whole Hierarchy it self*; and having ascended to this *high* degree of that which no *Christian* should once be guilty of, speaking *confidently* what he knows hath not the *least semblance* of *truth* in it, 'tis admirable that he should yet be able to *transcend* himself, and advance to this most *superlative* pitch of affirming our *present lot* (the *pulling down our Hierarchy*) to be *consequent to these* forementioned *grounds*, as if He which died in the *defence* of the *laws* and *hierarchy* of our *Church*, had been guilty of the *demolishing* of it. 'Tis hard I confess to reply to *such* reasonings as this.

SECT. VIII.

Anselm's *interpretation of* 2 Thes. 2. 7. *Lawful power of Kings. Kings founders of Bishopricks in* England. Regali authoritate, *in the Charter for* Battel *Abbey. Bishopricks bestowed by Kings by Investiture. Non-reception of Legates. Kings power to remove Patriarchates, prejudicial to the Papal, not Patriarchal pretensions.*

1. HIS next tender of *answers* to my 15. and 16. *Sections*, begins with many good words to *Anselme*, in pure *gratitude* for the *kindness* he expresst to the *Pope*, in *saving* his *authority*, before he would consent to the *erection* of the *Bishoprick* of *Ely*. And seeing he is by *S. W.* afforded the *Elogie* of the *gravest Prelate our Countrey hath ever been honoured with*, for this one *merit* of *refusing the Kings sole authority* to *conclude such businesses*, *without his* and the *Pope's consent*] I shall ask him what he thinks of *Anselm's* words, on 2 *Thes.* 2. 7. *Romanus Pontifex qui tenet nunc Ecclesias, teneat illas donec de medio fiat*, i. e. *donec ab ipsâ Romanâ Ecclesiâ, quæ est medium & cor Ecclesiarum, fiat iniquitas, ob quam ab eâ multæ discedant Ecclesiæ. The Bishop of* Rome, *who now holds the Churches, let him hold them till he be taken away*, i. e. saith he, *till iniquity be committed by the Roman Church it self, which is the middle and heart of the Churches, for which many Churches depart from her.* What ill luck was it that *S. W.* his profusest *acclamations* should be bestowed upon one that hath no better *deserved* them?

2. I have no more to say, but to desire the *Reader* to read over the *Sections*, to which they are *accommodated*, and only to remember, that when I speak of the *power of Kings*, I speak only of their *lawful power*, such as was by all disinterested persons accounted *really* to belong to them, such as is *approved* and allowed them by the *Canons* of the *Universal Church*, and in the exercise whereof, the *Bishops* or *Governours* of the *Church* then being, expressed their sense that it was so, and concurred, as far as they were concerned, to the acts of it (yet this still without the *authoritative consent*, or *concurrence* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, as to this Realm of ours) and that for any *all-lawful inerrableness*, as he calls it, I that do not allow it the *Pope* in any his *narrowest* sphear of motion, in his own *territories*, or *chair*, did never plead it to belong to *Kings* in theirs; Nor do I any more pretend, that they which are obliged to make no *law*, but by consent of *Parliament*, should make laws of themselves, without and against that *consent*; which is all the *Reply* due to his *Answer* to the instance of *Kenulphus* in his next *Paragraph*.

3. As for his other *answer* taken from the *Kings* founding of *Abbies*---- it will rather *assist*, than *prejudice* our pretensions, who acknowledge him *founder* of our *Bishopricks* also, and from thence framed an *argument* for this power of his, *Sect.* 18.

4. What he adds of *Regali authoritate*, in the *Charter* of *William the Conqueror* to *Battel Abbey*, *that it signifies the Jus Regis*, 1 Kin. *the power of the sword, and injustice, and this consequent* to his *being the Emperour*] needs no other answer than this, that he that came in by the *sword*, professed to rule by *law*, and is no more to be presumed to have broken his *oath*, than the *Popes* that vow to *rule* according to *Canon*, though they have come in by *Simonie*. And the particular *Charter* by me cited from him, having the *attestation* of the *Bishops* and *Barons* joyned to his *regal authority*, 'tis to be presumed (there appearing no cause of *fear* to extort it from them) that they thought it agreeable to *regality* and *justice* too, what he thus did, or would not have thus *attested*.

5. The *three* particulars behind in this 5. Sect. have been briefly toucht on already here, or in the *Reply*, and there is no appearance of *weight* in what is here suggested, to exact my farther inlarging. For, 1. If the *Kings* of *France* and *England*, and *Emperours* of *Germany*, have always *claimed to bestow Bishopricks by investiture*, then I must still suppose this some *prejudice*, or retrenchment to the *Pope's Universal Pastorship*, as *S. W.* will inlarge the *fringes* of it; and this his own words confess to me, when at length he minds me of the *Pope*, and *Clergie's* resistance to *Kings*, that usurped these *Investitures*: for if so they did, sure they must be thought to have deemed it some *invasion* of their pretended rights, that the *Kings* thus *claimed* and injoyed them, or else they would not have been so *peevish* to make such *unjust* at once, and *gainless resistances*. And this was all that I pretended from that *instance*.

So

So also for the *Legates* receptions, it cannot miss to be an *indication* of the *Supreme power* of *Kings* in all causes within their own *Realms*, and consequently of the no *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, that his *Legate*, which is *interpretatively* himself, cannot without leave from the *Prince*, lawfully enter the *Kingdom*, or exercise any *jurisdiction* in it, this sure being the *priviledge* of every *Supreme Governor*, that his *Dominions* should lye open to him, and to the πεμπομένοις ἀντ' αὐτοῦ, 1 Pet. 2. 14. his ἡγεμόνες, be they *ordinary Judges* of *circuit*, or fixt *Procurators*, or any that any way *represent* his person, as certainly *Legates* do, and are therefore styled ἀπὸ προσώπου from *his person*, or *à latere*, *from his side*, and come, and are either *received*, or *rejected* in the *virtue* of him that *sent* them. Of this see the *Reply*, p. 124. And then the greater the *number* is of such *Nations*, which still deny this *liberty* of *admission* to the *Pope*'s *Legates*, the more proofs there are of the no *Universal agnition* of his *Universal Supremacy*. 6.

And *lastly*, for his suggestion, that all *this while I mistake the Papal power for a Patriarchate*, See *Reply*, *c.* 6. *sect.* 4. *n.* 21. or remember, that the *Supreme power of Kings* being once asserted (particularly to this, to erect in their *Realms*, *Primates*, or *Bishops*, *independent* from all *foreign* power) is a competent *prejudice* to the *Popes* highest pretensions, those of the *Universal Pastorship*, and indeed most proportionable, and particularly *adequate* to that, and was never designed by me, as the *Engine* to oppugn his *Patriarchal just* rights, nor if it had, could it have hoped to be *successful* to that end. The *unlimited Papal* usurpations are they, that are found unreconcileable with the *power* of *Kings* in their own Realms, as one society cannot have *two Supremes*. This advertisement may assure him, I was not so blind as to mistake *Rome*'s pretensions to be for no more than a *Patriarchate*; If I had, I should either never have disputed at all, or have made use of some *other* Arguments, *viz.* The *Pope*'s *fastidious* rejecting and disclaiming *that* title, relinquishing and renouncing those his *just* rights, in order to these higher *pretensions*. 7.

SECT. IX.

Testimonies of the power of Kings in the Church vindicated, from Demetrius Chomatenus. οἷα. Constantine *in an Assembly of Bishops. His Ecclesiastick Laws.* τὰ ἔσω, *and* τὰ ἐκτὸς ἐκκλησίας. *The Bishops and the Kings power.* Constantine's *titles, and oversight of Bishops.* Leo Isaurus *stiling himself* ἱερεύς. Socrates *his testimony of the Churches dependence on Kings.*

HIS *sixth Section*, after some of his wonted *Discipline*, to remind me of what I was competently assured, that I was far gone in his *displeasure*, is pleased to apply *answer* to my *marginal testimonies* concerning the *power* of *Kings* in the *Church*: And first, to that of *Demetrius Chomatenus*, *Archbishop* of *Bulgary*, in his *response* to *Constantinus Cabasila*, *Archbishop* of *Dyrrhachium*, where he had no temptation to *flatter Kings*, yet affirms, ὁ βασιλεὺς οἷα κοινὸς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισημονάρχης καὶ ὢν καὶ ὀνομαζόμενος, *the King is as it were the common directer and ruler of the Churches, both in title and reality:* he *answers*, *that this signifies rather he was not so, than was so, unless I can prove, that* quasi, *as it were*, *can bear the sense of* revera, *in deed and in reality*; where to make short, and gratifie *S. W.* I shall undertake to prove what he thinks so *impossible*, both that [οἷα] *can*, and in that place *must*, signifie *revera*, *indeed*, and in *reality*. 1.

And 1. I premise, that the rendring οἷα by *quasi* in *Latine*, or, *as it were*, in *English*, cannot prejudice the notation of the word in *Greek*, particularly in the use of that *Writer*. Οἷα, saith *Hesychius* and *Phavorinus*, denotes ὥσπερ, καθάπερ, ἅτε, and is in ordinary use the same with *utpote*, *scilicet*, *videlicet*, *as*, *to wit*, and so hath no *intimation* of a *bare shew*, or *similitude*, as that is opposed to *reality*. In the fifth line of that *Response*, μηδὲ ἐξὸν μοι---οἷα εὖ εἰδότι, *it was not lawful for me--- as knowing well----* where sure he affirms himself *really to know*, and not in *resemblance*, as that is opposed to *truth*. So within few lines after in the first page, μηδέτερον ἀποσώζειν ---- κενινδύνευκα, οἷα τὴν μὲν ὑπακοὴν ὀκνῶν, *I have been in danger to preserve neither, as being slow* (not only *appearing* to be so) *in respect of obedience*; and thus 'tis evidently in this place; the *occasion* of the Speech is contained in the words immediately *precedent*, which I had occasion to recite even now, that the *King hath power by his sole Edict to change some things in order to publick advantage, which the Canons of the Church have determined*, δύναμιν ἔχει, saith that *Bishop*, *his command or Edict hath power*, and that μόνη *alone by it self*. And the words themselves in the *full* period, of which I cited but the *breviate*, run thus, ὁ βασιλεὺς γὰρ, οἷα κοινὸς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισημονάρχης καὶ ὢν καὶ ὀνομαζόμενος, καὶ συνοδικαῖς γνώμαις ἐπισκοπῶν, καὶ τὸ κῦρος ταύταις χαρίζεται, ἐκκλησιαστικὰς τάξεις ῥυθμίζει, καὶ νομοθετεῖ βίῳ καὶ πολιτείᾳ τῶν τῷ βήματι προσιόντων---- *For the King, as both being, and being called the common directer and ruler of the Churches* (evidently οἷα in the notion of *utpote*) *hath the presidence over the Synodical determinations, and gives them the validity, regulates the Ecclesiastical orders, and gives law to the life and conversation of those that wait on the altar*, and more to the same purpose in that place; which sure will abundantly reprove *S. W.* his κρητύγελον from the *quasi*, *as it were*, which he thought would stand him in such stead, to avoid and retort the force of that *first testimony*. Ὡς, saith the *Scholiast* on *Thucydides*, is ἀληθῶς, ὄντως, not appearingly only, but *really* and *indeed* (see *Joh.* 1. 14.) and so is οἷα also. 2.

The *second testimony* from the words of *Constantine*, he thinks hath brought in great *pomp* to his *triumphs*, but it will not prove so upon the *review*: For 1. the *words* I said *were spoken in an assembly of Bishops*; but I did not say, in a *general Council of Bishops*, nor meant I, nor foresaw that any, either the *simplest* Reader, or *learned* as *S. W.* should ever mistake me so. We use [*assembled together*] *Act.* 1. 4. of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, when the *Greek* συναλιζόμενος signifies *eating together*, and the propriety is equal, and the word in frequent use, for being *together* in any common meeting, whatsoever the *occasion* of the *assembly* be, and therefore *S. W.* hath sure gained little by this: It was, I acknow- 3.

ledge moſt willingly, at a *feſtival aſſembly* of *Biſhops*, that *Conſtantine* thus ſpake; yet I ſuppoſe, that, no more prejudice to the truth of his *ſpeech*, or to the importance of it, than if it had been ſpoken in the very *Council of Nice*, or in any other the *fulleſt*, and ſolemneſt *Aſſembly*; and therefore it was no ſuch rare εὕρημα, to add to *S. W.* his great *ſucceſſes*, that either he found the place in *Euſebius*, which is *vulgarly* known, (and therefore could not, as he ſuggeſts, be *prudently omitted* by me) or to find the *Emperour* and *Biſhops* at *dinner*, when he came, or that he was fain to ſeek to his *Latine Euſebius* to eſpy this, and make his *reports* of it.

4. 2. Whereas *S. W.* reſolves, that *there never was teſtimony, nor can be imagined in ſo little room more expreſly witneſſing that Kings have nothing to do with Eccleſiaſtick affairs, than this of* Conſtantine, *which the Doctor brings to prove the contrary*] I deſire this may be judged, 1. by the immediate *antecedents*, then by the words themſelves in the *Original Greek*, and not in his *miſ-rendring Latine Euſebius*. The *immediate antecedents* in that * very page, tell us of many ‖ *laws* of his concerning the obſervation of the *Lords day* in all the *Provinces*, concerning a *ſet form* of *prayer* to be *uſed by all* (μεμελετημένην ἐυχὴν ἐξ ἑνὸς συνθήματος ὁμοῦ τὰς πάντας ἀναπέμπειν θεῷ, and again, ἐνθέσμους ἐυχὰς) concerning the uſe of it by the *Roman Souldiers* in their *vulgar*, i. e. ῥωμαϊκὴ γλώττῃ, *Roman tongue*, concerning *Holy-days*, or the *feaſts* of *Martyrs*, and ſome other the like, which ſure were exercises of *power* in *Eccleſiaſtical affairs*. Then for the words themſelves, it matters little what the *title* of the *Chapter* in the *Latine edition* is, when *Euſebius* neither wrote *Latine*, nor, that we know of, affixt *titles* to his *Chapters*. The words in the *Greek* might eaſily have been come to, *Euſebius* εἰς τ βίον Κωνσταντίνε, is not ſo great a *rarity*, and *S. W.* was lately willing we ſhould know he could *read Greek*: And there theſe are the words of *Euſebius*, Λόγον ἀφῆκεν, ὡς ἄρα εἴη κ̓ αὐτὸς ἐπίσκοπος, literally, *he delivered this ſpeech, that he was alſo an Overſeer*, or *Biſhop*, adding the very words in which he *delivered* himſelf; in that Writers *hearing*, Ὑμεῖς μὲν τῶν εἴσω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν ἐκτὸς ὑπὸ θεοῦ καθισάμενος ἐπίσκοπος ἂν εἶην, literally thus (ſeeing *paraphraſes* of *obſcure* words muſt not be indured, when they ſound to *S. W.* his *diſadvantage*) *ye are Biſhops of the things within the Church*, or overſeers of the *Church*, *of the things within, but I am conſtituted under God, Biſhop, or overſeer of the things without*. Here 'twas neither my intereſt nor deſign to take the word ἐκκλησία *Church* (as *S. W.* ſuggeſts) for a *material Church of ſtone*, but for the *Congregation*, or aſſembly of *Chriſtians*, ruled or *adminiſtred* by the *Biſhops* in ſome things, by the *Emperour* in others. Matter of *ſacred office* of *Function*, *adminiſtration* of *Sacraments*, *ordination*, *excommunication*, and the like, which are the τὰ εἴσω, the *internal acts*, were peculiar to the *Biſhops* of the *Church*; but the τὰ ἐκτὸς, matters of *external order*, ſuch as were even now mentioned out of *Demetrius Chomatenus*, belong to the *Chriſtian Emperour*: he is by *God* appointed to be the ἐπίσκοπος, *Biſhop*, or *overſeer*, or *adminiſtrator* of ſuch: (in which reſpect I ſuppoſe it is, that St. *Chryſoſtome* is ſaid to have told *Arcadius*, οἱ κοσμικοὶ ἄρχοντες ἀρχόντων κ̓ ἐπισκόπων ἔργον ἐνεπιστεύθησαν, that the *ſecular Magiſtrates were intruſted with the work of Biſhops* as well as *Rulers*, (*Georg. Alex.* Βιὸς χρυσος. *p.* 187.) and accordingly *Arcadius* proceeds againſt the *Arians*, p. 198. l. 20. and againſt their Hymns, *p.* 199. *l.* 4.) and among theſe is particularly ſet down in the inſuing relation, the *inſpection and care of the lives of Eccleſiaſtical perſons*, which by his adjoyning *exhortation*, he expreſt to be one part of his ἐπισκοπὴ; and certainly this is an evidence of the *Emperor's power* in *Eccleſiaſtical matters* (and ſo in *ſpiritual* things in that notion of *ſpiritual*, for matters of *external order* in the *Church*, ſuch is *erecting* or *tranſlating Metropoles*, &c.) ſo is it the very thing that I was to *conclude* from that, and the other *teſtimonies*: And ſo all that *S. W.* hoped to have gained by a *corrupt Latine copie*, which, ſaith he, renders τῶν εἴσω & τῶν ἐκτὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπίσκοποι, *intra & extra eccleſiam Epiſcopi* (which the *particle* τῶν demonſtrates to be a ſenſleſs rendring) is viſibly come to nothing; they were things of the *Church*, that *Conſtantine* was *Governour* of, as well as thoſe that the *Biſhops adminiſtred*; all the difference this, that the former were but τὰ ἐκτὸς τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *external matters of order*, &c. of the *Church*, and *Churchmen* (whereas the *Biſhops* inſpection, or rule, belonged to other matters) to which agrees the ſenſe of the *Greek Church*, expreſt in the *Calendar* of the *Church* of *Conſtantinople*, ſtyling that *Emperour* ☩ ἐν Βασιλεῦσιν Ἀποστολον, and ἰσαπόστολον, *an Apoſtle among Kings, and equal to an Apoſtle*, not only in *aſſiſting* the *plantation* of the *Church* in ſo eminent a manner, (which gave him the title of *Religionis & fidei author*, *the author of religion and faith*, in an * *old Marble*) but in the *governing it* when it was *planted*.

* *Euſeb. de vit. Conſt. edit. Rob. Steph.* fol. 150. ‖ ἐν νόμῳ διεκελεύσατο, ἐνομοθέτησε πράττειν, νόμῳ ἐφοίτα, ἰσῦμα βασιλέως.

* *Gruter. p.* 159.

5. What he farther adds out of the *Latine copie*, to render his *interpretation* more probable, and *that all that was meant* by his *calling* himſelf a *Biſhop*, was, that it was *his calling to exhort all his ſubjects to lead a pious life*] is again a pitiful *ſtratagem*; for whereas his *Latine* hath, *animum in omnes qui ejus ſuberant imperio intentum habuit, hortatus pro virili ut piam vitam excolerent*, the *Greek* reads τὺς ἀρχομένους ἅπαντας ἐπεσκόπει, πρὸτρεπέ τε----- he *overlookt* or *ruled*, or *took care of all his ſubjects* (and the *Clergy* and *Biſhops* themſelves, if we may believe the *Fathers*, were of that *number*) *and exhorted them* moſt *earneſtly to follow* a *pious life*, and as long as the *Biſhops* did continue to do ſo, there was, I hope, no need of more than *exhorting*.

6. 3. For the words of *Leo Iſaurus*, that told the *Pope* he was ἱερεὺς, as well as βασιλεὺς, *S. W.* was able without an *interpreter*, to have underſtood the meaning of them, the very ſame that the *Kings* of *England* have aſſumed, not to be *Prieſts* in the *ſtrict* notion of that word ἱερεὺς, as that refers to matter of Order; that had been very *extravagant* indeed, and that puts it out of queſtion, that it was not meant by him; but to have *power* ἐν ἱεροῖς *in ſacred* or *Eccleſiaſtical* matters, and not in *civil* only; and 'tis more *reaſonable* and *Chriſtian*, to ſay with *J. C.* in *Goldaſtus*, that *Gregory* II. was not ſo *paſſionate* a pretender to the *incloſure* and *monopoly* of all *Eccleſiaſtical power*, but that he could allow the *Emperour* his part of it, than with *S. W.* to *pronounce* an *Emperour extravagant*, *Archheretick*, *infatuate*, becauſe he had unhappily incurred his *diſpleaſure*, by ſaying what was not for *S. W.* his *intereſt*, to have *believed* from him.

Another

Another [*thirdly*] now follows in *anſwer* to the teſtimony of *Socrat.* that from the *time of the Emperors receiving the Faith, the affairs of the Church depended on them*] and this is very ſharply rebuked, and poor I, for the ſake of it. 1. Becauſe the word *Supream is not there to be found, and becauſe the affairs of the head may depend on the arms and ſhoulders, and becauſe I catch at a word, and think to deduce thence a full ſentence.*] But to all this the anſwer is brief; 1. That the *Church*, whoſe affairs are there ſpoken of, is not the *head*, but the *body*, and that on, or (ἐξ) from which the *body* depends, is ſtill the *head*, though the *head* it ſelf may in ſome ſence *depend* on other *parts* of the *body*. 2. That 'tis *plain*, the *dependence* here ſpoken of, is of the *inferiors* on the *ſupream*, by that which here follows, as a proof of it in the next words, καὶ αἱ μεγίσται σύνοδοι τῇ αὐτῶν γνώμῃ γεγόνασί τε καὶ γίνονται, *and the greateſt Synods have been, and are convoked by their appointment*, and that ſure is an evidence of their *ſupream power*; for neither the *arms* nor the *ſhoulders* were ever called to that *office* of *convoking* and *indicting* of *Oecumenical Councils*, but only the *ſupream power*, whereſoever that was placed. 7.

SECT. X.

Optatus *his words of the Pope's headſhip.* Petrus Primus, *in many reſpects, before Chriſts promiſing the Keys.* Caput omnium Apoſtolorum. Cephas. Cathedra Apoſtolica, *in other Churches as well as* Rome. Romes *change from the Primitive Zeal and Faith. Power of Princes to ſuppreſs Schiſm. Eccleſiaſtical perſons not ſecured from Intereſts.*

THE place in *Optatus*, noting it as a *Schiſmatical* piece of language in the *Donatiſts*, to ſay, *Quid Imperatori cum Eccleſiâ?*] might, I doubt not, have been eaſily *found* in him, if *S. W.* had lookt with that deſign, though the figure of the book was miſtaken by the Printer. The words are to be found *l.* 3. *ed. Caſaub. p.* 81. and ſo before in the full ſence, *l.* 1. *p.* 27. *De nobis dicitis, quid Chriſtianis cum regibus? aut quid Epiſcopis cum palatio? You ſay of us, What have Chriſtians to do with Kings? what Biſhops with the Palace?* And it may be worth *S. W.* his obſerving, what return *Optatus* makes to this ſaying and practice of the *Donatiſt*, *l.* 3. *p.* 81. *Cum ſuper Imperatorem non ſit niſi ſolus Deus, qui fecit Imperatorem, dum ſe Donatus ſuper Imperatorem extollit, jam quaſi hominum exceſſerat metas, ut ſe ut Deum non hominem æſtimaret, non verendo eum, qui poſt Deum ab hominibus timebatur.* But ſometimes *diverſion* is the beſt way of *anſwering* arguments, as of avoiding of *enemies* forces; and accordingly this *method* is here choſen (and I am ſo obedient to all his *directions*, as to attend him in it) *In that ſecond Book of* Optatus, *he finds, forſooth, that ancient Father calling the Doctor Schiſmatick, and quite confuting and contradicting all his book, ſaying,* Negare non potes ſcire te in urbe Româ Petro primo Cathedram Epiſcopalem eſſe collatam, in quâ ſederit omnium Apoſtolorum caput Petrus; *then he proceeds to reckon up all the Popes of* Rome, *till* Siricius, cum quo nobis totus orbis in commercio formatarum in unâ Communionis ſocietate concordat, *and afterwards* --- probatum eſt nos eſſe in Eccleſia ſancta Catholica --- per Cathedram Petri quæ noſtra eſt, & per ipſam cæteras dotes apud nos eſſe, etiam ſacerdotium, *and then alas poor Dr.* H. *who having loſt communion with that Church, hath loſt alſo his Prieſthood, miſſion --- if this holy Father ſay true.* --- 1.

I ſhall have *S. W.* his pardon, I hope, for the *digreſſion*, and then being very unwilling to wave the conſidering any thing brought out of *antiquity* to this purpoſe, for the *Pope's ſupremacy*; I have no other *temptation* to decline following him καθ' ὁδὸν, through this whole paſſage, not meaning to caſt off this *ancient Father*, as he hath ſtiled *Optatus*, for no other fault, but that, which neither he nor *S. W.* could mend, of not being *born in due time*, or having *wrote after the* 300*th. year*, which he is pleaſed to fanſie the *fatal period*, lower than which we will *allow* of none, with how little ground of truth, may anon appear alſo. 2.

The *firſt* advantage then, I ſuppoſe, deſigned from *Optatus*, is, that he calls *Petrus Primus*, for thoſe two words are written in *Capital letters*; And I anſwer by theſe *ſteps*, 1. that thus much was ſure to be met with in the *firſt* 300 *years*, even in the *Evangeliſts*, πρῶτος Σίμων, which I have oft acknowledged, and is the ſame in *Greek* that this is in *Latine*; 2. that *Peter* might be *firſt* in ſome other reſpects, without bringing any *advantage* to *S. W.* his pretenſions, which depend only on his *Primacy* of *power* and *authority*, not amongſt, but *over* all others. 3.

Firſt he might be in *age*, and if he was not ſo *ſimply* of all, yet without *queſtion* of thoſe *three*, to whom *Chriſt* generally vouchſafed his *ſpecial* favours above the reſt: 2. he was in *Diſcipleſhip firſt*, as that ſignifies, the *following*, and *ſtrict* attending on him (though *Philip* were firſt *called* by *Chriſt*, *Joh.* 1. in which reſpect, ſaith * *Auguſtine*, *Petrus Primus Apoſtolorum, Paulus noviſſimus*, Peter *the firſt*, Paul *the laſt of the Apoſtles*; one ſo the *firſt*, as the other the *laſt*:) And 3. *Firſt in confeſſion*, and many *eminent* virtues (though the moſt *eminent* in *falling* alſo) and ſo *firſt* in *three* conſiderable reſpects (and perhaps in as many more, which I diſcern not) without having the *dominion* aſſigned, or promiſed him over the *reſt* of the *Apoſtles*. 3. That the *Primacy* which he had, he had *before* the *donation* of the *Keys*, or the *tu es Petrus*, Mat. 16. (on which, and on what was *after* that, *Feed my ſheep*, the *Romaniſt* grounds it) This appears by *Mat.* 10. 2. where that *title* is given him, and ſo by the *Fathers Scholia* on Mat. 16. 16. *loci non immemor ſui Petrus Primatum egit, primatum confeſſionis utique non honoris*, ſaith S. *Ambroſe*, * *he was mindful of his place, he had the Primacy of confeſſion, not of honour; of faith, and not of order*; and this ſuppoſes that he had it before *Chriſt*'s anſwer to him, wherein the *Keys* were promiſed; and that his *confeſſion*, and *Chriſts anſwer* upon that, was rather the *effect*, than the *cauſe* of his *Primacy*. And ſo ſaith * *Cyril* of *Alexandria*, προεξάλλεται τῶν ἄλλων κορυφαῖος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων προτέλαγμένος, καί φησι --- *as the Coryphæus of the reſt, and one placed before the reſt, he firſt breaks out and ſaith, Thou art Chriſt* --- having formerly obſerved of that *Apoſtle* in general, ὑπερίσροφος ἀεὶ πᾶς ἦν ἀνθρωπος, κεκινημένος ἀμείνως εἰς τὸ ἐπὶ τὸ δρᾶσαί τε καὶ εἰπεῖν προθυμίαν, διὰ καὶ πρῶτος ὁμολόγει τὴν πίσιν, *he was alacrious and nimble always in a high degree, in reſpect of forwardneſs both to act and ſpeak.* 4.

* Ser. 47. *de Pet. & Paul.*

* *De Incar.* c.

* To. 4. p. 1118. c.

As

5. As for the *second* title, *Omnium Apostolorum Caput Petrus*, 1. That signifies no more than *Primus* did before, and so exacts no *new* answer: 'tis no news that the word *head* in all languages should denote oft-times the *Primacy* of *Order*, not *Supremacy* of *Jurisdiction*; as when *Antioch* is called the *head* of the *Christian world*, because they were there *first called Christians*: 2. 'Tis no *special* observation, that *Optatus* calls him so, others did so before *Optatus*, who yet appear to have designed no eminent favour to *S. W.* his pretensions; witness * S. *Hierom*, or rather *Jovinian* in S. *Hierom*, who calls *Peter head*, *inter duodecim unus constituitur, ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio*, and yet in the very same *period* affirms, that as the *Church was founded on* Peter, *so 'twas, in another place, super omnes Apostolos, upon all the Apostles*, and *cuncti claves cœlorum accipiunt, all received the keys of Heaven*, and *ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidatur, the strength of the Church is established equally on them all*; and if *Optatus*'s words, and the title of *Head*, may be interpreted by the same stile in this place in S. *Hierom* before him, 'tis visible what is become of all the *advantage S. W.* can reap by that *testimony*.

* *Ad Jovin. l. 1 c. 14.*

6. But then 3. if to the mention of *Caput Petrus*, in *Optatus*, he had set down the words immediately following, it would have been little for the *dignity* of the *citation*, *Omnium Apostolorum*, saith he, *Caput Petrus, unde & Cephas appellatus est*, Peter *was the head of all the Apostles, from whence he was also called* Cephas. But doth *Cephas* a *stone* signifie a *head* with *Optatus?* was the *Greek* Κεφαλὴ a *head*, drawn in to favour this *Etymologie?* This may lawfully diminish ones *reverence* to *these* words of *Optatus*, though I preserve it never so *intire* to his other *excellencies*.

7. As for the rest of the words recited, that *the whole world agrees in one society of Communion with* Rome, *and that they that have the Chair of* Peter *are by that proved to be in the holy Catholick Church, and to have the rest of the dowries of a Church, particularly the Priesthood.*] Take it at the utmost of the literal importance, and I doubt not but it hath perfect truth in it; and so it would also, if it had been spoken of any *other* of the *Apostles plantations*, the Chair of S. *John* in *Asia*, *&c.* the meaning of the *chair* being evident to signifie the *ruling* power of the *Church* brought down (as it was in every *Apostolick See*) by *succession* from the *Apostles*, which, saith he, the *Donatists* could not pretend (and *l.* 3. he expresses it in another stile, *Unitatem cum toto orbe terrarum, & cum memoriis Apostolorum ---- habere noluistis, Ye would not have unity with the whole world, and with the memories of the Apostles*, in the plural, as well as with S. *Peter*) and so must be *pronounced Schismaticks*.

8. Thus in the same *second book*, he useth the same language of *other Churches* as he doth here of *Rome*, ‖ *Extra septem Ecclesias, quicquid foris est, alienum est, Whatsoever is without the seven Churches* (of *Asia*, mentioned *Rev.* 1.) *is strange*, or *schismatical*, and so of * *Thessalonica, Corinth, Galatia*. All which inlarges these *priviledges* of the *Church*, and so the *Priesthood* and *mission* among them, to all other *Churches* that have continued their *succession* from the *Apostles* (as I doubt not, we of the *Church of England* have done) and confines them not to the *Roman See*, exclusively or peculiarly; and so the poor *Doctor* may retain his *Priesthood*, and *mission*, and *power* to *preach*, and not be fain to seek out the *Donatists Ghosts* to hold *communion* with, and yet this *Father* be allowed to be of *age* to *speak*, and by my free *consent* his *testimony* be taken.

‖ P. 45.

* *Tibi unitas displicet; hoc si crimen putas, argue nos Thessalonicensibus, Corinthiis, Galatis — communicasse.* Ib. d. p. 52.

9. But the truth is, the full importance of these words in *Optatus*, must yet further be fetcht out from the consideration of the Schismatical *Donatists* practice. Of them 'tis well known, that they raised a Schism in the *African* Church, and every where set up a Bishop of their own Sect, even where there was an Orthodox Bishop already setled. This is lookt on by S. *Austin*, as the formal part of their Schism, *erecting Altar against Altar*, as he often expresseth it. And because they would gain to themselves the reputation of communicating with other Churches, they * created a clancular Bishop in *Africa*, and sent him to *Rome*, that he might gather together the *Africans* that dwelt at *Rome*, and there be Bishop over them that were of that Sect, and so they might have mutual intercourse *commercio Formatarum* betwixt *Rome* and their Sect in *Africk*. This design of theirs was first set up in the time of *Constantine*, about the year 321. in the City of *Rome*; the first Bishop of this Sect was *Victor Garbiensis*: Therefore *Optatus l.* 2. *adverss. Parmen.* useth that as a sure proof that they made a Schism at *Rome*, because at the time when he wrote, there had been but six Bishops in *Rome* of that Sect, *Victor Garbiensis, Bonifacius Ballicanus, Encolpius, Macrobius, Lucianus, Claudianus*; whereas the succession of Catholick Bishops there, had continued from S. *Peter* to *Siricius* by lawful election. Moreover those Bishops of the *Donatists* had no Canonical election, but were sent over and thrust in by the *Africans*, *toti Afri & peregrini in illa civitate sibi successisse noscuntur*, *Opt. l.* 2. *p.* 40. and had not so much as one Church in *Rome* to perform Divine Offices in. *Ecce præsentes sunt ibi duorum memoriæ Apostolorum: Dicite si ad has ingredi potuit, ita ut obtulerit illic, ubi sanctorum memorias esse constat. Opt. l.* 2. *p.* 39. and, *inter quadraginta ---- basilicas, locum ubi colligerent, non habebant*, p. 40. S. *Austin* urgeth the same arguments against the *Donatists*, *Ep.* 165. wherein he instructeth *Generosus* against the pretensions of a *Donatist* Presbyter, who boasted of a short succession in *Constantia* the *Metropolis* of *Numidia*. So that evidently the arguings of *Optatus* and S. *Austin* from the succession of the *Roman* Bishops, are set in opposition to that claim of a few successions, and those irregular, whether in *Africa*, or *Numidia*, or at *Rome*; and so they are very concludent against them, and the arguments serve to prove which of the two were Schismaticks at *Rome*: but that succession is not set down, as an infallible Rule for all Churches to be guided by, and give *Rome* a Title to be instructor of the whole world. And so this is a full answer both to those words in *Optatus*, so oft urged by the *Romanists*, and to the like of S *Austin contr. part. Donati*, *Numerate Sacerdotes vel ab ipsa Petri sede, & in ordine illo Patrum, quis cui successit videte: Ipsa est Petra, quam non vincunt superbæ inferorum portæ. Number the Priests even from the very See of* Peter, *and see who succeeded whom, in that order of Fathers, That is the Rock which the proud gates of Hell overcome not.* The meaning of which is now clear out of the Authors own words, without any foreign conjectures; For beside what hath been already said, if that were not abundantly sufficient, this further consideration will not fail to supersede all force of this argument from the bare sound of *Optatus*'s words. The See of *Rome* had from the *Apostles* to *Optatus*'s days shined in that lustre as to be the most eminent *Church* of any in the world; and if it had done so still, there might still have been place for *Optatus*'s words, but since

* *Victor Garbiensis à vestris jamdudum de Africa ad paucos erraticos missus. Opt. l.* 2. *p.* 40.

P. 39. & 41.

since the change hath been so great, that I may well take up *Priscus*'s words in *Excerpt.* Ἡ πολιτεια Ῥωμαίων ἀγαθὴ· οἱ δὲ ἄρχοντες οὐχ ὁμοια τοῖς πάλαι φρονοῦντες, αὐτὴν διελυμήναντο, *The Faith and Government of the Church of* Rome *was Apostolical and good, but the later Governours being not affected as anciently they were, have sorely wasted it. God* give her a return to her primitive zeal and faith.

So that *S. W.* may now return from whence he came, to the view of my testimony, and free him- 10.
self from the number of those *Donatists*, which would not allow the *Emperor* to have any thing to *do with the Church:* and all that he hath to say to it is, that *being the nursing Father of the Church, his power was to be granted sufficiently authoritative to punish and repress the Donatists.*] And if the *Prince* elsewhere may have the like power to repress all those that transcribe the *Donatists* guilt, or *Schism*, though they are most unwilling of any to own the name, then truly this is all that I ever designed to conclude from this testimony, and this being in *thesi* granted me, I have no more to contend for, this being no season to descend to the *hypothesis*, or *application.*

What he fastidiously subjoyns to the mentions of the Heathen practices in that *Margent*, I shall 11.
not attempt to make reply to, having placed no trust in that *medium*, though it could not, I thought, be amiss to annex the consent betwixt all Professions, of false, as well as true *Religions*, in this *Doctrine.* But if his severity be such, that the mentions of *Heathens* put him into ill humour, he may please, the next time he views that place, to pass more slightly over it, and not think it necessary to refute every *casual Marginal* note, which might be allowed such an unconsiderable place in a discourse, as this was, without offending any man. In his answer to it, one thing there is which he may please to review and correct at leisure. For though the *sacred mysteries and the Churches Government, be incharg'd* as he saith, *to those persons, whose state of life is purely dependent on God and his service*, yet sure there is no shew of consequence in what he adds, as the superstruction on this ὑπόμνον, *that this state of life secures them from being cross byass'd by worldly intrests, and secular pretences.* I heartily wish this had all truth in it, but shall not need endeavour to disprove it, the lives of some such men speaking louder than any arguments.

SECT. XI.

David's *ordering the courses of the Priests.* Solomon's *Dedication of the Temple.* Hezekiah's *Ecclesiastical Acts*, Josiah's. *S.* Paul's *Appeal from the Jews Sanhedrim to* Cæsar, Acts 25. 9, 10. *Judged before me, v.* 9. *Capital Judgment taken from the Jews.* Justinian's *Ecclesiastical laws in the* βασιλικα. S. W. *his falsifications and answers.* Justinian's *charge of Tyranny brought in at a dead lift.* Theodosius *no Tyrant.*

THE instances from the *Jewish practice* now follow: And to the first, of *Davids ordering the* 1.
courses of the Priests; his answer being the same that had lately been given me by Mr. *Cawdry* (a person of somewhat *different* principles,) *viz.* that *David* was a *Prophet* as well as a *King*, I refer him to my answer * there, that this was no act of *Davids prophetick*, but meerly of his *Kingly office*, founded on prudential considerations, and the change of times, *God* having formerly disposed otherwise of it. But it seems his second thoughts have better advised *S. W.* in this matter, for upon them he presently, in effect, retracts this answer (only it went against his heart to lose so much precious ink as must have perished by blotting it out again) and resolves there was in *this no strain of an higher jurisdiction* (by higher I suppose he means higher than is ordinary and regular for *Kings*, and then sure 'twas done by the *King*, not the *Prophet*) and *that as his greater zeal might invite him, so his exacter knowledge might make his assistance requisite to order the courses of the Priests.*] And then it seems I was in the right, and my instance was pertinent to infer my conclusion, that for matters of outward order in the *Church*, *Princes* were very competent, and no doubt were indued with power and authority from God, or else their zeal and knowledge could not have justified the interposing their assistance in them.

* *Account of* 3. *Diatr. ch.* 5. *Sect.* 4. *n.* 6, 8.

To the 2. of *Solomon*'s *consecrating the Temple, he answers*, it *was performed by offering sacrifice,* 2.
which he himself offered not, but the Priests, so as his consecrating it, was nothing else but causing them to consecrate it.]

I reply, that besides the *Priests* part in this work, the offering of sacrifice (which I never imagined 3.
to belong to *Solomon*, nor from thence pretended it lawful for the *Christian King* thus to invade the *Sacerdotal office*, in baptizing, consecrating the Host, or assuming any of the τὰ ἔισω τῆς ἐκκλησίας, that even now *Constantine* spake of) many other acts there were, conducing to that one main of *dedicating*, or *consecrating* the *Temple*, 1. *calling the Assembly*, and afterward *dissolving* it again; 2. *disposing* and appointing the actions of the *Priests*; 3. making the *oration* on that occasion; and *lastly*, the prayer and the blessing of the congregation of *Israel*, *kneeling* on his *knees before* the *Altar*, and spreading forth his hands toward Heaven, in the *presence of all the congregation*; and all these being *Ecclesiastical acts*, were yet performed by *Solomon*, 1 *Kings* 8. and that was all that I designed from that instance, and there neither is, nor can be any question of it.

To the *third*, of *Hezekiah*, and *Josiah*, there was more due than his *Sarcasm* will any way defray, 4.
(and yet that is all he can afford them) *Reforming* within his *dominions*, the affairs of the *Church*, exercising the ἐπισκοπὴ, or *inspection* over the *Clergie*, when they neglect their duty, the *highest*, as well as the *lower* sort of them, is the least that can proportionably be inferred from what is there done by the commandment of the *King Hezekiah*, 2 *Kings* 1. 18. and 2 *Chron.* 28. in *removing* the *high places*, *breaking the brazen Serpent in pieces*, and *cleansing of the Temple*, and *restoring* the *sacrifice* and *musick* of the *Temple*, and whatsoever was then wanting, or neglected in Gods service, by default of *Priests* or *Levites:* And so in like manner, from *King Josiah*'s act in *repairing* the *breaches of Gods house*, and *destroying Idolatry*, and *restoring*, by *Edict*, the *solemn observation of the Passover* --- 2 *Kings* 22. and 23.

To

To the nothing which he returns to these instances, all that I need say, is, that my conclusion is inferred, and he hath not attempted to invalidate it.

5. The next instance was that of S. *Paul, appealing from the judgment of the Chief Priests to the tribunal of* Cæsar; which if it had any infirmity in it, were not in reason to be imputed to me, but to him from whom I cited it, *Gregor. de Heimburg*, a person formerly well reputed of by *Pope Pius II.* till by defence of the just rights of his *Prince*, *Sigismund Duke of Austria*, he fell under his displeasure. But it seems though my citation were never so true, yet his name is not able to secure the *Doctor* from a most grievous mistake, such an one as hath brought a very ill report upon him for the like in *almost every place of Scripture he hath yet produced.*

6. What this so unlimited a charge signifies, I thank God I cannot divine, but that *S. W.* is now a drawing his *Chancery-Bill*, and thinks it not material, what degree or semblance of truth there is in any thing he casts in. This hath formerly appeared as often as he hath made the like charge, and 'tis not improbable it may yet prove so here also, when we have heard what he hath to object. S. *Paul*, saith he, *appealed not from the tribunal of the Jews, but from the tribunal of* Portius Festus, *a Roman Governour, unto* Cæsar *himself*; and this he will *prove so plainly* and *convincingly*, *from Acts* 25. 9, 10. that he shall *need only to put down the words in our own translation, and so leave the Doctor to be accused either for wilfully abusing, or ignorantly mistaking them.* The words he recites, are these, *But* Festus *willing to do the Jews a pleasure, answered* Paul, *and said, Wilt thou go up to* Jerusalem, *and there be judged of these things before me? Then said* Paul, *I stand at* Cæsars *judgment seat, where I ought to be judged.*]

7. These words then are left by their own native force, without any aid from *S. W.* to infer his conclusion, that *Paul appealed not from the tribunal of the Jews, but from the tribunal of* Portius Festus *to* Cæsar *himself:* Let us see how they will be able to do it: And first, to omit the harder part, the negative, let us examine what they say for the affirmative, that he here *appealed from the tribunal of* Festus. But for this 'tis most certain, that this text alledged can no way possibly conclude it. It is only an insisting on his right to be judged by *Portius Festus*, in opposition to going up to *Jerusalem.* This the very words by him alledged do evidence; *Festus* then hath him before him at *Cæsarea*, where he kept the *Assizes*, v. 6. and he is now sitting on the *judgment seat*, and it being the *Jews request*, v. 3. that he might be *sent to Jerusalem*, *Festus* to *gratifie them*, v. 9. proposes the *removing him* thither, which *Paul* directly disclaims and refuses, and challenges his right, as a *Roman*, *I stand*, saith he, *at* Cæsar's *judgment seat*; *he means certainly* this *tribunal of* Festus, Cæsar's *Procurator*, where he stands already, and *where*, saith he, as a *Roman I ought to be judged*; he makes no farther appeal as yet in these words from the tribunal, before which he stands, but requires to be judged there. This being cleared, *S. W.* his affirmative part hath certainly failed him, that of his *appealing* from *Festus*'s *tribunal*, in those two verses alledged by him, as the only *medium* to conclude it. His appeal to *Cæsar himself*, or to *Augustus*'s hearing, follows in the next words, *ver.* 11. and that expressly, not from *Festus*'s *judging* him there at *Cæsarea*, at the *Roman bar*, but from his *delivering him to the Jews to be judged at* Jerusalem, and that I hope is contrary enough to his negative, his *not appealing from the tribunal of the Jews.*] Nothing can be more manifest, *If*, saith *Paul*, *I be an offender, or have committed any thing worthy of death, I refuse not to die*, (let him be judged there by *Festus*, and whatsoever the event be, he willingly submits to it, without any appeal from that *Judicature* of *Festus*, *before which* now he *stands*) *but if there be none of these things, whereof these accuse me, no man may deliver me unto them* (i. e. to the *Jews*) *I appeal unto* Cæsar, So that 'tis not from *Portius Festus* judging him, that he appeals to *Cæsar himself* (if *Festus* would judge him, he would readily submit to it, and requires it as his priviledge to be so judged) but from his *delivering him to the Jews to be judged at* Jerusalem, *i. e.* from that tribunal of their *Sanhedrim* (which represents the *Christian Church*, and where the *High Priest* was the principal person, *c.* 24. 1.) he makes his *appeal to the secular Magistrate*, the *Roman Emperor himself*, and hopes for much more justice from him, though an *heathen Prince*, than he doth from such a tribunal of *Ananias* and his consistory.

8. If this be not yet plain enough, then 1. remember where 'twas that *Paul* was arraigned, (before *Lysias the Roman Commander sent him to* Cæsarea) at the *Council* or *Sanhedrim* of the *Jews*, *Acts* 23. 1. where the *High Priest sat down to judge him after the law of Moses*, v. 3. and from among them, *i. e.* that *Council*, the *soldiers*, *by the chief Captains command*, *take* him by *force*, v. 10. thither again they purposed to signifie to the *chief Captain*, *that he should be brought on the morrow*, v. 15. but upon discovery of the conspiracy to take away his life by the way, he is sent by safe conduct to *Cæsarea*, v. 23. Then upon *Festus*'s coming to the *Province*, the Jews renew their suit ἵνα μεταπέμψηται, that *he would send for him to* Jerusalem, *c.* 25. 3. this *Festus* then denied, v. 4. meaning to *judge him by the Imperial law at* Cæsarea, the *Jews* being required to go and prosecute him there, *v.* 5. When nothing could there be proved against him, *v.* 7. *Festus* having so far changed his resolution, to *do the Jews a pleasure*, proposes his *going up to Jerusalem*, v. 9. *there to be judged before him* (what is meant by that phrase, we shall see anon) and this he accounts of, as a *delivering to them*, and from that it is, that he makes his *appeal to Cæsar*, and that I suppose to be from the *Jews tribunal*, and so *Festus* expresses the meaning of it, *v.* 20. *I asked him* (saith he to *Agrippa*) *whether he would go to* Jerusalem, *and there be judg'd of these matters*; upon that occasion again expresly mentioning his *appeal to the hearing of* Augustus, *in opposition* to his *going up to* Jerusalem *to be judged.*

9. There is but one possible difficulty which appears to remain in this matter, and that is, what is meant by his being *judged before me*, i. e. *before* Festus *at* Jerusalem, *c.* 25. 9. for that may be thought to infer, that it was *Festus*'s *Tribunal*, and not the *Jews*, from which he appealed. To this I answer, that the power of the *Jewish Sanhedrim* at this time was but a very limited power, they might not *put any man* to *death*, *John* 18. 31. and consequently when any was judged by them, if the offence seemed capital, the *Roman Procurator* was to be called to assist, and thus to *sentence*, as in the *crucifixion* of *Christ* it was manifest. And this is all the reason of this phrase [*before me*] because *treason* against *Cæsar*, being put in amongst his *accusations*, the *Jews* could not judge of such matters, but only take upon them the part of *accusers*, as we therefore see they do, *c.* 25. 2. whereas for other

other things *concerning their own Law*, their tribunal was competent to take audience, and give judgment.

And this is the importance of those words of *Festus*, *Acts* 25. 20. wherein he gives the reason to *Agrippa*, why he asked him, whether he *would go to Jerusalem, there to be judged of these matters*, *i. e.* of those questions, or accusations, concerning the *Jewish superstition*, or *religion* --- because *Festus* doubted, or was ignorant of them, knew not what judgment to pass in them, and therefore would have had him to *Jerusalem*, for the *Sanhedrim* there to take cognizance, and judge of such matters, himself going also, there to sit upon him, in case any capital crime, censurable by the *Roman* laws, should be proved against him. And from the former of these it is, *i. e.* the *Sanhedrim*'s *judicature*, that *Paul appeals*, as hath hitherto appeared, and only from that, and so not from *Festus*'s *Judicature*; For that he was already under at *Cæsarea* (as much as he could be at *Jerusalem*) and yet appeals not from that, but saith he *ought to be judged there*, and only averts the *going up to Jerusalem*. A visible difference there is betwixt his being *judged by* Festus *at Cæsarea*, and at *Jerusalem* before him. In the former he stood only at *Cæsar*'s *judgment seat*, *to be judged by none but his Procurator*, according to the *Roman law*; and if he were found guilty of no capital crime, rebellion, and the like, he was sure to be *set free*; and this he feared not, whersoever he was judged; but if he *went up to* Jerusalem *to be judged there*, then whatsoever his innocence were as to such capital accusations, he might be deemed guilty of some breaches of the *Judaical law*, and for them be judged to other *punishments*, such as remained in their power, by the *Sanhedrim*; and besides, the *high Priests*, and *chief* of the *Jews*, that pressed so earnestly that he might be remanded to *Jerusalem*, had a treacherous purpose in it, having laid an ambush in the way to kill him, *Acts* 25. 3. and so *Paul* had all reason to appeal from this *proposal* of *delivering him to be judged by the Jews*, though none to distrust *Festus*'s *sentence* at *Cæsarea*: and so still it is most visible, that from *this* it was, that his appeal was made, and not from *Festus*'s *bench at Cæsarea*, which was the thing I undertook to conclude from these passages. 10.

Thus have I clearly deduced this whole matter, and evidenced the truth of *Gregorius de Heimburg* his observation, not that that *Emperor* was *head of the Christian Church*, but that S. *Paul* expected relief from this *heathen Emperor* against the oppressions of the *high Priest*, and his *Sanhedrim*, which is all that from *Heimburg* was pretended. 11.

And then who will ever take *S. W.* his word again about a *grievous mistake*, who yet never had the luck to be himself in the right, when he came in the greatest rage of *Discipline* to chastise mistakers? 12.

If there be not in all his darts some desperate incurable poyson (by strength of the old *Aphorism*, *Calumniare fortiter*, *aliquid hærebit*) I shall for once adventure to *advise S. W.* if it be but for his own interests, never to cry [*grievous mistakes*] again, till he hath gotten some firmer title to *infallibility*, than yet he hath attain'd to, lest still it be the *looking-glass*, and not the *perspective* which helps him to all the mistakes. 13.

In the last place he is come to that meanness of changing my words, that he may get some advantage of carping at them, which otherwise he must miss of. I said *that in the βασιλικὰ, the whole third Book is made up of* Justinians, *that is of the Emperors, constitutions de Episcopis, Clericis, & sacris, concerning Bishops, Clergie-men, and sacred Offices. And he will read this*, that *Justinians third Book is made of Constitutions* de *Episcopis, Clericis & Laicis, Bishops, Priests, Lay-men*, and then answer, that *all the laws found there must not be necessarily* Justinians.] What will this dealing advance to, by and by? *First*, *Laicis* must be suborned to turn out *Sacris*, and that we may be sure the Printer had no hand in this, 1. the *Englishing* it *Lay-men*, instead of *sacred Offices*, and 2. the no notice of either of these in the *Errata*, is full evidence. And then what trust is to be given to such *fingers*? 2. How came we by the mention of *Justinians third Book*? Or what *third Book* doth he mean? I spake of the *third Book of the βασιλικὰ*, which if he knew any thing in the affairs, or *Canons* of the *Church*, is a *Synopsis* of LX. books *universi Juris Romani* set out Eighty years since in *Greek* and *Latine* with *Scholia*, by *Jo. Leunclavius*. And if he knew not what belonged to this, why might he not have softly glided over it, rather than have adventured blindfold, and in the first words changed this into *Justinians third book* of He knew not what, and then solemnly applied answer to it, which cannot possibly be accommodated to the matter in hand. *Keepers*, saith he, *of laws, use not only to put in their law books those Constitutions themselves made, but also those they are to see observed, among which are the Canons and Laws of the Church made before by Councils and other Ecclesiastical powers.*] But this cannot be applied to the present instance. 'Tis certain, *Justinian personally* made many διατάξεις concerning Ecclesiastical matters, which are now visible in his *Novels*, each of them cloathed with those particular individuating circumstances of the *Authors* name, and the persons to whom they were written, which remove all possible doubt in this matter; and the *third book* of the *βασιλικὰ* is a *collection* or *breviate* of such as these, which are thus at large to be found in his *Novels*, and there discern'd to be none but his. Such luck hath *S. W.* constantly, when he combates blindfold. 14.

But he satisfies not himself with this *first* answer; he hath a *second*, that *Justinian may make Constitutions of his own concerning Bishops and Clergie-men*, in *what relates to temporal offices*, *or as they are parts of the civil Common-wealth.*] But it is evident, if he will now upon advertisement turn to the *Basilica*, or to the *Novels* themselves, that many of them are of matters *purely Ecclesiastical*; I must not adventure losing my Reader, and my self, in reciting them. 15.

But because this answer was so feeble also, a third is called in, to relieve at a dead lift: If neither of these answers will serve, If *he shall be found to have made any laws concerning them, and without the authority of the Church, then*, saith he, *let the Doctor prove he had power to make such*, minding me of the note of *Tyranny which is objected against* Justinian. But 1. this is strange hewing asunder, instead of untying of knots, and difficulties; If the argument could be answer'd any other way, then *Justinian* may stand right in the *Court*; but if *S. W.* be so driven up to the wall, that he have no way to invent for his *escape*, then in great sadness *Justinian* must be content to be a *Tyrant*, rather 16.

than *S. W.* be foil'd in this manner. 2. Though *Justinian* for some other unkindness to the *Pope*, have been lookt on unkindly by the *Romanists*, and call'd by some ill names, so long after his death; yet I believe *S. W.* will not be able to produce any *Romanist*, which hath affixt this ill *character* on him upon this single score, which alone I have now insisted on, making of constitutions for the *good government* of the *Church*; and then I hope he that hath *offended* once, is not under a necessity of doing all things amiss; if so, truly *S. W.* will have a hard time of it, can never redeem, as long as he lives, what he hath offended in this one leaf, if as he judges this *Emperor*, he shall be *judged*. But to conclude, 3. my argument vouched the *Theodosian Code* for decrees in *Ecclesiastical affairs*, and this reserve, of the *Emperors* being a Tyrant, is no way appliable to him; and so we have done with his last answer.

17. For the appendage of this argument, and answer concerning the *Canons* of the *Councils receiving their authority and publication from the Emperor*, I need not reply, having never pretended, or seemed to pretend what he charges on me, concerning the *Emperors Negative voice* in the *Council*; what I pretended, I spake out in plain words, that the *Canons* have been *mostly set out, and received their authority by the Emperors* (and this *receiving their authority*, is I suppose, in order to their *powerful reception* in their *dominions*) and this he acknowledges in the fullest latitude, not only mostly, but always; and so we are for once friends, though he knew not of it, and no man knows how little while it will last.. As it is, 'twill be a good season to sit down in peace, at this end of the sixth *Section*.

SECT. XII.

Answer to his seventh Section. *Strictures on the lighter part of it.* Ethelberts *erecting the Primacy at* Canterbury. *Removal of Primacies, and Addition of Provinces, to whom justly assignable.* Caerusks *remove to S.* Davids. Valentia *and* Flavia Cæsarienſis. *From* York *to* Canterbury.

1. THE first three pages of his seventh *Section* have no *appearance* of *weight*, or *difficulty*: to which any more answer is in reason due, than the *Section* in the *Treatise*, to which they belong, will readily, if it be consulted, afford any man. But he, 1. finds fault with *parentheses*, which are a very visible part of the *Scripture stile*, and so may not reasonably be found fault with in mine; 2. *misreports* my arguing, which neither denies *tradition* as he would have it, nor lays any more *weight* on the *negative argument*, than evidently belongs to it, and *requires* not of him, as he suggests, to *find the name of Primates or Patriarchs in Scripture*, but saith that there is *no imaginable obstacle there*, against which, though but *interpretatively*, *the Prince* can be said to offend, when he shall make such *changes*; and 3. from *faber fabrilia tractet*, he concludes it the *testimony of common sense*, *that Kings must not meddle with such matters*, as if none could ever judge which were the largest City, and most fitly accomplisht to be a *Metropolis*, but he who had spent his *age* in the *study of Divinity*, which yet no way belongs to it; and 4. he resolves that *nothing hath been said either to disprove the Popes Universal Pastorship, or to evidence this right of Kings to remove Patriarchs, to be founded in the Canon of Chalcedon* ---- when I have all reason to think, that he hath not said one word in defence of either of these *pretensions*, which is not now answered, and when without any *id est*, the seventeenth *Canon* of *Chalcedon* is plain, that whensoever any City is erected or restored by the *Imperial power*, the *order of the Ecclesiastical divisions shall follow the Civil forms*; Of which, and of the *Canon* in *Trullo*, and the acknowledged force thereof to this matter, I have in this *Reply* inlarged abundantly.

2. But what he next proceeds to, hath transported him into several passions, betwixt which he hath found out another grievous mistake, if it have but the luck to stand good to him; However it makes a *dish in the bill of Fare*, that *allowance of an house to dwell in and meat to eat*, is *the erection of a Primacy*. And was it not truly said of old by the *Deipnosophist*, that οἱ μαγειροὶ ποιηταὶ, *Cooks* are *Poets*, and that a little skill in that *Art*, is sufficient to convert the *Rape root* into a delicate *fish service*, at a time when nature denied, and all the Ocean would not afford the like. Just thus it is here; I said that *Canterbury* or *Dorovernia* was the seat of King *Ethelberts* Kingdom, and proved it by the words of *Bede*, who calls it * *Imperii sui totius Metropolis*, and that King at the time of *Augustines* planting the *faith*, did erect a *Primacy* in that *City*, not bringing any proof of this, but mentioning it as a certain thing, that needed no probation. And he very diligently seeks out the place in *Bede*, where those words are, *Imperii sui Metropolis*, and finding there a mention of his giving them a *mansion* and *food*, this forsooth must be drest out for my proof of his erecting a *Primacy* there, and that at a time when *Ethelbert*, he confesses, was not yet converted, and all this managed with great demureness, as if I had been really guilty of this senselesness. The short is, I did really prove from those words, what I designed from them, that *Canterbury* was King *Ethelberts seat of his Kingdom*; but never dreamt of inferring from that place, the erecting of an *Ecclesiastical Primacy* there. I know that could not be done, till after the *Kings conversion*, and then it is distinctly mention'd by the same *Bede* in the * next Chapter, in the title whereof we read, *Ut in urbe Regis sedem Episcopatus acceperit, how* Augustine *received the seat of his Bishoprick in the Kings City*: and so in the *chapter* it self in these words, *Nec distulit (Rex) quin --- doctoribus suis locum sedis eorum gradui congruum in* Doroverniâ *Metropoli suâ donaret, simul & necessarias in diversis speciebus possessiones conferret*, *The King deferred not to give his Teachers the place of a seat, agreeable to their degree, in* Canterbury *his Metropolis, and together with it conferred on them necessary possessions in several kinds.* And there can be no ground of doubting it. The *Pope sent them to preach*, * *appointed* Augustine *should be ordained Bishop, if the English should receive them.* The || *Archbishop of* Arles *ordained* him according to the *Popes direction*. But where the *seat* of his *Bishoprick* should be fastned, it is not imaginable, who should give order for

* *Lib.* 1. *c.* 25.

* *Lib.* 1. *c.* 26.

* *Episcopum ordinandum (si ab Anglis susciperentur) disposuerat.* Bed. *l.* 1. *c.* 23. || *c.* 27.

for that, but only *King Ethelbert*; the *Pope* could not, who did not certainly foresee his reception; the ordainer the *Bishop* of *Arles* had nothing to do with it; nay, this he was first to have as his title, before he could by *Canon* ordain him; and accordingly so it is in story, that, and the *Pall* from the *Pope*, his *ordination*, and *consecration* were both consequent to the Kings assigning him the seat, the first in 27. the other in 29. *chap.* And so much for the *childish picce of insincerity*, as he calls it: the Reader will now judge, on which side it lies.

Next follows the arraignment of my words about the *Removal of the Primacies in England*, and *addition* of *Provinces*, which I conceived assignable, *i. e.* justly, or so as might agree with the truth of History, assignable to nothing but the acts of Princes in removing, and erecting *Metropoles*; but he affirms *these to be assignable*, 1. *to the Popes power*, 2. *to the consent of Bishops.*] Here if by the consent of *Bishops* he mean the concurrence of their consent to the Kings act, I shall make no question of that; this differs from an *authoritative consent*, and so still the King might do it, though the Bishops concurred and consented to it: his doing it, was never by me intimated to be his doing it against their will, but his doing it regularly and advisedly, as in reason, and for the good of the Church he ought to do it. The former then is the only matter of question, whether it were the *Popes* or the *Kings act*; and as yet there being nothing produced on *S. W.* his side, but the bare mention of the possibility that the *Pope* should do it, without all tender of proof, that he did, there is nothing to be answered, or replied by me; yet I shall by one instance (which will suffice in this matter) evidently prove that in *that* at least, he neither did, nor could do it. The *Archbishoprick* of *Caerusk* in *Monmouthshire* was removed to S. *Davids* in the reign of King *Arthur*, and that as hath been shewed, as before *Augustines* coming into *England*, so before the *Pope* had any hold here, and whilst *Caerusk* was not subject to any other Bishop whatsoever, as hath formerly been proved and vindicated; and therefore I conclude, this is no way assignable to the *Pope*, without confounding, and denying all that our Histories tell us in this matter. As for the addition of *Valentia* and *Flavia Cæsariensis*, it was certainly done by the *Roman Emperors*, and those are not the *Pope* And the choice of *Canterbury* for the *Metropolis* having even now been cleared to be the act of *Ethelbert* (though *Augustine* the *Bishop* there was sent from *Rome*, and ordained by the Bishop of *Arles*, and after had a *Pall* from *Rome*) the removal of it from *London* (where it was formerly, even at the time of the *Nicene Council*) must be assigned to that *original*; and the rather, because that which the *Pope* in his Letter to *Augustine*, saith of *London*, that the *Bishop* thereof should *semper in posterum à synodo propriâ consecrari*, *be for ever afterward consecrated by his own Synod*, i. e. be an *Archbishop*, never came to any effect, the *Archbishoprick* continuing to be established at *Canterbury*, and no remembrance remaining to us, of *Londons* being an *Ecclesiastical Metropolis* after this: So that *Neubrigensis* resolves, it must be understood of *Canterbury*, what *Greg. Ep.* saith of *London*; discerning it seems, that as to *London* it found no accomplishment. *Lastly*, for *York*, the principal *Colony* of the *Romans* in *Britain*, and the *seat* of the *Emperors* Palace, and the place of the *Lieutenants* residence, and adorned with other dignities, mentioned in *Tract of Schism*; 'tis certain the *Primacy* continued there, while the *Romans* held the *Government*, and after that, while the *Britains* held *England*, and in memory thereof *Gregories* appointment to *Augustine* after his coming was, that * *if that City received the Faith, it should so far enjoy the former priviledge, as to be the seat of a Metropolitan, with twelve Bishops under him, and without any subjection* Londinensis Episcopi ditioni, *to the power of the Bishop of London*, or (as *Neubrigensis* with all reason saith it must be understood) of the *Bishop of Canterbury*, and ‖ *for the future after* Augustines *death, he to be the first of those two Archbishops, which from time to time was first ordained*, which again being not agreeable to *Canterburies* having the *Primacy*, (for that differs from all such equality) 'tis evident that that *Pope* did not remove the *Primacy* from *York* to *Canterbury*; and that any successor of his did, I know not that it is pretended. And thus he sees the grounds of the *Doctors* reasoning not so irrational, in respect of the process, or unconcluding in respect of the *Medium*, as he would have perswaded by his *Sarcasms* (not his *Reasons*) which make up the far greatest part of his confutations.

3.

Greg. ex Reg. l. 12. Indict. 7. Ep. 15.

L. 5. c. 10.

* *Si civitas cum finitimis locis verbum Dei receperit, ipse quoque 12. Episcopos ordinet, & Metropolitani honore perfruatur. l. 12. ep. 15.*

‖ *Sit verò inter Episcopos honoris ista distinctio, ut ipse prior habeatur, qui prius fuerit ordinatus.* Ib.

SECT. XIII.

The African *Canon contrary to the* Roman. *Lenity to the Donatists. The History of the Canon.* S. W. *his Exceptions answered. The feigned Revocation, and Request.* Romes *Umpirage between* Cæcilianus *and* Donatus, *no act of Jurisdiction.*

THat the power which is duly vested in Kings, in case it be taken away by foreign, *i. e.* by the *Popes Laws*, is perfectly lawful to be resumed by the *Original possessors*, *i. e.* by our *Kings of England*, I endeavoured to shew *à pari*, by the practice of the *African Church*, set down in the *Council of Carthage*, *Can.* 71. Where when the *Pope* had determined one thing about the *non-reception* of the *Donatists*, and by letter signified that to the *Council* of *Carthage*, they prudently and deliberately decree another, and incur no danger of *Schism*, by this means. This in the Treatise of *Schism*, p. 128. I shortly toucht, but now upon this occasion must more largely deduce, to vindicate the truth, and force of that testimony for the inferring of my *conclusion*. 1.

When that great dissention fell out in *Africk*, between *Cæcilianus* *Archbishop* of *Carthage*, and *Donatus à casis nigris*, and S. *Augustine* tells us, that though *Pope* * *Melchiades*, by the judgment of his *Collegues*, or *Bishops in Council* assembled with him, condemned *Donatus*, yet they so spared the *Donatists*, as many as should repent, that they were ready *to give them free choice to regain the peace of the Church*; and even for those that had been ordained Bishops by *Majorinus*, so that they were *two Bishops in one See*, they thus compounded it, that he *that was first ordained in each See, should be confirmed*, and *some other Church and flock be provided* for the other. And the same he affirms again 2.

Ep. 162.

* *Miltiades, Opt. l. 1. p. 28.*

again in his 50. *Ep.* The *Bishops*, saith he, *in the Church of* Rome, *thus judged in the difference betwixt* Cæcilianus *and the Donatists*, that all, *beside* Donatus, *the author of the Schism, should upon reformation be received unto their honours, though they had been ordained out of the Church; not* that *they might* have the holy *Spirit out of the unity of the body of Christ, but that they might not, by continuing out of the Church, deceive* others, *and that being thus mildly handled, they might more probably be cured.* This was thus resolved in *Constantine*'s time, about the year 300. But 100 years after, *Pope Anastasius* in a *Synod* at *Rome* determines a greater severity necessary toward the *Donatists*, and sends an *Epistle* to the *Council* of *Carthage* to signifie this their judgment. The *Epistle* of *Anastasius*, I suppose, is * *not extant*, but the || *Acts* of the *Council* of *Carthage* assure us thereof, and set down the summ of it to be an advice to the *Africans*, that they should not by any means παραπροσποιεῖσθαι περὶ τὸ τῆ --- Δανατισᾶν ἐπιβουλῆς καὶ ἀναισχυντίας τὸ τε κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν Ἀφρων χώραν Καθολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν βαρέως πορθέσης, *dissemble*, or proceed with that *lenity, toward the treachery and impudence of the heretical and Schismatical* Donatists, *which did grievously waste the Catholick Church through all the* African *region.* On receipt of this letter, the *African Fathers* in *Council* give humble thanks to God for his mercy, and to *Anastasius* and his *Council*, for their pious care for them, as for *fellow-members of Christ*, τοῖς κἂν ἐν διαφόροις τῆ ᾗς μέρεσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν μιᾷ σώματος καὶ ἁρμονίᾳ καθισαμένοις, *who though they be situate in several parts of the earth, yet consist in one harmony and concord of a body.* But that being done, they proceed *conciliarly* to handle, and consider that matter, and all things that seemed to *tend to the profit of the Church*; and finally they resolve ἡπίως καὶ εἰρηνικῶς διαπράξασθαι, *to continue to deal mildly and pacifickly with them*, deeming that the likeliest means to convince gainsayers, and to reduce them to the *knowledge of the truth*; and accordingly several things they * *decree*, particularly to write an *Epistle* to their other brethren and fellow-Bishops, especially to the *Apostolical See* of *Rome*, where *Anastasius* presided, to signifie to them μεγάλην ἀνάγκην, *the great necessity*, lying on them in order to the peace and utility of the *Church*, to receive the *Donatists* to their dignities, as many as should return to the *unity of the Church*, proposing to all other *Bishops* to do the like after their example, who were first infested with them, and with a *non obstante*, *notwithstanding* what had been decreed at *Rome*, Μὴ ἐμποδίσῃ τούτοις τὸ ὁρισθὲν κατὰ τῶν τιμῶν αὐτῶν ἐν τῇ περαμαρικῇ συνόδῳ, *that which is determined against their honours in the beyond-sea Synod* (ἤγουν τῇ ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ, viz. *that in Italy*, saith the *Scholiast*) *shall not*, say they, *hinder or prejudice this decree*; and again, οἱ χειροτονηθέντες ---- *they that have been ordained on the part of the* Donatists, *if they shall reform and return to the Catholick faith, shall not be proceeded with according to the transmarine Synod* (which had determined that they should not be received to their own dignities) *but shall the rather be received as those that take care for Catholick unity.*

*Fustel. in Cod. Can. Eccl. Afr. p. 74.

|| Fust. Cod. Can. Ec. Afr. p. 184. and Bals. in Can. p. 692.

Can. ξς'. Sec. Fustel. ξθ'. secund. Bals.

* Can. ξη'. Sec. Fust. cα'. Sec. Bals.

3. Here thus anciently, *i. e.* in the year 401. 'tis clear, that the decree at *Rome* was not thought fit to prejudice or hinder the *African Synod*, to adhere to their former resolution, and so, to laws contrary to the *Roman See*; and that was all that I undertook to infer from it.

4. Now to this what hath *S. W.* to say? Why, confessing the former part of the story, about *Melchiades*, first, he resolves that the *Donatists obstinacy permitted not his decree to be executed, and therefore it was recalled*; then *that under Pope* Anastasius, *the* African *Council commanded a request to be made to the Bishops of* Italy *by whose predecessors the Revocation was made, that the Donatist Bishops might retain their places*, adding that *the cunning* Balsamon *puts the provision it self for a Canon of this Council, and the* Doctor *takes no notice of the request, though he must needs have read it in* Baronius *whom he there cites.*] And out of these *premises* his *conclusion* is, that as *far as can be drawn out of the fact and Council, it argues the direct contrary to what the* Doctor *concludes*, viz. *that it was not lawful for their national Council to infringe what was done at* Rome.]

5. What truth there is in these premises, but especially how his contrary conclusion is inferred from them, he hath not used any *medium* to shew us. And therefore 'tis all as easily denied, as suggested. But I shall farther desire it may be observed, that he doth not so much as pretend, that what the *African Council* here did in this, was *Schismatical*; and then without more ado, it follows, that a national Council may without *incurring of Schism*, make contrary laws to what is decreed at *Rome*, for this it is evident the *Africans* did in that *Synod*, 401. and he no way denies their having done it, and yet neither doth he accuse them, for what they did. This being thus yielded, there is no more that I desire to gain from this testimony. And therefore, 1. I need not be solicitous whether *Melchiades decree were revoked.* There was indeed no need of revoking, for if the *Donatists* would not take the benefit of it, but as *Optatus* farther tells us, appeal'd from it (*Donatus appellandum esse ab Episcopis credidit*, l. 1. p. 29.) it voided it self, and became of no force of its own accord: 2. I demand, when, or by whom it was revoked; not before *Anastasius*, for then sure that *Council* under him, that sent to *Africk* to press that severity, would have pressed that Revocation; and it is sufficient to say, no such precedent Revocation appearing in any *Popes*, or *Councils* time betwixt *Melchiades* and *Anastasius*, there is no ground to affirm that before *Anastasius* it was revoked; and yet that 'twas not *Anastasius* that revoked it, is confest by *S. W.* when he saith the *revocation was made by the predecessors of those Bishops of* Italy *that were under* Anastasius.

6. But then 2. for his *suggestion*, that *under Anastasius* the *African Council ordained a request to be made to* the *Bishops of* Italy, *that the Donatists Bishops might retain their places*, there is not the least proof offered, save only from *Baronius*, who is far from being a competent witness in this matter. And on the other side, we have these strong prejudices against it; *First*, that the *Decree* from *Rome*, read at the opening of the *Council of Africk*, having been directly contrary to all mercy, or mildness to the *Donatists*, it no way appears by any subsequent decree, that they after *softened* it; and for that decree it self, being so contrary to the *Donatists* retaining their places, it could be no answer of favour to the *Africans request*, that they might retain them; 2. Of any such request we have not the least footstep in that *Council*, and 3. that * *Canon* from whence || *Binius*'s note deduces it, belongs not to any such request, but is clearly the setting down what the *Africans* had * already decreed in this matter, contrary to *Anastasius*'s *conciliary determination*, brought to them, and read at the opening of the *Council*, and is that very *Canon*, from which I fetch the evidence of their making a decree contrary to what had been determined at *Rome*, with the μὴ ἐμποδίσῃ, or *non obstante* of *Romes contrary* determination.

* 68. *sec. Bin.* & *Fust.* 71. *sec. Bals.*

|| *Concil. Tom.* 1. p. 749. D.

* *Can.* 66.

This

This being briefly thus cleared, I may add *thirdly*, that if the *African Fathers* did so request, and thereupon the *Council* at *Rome* made any decree to revoke their revocation, and consequently to agree with the *Africans* in the milder way, yet this could not have been to the prejudice of the *Africans*, for still this was to comply with, not to over-rule the *Africans*; and we know that even in *Melchiades*'s time, when it is granted that the *Council* of *Italy* did judge betwixt *Cæcilianus* and *Donatus*, the *Catholicks* and *Heretical Schismaticks* in *Africk*, this came not before them by way of ordinary appeal, as to *legal judges* or *superiors*, but of extraordinary complaint, because the Bishops of *Africk* being divided one from the other in a horrible Schism, and *Cæcilianus* the *Bishop of Carthage* and *Primate* of *Africk*, being a party in the controversie, it could not possibly be determined at home, and so was most properly, and necessarily to be done by foreigners, and accordingly not by the *Pope* alone, but by a Council of Bishops; and *Augustine* saith, *Ep.* 162. that there were *thousands of those Collegues, where the differences might have been determined*, meaning a *fraternal determination*, (by allowing the one, and granting communion with him, and expressing disallowance of the other) and not an *authoritative* act of *Jurisdiction*, a neighbourly interposition, such as the present case, and necessity of the *Church* of *Africk* required, but not any injunction or command as to legal subjects. And indeed this sufficiently appears by the *Africans* behaviour here, upon that decree of *Anastasius* and the *Council*, which was certainly sent from them, and read at the opening of that *African Council*, and yet deemed no way constringent to them, but a decree presently made by the *Africans* quite contrary to that from *Rome*. How little that of subjection was owing or acknowledged from *Africk* to *Rome*, I shall now add no more, having formerly made it clear, when I spake of the *exemption* of *Carthage*. 7.

4. When he attributes it to the *cunning of* Balsamon, *that he puts the provision it self for a Canon of this Council*, I know not well what to answer; for I am not sure, I judge right (and I believe the Reader will be as little able to resolve as I am) what he means by the *provision it self*; Only I am sure *Balsamon* doth no otherwise set down those *Canons*, than now I see *Binius* himself doth, out of the *Codex Can. Eccl. Afr.* (save only that the *numbers* of the *Canons* are varied) as may appear to any by comparing *Balsamon* p. 692, &c. with *Binius*'s *Councils*, *Tom.* 1. *p.* 942, &c. and so sure the cunning was not on *Balsamons*, but on *S. W.* his side, who having nothing to say, was to divert by finding fault, and accusing some body. 8.

5. That the *Doctor* took *no notice of the request*, he now hath given a sufficient account, because though *Baronius* mentioned it, he had many weighty prejudices against it, and no motive to believe *Baronius*. 9.

And then *lastly* for the *conclusion*, it follows most evidently, as I inferred it, that the *African Council* decreed the very contrary to what *Rome* had determined at this time, and that when they had taken so solemn a cognizance of her determination, and yet were under no mark of *Schism* for so doing. 10.

SECT. XIV.

Laws against the Civil right repealable. S. Peter's *priviledges interfere not with Regal power.* Sayr's *resolution. My using it, no begging the question.*

WHat was added by me §. 22. that a *Law though made by a General Council, and with the consent of all Christian Princes, yet if it have respect to a civil right, may in this or that nation be repealed*] was directed by me to infer this, formerly set down, *conclusion*, that the power of *Kings* to *remove Primacies*, if taken away by *foreign Laws*, *viz.* those of the *Court* of *Rome*, is resumable; This I suppose was proper to induce that, because the Law of a *General Council*, with the consent of all *Christian Princes*, was so much above *Phocas*'s *donation* to *Boniface*, or a *Pontifical decree*, that my *conclusion* would follow *à majori*, and with advantage. Now to this saith *S. W.* that *ere it will do me any good, I must first suppose the title of Head of the Church to be a thing belonging to a Civil right. 2. that that title is denied our Kings upon pretence of a Canon of a Council, and not on Christs donation of it to S.* Peter. 1. *p.* 128.

To these I answer, 1. that the power of removing *Primates Sees*, being the thing I spake of, and not the title of *Head of the Church*, all that I am to suppose in the first place, in order to my conclusion, is, that this is legally annext to the *Regal*, or *Imperial power*, and that I suppose I have formerly proved, and so do not rely on an unproved supposition. 2. That all that I need add to that, is, that *Christ* never took away from Kings any thing, that was vested in them, to bestow it upon S. *Peter*, and consequently that whatsoever *Christs donations* to S. *Peter* were, this priviledge of erecting *Metropoles* may, and doth still remain to Kings, and the decrees of the *Councils*, that the Ecclesiastical forms shall follow the Civil, will farther secure it to them, without recurring again to the question long since debated, concerning S. *Peter*'s priviledges. 2.

That of §. 23. from *Balsamon*, as saith he it hath by *S. W.* been already answered, so hath it also been vindicated in *this Reply*, and shall not be here repeated. 3.

To the last §. where from the resolution of *Sayr*, their own *Casuist*, I inferred the no force of prescription to alienate any such right of *Kings*, he offers two prejudices, 1. that *Sayr* was a *Monk*, his book *written at* Rome, *and so not likely to speak much on the Doctors behalf. 2.* that *in case he say any thing against them, he is but a private Casuist, and so his opinion with the same facility rejected as alledged.*] But to this I reply, 1. that to matters of this nature, none being so fit to judge, as *Casuists*, no *Casuist* could by me be produced with more advantage against the *Romanist*, than honest *Sayr*, as he calls him, who if he were honest, did not prevaricate; if he were a late *Monk*, wrote not in favour of us; if he wrote at *Rome*, had his Book examined and licensed, every period in it, by the *Inquisitors* there; 4.

there; and if after all that, he do *really* ſay any thing, on which my *concluſion* is regularly *founded* (as his words ſet down in the *Tract* of *Schiſm*, p. 130. do teſtifie, that he doth) it matters not, how *unlikely* it is, that he ſhould ſay it; ſuch *arguments* of *improbability* againſt a matter of *fact*, are of all others the moſt *improbable arguments*.

5. But theſe were but the *procinctus* to his *anſwer*, and that comes more *ſolemnly* after them, yet ſuch as you might know it at firſt ſight, it is ſo like, what ſuch *harbingers* promiſed, *viz.* that *by uſing this teſtimony*, I ſuppoſe, *two things which muſt not be granted me* gratis, 1. *that the Pope preſcribed againſt the Kings of* England *in their pretended right in Eccleſiaſtical matters*, 2. *that this preſcription of the Pope hath not its force from any thing but a Canon or Civil Law*,] and great *ovation* there is in obſerving this *infirmity* in my *diſcourſe*.

6. But I deſire to be *adviſed*, and directed by *Artiſts* from their ſevereſt *laws* of νομίμων ἀθλησις, whether a *treatiſe* be obliged to be made up of no more than one *propoſition*, or when a *foundation* is laid, and competently *eſtabliſht*, it be unlawful ever to proceed *farther*, either by way of *inlarging* the *foundation*, or *ſuperſtructing* any *fabrick* upon it. I had in the former *chapters* indeavoured to ſhew, that neither from *Chriſt* to S. *Peter*, nor from S. *Peter* to the *Pope*, nor from the *planting* the *faith* among us in this *Iſland*, nor from any *preſumed* right in *ancient* times, any *ſupreme authority* or *Univerſal Paſtorſhip* divolved or deſcended on the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, and having propoſed that, which I thought ſufficient to the deducing of theſe, I was willing to foreſee and *examine* all their other *pretences*, and among them, not to omit their long *poſſeſſion* of this *power*, (which both the *Catholick Gent.* and *S. W.* have ſince pleaded, *Sch. Diſar.* pag. 24. [*on the one ſide*, ſay they, *is the authority of Antiquity and poſſeſſion*] and which I cannot but acknowledge as *reaſonable* a plea, as that, which alſo they *both* have made uſe of, taken from the *poſſeſſion of the belief* of that and their other *doctrines*) and in order to the *refuting* of that, I could not, I hope, be obliged to eſtabliſh *afreſh*, that which had been formerly *confirmed* (and was ready to be viewed by him that *queſtioned* it) any more than the *Geometer* is to *demonſtrate* anew every *foregoing* Propoſition, whenſoever he adds a *ſubſequent*. For the *Popes Univerſal Paſtorſhip* being not by the *Romaniſt* deduced either from the *Law* of *Nature*, or *Nations*, and their *pleas* from the *Divine Law* or *donation* of *Chriſt* being examined, and, as I had reaſon to think, found *invalid*, it was no *begging* the *queſtion* ſure, to ſuppoſe it held either by *preſcription*, and that at the moſt from *force* of *Canon* or *Civil Law*, or elſe by ſome leſs *valid* or *no* title.

7. This renders the *account* manifeſt, why I inlarged no farther to the applying this *reſolution* of the *Caſuiſt* to the *precedent* diſcourſe, and it now appears, that if I had done it, I had *prevailed* nothing with my *Diſarmer*, unleſs I had *reverted* again to prove the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, and yet ſo ill provided is his *table*, that even this muſt be put into the *bill of fare*, as a *ſpecial* piece of *wit* to add to the *entertainment*; And I cannot but have ſome *guſt* of it, becauſe it is a *concluſion* of his *declamation* againſt my *6th. Chapter*.

CHAP. VI.

A Defence of the ſeventh Chapter of the Tract of Schiſm.

SECT. I.

Henry *the Eighth's Vices not Schiſm. The cauſe of Biſhop* Fiſher's *death, from his Chaplains hiſtory. The fear of the præmunire cauſed their ſerious conſideration. The recantation in Queen* Mary's *days. Charge of Schiſm on the Romaniſt.*

1. HIS 8th. Sect. of this ſecond part, beginning his *Reply* to my 7th. *Chap* is ſpent on the view of *Henry VIII.* his fact in caſting off the *obedience* to *Rome*; And his firſt and principal task, aſſumed on himſelf *ſpontaneouſly*, being to *declaim* againſt the *luſt* and other *vices* of that *Prince*, who, ſaith he, had a *little before ſet out very excellent doctrine againſt* Luther, I have no obligation to make any *return* to it, having ſaid already upon the *Cath. Gent.* his importunity, as much as our preſent *queſtion* requires of me; and the *vices* of this *Prince* being no more chargeable to the *prejudice* of our *Reformation*, if it be otherwiſe *regular*, than the as many, and as eminent *vices* of ſome *Biſhops* of *Rome*, who have advanced the *Papal greatneſs* to that *height*, wherein it now ſtands (particularly thoſe of *Pope Hildebrand*) can prejudice the *legality* of their preſent *pretenſions*, in caſe there were nothing elſe againſt them.

Repl. ch. 7. ſect. 1.

2. We know that *S. W.* hath great *fluency* in the *declamatory* ſtyle, and that *Henry VIII.* was no *Saint*; yet it might have been remembred what Cardinal *Perron (Opuſc. p. 440.)* ſaith of him, that he was *un de plus celebres & virtueux Princes de ſon ſiecle, one of the moſt virtuous and famous Princes of his age*; and again, what many of the eminenteſt *Univerſities* and learned Men in *Chriſtendom* thought of his divorce from Queen *Catherine*, judging his act more *Chriſtian* than the *Popes*. However, when all is done, 'tis ſtill manifeſt, that neither his *luſt*, nor his *ſacriledge* was *ſchiſm* (any more than his burning of *Proteſtants*, or his writing againſt *Luther*) much leſs is my confeſſing him *guilty* of theſe, my *excuſing*, as *S. W.* ſaith, the *imputation of them*. In brief, the *ſins* which I acknowledge him *guilty* of, I mean not to *defend*, and the *ſchiſm*, which I deny to be cauſed by him, cannot, 1. be ſuppoſed to be *chargeable* on him, and then the *original* of it be examined, without *begging the queſtion* of the *whole Book*, which is too unreaſonably large to be put into *one requeſt*; and

and yet the undertaking to diſcover the grounds of this *ſchiſm*, and to *devoid it of all excuſe* (which is the deſign of the *greateſt* part of this *ſection*) is viſibly that, and therefore this is all I have to ſay to his *firſt propoſition*. For as to thoſe *grounds* of mine, which he ſaith, *abſolved the Rebel, Outlaw, and Anabaptiſt, and might abſolve King* Henry *too, by ſaying it was his preſent perſwaſion*, I have long ſince diſcovered what a *calumny* that was, when 'twas firſt *ſuggeſted* againſt me, and it hath not yet *provided* it ſelf with any more *artificial* viſard, to *perſwade* or *deceive* any man.

His ſecond conſideration, beginning with the mention of *King* Henry's *force to make the Eccleſiaſtical ſtate ſubſcribe, to the ejecting of the Papacy*, and the examples of *Biſhop Fiſher, and Sir Thomas More*] will loſe its weight, by remembring what *King James* affirms knowingly of the *cauſe* of the *death of Biſhop Fiſher*, which was the only *Eccleſiaſtical perſon*, that is pretended to have ſuffered on that ſcore. *Is nec ſolùm nec præcipuè carceri mandatus eſt propter cauſam Primatus, the ſupremacy was not the only or principal cauſe of his impriſonment.* And this is more fully expreſt in that *Biſhops life*, written ſoon after his death by his *Chaplain*, in theſe words: *After the Biſhops had been with him, his own man blames him for not aſſenting, and tells him, he may think as he liſt.* To whom Biſhop *Fiſher* replied, *Thou art a fool, thou knoweſt little what this matter means, thou mayſt know more hereafter; but I ſhall tell thee, 'tis not for the Supremacy only that I am thus toſſed and troubled, but alſo for another thing, (meaning the Oath of the King's ſucceſſion) which if I would have ſworn, I doubt whether I ſhould ever have been queſtioned for the Supremacy or no: God being my good Lord, I will never agree to any of them both. And this thou mayſt ſay another day, thou heardſt me ſpeak, when I am dead and gone.* Thus far the words of that *Hiſtory*. 3. *In Apol. pro Juram. Fidel.*

What he adds from my words, of their *fear* of the *præmunire*, which he will reſolve to have *been of force to make the Clergie ſubſcribe againſt conſcience*, and to conclude my *charity* to them *uncharitable*, a *cenſure* of their *obduration*, inſtead of *weakneſs*] is wholly deſtitute of all grounds to infer it; For as it is obvious to believe, that their *fear* put them upon *deliberation* of all *lawful* means to avert their *danger*, and ſo upon the ſtudy of the *queſtion* of the *Pope*'s *ſupremacy*, from the very *bottom*, and *root* of it; ſo 'tis no leſs than duty of *charity* in us, who ſee by the *Books*, then ſet out by them, the *ſolidity* of the grounds, whereon they founded their *reſolution*, to believe, that their *conſciences* being duly *ſatisfied*, their *ſubſcriptions* were after that, *cordial* and *unfeigned*. 4.

As for his only *συνέκλικον ὑποθέσεως*, which can pretend to *ſalve* his *phænomena*, and make his way of *arguing conſiſtent* to it ſelf, the *Recantation of all the Biſhops in Queen* Mary's *days*, 1. it is far from all *appearance* of truth; we know that many of the *Biſhops* in *Queen Mary's* days remained conſtant to *death*, and ſo ſealed the *contradictory* to what he ſuggeſts of them; and 2. for thoſe that did *recant*, 'tis as viſible, what their *motive* might be, the *bloody examples* before their *eyes*, now, as it can be imagined, that the *præmunire* over their *heads* before, could perſwade their *ſubſcriptions*. In *Biſhop Fiſhers* ſtory 'tis plain the *Biſhops* perſwaded him to *aſſent* and *ſubſcribe*; and if ſome that ſo *perſwaded* him, *recanted* afterwards, their *fears* being granted to have *force* on them on *both* ſides, is ſure as *argumentative* to infer *mine*, as *his* concluſion, and the *advantage* on my ſide, becauſe the *fagot* was more *formidable* than the *præmunire*. But why *ſtrength*, and *force* of *conſcience* ſhould make them *recant* againſt the *reaſon* of their *ſubſcription*, rather than to *ſubſcribe* what they afterward *recanted*, without *anſwering* thoſe former *grounds*, or offering more powerful *reaſons* to the *contrary*, there is no other *account* to be expected from *S. W.* but that the one was *agreeable*, the other *contrary* to his *eſpouſed* intereſt. 5.

His third thing falls into the *Cath. Gent.* his way of proving us *guilty* of *ſchiſm*, from the *poſſeſſion of their claim to the authority of the Roman See*. And that hath been largely *conſidered*, and *refuted* in the *Reply, Chap.* 7. *ſect.* 1. from *n.* 10. to the end of that *Chapter*; And that will ſecure us from the *force* of his *ſyllogiſm*, and all the *auxiliaries* called in to ſupport it, it being no undertaking of ours to *confeſs firſt*, and then *excuſe* our *ſchiſm*, or *avert* the *criminalneſs* of it, but denying our ſelves to have *ſeparated* from any our *lawful ſuperiours*, whilſt we *renounced* the *Papal ſupremacy*, or from the *body* of the *Catholick Church*, to which both by *faith* and *charity* we are ſtill cloſe knit, in the *unity* of that *ſacred body*, to lay all the *charge* of the *ſeparation* and *ſchiſm* on them, which will not admit us to their *communion*. 6.

SECT. II.

S. W. *his diſcourſe of the nature of Schiſm. The continual begging the queſtion in it. Poſſeſſion of obedience*, Romes *only claim, invalid.* S. W. *his wonderful arts. The Kings power of removing Patriarchs, a prejudice to the Papal power. The neglect of the uſe of Communicatory Letters. The uſe of them to Catholick Unity.*

IN his ninth and tenth *Sections* he hath forſaken the *propoſed* method of *anſwering* my *arguments*, and now he is become the *aſſailant*; And it will not be a work of any great *length* to ſhew him how little he hath gained by this *variety*, the whole weight of his *diſcourſes* being laid on ſuch ſlender *Elenchs*, as is the *begging the queſtion* almoſt in every *period*, which is a very ineffectual *expedient* to infer his deſigned *concluſion* with that *evidence*, to which he hath oft pretended. 1.

I ſhall ſhew this as *briefly* as I may. And firſt, when he undertakes to *open*, and *deſcribe the nature of Schiſm more clearly and exactly*, and in order to that, to *conſider*, 1. *the formal unity it ſelf*, and 2. *the reaſon of that unity*; *the unity it ſelf, in ſubmitting to one common head, and acknowledging the ſame Articles of faith with other Churches*, &c. *and this not only negatively, a not diſacknowledging, but poſitively, when there is an obligation, to do both theſe*; and *the reaſon of that unity inſtantly reſolved to be the infallibility of the Church.*] What is this but to lay for the *ground-work* of all this *new* Treatiſe of *Schiſm*, the *obligation* to *acknowledge* 1. the *Monarchick* (as that is oppoſed to *Ariſtocratick*) 2.

govern-

government of the *Church*, and that explain'd to import the *chief Pastorship of the Bishop of Rome*, which 'tis strange he should affirm *acknowledged by us* (whether that be *by us now*, or those which then *cast* it out) to be *universally extended over all Patriarchs, and the whole Church*, when he cannot but know, that neither *we now*, nor they then *de facto*, or *de jure*, did, or do think it is, or ever was so *extended*; and 2. the *Infallibility* of the *same Church*; the *denying of which*, he saith, *is not only the reason of all schism and heresie, but the very heresie of heresies it self.* Thus the *two* things that are most *denied* by us (and must be evidently *proved* by him, before ever any charge of *schism* can be found against us) are *S. W.* his *postulata*, his *undeniable first principles*, which for this only *reason*, that I guess at, must not be *questioned*, because they cannot be *proved*; And to this issue is his whole *argument* suddenly brought, by *attending* him, while he lays the *foundation* of it.

3. And yet when this is done, there being yet another *pair* of *difficulties* still behind; In case the *Government* of the *Church* were *Monarchick*, to assure us that *Rome* is that *Monarch*; and in case the *Church* were thus *infallible*, to prove the *Church* of *Rome* to be this *only infallible Church*; these two are by *turns* either to be *believed*, as *principles* again, or to *induce* and *prove* one the *other*; One while each of them is to be *believed*, as a *principle*; the *later*, when it is silently *assumed*, and yet the *denying* thereof affirmed to be the *heresie of heresies*; for certainly it is the *Infallibility* of the *Church* under the *obedience of the Pope*, i.e. of the *Western* and the *Roman Church*, which he then speaks of, as soon after he makes no *scruple* to express, *p.* 197. The *former*, when he resolves that the *unity* it self consists in the *obligation* of *submitting* to this, without rendring any other *reason* either for that *obligation* of *submitting*, or for *Unitie's consisting* in it, but only his *affirmation*, that *it* doth so, and his mention of an *undoubted possession*, which ought to be *founded* in, and not it self to be the *ground* of the *obligation*. By the way, What now is become of the *title* from S. *Peter*, and *Christs donation* to him? which formerly was, and §. 11. is again voucht, as their only *tenure*, and yet here is no one *mention* of it in this whole *discourse*, or intimation of any such thing, nor indeed of any other, but that which may equally be had, without any *original right*, an *establishment* (as, it seems, first *principles* may be *confirmed à posteriori*) *in an undoubted possession:* And yet this again cannot possibly hold, as to the *Universal Church* (whatsoever it is feigned to do, in respect of this *Church* of ours, at the time of the *Reformation*) for *Rome* cannot pretend to have had the *possession* of the *supremacy* over the *Greek Church*, when they acknowledge them *Schismaticks*; nor over the *Abassines*, when they acknowledge them *aliens*; nor of any other, but of those, which for the *time*, upon what *motives* soever, acknowledged *obedience* to them: which bare acknowledgment, if it were of *force*, without farther *right*, the *disacknowledgment* upon due proofs of *liberty*, will be of *greater* force against it, whensoever 'tis pleaded, as by us it hath been, ever since we *renounced* it.

4. And yet another while (in the laying these very grounds) each of these is *mutually* brought to *induce* the other. For 1. the *subjection* to the *one head* (which sure must suppose the *head* to be *one*, and to the *Romanist*, that the *Pope* is that *head*) is * *brought* as the *medium* to prove that they *are a Church*, which till they are *proved* to be, they cannot be *supposed* to be, though it were granted that the *Church* is *infallible*. And 2. the *infallibility* of the *Church* being ‖ made the *only tye to communicate* (among other things, particularly) *in Government*, that is again (by way of *retribution*) become the *medium* to induce the *subjection* to the *one head*. And indeed when at the same time that he concludes the *necessity* of the *subjection*, he contents not himself with the *negative subjection* (or *indifferent acknowledgment, having no* tye) but exacts the *expres positive obligation to obey this head*, without which, saith he, it *may be a multitude*, but *not a Church*; as he will never be able to *produce* any such *expres positive obligation* to *all Christians*, to *obey the Bishop of Rome*, save what is founded in the *dictate* of his *infallible Church*, so it is most *evident*, that this his *Infallibility* must be the *principle* of this *subjection* to this *head* of the *Church*, as before, this *subjection* was the *principle* of the *very being*, and so of the *Infallibility* of his *Church*. And he that can do such *miracles* as these, take two the most *movable stones*, and with no more than *blowing* on them, *fix* them like two *immovable rocks* (and yet St *Peter* himself not so much as mentioned to be *one* of these) and whilst each of these stands thus *firm* upon its own *basis*, without any *help* of the *other*, or indeed of any *third foundation* (a *rock* firm in the midst of the *Air* or *Sea*, without any thing to *support* it) can, in the very *twinckling of an eye*, so *conveigh* one of these to *bear* and *support* the other, as that the *other* shall at the same *time*, bear the *whole weight* of that, which *supports* it, is, I confess, too great a *Master* at his *Weapon*, too profoundly skilled in the *Magick*, rather than *Mathematicks* of *Arms*, for me to *fence* with him at his *own foils*. So again, that he may with ease conclude us *unexcusably guilty* of *formal sin* (which I profess to grant) in case we were proved *guilty* of *dividing*, and so of the *material schism*, he will needs *assume* this as *granted*, and *confest* by us, which sure I expresly *deny*.

* A positive obligation to acknowledge that *Head* is that which only can make a Church. *Sch. Dis. p.* 194.

‖ Pag. 195.

5. Having said this, I shall now therefore leave him to *skirmish* with the *Air*, or his own *shadow*, for those two *Sections*, which, by thinking it *high time to return* to *over-look the work*, he acknowledgeth (and I have many more *reasons* to grant) to be *long digressions*, and presently fall in with him at his *return*, in the *beginning* of his eleventh *Section*.

6. Only before I leave it, I shall first mind him of one *fallacy*, (oft before discernible) in accusing the *frivolousness of my digression, to prove that Kings may remove Patriarchs, when*, saith he, *the Papal is greater than Patriarchal power.*] For 1. this is but the *begging* the whole *question* again, *viz.* Whether there be any *greater power* in the *Church*, than that of *Primates* or *Patriarchs?* And 2. that *question* is decided in the *Negative*, by this one, which he calls *frivolous digression:* For sure if there be any such power of *removing Patriarchs*, vested in any other but the *Pope*, (as there must be, if *Kings* can *remove Patriarchs*) then the *Pope* is not the *supreme Governor*, or *Pastor* of the *whole Church*, over all the World, and consequently can be no more than the *first Patriarch*.

7. 2*dly*, I shall ask his advice in two things, on occasion of * his mention of the *ancient use of communicatory letters, which*, saith he, *was afterwards, by reason of the perfect colligation of the several members with their head, neglected, as unnecessary.*] 1. How then it can with justice be pretended, that the *Popes Universal Pastorship* or *headship* was *anciently* and *universally* acknowledged; for then

* *Sch. Disarm.* pag. 94.

sure

ſure the *colligation being ſo early ſo perfect*, the *Communicatory Letters* would, as *anciently*, have *been unneceſſary*, as ſince that *perfect colligation* they are by *S. W. acknowledged* to be: And 2. what hinders but that *Unity* over the *whole Chriſtian world* might ſtill thus be maintain'd between all *National Churches*, each under their own *Primate*, by the help of theſe *Communicatory Letters*, without need of one *viſible head*, in *ſubjection* to whom all *unity* is by *S. W.* ſaid to conſiſt.

When theſe *two queſtions*, together with the *exceptions* here premiſed to the *ground-work* of his 8. *Argument*, are *ſatisfactorily* anſwered, I ſhall have *incouragement* farther to inlarge on the *view* of the *remainder* of his 9*th. Sect.* and to make *anſwers* for my ſelf inſtead of thoſe, which in the 10*th.* he hath put into my mouth (and may without much *difficulty anſwer* the *queſtions*, which himſelf hath *propoſed*, and that on a *ſubject*, which before he begins, he acknowledges to be *confeſt* by me, *viz.* that there can be *no juſt cauſe given of ſchiſm.*) In the mean, being *confident* I have here, and in the foregoing parts of this *Reply* laid ſufficient, and evident *grounds* to ſatisfie all the *objections*, which here are made to us, I ſhall reſiſt the *temptations*, which are before me, to *purſue* this new *path* any farther, and indulge no longer to ſuch *Divertiſements*.

SECT. III.

Conceſſion of Kings renounced by S. W. *Strictures on his* 11*th. Sect. The King cannot alienate his regality. Some gifts revocable. The Suns light ſuch. So God's graces. The Pope's Territory. The admiſſion of Legates an acknowledgment of power.* S. W. *his calumnies. The Oath of Supremacy to ſecure Allegiance.*

IN the 11*th. Sect.* I am *rebuked* for mentioning the *voluntary conceſſion of Kings* (as formerly the 1. *title* of *Converſion*) for any *part of the ground of the Popes pretenſions to ſupreme authority* in this Nation, which, ſaith he, they *found only on the ſucceſſion to S. Peter.*] If this will indeed be ſtood to by all, I am again diſcharged of an *unneceſſary* fear, and by *analogie* with, and *conſequence* from this, of all need of conſidering the title of *poſſeſſion*, which ſurely hath ſometime been mentioned by ſome body, whilſt the very name of S. *Peter*, or *ſucceſſion* by him, was quite left out in the whole *ſcheme*, as was ſhewed in the laſt *ſection*; And then the whole matter is once more reduced to that *one* head of S. *Peter's right* to *Univerſal ſupremacy*, and the *Popes ſucceeding to him*. And having not only diſproved this, as I then thought, by thoſe 4*th.* and 5*th. Chap.* of *Schiſm*, but alſo thus largely and doubly *vindicated* them now, from all that hath been objected by the *Cath. Gent.* and *S. W.* to thoſe *chapters*, I diſcern not, how it is poſſible, I ſhould have any more to do in this *buſineß*; Or how I can ſafely add any word to any *other* head but that, without danger of *relapſing* into this *impertinent*, as well as *toilſome* errour of *treating* thoſe things, which are not queſtioned by them.

I ſhall therefore in *obedience* to his repeated *Rebukes*, indeavour to make *ſhort* work of the *remain-* 2. *der* of this *ſection*, (and ſee whether the third part will afford any new reaſon of *farther ingaging*) there being indeed nothing behind here, beſide *ſcurrility*, that requires any further *anſwer*, than what is already made in the *Reply*, *chap.* 7. *ſect.* 11, *&c.* and what the *addition* of a few *ſtrictures* may diſcharge.

As 1. when he ſaith, the *Papacy was never imagined at any private King's diſpoſal, till Dr.* H. *his* 3. *time.* I anſwer, that till he hath ſolidly aſſerted the *Popes Univerſal Paſtorſhip* from *Chriſt's donation to S. Peter*, and all his *ſucceſſours* in the *See* of *Rome*, there cannot any other colour of *tenure* be imagined for the *Pope's* having the *ſupreme juriſdiction* over this *Church* of ours, but the *conceſſion* and *diſpoſal* of ſome of our former *Kings*; and that was all I was to conclude in that place, and is no way invalidated by *S. W.*

2*dly*, When he blames my *inference*, that *if it were in the Kings power to diſpoſe of it to the Pope,* 4. *then the ſame power remains in the Kings to diſpoſe it from him to ſome other*, inſtancing in the *King's yielding an Iſland*, &c. *to an over-powering enemy.* I anſwer, that the *parallel* holds not, upon this *reaſon*, becauſe in that caſe, that *Iſland* muſt be ſuppoſed to go out from under that *Kings power*, which notwithſtanding, he may remain in the full intire *ſupreme power* over *thoſe* parts of his *Kingdom*, which are *left* him, and ſo be a *ſupreme Monarch* ſtill over all his *remaining* ſubjects, although his *Province*, or *ſphere* of *adminiſtration* be leſſened; but if the *ſupremacy* it ſelf in every part of his *Dominions*, be thus *parted* with, as that *Iſland* is parted with, *i. e.* not to *remain* to him, then he becomes leſs a *King*, than formerly he was, and, as I ſaid, ſuch *acts*, which make him ſo, are acknowledgedly *invalid* acts, it being above the *power* of a *King* himſelf, to *alienate* the *ſupremacy* or *regality*.

3*dly*, When from his ſorts of *prayers*, and *ſeekers*, which *neither ſeek nor pray*, he would have it 5. believed, that I have committed the like *abſurdity*, in making one ſort of *gifts* to be ſuch as are *not given*, and this as a *rare ſervice* to be rejoiced in, in the *bill of fare*; this is nothing but the *obſcuring* and *perverting* of a plain intelligible *propoſition*, the truth whereof is every day exemplified to us by a *Kings* removing his *Chancellour* from his place, upon any *good cauſe*, without any wrongful diminution to his former *liberality*, which beſtowed that office upon him. Is it not ſenſe to ſay, ſome things are *given revocably*, as well as others *irrevocably?* ſome *quamdiu ſe benè geſſerit*, ſome *durante beneplacito*, or as far as to the *uſus fructus*, as well as others by parting with the *propriety*, and finally *diveſting* my ſelf of all *power* and *right* either in, or to them? Or muſt this be δῶρον ἄδωρον, a *gifteleß gift*, if I retain any ſuch *fundamental Original propriety* in it, of ever *recalling* it again?

4*thly*, I wonder what *infirmity* it was, either in *Philoſophy* or *Theologie*, to exemplifie this, either 6. by the *Sun communicating* his *beams*, or *God his graces*, * without emptying, or *diſpoſſeſſing* them-

* So ſaith S. *Baſil* of *Chriſt*, *Hom. de Pœnit.* T. 1. p. 616. Χαρίζεται τὰ ἑαυτῦ ἀξιώμασι, οὐκ ἀποκενούμενος, ἀλλ' ἔχων ἃ δίδωσι. τοῦτο δὲ σημεῖον πλουτίου. τὸ ἔχειν καὶ χαρίζεσθαι — and ὅσα ἐὰν χαρίζηται, τοσοῦτον μένει πλούτου ὤν, ὅσπερ πάγη ἀένναος. ὅσον ἂν λάβῃς, οὐκ ἀπομειοῦται τὸ ῥεῦμα.

selves of that, which they *bestow* on others; and consequently, without parting with this power of *revocation*. *This*, saith he, *is to affirm, that the very beams sent hither by the Sun, are notwithstanding retained there still, and so in far more distant places at the same time, than I will grant the glorified body of Christ in the Sacrament.*] I answer by denying his *consequence*; 'Tis only to *affirm*, that the *Sun* retains the *power* over his own *bounty*, and may as freely *withdraw* it from this, and bestow it the next minute on some other, as it formerly bestowed it on *this*. This was evidently signified by the phrase of *retaining all which* it *communicates*, not *retaining* at that minute the particular *beam*, which was already *sent out*, and *parted* with; that would indeed imply the same *contradiction*, that we affirm their *doctrine* of *transubstantiation* doth; but *retaining* the *power* over its own *light* and *beams* in *general*, so as to continue them no longer to any one, than it pleaseth, and so that when it shall *depart* and inrich some other, the former *usufructuary* cannot plead prescription against this act of *revocation* of free *bounty*. Thus, saith * St. *Basil*, is the fire in the Iron, ὃ μεταβαλικῶς, ἀλλὰ μεταδοτικῶς, ὃ γὰρ ἐκτείνει τὸ πῦρ εἰς τὸ σίδηρον, μένον δὲ καθ' χώραν μεταδίδωσι ἑαυτῷ τῆς οἰκείας δυνάμεως, ὅπερ ὅτε ἐλατῶται τῇ μεταδόσει, ᾗ ὅλον πληροῖ ἑαυτῷ τὸ μέτεχον.

*in Chr. Nativ.

7. And then *S. W.* might have spared the cost of providing the *long strings and pullies*, which he talks of, to *fetch back those beams*, *which* he resolves *incorporated in other bodies*; for unless the whole *treasure* of *beams* be so *poured out*, that the *Sun* retains no *power* for the future, to withdraw from *Rome* and fix on *Canterbury*, so that now for the future, the latter shall have the same *benign influences* as largely, and as justly *communicated* to it, as formerly the former had had, the *parallel* still stands exact enough, to conclude the *Kings power* to remain to him, of *removing* and revoking from *Rome*, what he had at any time bestowed on it.

8. 5*thly*, For the instance of *God*, though *S. W.* hath chosen an *unlucky* phrase, saying that *God never takes away what he gives*, when the *Scripture* saith so often the *contrary*, If *he take away our breath*, *we dye*, and from him which *useth* not his *grace* which he had, *auferetur*, *it shall be taken away*; yet his *explanation* of himself is the yielding of all I affirm in this whole matter, that *God is then said to take away any thing*, *when he with-holds his bountiful hand from a farther bestowing* it. And then I that said the very same of *Kings*, that might thus *give*, and yet *retain power* of thus *withholding* the *hand* from this farther *bestowing*, concluded all, by *S. W.* his own *suffrage*, which I attempted to *conclude*. And then *ad quid perditio hæc?* why might not all *S. W.* his *laborious bounty*, and *expence* of so many lines also, have been *otherwise bestowed?*

9. 6*thly*, What the *territory* meant, which I said the *Pope* was willing to *inlarge unlimitedly*, was *obvious* enough by the *foregoing* mention of a *Principality*, and the contenting himself with that, might well enough be *reconciled* with his *greatest zeal* and *industry* in *bringing* in the *fulness* of the *Gentiles* to the *faith* of *Christ*, (which certainly is a very distant thing from *obedience* to the *Papacy*, as *Xaverius*'s *Gospel of S. Peter* was somewhat different from S. *Matthew*'s of our *blessed Saviour*) and then to what purpose again was all that ensuing *harangue* of the present *prosperity of theirs*, and *improsperity* of our *Church?*

10. 7*thly*, What I observed of *Queen Maries time*, did distinctly enough belong, and was applyed by me, not to her *own private affections* or *judgment*, of which I never doubted, but to the *publick* acts of *state* made in her *reign*. And then to what purpose is his *justifying* of that *Queen*, that she was no way *favourable* to our *pretensions?* But to that I have spoken in the *Reply*, p. 123 as also to the *business* of *refusing* the *Popes Legates*, the admitting of whom, I now see to be made use of twice in a Page, by your *Bishop of Chalcedon*, in his late *survey* of the *Bishop* of *Derry*, as a *testimony* of our *Princes acknowledging* the *Popes Supremacy*; And then sure, if the *admitting* will infer the *acknowledgment*, the * *refusing* must imply the *disacknowledgment* of it. Nor can I perceive what proportion that act of *refusing* of *Legates*, can be thought to bear with the *Peoples denying* the *Kings subsidies*, to which he *parallels* it; for sure if the *Pope* have any *supremacy* in this *Kingdom*, it must be the same offence against that *supremacy*, to exclude his *Judges* of *Assises*, or his *Lieutenant*, by him *authorized*, (and such his *Legate* is) as to *exclude* a *Prince* out of his *Dominions* (which is no way *implyed*, or *intimated* in the other) and if, as *S. W.* saith, all *Catholick Countreys*, *when they see it convenient*, *do the like*, It will be less strange, that I think that *safe*, which hath so many *precedents*, and consequently that our *offence* was not *great*, when we *excluded* him, whom that *Legate* represented.

* Of the danger of receiving *Legates*, see Archbish. *Chichle*'s letter to *Henry* vi. in *Vita Henr. Chichl.* p. 79. of the King's power to refuse him, see *Rich. Cawdray* the King's Attorney his Protestation, *Ibid.* p. 82. Of the Kings of *France* practice in this matter, see *Lud. Servin aux Plaidoier*, Vol. 4. before the Parliament of *Paris*, *Ann. Dom.* 1590. when Cardinal *Cajetan* was sent into *France*. Ibid.

11. 8*thly*, I believe not that *S. W.* was ever *Bishop Cranmer*'s *Confessor*, or consequently hath had real *intelligence* of his being guilty of that *Carnality*, which no *story* that I ever could hear of, *charges* on him, till this impure Pen *suggested* it against him. And with this may be associated another *calumny* that follows in the next Page, that *Robert Wisdom*'s *hymns* were a part of our *Reformation*.

12. 9*thly*, What is objected to the *Ordination* of *Bishops* in *Queen Elizabeth*'s days, was prevented in the *Reply*, *Ch.* 7. *Sect.* 4.

13. 10*thly*, When he objects to me, that I *know not the difference betwixt the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy*, adding that *there could be no need to press the latter to approve Mens fidelity and allegiance*; I *answer*, that this is not any *error* or *ignorance*, but a *truth* visible enough by the *effects* of it: If the *Bishop* of *Rome* be *supreme* in this *Kingdom*, and so our *King* in the number of his *subjects*, we know one obvious *effect* arising from hence, that then 'tis in the *power* of his *Bulls* to *absolve* all *subjects* from their *obligation* to *allegiance*; and then what means can there be to *secure*, or approve any Man's *fidelity*, and *allegiance* to an *Excommunicated Prince*, beside *disclaiming* that *Papal supremacy*, and these so consequent *attendants* of it, which is the matter of that *Oath?*

As

As long as the *allegiance* is duly paid, there is no need indeed of any farther *security*, as *whilst* men do *universally* perform their *duty*, there is no need of *laws* or *punishments*; but when another *supreme* is acknowledged, beside and *above* the *King*, who need not *unking* him by any *new act*, having done it already by being his *superior* in his own *dominions*, the first *contestation* that shall happen between these *two*, must render the *inferior criminous*, and *punishable*, and the *punishment* we know is such, as renders him unfit for *government*, the *King* shall be in *S. W.* his style, the *head of Schismaticks*, and then what *fidelity* is he to expect from those, who acknowledge his enemies *Supremacy*?

This *last* objection of *reforming end-ways*, had been made use of by the *Catholick Gentleman*; 14. and is *answered* in *Reply*, p. 130. And so much for what hath been attempted by *S. W.* (not over *prosperously*) in his *second Part*.

CHAP. VII.

A Survey of the Third Part of Schism Disarmed.

SECT. I.

The second species of Schism. Unity of faith among brethren. The Apostles Institutions reducible to Faith. Disobedience to Superiors, without casting out Government. My method vindicated. The Popes supremacy not fixt by any appointment of Christ. The Bishop of Chalcedon *his confession that 'tis not* de fide, *that it is* jure divino; *The Doctors of* Paris. Jerom's *testimony of S.* Peter *being made head. Christian unity equally conserved by all the Apostles plantations. Vigour of tradition in* Rome, *not for ever.*

I Come now to his third *Part*, which begins with some *quaint* observations on my eighth *Chapter*. And for the introducing of the *first* of them, he falls very early into an *open* falsification of my words, against the plain *testimony* of his *own*, and the meanest *Readers* eyes; for having duly set down the second *sort* of *schism*, (now to be treated of) an *offence against the mutual unity, peace, and charity which Christ left among his Disciples*] in the very *next line* he will *abbreviate* this, and call it *schism against charity*, and then one *species* of this second *sort*, being a *departure from the unity of the faith*, &c. Here is a special *infirmity* observed in the *Doctors method*, that he *makes faith and charity all one, putting his schism against faith, for the first species of schism against mutual charity*] But 'tis evident this was not my *fault*, but his *mis-representation*. The *genus* which I divided into those *species*, was *schism against the mutual unity, peace, and charity*, (as *mutual* notes *equality* of *fellow brethren*, opposite to the relations of *subordination*) and there being an *unity* of *faith* between *fellow-brethren*, as well as of *charity*, 'tis visible that the *departure from the unity of Faith*, is a *species* of that second kind of *schism*, though not of the *schism* against *charity*, and so there is an end of his *first subtilty*. 1.

And the *next* is like unto that, whether for want of *understanding*, or of somewhat else, I cannot define [*the Dr.* saith he, *ranks the rejecting Christs institution of government, under this second schism against charity, which was the first head hitherto treated of*, i. e. *offence against subordination*] But I answer, 1. as before, that 'tis *departure from mutual Unity*, of which I make this a *species*, and not of *schism* against *charity* alone. Secondly, this is not coincident with the *former* kind, the *offence* against *subordination*, but falls under this head of *departure* from the *Unity* of the *Faith*, by way of *reduction* at least (as I there set it) or so as to be *comprehended under it*. For the *objects* of *Faith* being the *doctrines* of *Christ* and the *Apostles*, &c. the *Institutions* of *Christ*, and the *Apostles* are *comprehended* under that head, as being *taught* by them to be *practised* by us, (for that is the meaning of an *Institution*) and the manner of *Government*, which the *Apostles* left for the *Church*, being the matter of *one* of these, hence arises the *propriety* of this *reduction*, and consequently the casting out of the *Church* of *God* that *form* of *Government*, which *Christ* or his *Apostles* placed in it, or *instituted*, is a *branch* of *offence*, by *reduction* at least, against the *unity* of the *Faith*, a not *believing*, or not *acknowledging* the whether *necessity*, or but *lawfulneß*, or even *expedience* of that form, which so great an authority, as is that of *Christ* or his *Apostles*, not only countenanced and *practised*, but *fixt* for *continuance* in the *Church*. As for his way of *arguing* to the *contrary*, *because*, saith he, *there can neither be subordination without Government, nor Government without subordination*] it is founded in a very thin *sophism* which will presently be seen through; for meaning by *Government*, as 'tis plain I do, that particular *form* of *Government*, which *Christ* or his *Apostles* instituted, and by *subordination*, that regular living under the *Government* of all our lawful *Superiors*, as it evidently signified in the former part of the discourse of *schism*, 'tis thence evident, that there may be *Government* without this *subordination*, i. e. the same Man that acknowledges the *Government* of the *Church* by *Bishops*, may yet *divide* and *separate* from his own *Bishop*, and he that *separates* from his *Bishop*, may yet not *deny*, nor cast out the *Episcopal order* out of the *Church*; and so, besides that first sort of *schism* which was an *offence* against *subordination*, i. e. a breaking off from the *Communion* of, and *obedience* to their *lawful Superiors*, there may be also another *species*, referring to *Government*, a *disacknowledging* or *rejecting* the due *Government*: As supposing an *Aristocratical Government* of the *Church*, whether by *Bishops* and *Metropolitans*, or with the addition of *Primates* also, to be that which was placed in 2.

the *Church* by the *Apostles*, then as the reducing this either to *Democrasie* or *Anarchy* on the one side, is a departure from the *Apostolical institution*, so the erecting a *Monarchick Government*, a *Papal universal Pastorship* over all, will be a *departure* from the same *institution*, on the other side. And so certainly there was good reason of this *Method* of mine, and all the *confusion* that was fansied, was but an *invention* of *S. W.*

3. A third now follows, which came out of the very same *forge*, for he will needs perswade us, that *there is no difference between breach of external peace, and want of that charity which is due from every Christian to every Christian*] which is in effect, as if he said, there is no difference betwixt *external* and *internal*, for to that *internal charity* it is, that that last *species* belongs. Thus successful is he in all his nice observations.

4. After this προπύγμη, wherein none but the *Air* was wounded, or fled before him, he now advances to his more *serious* strokes, and after some recital of my words, (which when he hath never an *objection* in the forge, he can perform well enough) he pitches on my *answer* to their *objection*, that by casting out the *authority* of the *Bishop of Rome*, we have *cast off the head of all Christian unity*: And my *answer* being in these words, 1. That the *Bishop* of *Rome*, was never appointed by *Christ* to be the *head* of all *Christian unity*, or that *Church* to be a *conservatory* (for ever) of all *Christian truth*, any more than any other *Bishop* or *Church* of the *Apostles ordaining* or *planting*, he designs great advantage by the skilful exercise of his *faculties*, on these words. For 1. saith he, *what signifies, the Bishop of Rome was not appointed by Christ? Christ*, saith he, *not being on earth when* S. Peter's *successors sat there, and when he ordain'd* S. Peter *chief of the Apostles*, S. Peter *was not yet Bishop of Rome*] I answer, that my words exacted not of him the proof of such a *personal* or *immediate appointment*, I shall yet be content, if by any other means more *remote*, by any certain, though not close *connection* or *consequence*, he shall prove that the *Pope* was ever designed or foreappointed by *Christ* to be the head of all *Christian unity*. And truly if this be not done, I must suppose, that we are secured from the guilt of *that* sort of *schism*, of which in that place I was treating, which consists in a *departure* from those rules, appointed by *Christ* for the *founding* or *upholding* in his Church the *unity of doctrine*, upon this one score of our *rejecting* the *Papal supremacy* in the Church.

5. For if *Christ* hath no way, *mediately*, or *immediately*, fixt any *supremacy* in any *single* person in the *Church*, or in a *succession* in some one singular See; or if that *single* person, that shall be said to be appointed to succeed *Christ* in all his power, so as no other *succeeds* him, shall not also appear to have left the *Bishop of Rome* to all *posterity*, as his *hæres de asse*, *inheriter of that universal supremacy*, vested in him by *Christ*; then certainly the *casting off any* such pretended *power* of the *Bishop of Rome*, is not the departure from any rule for the *founding*, or upholding of *unity* appointed by *Christ*, nor consequently a *rupture* from that *faith*, which was once delivered unto the *Saints*, which is the sort of *schism* I there spake of.

6. And because *S. W.* was not at leisure to speak home to this *question*, whether or no it were by any *divine right*, or *institution* of *Christ*, that this *supremacy* in the *Church* belongs to the *Bishop of Rome*: It may not be amiss to take notice, what his *ordinary* the *Bishop* of *Chalcedon* in his *answer* to the *Bishop* of *Derry* hath, with less *reservation*, acknowledged in this matter. *To us*, saith he, *it sufficeth that the Bishop of Rome is* S. Peter's *Successor, and this all Fathers testifie, and all the Catholick Church believeth; but whether he be so jure divino* or *humano*, *is no point of faith, and many things are de fide which are not de jure divino.* Where not to examine the truth of the affirmation, that the *Bishop* of *Rome* is *S. Peter's successor*, it being yet as certain, that he is S. *Paul's successor*, as S. *Peter's*; nor of the close, that some things are *de fide*, which are not *jure divino*: All that I take notice of is, that when to conclude the point in hand, that the *casting off the supremacy of the Bishop* of *Rome*, *is an act of schism*, as that signifies a *departure* from the *faith* of *Christ*, or those *rules* which *Christ* appointed to uphold the *unity of doctrine*, two things must necessarily be proved by the *Romanist*, 1. That this *supreme power* over all, was by *Christ given to S. Peter*; 2. That the *Pope is S. Peter's successor* in this; these are not so much as pretended to be so proved by the *Romanist*, as to be able to infer the *conclusion*. For that they may do so, it is necessary both that *S. Peter's right* to the *supremacy*, and the *Popes* from him, should be *de jure divino*, and that it should be an *article de fide* that they are so, for if both of them be not *jure divino*, then neither is the *Popes supremacy*, which *depends* upon these two, as a *conclusion* on *premises*, *jure divino*, nor consequently any such *appointment*, or institution of *Christs*, as that the *casting off* that, shall be the *casting off a doctrine, or institution of Christs*. And if it be not *de fide* that they are both thus *jure divino*, (as that *Bishop* saith they are not) then 'tis no *breach* of the *unity* of *faith*, to deny these to be of *divine right*, nor consequently to deny the *Popes supremacy* to be of *divine right*, which depends on these, and cannot be of *divine right*, if these are not; which was all that I had to demonstrate.

p. 69.

7. And as, if this be granted me, there is very little more, which I need contend for, in this whole matter of our present debate, so if my intelligence do not deceive me, it is the common opinion among the *Doctors* of *Paris*, that the *Pope* hath not *universal jurisdiction jure divino*, (and then certainly not from *tu es Petrus*, or *Pasce oves*) and that his *headship* of the *Church* consists only, in being *Primæ sedis Episcopus, the Bishop of the first See.*

8. As for the testimony of S. *Hierom*, which *S. W.* here opposeth to my affirmation [*that among the twelve one was chosen, that a head being constituted, the occasion of Schism might be taken away*] 1. those words seem not to be S. *Hierom's*, but *Jovinian's*, for so it begins. *At dicis, super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia, But you say, the Church is founded on* Peter.

9. Secondly, whose soever that *testimony* is, it hath been by me formerly produced, and answered, and must of necessity be so interpreted, as shall be reconcileable with his words in the same place, that the *Church* which was *founded on* Peter, was *founded on all the Apostles as well as on him, and that* ex æquo, *equally, the strength of the Church was established on them all.*

Ch. n. Sect. 10. 1, 5, &c.

And

And thirdly, of S. *Hieroms* opinion in that place, it is evident, that whatever priviledge it was, 10.
that he allowed S. *Peter*, it was but upon the account of his seniority, either of years, or of his reception into the *Discipleship*, but rather of the former, for so it there follows: *Cur non Johannes electus est virgo? Ætati delatum est, quia Petrus senior erat.* *Why was not* John *who was a virgin chosen, or preferred before the rest?* (so *electus est*, is in the ensuing words *interpreted* by *præferretur*, not in *Dominion over*, but in *place before the other Apostles*) his answer is, *Because* Peter *was the Elder*, the *deference* being given to his *age*: Which being but a *personal advantage*, not communicable to all that should sit in the *Roman* See after him, is no way appliable to the benefit of the *Romanist*, who is to prove the *Popes supremacy*, and not only the *Primacy* of S. *Peter*.

And fourthly, if the utmost were granted that can be pretended from these words, it could never 11.
inforce or acquire to the *Pope* any more than the dignity of the *Prime Patriarch*, who in case of *extraordinary difficulty*, or *contention* falling out between two *Primates*, neither of them subject to any superior *Bishop*, or the like, might by way of voluntary appeal by mutual consent of parties, be resorted unto (and that would be beneficial to the unity of the *Church*, in case the *Bishop* of *Rome* persisted in the footsteps of S. *Peter*, and no way varied from him) But still this is nothing to the plenitude of power, as of an *universal Pastor*, which was that which I had at that time under consideration. And so all *S. W.* his hopeful fabrick, which depended on S. *Hieroms* words, is fallen to the ground, without any farther pains of ours, toward the demolishing of it. As

When he adds thirdly, that *hence it follows that Christian unity is conserved by the Bishop of* Rome, 12.
more than any other Bishop, contrary to the Doctors assertion] this is not in these words by him recited, of any force against the *Doctors assertion*, who made the comparison not simply betwixt the *Bishop* or Church of *Rome*, and all other *Bishops*, but betwixt that Church and any other Church of the *Apostles plantation*; And sure many such there were, as well as the Church of *Rome*, and more ancient than the Church of *Rome*, as the Church of *Jerusalem* and *Antioch*, the *Churches of Asia*, and many others, and consequently, if *Rome* have any priviledge above others, it is not from any appointment of *Christ*, whether *mediate* or *immediate*, that it thus hath it.

Fourthly, saith he, the *Doctor equivocates in the word* Roman *Church, and takes it in a sence which* 13.
he knows we never meant it, our acception of it being of the universal Church, communicating with the mother Church of Rome, *his of the private Dioceß of* Rome *it self.*] But it is manifest I did not *equivocate*, I spake of the authority of the Bishop of *Rome*, meaning just as he doth, the *pretended authority* over the *whole Church of God*, for else how could I speak of our *casting out* that *authority*, sure we never *cast out*, or denied his having authority in his own *Dioceß*; But then to deny the truth of their pretension, and to appeal to my former proofs, that the whether *Church* or *Bishop* of *Rome* never had any appointment from *Christ* to be the *head* of all *Christian unity*, more than every other *Church* or *Bishop* of the *Apostles planting* and *ordaining*, (which was all I said in that place) this was as plain on the other side, and no kind of *eqdivocating* in that.

Fifthly, When of the *private Church of* Rome *it self* he saith, that the *Fathers hold that it had a* 14.
greater vigor of Christian tradition than any other Church,] though this he hath not proved, yet the yielding of it, is perfectly *reconcileable* with all that I there said; For 1. it was of *Christs appointment*, that I spake, and whatsoever reverence the *Fathers* pay that *See*, yet they affirm not of *Christ*, that he by any peculiarity of promise conveyed any such priviledge to that *See*, of having a greater vigor than all other Churches of *Apostolical plantation*; Secondly, it was of the *perseverance* or *conserving for ever all Christian truth*, that I spake; and against that, the *Fathers* say nothing, but speak of it as of a matter of fact, that in their time *Christian tradition* was most eminently preserved there, not undertaking to divine, that it should to all perpetuity be so faithful a repository. Nay 'tis not
* long since I told him out of *Anselm*, his prediction of the iniquity of that *See*, which should cause * *Ch.* 5. *Sect.* 8. *n.* 1.
many *Churches* to depart from her. And it is small advantage to have this *vigor once*, if it have *since* betrayed that truth, and obtruded *Pontifical dictates* instead of such *Tradition*.

And lastly, When he is so unsatisfied with my *interposing* this word [*for ever*] as if, saith he, 15.
Christ might perhaps appoint her to conserve truth for a while, but meant after some time to discharge her of that office, I answer, that speaking, as we now do, of the *particular See* of *Rome*, there is no colour of *appointment* or *determination* of *Christs*, that it should for *any* time be a conservatory of all *Christian truth*, any otherwise than it is his *will and command* and *appointment*, that every Church should conserve all *Christian truth*, and therefore that was not the motive to my putting in the word [*for ever*] but because to make good the *Romanists* pretension, that the *casting off the authority of the Bishop of* Rome, *is the casting off the Faith of Christ*, it is necessary not only that that *Church* be appointed by *Christ* to be a *conservatory* of all *Christian doctrine*, but that it be secured to continue so *for ever*, else as the *Churches* of *Asia*, which were once very *zealous conservatories* of *Christian truth*, afterward *forsook their first* zeal, and admitted foul *heresies*, so it may be true of the *Church* of *Rome* also.

SECT.

SECT. II.

The Apostles depositum. *Grounds of belief. Our State fallible as peccable. Regal power differs from Sacerdotal.* Peters *Primacy what it signifies. Whether given him by Christ. Primacy of jurisdiction never without Dignity of place.*

1. WHat I said in the second place concerning the *acts* of *Apostolical providence* for the *preserving unity in the faith:* And 1. their *resolving* on *some few heads* (of *efficacy* to the *planting of Christian life*) to be *deposited* in every *Church*, hath somewhat perplext *S. W.* For 1. saith he, Doctor *H. is suddenly become a plain Papist* (and if he be, I must only wonder how a *Romanist* can find in his heart to write in *confutation* of him any longer) but then 2. he *fears very much that Mr. H. in this his doctrine, neither goes to Church, nor stays at home*] (and this very *fright* of his, the *factor* or *stationer* hath put in his *bill of fare* for a notable piece of *wit*, a *special* service) But to give him full *satisfaction*, I have written an intire *tract* on this *subject*, and given him the sum of my *belief* in this matter, what that *depositum* was that the *Apostles* thus *deposited* in all Churches, the several *articles* of the *Apostolick faith* or *Creed*, and if the Church of *Rome* would keep close to that *depositum*, and not *corrupt* by *increasing* of it, coin no more *articles*, than they had from the *Apostles mint*, there is not a more promising way of *return* to that *unity*, from which *Christian professors* long have swerved; and that the Church of *Rome* will not yield to this, is absolutely a breach of the *Canon* of *Ephesus*, to which I have spoken at large in the *reply*, Chap. 8. Sect. 2. and shall thither refer the *Reader* for what might be added in this matter.

2. But he proposes in this matter a *subtle Quære, whether these Churches, in which these heads of such special efficacy were deposited, were infallible, or no?*] I answer briefly, that every of those Churches single, and particularly the Church of *Rome* was no farther *infallible*, than they should actually adhere to this *depositum* intrusted to them. If they swerved from it, by addition or substraction, they so far failed of their trust. And that they might, any one of them so fail, I have no reason of doubting, who see so many visible demonstrations *à posteriori* of many of those *Churches failing* thus. But that all of them should *uniformly*, without ever *consulting* of it, agree to *impose* upon *posterity* somewhat else, instead of that *Apostolical depositum*, I think not any more *probable*, than that so many *Atomes* should *casually* yet *orderly* concur to make this *Universe*. But on the contrary, I think the *universal consent*, and *attestation* of all the *Apostolick plantations*, so forcible an *argument* to induce *belief*, that the *Apostles* did really *deposit* these *Doctrines* in all *Churches*, that any *prudent* man may safely venture his *life* or his *soul* on the *truth* of it, and resolve it as *impossible* to be otherwise, as that he and a *multitude* of other men should be *deceived* in that which they *affirm* from their own *sensations*.

3. Much more might be here said, but this is all that is necessary to be answered to that *question*. For as to his *answer* to my *addition*, that *if we hold these doctrines deposited in the Church as zealously as the Romanist, we must hold them as of faith, and that the depository is so trusty, as it cannot deceive us.*] I reply, 'tis sufficient to hold it of *faith*, and upon *prudential* grounds of *resolving*, that all the *world* of *Christian Apostolical Churches* would never *concur* wilfully, and gainlesly to deceive; not that any one or more of them single cannot possibly have been first misled themselves, and then mislead others. And therefore when I said, those *few heads were asserted by us as zealously as by any Romanist*, my speech belonged to *sincerity* of *belief* induced thus as I now express, and to the degree of that sincerity; and if I that pretend not the same *motive* to induce my *faith*, as the *Romanist* pretends, have yet the same *faith* that the *Romanist* hath, and will adventure as high a stake, practise what Christ commands as confidently upon this *faith*, not built on the *belief* of their *Churches infallibility*, as the *Romanist* doth upon his *supposed infallible ground*, my *faith* will still be as much (if not more *properly*) *faith* as his, and I doubt not as secure of its *acceptation* and *reward* in Heaven. And then sure I am as far from the *sceptick School* of *Academicks*, as the *firmest*, and most *undoubted faith* can secure me to be. For though I willingly grant, that mans *wit cannot invent a better way to preserve unity of faith, than belief of their Churches infallibility would be*; yet I, that for all *fundamental truths* of *Christ*, thus derived to me by *undoubted tradition*, am so richly provided for, and must not for all other particulars invent or carve for my self, but sit down satisfied with that portion which God hath thought fit for me, and cannot believe all that I would have; (my fancies, or my wishes;) ought in reason, for all these, to content my self with such means, as *God* hath afforded me; and till I discern by some *infallible* argument, that there is some man or society of men, which hath the never-ceasing *priviledge* from *God* of being *infallible*, never go about to deceive my self into a *groundless confidence*, or perswasion of a present *Utopian infallibility*. I know it agrees with *Gods good providence* to leave me in a peccable, and I cannot *resist*, must not *repine*, if he hath left me for some things in a fallible state, and only support my self with my *diligence* and my *prayers*, that I fall not willingly into *fault*, or *mistake*, *sin* or *error*.

4. What next follows upon my *second* way of *preserving unity in faith*, is lightly varied from the questions and answers in the *Catholick Gentleman*, and was punctually answered in the *Reply*, *Chap.* 8. *Sect.* 1.

5. As for his great care of *providing a place for the King* among the *Bishops* (which next follows in his *play-some* mood) it shall be seriously examined, whensoever he finds in any of my Papers, either that the *King is by* me stiled *head of the Church*, as he will feign me to call him, or that he, whose office

office it is to be *Supream Governour* over *Bishops* even in *Ecclesiastical* causes, and to order the *external* affairs of the *Church*, hath the censures of the *Church*, or the Ministry of the Word and Sacraments, and so of admitting into, and excluding from the *Church* committed to him. If he knew not the difference of the *Regal* and *Sacerdotal*, the *coercive* and *directive* power, he may learn it more seasonably of those, which have written *ex instituto* on that subject, than expect a new *treatise* of it from me here, *loco non suo*, who have a task of a competent wearisomness already before me.

Here follows now a special piece of *art*, on occasion of my allowing a *Primacy* of *order* or *dignity* among *Primates* or *Patriarchs*, proportionable to the πρῶτος Σίμων in Scripture, and agreeable to what is by the ancient Canons allowed the *Bishop of* Rome, [If so saith he, *then for any thing you know, it may be a Primacy of jurisdiction, and it stands only upon the certainty of yours and our interpretation of Scripture, whether it signifie such a Primacy or no.*] I answer 1. that a [*may be*] no way concludes that *it is*; a thousand things *may* be, or might have been, if *God* had pleased, of which no one ever *was* or *shall* be, and I willingly grant S. *Peters Primacy* of *jurisdiction* over *all the Apostles*, to be one of that number. 2. My not knowing, or having no certainty of *interpreting Scripture*, can have nothing to do in this matter, with the grounds which *S. W.* can produce to infer from Scripture what he affirms; and the solidity and irrefragable force of those grounds, are the only considerable in this business, and he that is, and acknowledges himself *fallible*, may yet by the right use of those *means* which *God* affords him, discern the *truth*, when they that use not those *means*, but rely on their feigned *priviledge* of *inerrableness*, do by *regular consequence* from this *presumption*, swerve and fail in judging of *truth*, and *interpreting Scripture*. And so these are too weak *Topicks* to conclude a matter of such *importance* to the whole *Church*, as is this of *Peters*, and from thence the *Popes Supremacy*, and *universality* of *jurisdiction*. 6.

But *S. W.* hath yet a more *efficacious Topick*, at least *ad hominem*, which will conclude it impossible to be otherwise, (*neither could it be any other*, saith he) *if any hold may be taken from his words. For*, saith he, *S.* Peter, *as you grant, and as the words* πρῶτος Σίμων Simon *the first of the Apostles, plainly evidence, had some kind of Primacy then given him, and if it were then given him, he then had it*, i. e. *in our Saviours life-time. But you told us Chap. 4. Sect. 14. that S.* John *had the dignity of place, which is the same with Primacy of order, before all others in Christs life-time, even before S.* Peter *himself, the Primacy then, which S.* Peter *had in Christs life-time, must be some other Primacy, and what Primacy could this be, but the Primacy of jurisdiction.* 7.

I answer 1. to the question in the conclusion, by telling him what *Primacy* it was, that *Peter* had at this time, when the *Scripture* saith πρῶτος Σίμων; It was *Primacy* both of *years* and *discipleship*, he was the *ancientest* man, as *Hierom* told us even now, at least the *ancientest* of them which had any special remark of *Christs favour* on them, of the three, ὑπὸ τῦ κυρίυ προσλημμένοι, as * *Clemens* calls him and the two sons of *Zebedee*, and the *ancientest disciple* of *Christ*: not the first that was called, that appears to be *Philip*, but the first that so *obeyed* his *call*, as constantly to adhere to him. And this having nothing of *jurisdiction* over all his *fellow disciples* annext to it, on the one side, only the dignity of speaking first, or being spoken to, and answering in the person of all, and yet being very reconcileable with all that I said of *John*, Chap. 4. Sect. 14. *viz.* that he had the *favour of Christ*, *and the dignity of place before S.* Peter *himself in Christs life*, *leaning on his breast*, having the πρωτοκλισία (for the *younger man* and the *later disciple* might by *Christs favour*, have that) there remains no force in this argument against my pretensions. But then 2. what is by the disputer assumed, both as granted by me, and plainly evidenced by the words, *First Simon*, *viz.* that *some Primacy was given* Peter] may have some ambiguity in it, and therefore must be cleared, before I can either grant it to be true, or disclaim the granting it. If by [*given*] he mean no more than I have already said, that he had it by that *favour of Christ*, which was specially afforded to three of them, of whom he was the *ancientest*, both in respect of *years* and *discipleship*, then I freely grant it, and am no more incommodated by it, than just now I appeared to be. But if by [*given*] he mean any farther particular *donation* of *Christ* to him, then this *Primacy* no way appears to have been thus *given* him. For whatsoever is by the *Romanists* supposable to be *given* him, upon *tu es Petrus*, cannot be applied to this; the title of πρῶτος Σίμων being mentioned by the *Evangelist*, before that part of the *story*, which sets down *Christ's* delivering those words to him. And for any other *donation precedaneous* to that, 1. the *Scripture* mentions none, and 2. 'tis not conceiveable there should be any, or indeed such force in that, when all the time of *Christs life*, *John* had the πρωτοκλισία, the *dignity of place* next *Christ*. For though that *dignity* of *place* may be (and was in *John*) without any superiority of power or jurisdiction, yet the *Superiority* or *Primacy* of *Jurisdiction* is never to be found in any without the πρωτοκλισία or priority of place: and therefore I say, it is not Imaginable (when the Scripture is silent) that any such *Primacy* of *jurisdiction* should at, or before the time of the [*first Simon*] belong to S. *Peter* by *Christs donation*, and yet the dignity of place remain to S. *John* by *Christs indulgence*. And so much for the *argument ad hominem*, which doubtless made him promise of doing him special service, but hath much failed his expectation. 8.

* Κατὰ τυπωσ. l. 5.

But this great advantage must not be lost so, if it be good for nothing else, yet it may be so disguised and brought out a second time in other dress or garnish, that it may serve very well for a *quelque chose* in the *bill of fare*, and so indeed it is improved in the next onset; and from our *Saviours* making *Peter* the *first*, there must needs be *some better thing bestowed on him*, saith he, *than a dry Presidency, or an obliging all the Apostles under pain of damnation to make a leg to S.* Peter.] I answer, it now appears what the design was in the former urging of the *argument*, to shuffle in the giving of the *Primacy* to him. But that art being now discovered, and no donation of *Christs* being discernible to be included, or intimated in this title of S. *Peters*, the *puff-paste* may have served to furnish the *table*, but hath not *fed* any of the *guests*: and so we have done with that *Paragraph*. 9.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The Romanists *peace not perfect. The* Greek *Church, acknowledged not the Popes Supremacy. The Politick Problem. The Kings power in externals. His judgment what good for the publick.*

1. IN his answer to *Chap.* 8. *Sect.* (it should be) 6. he hath made a shift at the entrance quite to *mistake* my *words*, and *design*. I speak of the *unity* of the *whole body*, i. e. of the *whole Christian Church*, and all the parts of it, *Eastern* as well as *Western*, *&c.* to which I thought the *subjection* of this *Nation* to the *Pope*, could not effectually *contribute*, because before the time of our pretended departure, the *Eastern Churches* had long renounced all *subjection* to the *Papacy*. And he refers me to the *great tranquillity which they enjoy who are under that government now.*] I answer, 1. that I discern not the truth of his affirmation, nor acknowledge the so perfect *peace* which he *boasts* of; I need not go far for instances; 'Tis not long since we saw the *seculars* and *regulars* far enough removed from such huge *tranquillity*, ingaged at a competent distance (as *Watsons Quodlibets* will testifie) in many things; particularly, and more lately in that controversie concerning the necessity of an Ordinary in these Islands, and *S. W.* may remember it, by the token of the *Jesuits Creed*; and whether their agreement be now so perfect in respect of the questions long agitated betwixt the *Jansenians* and *Molinists*, even after the *Popes decision* on the *Molinists* side, he may please to inform us in his next; And till then I shall omit the debate concerning the *state* of the *souls departed*, and the doctrines attending that, which are of some weight of importance.

2. Secondly, Be the *tranquillity* of the *Romish Subjects* and *Votaries* never so profound, yet 'tis evident the *unity* of the *Romanists* is not the *unity* of the *whole Christian* world, and that being it I spake of, 'tis certain he yet renders no answer to that. 'Tis true indeed, if it were all *Christians duty*, and so ours, to be subject to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, others *default* would not *secure* or *justifie* us, but that this is the duty of all *Christians*, or of any more than of right belong to the *Roman Province*, is the *principal question* all this while, and must not be *begg'd* (as in the process of this *answer* it is) while it is under dispute.

3. But at length he comes nearer the point in hand, and considers the *Greek Church*, and of them affirms these three things. First, *that for rejecting the Popes Supremacy they were by all the Christian world held and called Schismaticks*; *and yet* Secondly, *when they were in their right mood, as in the Council of* Florence, *they admitted it as much as any* Roman *Catholick*. Thirdly, *that when they were disgusted and refused unity, they acknowledged the power of the Bishop of* Rome, *as*, saith he, *appears by the testimony of* Gerson, *cited by Bishop* Bramhal *against himself, which witnesses that the* Greeks *departed from the then Pope with these words, we acknowledge thy power, we cannot satisfie your covetousness, live by your selves.*]

Just. Vindic. p. 16.

4. To these I answer, 1. that their being the *greatest Schismaticks* for the *rejecting* the *Supremacy*, and yet their acknowledging as much as any *Catholick*, and when they *refused unity*, yet *acknowledging* the *Popes power*] are *riddles* for none but *S. W.* to expound, and when he hath done that, he may very justly turn *Southsayer*, and set up *ex tripode* to deliver *Auguries* or *Oracles* which he please. For certainly if their *Schism* consisted in denying the *Popes Supremacy*, and that is his power, then when they *refused unity*, in which *refusal* their *Schism* consisted, they did not acknowledge his *power*. Secondly, if sometimes they were in the *mood* to deny the *Popes Supremacy* sometimes to grant it, then, for ought *S. W.* hath here attempted to prove by any other means, than that of his own *approving* it, the *yielding* the *Pope's power* doth no more appear to have been their *good mood*, or *interval*, than their much more *constant* and *continued refusing*. Thirdly, for their *subscription* in the *Council of Florence*, he cannot but know, how *invalid* it is to infer their submission to the *Popes power*, else it were great *unkindness* to account them as *great Schismaticks* since, as before that *Council* (of the *Greeks* doctrine in this *Council*, I have also spoken in the *reply*, *Chap.* XI. *Sect.* I.) Lastly, for Bishop *Bramhal's* citation out of * *Gerson*, part of the Bishops words are, that the *Greek Church never acknowledged any obedience to be due from them to the Bishop of* Rome, and he that is acquainted with the *Chancellor John Gerson's* writings; or but with as many pieces of his, as are put together by *Goldastus*, in his *Monarchia*, will not doubt that the same was *his* sence also, and we need no further evidence, than the words thus cited from him, for sure they that *bid the Pope live by himself, res suas sibi habere* (the solemn *form* of *divorce* or separation) did in these words profess to separate from him, moved thereto, among other things, by his grievous exactions, and cannot at the same time acknowledge any such power, as *S. W.* pretends to, or any more than that of the *Prime Patriarch*, or *beginning* of *unity*, which that learned Bishop was there willing to acknowledge. The truth is, the words are not *potestatem*, but *potentiam tuam recognoscimus*, *we acknowledge thy might*; and that was proper enough to be said to the most violent usurper or exactor; and the other words, and the whole context, restrain it to that sence.

* *P. 4. Serm. de Pace & Unit.*

5. He next replies to my mention of the *Politick Problem*, whether the *Bishop* of *Rome* be probably able to *administer so vast a Province*, the truth of which I thought belonged to *prudent persons to judge*, *and especially to Kings intrusted by God with the care of their own Realms*; And first he is willing to interpret my words of such *humane policy*, as was to be had among *heathens*, and streightway to advance to such a *fastidious* despising of my conclusion drawn from the *Christian Kings* being *nursing Fathers* to the *Church*, as to make it equally to infer *Nero to have right and title to be head of the Church*, *whilst he remained an heathen Emperor.*] But all this hath no more appearance of *weight*

or

or *earnest* in it, than will briefly be answered, by my telling him, 1. that I spake of *Christian policy*, or skill of managing and regulating the *external* matters of the *Church*, such is this of *dividing* or *bounding* of *Provinces*, appointing of *Bishops Sees*, or *Metropoles*, and the like in such a manner as may most tend to *publick good*, and as an Heathen Emperor by accident may do somewhat in this, *viz.* by dividing the Empire into Provinces, as we know *Augustus* did by *Mecenas*'s *advice*, and S. *Paul* in his ordaining *Bishops in Churches*, follow the τάξις *order*, as he found in the *civil notitiæ*. So now that *Princes* have received the *faith* of *Christ*, and undertaken the defence of it, sure none is more fit to judge of all things of this rank than he, whom in every *Nation God* hath appointed to be *Supream* over all, even *Ecclesiastical* persons, *viz.* the *Christian King*, as (both in this particular, and more generally) had before been proved to be the sence and resolution of the *Christian Church* and *Councils*, and as the very title of *Father*, which the *Scripture* gives *Kings*, in relation to the *Church*, *Isa.* 49. 23. doth demonstrate; For to the *Fathers power*, *subjection* and *obedience* in *external* things is *relative*, as even by the instance, which he thinks most confutes it, is manifest; for though *Joseph* was but a *foster Father* to *Christ*, yet the *text* assures us, *Christ* lived in obedience to *Joseph*, for else it could not be truly said, that he was *subject* to them, in the plural, *Luke* 2. 51.

What he adds in conclusion of that *Section* as a consequence from my words, that *by making the King in each Nation Judge of this Politick Problem, I make the party in the controversie to be Umpire of it*] can really have no place here, where I am speaking, not of the point of *right*, whether the *Pope* be rightfully the *head* of our *Church* (for if that were the thing now under consideration, I should acknowledge the *Prudential* or *Politick Problem* it self to be very *unseasonably* interposed) but whether it be most for the *good of our*, *or any particular Church* (abstracting from the point of *right*) that the *Pope* should be *head* of it, or whether he being himself of but *finite faculties*, and at such a *distance* from us, and many other *nations*, he be fitly qualified to *administer that vast Province*, one *Monarch* over the *whole Christian world*, For of this it was evidently, that I there spake, and in that I thought it reasonable that the *Prince*, that is the *Common ruler* both of *S. W.* and of me, should be deem'd the most competent *judge* betwixt us, what is *best* for either of us, and for all others in the same *condition* with us, which is far enough from making either *party* the *Umpire*, as *S. W.* suggested me to do, and is only angry with me, because I would not let him be guilty of the same fault himself, which he *unjustly* accuses me of, for if the *Pope* should be *Umpire*, as he would have it, 'tis visible that a *party* is *Umpire*. And so much for his *first* Section. 6.

SECT. IV.

The first Ages most competent testifiers of Tradition. Scripture a witness of Apostolick practice, and not only Tradition. Scripture as infallibly interpretable as Tradition, or Papal Decrees. The four first Councils preferr'd before all subsequent, Why? The Articles of Faith consigned in them, not to be increased. Authority of Councils. Docibleness in a Church no fault. Not learning of Rome *our only charge. Belief without Infallibility. Purity the flourishing of a Church.*

HIS second *Section* though well lengthened with *exaggeration* and *sarcasm*, is but a recitation, and enlargement of the same mistake of my sence, which the *Catholick Gentleman* had hit on before him, concerning my mention of the *first three hundred years*, *and the four first general Councils*, as if I rejected all the *rest* of the *Church*, which was not comprised within those bounds, as *erroneous*, and such as I refused to be tried by, for the *Doctrines* in *Controversie* between them and us; Whereas it is most manifest by the occasion, and whole contexture, that I mention'd the *Scripture*, and those, as the *safest Depositaries of all that faith which was delivered by Christ and his Apostles*, and so, as the most *competent testifiers* of *tradition*, which certainly they must be, if either he that was an *ocular witness*, or lived neareſt the times of such, be more creditable, and *authentick* for the relating a matter of fact, than any other, no more honest than he, which hath not so good means to attain to the knowledge of it. Do not we *cæteris paribus*, give more *credit* to one *eye-witness*, than to many that were not such, but make *distant relations* from times which were long before them, offering no testimony, or record of any αὐτόπται, for what they say? Or indeed is it possible for us at this distance by any optick to discern or judge, what the *Apostles* did or taught, if it were not conveyed to us by some who lived in, or soon after their *times*? Is there any *satisfactory* motives to induce belief of a matter of fact (such it is, that the *Apostle* did *institute*, or teach this or that) but the *authority* of the *Reporter*? and is there any proper ground, whereon to build this sort of *authority* of one man, or society of men above another, but the consideration first of the means, he hath to inform himself *rightly*, than of his *fidelity*, that being not deceived himself, he was not *presumeable* to be willing to *deceive* others? So that what *infallible judgment* soever the *Church* of this or any former Age can be deemed to have, yet sure matters of *fact*, such are all *traditions*, are not the proper matter whereon 1.

to exercise it; 'tis not imaginable that the most *inerrable Pope* or *Council*, should by strength of that, unless they have also (which I suppose they pretend not) *immediate revelation*, and *inspiration* annext to it, affirm infallibly, either what *S. W.* hath written in *Schism disarm'd*, or what *Simon Zelotes* preacht in *Britain*, or indeed that ever he was here, or any one *Christian Doctor* for many hundred years, or consequently what *Depositum* was intrusted to our *Church*, any farther than they are advertised by some *Records* of the times, wherein each thing was done, or of the succeeding times, within such a distance, as it can by some sure means be conveyed to them. What can be more plain and evident than this? What less liable to those *ridiculous consequences*, of being *judged by those that speak nothing of our differences, of making the whole Church first pure, then impure, then pure again, as it sutes best with my purpose, of expressing a plain tergiversation*, and the like, which are affixt to my mention of the 300 *years, and the four General Councils?* But of this I have spoken enough, in the *Reply*, Chap. 8. Sect. 3.

2. But *S. W.* hath one *specialty* here, wherein he surpasses the *Catholick Gentleman*. His first objection is against my but naming *Scripture* for any *way of judging of Apostolical doctrines and traditions.*] The *concordant testifications* of the *first ages* of the *Church*, and the *four General Councils*, I had particularly named, as means to conveigh to us the *knowledge* of *Apostolical traditions*, only I set *Scripture* in the *front*, as having *Vincentius Lirinensis* his direction to do so, (*duplici modo munire fidem, primo scil. divinæ legis authoritate, &c.* contr. Hær. c. 1. and *quascunque antiquiores vel schismatum vel hæreseon profanitates nullo modo nos oportet convincere, nisi aut sola, si opus est, Scripturarum authoritate, &c.* c. 39.) and as verily believing that at least some *Apostolical practices* and *doctrines*, were conserved there, suppose it were *Christs Sermon* on the *Mount*, or his *institution* of the *Sacraments*, or his very *death* and *resurrection*, &c. And I must be arraigned and chastised, and very demure arguments formed against me, for no more but this; For first he will ask, *Are those doctrines clearer expresst in Scripture, than in the depositories of the Church, or no? If they be*, saith he, *what needed we those Depositives? If not, how can we judge of them by Scripture?*] I answer, what need hath the world of the itch of disputing, which suggests arguments against the Suns giving light at noon-day? and *S. W.* his invention serves him as well on such a Theme, as for the defending any of his most precious concernments. Or if a man is bound either to be a *Schismatick*, or to render punctual satisfaction to all such forked *dilemmas* as these, like the *brute* in the *fable*, which mistook his own *ears* for *horns*, it then sufficeth me at the present, that which soever is most obscure, should receive light from the more perspicuous, and so that sometimes the *Scripture* should illustrate the *Depositories* of the *Church*, sometimes receive lustre from them, and such very good friends as are the writings of the *Apostles*, and the *records* of their *preachings*, live amicably and profitably together, and administer each to the others necessities, and we receive our instruction from both, when they are both willing to afford it, and content our selves with either, when the other is silent, and never *question Gods* bounty, what need we have, or what benefit we can reap of that which he hath afforded; It being visible both *in thesi*, that that which is not needful at one time, may be beneficial, nay necessary at another; and *in hypothesi*, that this is the very case of *Scripture*, and the *faith once delivered to the Saints* (as that is mentioned by, and so is a *disparate* thing from the *Scripture*) that one lends at one time, and at another time *borrows light* from the other.

3. As for his singular instance, to prove *how difficult a thing it is, to judge when things are clear in Scripture, when not*, from the *Doctors* not being *satisfied from thence, that S.* Paul *converted Jews, S.* Peter *Gentiles*,] 'tis long since demonstrated to be a calumny, and that all that I said was no more than what was affirmed by the plainest words of *Scripture*, set down as intelligibly, as ever any *tradition unwritten* can be *delivered*, or as the *Pope* or *Council* can define any thing, *viz.* that by compact between those two *Apostles* and some others, where they met in a City of mixt inhabitants, one should betake himself to the *Jews*, the other to the *Gentiles*. And therefore, as to that *supernumerary* exception, let *S. W.* but tell me what *sure rules he gives us to settle our judgment, when things are clear in the definition* of a *Pope* or *Council*, when not, or in case of a doubt, what the meaning is of such *supposed infallible decree* (which if it want an *interpreter*, is a *Barbarian* to him that *understands* it not, though in the *spirit*, it delivereth never so *infallible* an *oracle*) and I will not fail to satisfie his importunity, and direct him to as proper and safe means to *interpret Scripture* also, or else I will not impose on him the believing this or that sence of it.

4. The equality of the authority of all *Councils*, he also presseth, against my naming but the four first (which the *Catholick Gentleman* was not *acute* enough to take notice of.) But besides many other grounds of difference between those four first, confestly *Oecumenical Councils*, and the fourteen more which he sets under that title (which I shall not now insist on) I have already more than *intimated* the *reason* which in that part of my *Discourse* gave the *deference* to those, because those were so near the *first times*, that they were competent witnesses or judges of the *Records*, which were then produced for the truths, which were there defined as from *Apostolical tradition*. This I suppose the ground of Pope *Gregories* exalting these four Councils so high in these words (*l.* 1. *Regist. Ep.* 24.) *Sicut sancti Evangelii quatuor libros, sic quatuor Concilia suscipere & venerari me fateor, Nicænum scil. &c. quia in his velut in quadrato lapide sanctæ fidei structura consurgit, & cujuslibet vitæ & actionis norma consistit.* And although he add the *fifth*, with a *pariter veneror*, yet sure this lessens not the eminent veneration yielded to the former. In like manner Pope *Gelasius* in the name of the *Roman* Church, after the Scriptures, yields authority to these *four Councils*, and for all other *post istorum quatuor authoritatem & custodienda & recipienda decernimus & mandamus.* See *Corp. Jur. Can. Decr. par.* 1, *Dist.* 15. *c.* 2. & 3. To which I farther add, because the *Creeds*, or *summaries* of the *credenda*, were in these so *consign'd*, as that they might not afterwards be *inlarged* by any to any new matters, as appears both by the *Nicene Creed*, form'd by the *Fathers* of that *first famous Council* (the *Athanasian* being but

an

an explication of that) and the expreſs words of the *Epheſine Council* Can. 7. ἐτέραν πίστιν μὴ ἐξεῖναι, *that it ſhould not be lawful for any man to produce, write or compoſe any belief, beſide that which was thus eſtabliſht by the Fathers of* Nice. And that they which ſhould dare συντιθέναι, προσκομίζειν, ἢ προσφέρειν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἐπιστρέφειν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἀληθείας, *to compoſe, or tender, or offer any ſuch other Faith to any that were willing to convert to the acknowledgement of the truth from* Judaiſm, Gentiliſm, *or any other Hereſie whatſoever, if they were Biſhops, ſhould be degraded, if Laicks, anathematized or excommunicated*; which as it renders a direct account of my pitching on this way of *trial*, whether the *Church* of *Rome*'s conditions of *Communion* are too ſevere to us or no, ſo is it our evidence, that we are not *hereticks*, who believe all this *faith* of *Nice* and *Epheſus*, &c. or if we were, and for no leſs than *hereſie* caſt out by the *Church* of *Rome*, they muſt not under pain of *degradation* and *excommunication*, I may add the crime and pain of perjury alſo, (the *Pope* at his Conſecration ſwearing to obſerve inviolably all the ordinances made in the eight *firſt General Councils*) impoſe any new Articles of belief upon us, (I mean ſuch as were not in * *ſubſtance* comprehended in thoſe former *Creeds*) in the way to our *readmiſſion* or *return* to their *Churches* peace.

* See *Vincent. Lir. c.* 28.

By the way, when there have been in the *Romaniſts* account ſo many *General Councils* above the number of the Eight *firſt*, I might ask, whether in the *Popes* * *Conſecration-Oath* he ſwear the *obſervation* of all the whole number *indefinitely?* Or if he do not, whether I may not as ſeaſonably retort the *Queſtion*, as *S. W.* could propoſe it, whether all the *Councils are not of equal authority, there being nothing found to authorize* the *firſt eight*, *which was not found in the ninth, tenth*, &c. And then ſure, that *anſwer* that can be ſo eaſily *retorted* upon the *reſpondent*, is no *unrefutable* anſwer. 5.

* See the words, *Corp. Jur. Can. Decr. par.* 3. *diſt.* 16. *c.* 8.

What now hath been ſaid, demonſtrates ſufficiently how little *ingagement* lies upon me by force of the mention of the *four firſt Councils*, to imbark in a new *Ocean* of *Controverſie*, concerning the *ſacred* and *obligatory authority of all Councils*, any farther than their *determinations* appear to be grounded on *Apoſtolick tradition*; ſo far indeed my words obliged me, and to that I have ſpoken already, (and I ſuppoſe, yielded as much, as is demanded by many *learned Papiſts*) but to any more, my leiſure is not ſo great at this time, as to *invite* me to *expatiate* ſo unneceſſarily, though if it were ſeaſonable, I might ſafely adventure on the *queſtion* in the very terms, that *S. W.* hath propoſed it unto me, *viz.* with his *interpoſition* of thoſe *two exceptions*, *unleſs their votes have not been free, or ſome other known defect have been in the managing of it.* In which ſecond rank of exceptions, I ſhould not think fit to name the *Primate* of *England* his not conſenting to the *Canon*, as *S. W.* will be forced to decry the *Canon* of *Chalcedon*, becauſe the *Pope conſented* not to it, and this after he hath *rebuked* it in me, as *illogical* and *illegal*, to commit the *Umpirage* to a *Party*. 6.

The laſt on-ſet is againſt my *extolling* the *humble docible temper of our Church*, i. e. in plain terms againſt *imitating* our *Saviour*, who did more than commend or extol humility, even μακαρίζειν, pronounces it a prime ingredient in bleſſedneſs, and commands us to learn and tranſcribe it from him. If it were an hypocritical or falſe humility that I had thus extoll'd, and I were now chid for *talking like a ſaint* (as juſt before I was, when I did but profeſs, that our *ignorance, if we ſhould be found to miſtake, is an unaffected ignorance*, which *S. W.* ſuch is his *Chriſtian temper*, reſolves to be a *conſciouſneſs to my ſelf, what pitiful ſhifts I make uſe of, inſtead of grounds*) If I ſay, the pretending to the humble and docible temper, whilſt it were far from us, had been the matter of the charge, this had been but the old *S. W.* ſtill, and I could not with reaſon ξενίζεσθαι *think ſtrange* of it, having been ſo long ſo *intimately acquainted* with his *humour*, and taught to expect ſuch conſtructions from him. But it is the very humility which we profeſs to have, the docibleneſs which I verily thought had been our ſtricteſt duty, which is become *S. W.* his greateſt *ſcorn*. *Truly Mr. Doctor*, ſaith he, *it is a wonderful commendation to your Church, that ſhe is yet to be taught; pray when will ſhe be of age to leave going to School?*] In anſwer to this queſtion, I confeſs I am forced to *ſpeak like a Saint* (but that is not indeed like an *hypocrite*) in the words of S. *Paul, when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part ſhall be done away. For now we ſee through a glaſs darkly, but then face to face. Now I know in part, but then ſhall I know even as alſo I am known.* Since I firſt read thoſe words, I thought I had reaſon to expect nothing in this world above an *imperfect fallible* eſtate, which ſignifies not any ſceptical ἀκαταληψία, any doubt of the truth of any thing, which we believe our ſelves to be taught by the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, or an imperfectneſs, or darkneſs of any truth, which from him either by written or unwritten Tradition hath been ſurely and clearly conveighed to us, (We ſure believe all the *Articles* of the *Creed* as firmly as any *Romaniſt believes* them) but an imperfection in reſpect of the object or of the light; ſome things being believed by others, which we do not believe, becauſe we have yet no convincing motive to induce the belief of them; other things alſo, wherein though as far as appears to us, they are falſe, and not reaſonable to be believed by us, at leaſt by *divine faith*, as long as we have no *divine ground* of that *faith*, either from *Scripture* or *Tradition*; yet becauſe we believe our ſelves *fallible*, and that we may poſſibly come, even in this world, to ſee more than yet we ſee, therefore humility and docibleneſs, is in this reſpect, all that we pretend to, and truſt it will find a more favourable acceptation at his hands, to whom we deſire to approve our ſelves, than here with this diſputer it hath met with. 7.

But it is evident enough, that it is not our *humility* or *docible temper*, that hath ſeriouſly *diſobliged S. W.* If we will but give him leave to chuſe a miſtreſs for us, we ſhall then be allow'd to be as *humble* and *docible* as we pleaſe; For ſo it follows. *Is it docibleneſs or humility to forſake a miſtreſs which had all the qualities which could give her authority?*] To ſee, whither paſſion or intereſt will drive one! 'Twas even now a fault that we were not out of our *Prentice-like Tutorage*, that we did not *ſet up for our ſelves, to profeſs truth as a Church ſhould do*; and that *he thought*, the *Church ſhould have been the pillar and firm foundation of the truth*] and leſt we ſhould do ſo indeed, become his *Scholars*, and having *ruminated* upon this his firſt *lecture*, reply to him, that upon that very account our *Church* acknowledges no *miſtreſs* upon *earth*, no not the *Totius Orbis Domina*, the *Univerſal Miſtreſs*, the *Roman See*; being for all neceſſaries ſufficiently furniſhed 8.

by that *depositum* which the *Apostles* left with us, and for what remains dark and undiscovered to us, secure, that the knowledge or explicit belief will never be exacted of us; Upon this sudden apprehension, a pin is fallen out of the *Machine*, and the scene is perfectly changed, we must now be disciplin'd afresh, that we will *set up for our selves*, that we will *ever be of age*, that we have at length out-grown our Pupillage, that we are not so *docible*, or rather so *tame*, as to believe all that can be told us by one, whose *Proctor S. W.* assures us she is *infallible*, when in the very truth there is no one thing she doth, or can tell us, that we have less reason or authority to believe, than that the *Roman Church*, which is this *Mistress* all this while, is either *infallible*, or free from many gross errors, and have no greater prejudice against learning of her, than this, that she hath no other possible means to infer the belief of many of her doctrines, but this *fallacious circular* one, because she cannot *erre*.

9. What yet farther follows in reproach of this *magnanimous piece of our docible humility, that we hold Articles of faith upon that authority, which it is an article of our faith that it may deceive us,*] hath been answered many times over, *viz.* that we may reasonably believe without doubting, what yet is made known to us, by an authority, which we know to be *fallible*, having so little reason to distrust its testimony, though it be *fallible*, that I adventure my life confidently upon no securer terms. And indeed the *magnanimity* or *temerity* is not lessened but increased, by my taking up all my belief in gross from *S. W.* his *infallible guide*, for that she is truly so, as she pretends, I am far enough from being *infallibly* ascertain'd, so that the balance or competition hangs but thus, betwixt a *fallible authority*, believed or affirmed by it self to be *infallible* on the one side, and another, or the same *fallible authority believed* to be *fallible*, on the other side, and which of these two is really the safest guide, the one that leaves no place for *caution* to *S. W.* the other that leaves me as safe, but more *cautious* (for certainly if these *guides* are really such, as cannot mislead me, my believing of them, though I think them, as all *humane* things, *fallible*, will not render them *fallible*, if they are not, or me *deceivable* by them, who really cannot be *deceived*) I now leave *S. W.* in his *humble pusillanimous* fit of *believing* nothing but what is represented by an *infallible authority*, to consider, and 'tis possible it may go for reason, and not for folly or fancy, in his *severest retirements*.

10. What he means by asking, *why the Primitive times must needs just end then, when the Church began to flourish*] expounding that by [*the times when the Fathers began to write against our doctrines*] I cannot well *divine*, who think *Christianity* may flourish, when the *profession* of it is outwardly *persecuted*, ('tis not the *grandeur* of *professors*, but *purity* of *Religion*, which is the true *verdure* and *flourishing* of it) and who am assured, that in the time of the *four general Councils*, *Christianity* was in all respects as flourishing as ever: and that the coming in of *new doctrines* into the *Church*, which had not been taught by the *Apostles*, is the *decay* and *withering*, not the *advancing* or greater *flourishing* of it. I shall rather ask, why the *Church* must then attain to its *plenitude* of *authority* with *S. W.* when it begins as he saith, to *write against our doctrines*, when it is certain we embrace no *doctrines*, but what the *Church* delivers us from the *Apostles*, and are accused by the *Romanists*, not for *introducing more* doctrines, than they acknowledge us to have *received*, but only for questioning the truth of, and *tradition* for *some* which they have *introduced*, and for which they cannot pretend *Apostolical tradition*, unless they find them testified in those first ages which were next the *Apostles*, (and so are the only competent testifiers of what is *Apostolical*) which ages if they have testified the truth of all the *Romish doctrines*, and the *Romanists* take up their *doctrine*, upon their *testification*, then we cannot be blamed by a *Romanist*, who are by his very *objection* here acknowledged to *believe* all that they have testified. And this is all that is due to his second Section.

SECT. V.

Retaining Apostolical Government, one indication that we are no Schismaticks. Vindication of my method. The one sort of Schism with the Romanists. Altare contra Altare, *Schism: yet all Schism consists not in that. The Primate in each Church. The Kings Supremacy in Ecclesiastical causes, wherein it consists. Of Liturgies and Ceremonies, and Discipline. Of Sacriledge. Of the Mass. Of the Popes Monarchy, and Festivals.*

1. IN his third *Section* his first dish, or jest (for it is with the *Stationer* under one, with the *Author* under the other of these *notions*) is raised out of the *view* of my *method* again, which when all is done, is as *exact*, as he could have taught it to be; That *dividing* from our *Ecclesiastical Superiors* was fitly set for a *first kind of Schism*, that against *subordination*, and that *casting off all government* quite, was a *species* of another kind, by way at least of *reduction*, as the *institutions* of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, are reducible to the *faith* of *Christ*, hath been vindicated already; And all that is now behind to be justified in this place, is, that *external communion being one part of unity*, and the *offences* against that one part of *Schism*, our retaining and living regularly under that *form* of *Government*, under which the *Apostles* founded *Ecclesiastical Assemblies*, is one evidence of our not being guilty of *Schism* against *external Communion*. And to this purpose what proofs can be needful, when it is once considered, that *external Communion* is nothing else but συνευχεσθαι *joyning regularly* in the *Ecclesiastical Assemblies*, and that that is stiled being ἐντὸς θυσιαστηρίου *within the altar*, in *Ignatius*'s phrase,

in

in *communion external* with all those whom *God* hath set over us, and with all those that keep close to them, all others that live out of this, being, as *S. W.* told us even now, a multitude, but not a *Church*. And indeed when the *rulers* of the *Church* are the *Masters* and *Ministers* of the *Assemblies*, who have the *ordering* and *transacting* of all in them, what possibility is there of considering *external communion*, without an explicite consideration of this *head*, the form of *Government* appointed by *Christ*, and the *regular* living under it.

To this I shall only add, that if there had been any *infirmity* in my *method*, and if that were the very *default*, which he would have reprehended, the *reverting desultorily* to the matter of *Government*, *S. W.* would have been the *unfittest* person in the world to *complain* of it, or upon this one score of the *immethodicalness* of my process, to *feast* his neighbours as he doth with the news of my *preaching* in a *Wilderness*; For certainly none can be more *guilty* of it in the very kind, than he, for the denying the *Popes Supremacy* being his *schism* of *schisms*, as the denying his *Infallibility* is his *heresie* of *heresies*, 'tis consequent and certain, that whensoever he comes to distribute *schism* into its parts, *Denying* the *Popes Supremacy* must be the root and branch in every one of them. Thus very unsuitable it is to *S. W.* his condition, to *blame* other Mens *methods*, who if he were never so subtle an *artist* or *methodist*, could not *serve* his *rules* and his *hypothesis* at once, but must be fain to *divide* his *theme* (Schism) as the keen *stomack* did his short *Commons*, or the blunt *Friar* his Text, into *one* bit, or part. For that is the breviat of the *Romanists divinity*, that all that live in *obedience* to the *Bishop* of *Rome* are *Catholick*, and all that do not, *schismatical*. 2.

But he tells us next, that *Arians and other hereticks have after their breaking from the Church of God retain'd the authority of their own Bishops*] I answer, that when *heresie* and *schism* went together, and the *Bishops* themselves were not the *ring-leaders* of it (as among the *Arians* it was) there generally the *hereticks* renounced the authority of their own *Bishops*, and set up others against them, and so *erected altar against altar*, i. e. *Bishop* against *Bishop*, the ordinary stile of *schismaticks* in the *Fathers*, and notorious in the instance of the *Donatists*. But then 2. I grant that retaining the *authority* of their *Bishops*, is not, being taken *alone*, any certain argument, or evidence of not being *schismaticks*, and therefore I took it in *consort* with others, and made it but *one* of *six* indications, on our side, for our not being *guilty* of this one *branch* of *schism*, against *external Communion*; and that I hope was just as *S. W.* would have directed me. This being still one branch of *schism* in them that are guilty of it, though all *schism* do not consist in *this*. Which also may be useful advertisement to him, if he please, and mind him, that the *adhering* to the *authority* of the *Bishop* of *Rome* is no certain defensative against *schism*, and that there may be other *schismaticks* besides those, which are either by, or without their own *default* or *consent*, *divided* and *separated* from that *See*. 3.

What he here adds of my *not telling him of the main hinge of our Churches Government, which is of the King being its head and supreme in Ecclesiastical matters*] is a special device, For I ask, doth he believe the *King* to be in any Nation *head* of the *Church?* If he doth not, why am I to be *rebuked*, for not putting him into my *scheme*, and so for not *telling him of it?* I acknowledge indeed that I do not *tell him* of it, and that with very good *reason*, because in my poor opinion, the *King* makes no part in our *Hierarchy*, the *Primate* of each *Nation* is he, whom, according to the *Apostolick Canon*, and that of *Antioch*, we acknowledge. The *Apostolick Canon* is express. Τὺς ἐπισκόπυς ἑκάστ ἔθνες ἐιδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον, καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὡς κεφαλὴν, *the Bishops in every Nation ought to know the first* or *Primate among them, and to account him as their head*; and the *Canon of Antioch is as full*, τὺς κατ' ἑκάστην ἐπαρχίαν ἐπισκόπυς εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει προεστῶτα ἐπίσκοπον, *the Bishops in every Province must know the Bishop which presides in the Metropolis*, and do nothing of *common concernment* without him. As for the *King*, we know the *title* and *power* which by our *doctrine* belongs to him, *viz.* to be *Supreme* over *all persons in all causes whatsoever*. That he is *Supreme*, the *Scripture* tells us in many places, and particularly *S. Peter*; and how far this *Supremacy* extends in respect of *Persons*, the *Fathers* of the *Church* have made no scruple to *affirm*, without excepting of *any*; so Saint *Chrysostom* on *Rom.* 13. 1. Πᾶσι ταῦτα διατάττεται, καὶ ἱερεῦσι, καὶ μοναχοῖς, οὐχὶ τοῖς βιωτικοῖς μόνον, *The precept of subjection to Kings as Supreme, belongs to all, both to Priest and Monks, and not to seculars alone*, and, κἂν Ἀπόστολος ᾖ, κἂν εὐαγγελίστης, κἂν προφήτης, κἂν ὁτισοῦν, *though thou be an Apostle, an Evangelist, a Prophet, or whosoever, thou art under this precept of obedience to the higher powers*. And indeed the matter is clear, that if as *men* we are born *Subjects*, 'tis neither in the power of our *baptism*, which makes us of *men Christians*, nor of our *Ordination*, which makes us of *Christians Priests*, *Bishops*, *Metropolitans*, *Primates*, to rescind the *obligation*, and *oath*, under which we are born, to quit us in the least degree of our *allegiance* before *incumbent* on us. And as for *persons*, so for *causes* also, the *Supremacy* of the *King* is *universally* extended, the *Church* having its *foundation* in the *Kingdom*, and not the *Kingdom* in the *Church*, and *Christ* having interposed no *exemption* in this kind, save what the *law* of *God* and *nature* had always supposed, that we must *serve*, *obey*, and *fear God*, *more*, and *rather than men*, (*timendo Majestatem contemnere Majestatem*, i. e. *adhere* still to the *supreme*) when there is a *competition* and *unreconcileableness* betwixt their *commands*; But when there is none, then *subject* and *prostrate* all our *obedience* before him, who bears *God's image* and *superscription*, being indeed his *vicarius* or *proxy*, commissionated by him. From whence it is visible what causes they are, wherein the *Church* or *Ecclesiastical* persons depend not on the *Prince*, what powers they have, which flow not from him, *viz.* those to which their *calling* from *God*, or office to which he hath *commissionated* them, doth *oblige* them, and which they cannot omit without the same *woe*, under which *S. Paul* was obliged to *preach the Gospel*; Agreeably we know, these things the *Bishops* in this *Nation* have done in the *name of God*, and as *Ministers* of his, and *commissionated* by him, in their *own names*. The *Censures* of the *Church* were never slighted out, as the 4.

Can. 38.

Can. 8.

T. 3. p. 189. l. 17.

civil

civil acts of *judicature*, in the name of the *Prince*, but after the example of S. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 5. *In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, by the Bishop*, as his *Officer* and *Minister* and *Embassador*. In a word, the internal acts of the *Ecclesiastical Function* are those, wherein the *Primate* is under *Christ*, the chief in each *Christian* nation. But the external acts, or causes of the *Church* it self, such are all those, that in the *discourse* of *Schism* have been attributed to him, are as regularly subjected to the *Prince*, as the Βωτινὰ, whatsoever is most purely civil or secular.

5. When therefore he saith, we *substitute the King instead of the Ecclesiastical head we rejected*, i. e. *the Pope*, The meaning, if it have any truth, must evidently be this, The *Bishop of Rome* having assumed a *Primacy* in this *Kingdom*, and usurped a *transcendent uncanonical* power over our *Primate*, such as neither *Apostolick*, *Nicene*, *Ephesine*, *Antiochian*, nor any other ancient Canon afforded him, or gave him any ground to pretend to, contented not himself with this, but assumed as confidently the *Supream Regal* power, as far as to *Ecclesiastical causes* and *persons*, in external things, such as no way belong'd to a *Primate* by the same *ancient Canons*, but were reserved as the *Priviledges* of *Majesty*, to every *Christian Prince*. Consequently, at the return of each part of this usurped power to its due chanel again, that which really belong'd to the *Ecclesiastical Primate*, reverted to the *Archbishop* of *Canterbury*; and what as duly, and regularly belonged to the *Supream Monarch*, returned to its proper seat of *Majesty*.

6. And thus, I hope, I have, if not satisfied *S. W.* yet secured his *seducible* reader from being *imposed* on by him, in this his grand *particular*, which promised such *flowers* to his *Crown*, such advantages to adorn his triumphs over us.

7. His next fling is at my method again; but they that have eyes in their heads, cannot chuse but see, that they that acknowledge *Episcopal*, nay *Papal Government*, may yet not live regularly in obedience under it, and so, that as the want of that obedience is a several branch of *Schism*, so to secure our selves from being *Schismatical offenders* against external communion, the obedience to, as well as acknowledging of our *Lawful Superiors*, was to be mentioned in my defence.

8. In his answer to my third plea, as he calls it, many passages there are, before we find the least motion toward truth, or earnest, or arguing: For that 1. *all Schismaticks meet at such appointed places as* I spake of, *viz. Churches*; or 2. *observe such set times, fasting or festival*, the *fasts* and *holy days* of our *Calender*: thirdly, that *Copes* and *Surplices* are *Sacramental*: Fourthly, that we *preach such doctrine as our first fore-fathers* (i. e. the *Apostles*) *sent us not to preach*: Fifthly, that we *imbue tender minds with tainted doctrine*] are all equally *fictions*; and Sixthly, that our *prayer and praises is almost all out of their Mass and Breviary*, if, being taken out of the *ancient Liturgies* of the more *Universal Church*, it can yet be truly said to be taken from them, that have varied from the *ancient form*, yet sure it cannot be *argumentative* against us; for why must we that are blamed for receding from them, be blamed also for this act of not receding?

9. Seventhly, then, As for *ceremonies*, of which saith he, we *accepted from the Primitive Church only what we thought convenient, the same authority that recommended them, recommending more to us*] I answer, that 'tis sufficient that what we took from the *Roman Church*, was such as they had from the practice of the *Primitive Church*, no obligation lying on us from thence to adhere to that *Roman order* in all other *ceremonies*, which we find not to be *Primitive*, or to observe every other *rite*, which the *Primitives did*: For as to those which we do *retain*, what need we own any other authority for retaining them, than that of the *Primitive practice?* and then why should the same, *i. e.* the *Roman authority*, from which we had them immediately, oblige us to receive all other that the *Romanists* use, but the *Primitive Church* did not use? and for those which the *Primitive* used, and we retain not, why are we more guilty therein than the *Romanists* are, who certainly do the same thing, either in the same, or other instances, *retain* not all *ceremonies* which the *Primitive Church* observed, witness the *standing*, not *kneeling* in the *service* of *God* betwixt *Easter* and *Whitsuntide*, and on every *Sunday* in the year, which sure was of *ancient Primitive*, but is not of *Modern Roman*, any more than of *English* use, and so proclaims the liberty of the *Churches* in *retaining* or not *retaining*, *i. e.* of *chusing* and *culling* out some *ceremonies* that are most *salubrious*, without burthening the Church with the greater weight and number of all, that have at any time been used.

10. As for our *discipline*, which he saith *is too weak to hold us together in unity, profest fallibility being*, saith he, *too weak for that*] The answer is obvious, First, that pretension to infallibility is not discipline. Secondly, that the censures of the Church, which we are wont to understand by that phrase, are the same both with them and us, the weapons of our, as well as of their *spiritual warfare*, and the *Apostle* tells us, they are *mighty through God, for the bringing down of strong holds*, but with neither of us have that force, when sons of the *Church rebel* against, or cast off their *Parents*. And this is all that our experience tells us, that the censures have lost their force, since the Governours of the Church have been cast off, and I suppose the Church of *Rome* hath no fence against that; when any members of their Church renounce obedience to them, what force is there in respect of them, that do so, in all their *thunderbolts?*

11. In this place *p.* 257. after his answers to three particulars of the plea concerning our not being guilty of this *Schism* against *external Communion*, here is a very excellent prize played; My fourth particular concerned all that under any of those three former heads, the *Romanist requires us to add farther to that which we voluntarily receive*. And before he will proceed to that fourth, he must once *more look back and take a second survey of these three*, like him that after once *saying grace* could not fall to his meat, till he had exercised his *gifts* in praising God better. And what was the design of this? Why that in this review he might tell his Reader one great mystery, which yet he had once revealed to him before, that *D. H. who mentioned some things wherein he was no Schismatick, omitted others wherein he was*. But why did he not stay, till to the other three particulars these were added? The reason is evident; for then his exception, as far as there was any colour for it, had been prevented, the very next that follows, taking notice of the *Principal*, and of all that are *material* of those, which he saith are omitted.

And

And then what doth this special *enterprize* of his amount to? But this in effect, that D. *H.* having mentioned six things, he had yet gone through but *three* of them, which is most true, because *S. W.* at his *Welchmans bait*, would needs stand still in the *midst*, when the very next *step* or *line*, had else certainly given him a *view* of the rest of them. And was not this a fair reason why he should thus glean after *himself*, review and pick over his *clusters* again, and mind his Reader, beside those *answers* that were already given (and already proved to have no *force* in them) first that we had *cast out the Popes authority*, and secondly, had *been guilty of Sacriledge*, and again, *denied obedience to their Churches*, i. e. the *Popes authority*, and *ruin'd religious houses*, i. e. *committed sacriledge*? Where, as *sacriledge* is certainly (as hath been said long since) neither *schism* nor any *branch* or part of it (or if it were, the *Romanists* would find good store of *schismaticks* among their own subjects) and as this is not the *fault* but the *misery*, not the *guilt* but the *pest* of our *Church*, so the other is particularly named, and spoken to by me, in the fourth particular, and can no more be said to be *omitted* by me, than the former three which he hath surveyed, might be said to be *omitted*, before he entred on the *survey* of them. 12.

One thing indeed he mentions more, *that we left out all the most sacred parts of their service books, the Canon Missæ, and whatever concern'd the heaven-propitiating sacrifice, and highest and soul-elevating act of religion*; and again, that we *took out of their Masse book only the slighter things which were enough to serve us to cry Lord, Lord.*] From this I acknowledge to learn *two* things to be affirmed by *S. W.* first, that we which retain in our *services* the *prayers* to the *holy blessed and glorious Trinity*, but do not take in prayers to *Saints* and *Angels*, are by *S. W.* judged to retain only the *slighter things*. Secondly, that the *sacramental* partaking of the *real sacrifice* of *Christ's body and blood*, *commemorative* of that *sacrifice* once offered upon the *Cross*, and *applying* to us the *propitiation* of that, if it be not yet farther, the *same sacrifice* offered now by the *Priests*, which was once offered on the *Cross*, and that by means of his *stupendious transubstantiating* the *Elements* into that very *body* (one of which *S. Augustine* tells us is a *savage thing*; and *S. Chrysostome*, that what the *Priest* there doth, is rather ἀνάμνησις than θυσία, a *commemoration* of the *sacrifice of Christ*, *than the sacrifice it self*; and of the other, our *reason* assures us, that it implies many *contradictions*, and so *impossibilities* in it) is none of the *most sacred parts*, none of the *soul-elevating acts* of our *religion*. In all this I acknowledge we are not of *S. W.* his mind, nor have as yet discern'd in his *temper* any great *effects* of that *soul-elevating act of religion*, who yet I doubt not, hath been at *Mass* in his days; and if our not *opening* with him in these particulars (to which our not practising is but consequent) must be *schism* after all, and we irremediably cast out from the *Romanists* peace and mercy, there is no help for it, that I know of, but by appealing to a more *equal Judge*, than is our *profest enemy* in this matter. 13.

At length he is perswaded to proceed to the fourth *head*, which was the consideration of the *particulars*, which the *Romanist* requires us, but we deny to *receive*, *viz.* the *Popes Monarchick* power over us, and the *whole world*, and the use of more *ceremonies* and *festivals*, of both which I affirmed that they were without *precedent* of the *ancient Primitive Church*, usurpations or *impositions* of the *present Romanists*. To these he hath nothing to say, but that the *supremacy of the Pope was brought in* 900. *years ago*, (*and they that now live were not alive then*) *proving it only from our granting of it*, and that *ceremonies and festivals are indifferent things*, *which 'tis lawful for them to recommend to their Subjects*. 14.

To these I *answer*, First, that I said not of the *Popes supremacy*, that it was an *imposition* of the *present Romanists*, but that that, and the other things mentioned, were *usurpation* or *imposition* of the present *Romanist*; and if it were *usurpation* (though of some *former Popes* before this *last* age) this will suffice to verifie my speech, and 'twas truly all that I meant by it, and he may have heard of him, that had a *Legacy* given him either of the *black horse*, *or cow*, and suing the *Executor* first for *one*, then for the *other* of them, was twice *non-suted*, till he laid his plea exactly by the words of the will, either for *one or other*. The same is *S. W.* his portion at this time. Secondly, That we in no wise grant, that for 900. years the *Pope hath been possest of the universal supremacy*, nor indeed acknowledged to have it in this *Island* of ours, witness the treatise of *schism* C. 6. throughout. And therefore this must be better proved than by our *confession*, and so needs no *refutation* from me, but that of *denying* it. Thirdly, That if the *Popes power* over us, were *usurped* only, and so we none of his *Legal Subjects*, he may then *retain* and *exercise* his *power* of multiplying *ceremonies* and *holy-days* over his own *subjects*, without *our* being at all concern'd in the *obligation* to *observe* them. And so much for his *third Section*. 15.

SECT.

SECT. VI.

Unsincere professors admitted to Communion, and such as may turn Schismaticks. No paternal relation of Rome *to us. The foundation. Tradition. Denying* Romish *Infallibility the great Schism.*

1. HIS fourth Section sets out with a full cry, wilfully *misunderstanding* my words, concerning our *excluding* no *Christian from our Communion.* By *Christian* he will understand all *nominal Christians*, who though, *by all the World else call'd hereticks, and which though they deny all the points of Christ's doctrine, yet profeß Christs name.*]

2. But first, when I spake of *Christians*, it were hard that my words should indeed be understood of the quite contrary, of *hereticks*, and *assumers* of the *name*, without any of the *reality* of the *Christian faith*, that the word *Christian* must signifie, and be understood in the notion of *unchristian*, to enable *S. W.* to *dispute*, or *confute* me.

3. Secondly, when I expounded *Christian*, by *such as hold the foundation*, &c. must it still be suggested, that *all the no-Christians* are such, that *Simon Magus* himself (whom he here names in rank with my *Christians*) do indeed *acknowledge the foundation laid by Christ and his Apostles?* I wish it were now considered, who is the *hospitable* friendly person, the most *charitable* to hereticks. 'Tis true indeed our Communion is such, that *hypocrites* who are not *uprightly* what they *profeß* to be, may find reception among us, (but 'tis as true that *hereticks* continuing such, are *cast* out by us) Our *judgment* truly is not so *inerrable*, that we can *search mens hearts*, or look into those *closets* by any other *perspective*, than that which their *actions* and *professions* allow us. And I have not yet been assured that *S. W.* his *infallible Church* hath assumed to be *scrutatrix cordium* to have any sure test, to descry and *purge* out of its *bowels* all *unsincere* professors, that are not *really* what they pretend to be. I am sure *S. Peter* himself, to whom they pretend to owe their *infallible chair*, did *baptize Simon Magus*, when he had not γνησίαν πρόθεσιν the genuine purpose, as *S. Cyril* saith of him, and so ἐβαπτίσθη ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἐφωτίσθη, *had his body baptized, but not his mind illuminated*, which he did not long *dissemble*, but demonstrated it to all by very early actions, *Act.* 8. 23. and after proved the πρωτότοκον τῦ Σατανᾶ *the first-born of Satan*, and beyond all the world beside, set himself against *S. Peter*, who had thus *baptized*, i. e. admitted him into his *Church*. And unless the *modern glasses* have helpt the *Church* of *Rome* to means of *profounder* inspection than *S. Peter* had then met with, I doubt not but they will upon consideration acknowledge, that *hypocrites* may impose on them, as well as us, and that those who are *baptized* into a *Church*, may *heretically* and *schismatically* oppose it, and that this is but *common to men*, and cannot hope to be *remedied*, until *Rome Christian*, as well as *Rome heathen* assume to be *deified*, and to *communicate* the same *divine nature* to their *frailer brethren.* And now let *S. W.* say, if this be not the full *importance* of his *first answer.*

Cyr. Hieros. Catech. p. 2.

4. Next he is to please himself with my phrase of *excluding none from Communion, that will either filially or fraternally embrace it with us*, i. e. in plain terms, that the *Governors of our Church* do not *causlesly excommunicate* the *sons* of this *Church*, nor any *true* son of any other *true Church*, for all such they look on as *brethren.* And here he hath great *Ovations*, that we *can admit none that will paternally communicate with us, that we have as much courtesie as may be, but not a dram of humility nor subjection to superiors.*] But the matter is clear, we do not acknowledge the *Bishop* of *Rome* our *superior.* All that are so, we *obediently* live under, as many of us as are *under authority*, but do not exact from our *English Primate* that he should acknowledge another *foreign supreme* over him and us. And that is all the news *S. W.* hath told us in that Paragraph.

5. Next when I say we acknowledge the *foundation* laid by *Christ and his Apostles*, he must first *perswade* his Reader, that I call him *fool*, and then *ask Mr.* D. *what he means by acknowledging the foundation laid by Christ and his Apostles?* And who knows but I may again be accused of *calling* my *Catechist fool*, if I answer this *question*? But I shall do it in as *secure* a stile as I can, and assure him I mean, what I have written an intire treatise on, the *Depositum* both in the *scriptures* and by *Oral tradition* of the *Apostles* committed to the *Churches* which they planted, of which the *Church* of *Rome* was one, and but one. And this supersedes all the force of this *Paragraph.* For certainly more than this *S. W.* will not pretend himself to mean by the *foundation* (as p. 266. he confesses) only he hath a *reserve*, I know, that his *Church* must have the *incloßure* of the *priviledge* to expound to us *infallibly*, and tell us what this is, first to *interpret Scripture*, and then to *testifie* of *tradition.* And herein I do not oblige my self to *comply* with him, as upon many other reasons, so upon this, because I have no *infallible* proof offered, nor any other indeed, besides their own *affirming* it, that they are *infallible* in either of these.

6. When the remainder of his *displeasure* falls on me for *talking of fundamentals, and not naming what they are*, I again answer, that I wrote a *treatise* of that subject, which was too big to come in by way of *parentheßis* in that place, and therefore stay'd for the *Preß*, till that of *schism* was printed off. But saith he, *if we thus interpret the foundation, we must admit only Catholicks, since only they* (i. e. in his stile, only the *Romanists*) *hold this foundation.*] For this I must not demand any *proof* or *reason*, but am to look on it, as one of *S. W.* his *indemonstrable principles*, which are to be confirm'd only *à posteriori*, by his saying it, or by some such like *irrefutable Topick*,

and

and howsoever severe an exacter he is of *probations* from others, I shall not so much as expect from him, that he shall afford that any *probation*.

But it seems his heart misgave him, after the delivery of those words, for fear we should grant 7.
him his *position*, and according to his *argument* oblige our selves to *admit* the *Romanists* to our *Communion* (which yet he knows we never refused them, if they would *sincerely* come to it) and therefore he presently *retracts* again, *we must not*, saith he, *admit them neither*, being it seems resolved, that the *ball* of *contention* shall be held up for ever; otherwise I assure him we should not yet break with him upon those terms, which alone here he mentions. *Since*, saith he, *you deny this way of bringing down faith to be sufficient, it follows that you must not admit Catholicks neither*] But what is this *way*, which he saith we *acknowledge not to be sufficient?* why he had before set down that, the *solid sense of Christs law written and planted in the tables of mens hearts by the Apostles, and thence by a well linkt chain of universal tradition derived to our times*] This being all, and *tradition*, or *planting in mens hearts*, no way excluding *written traditions*, which we ordinarily call *Scripture* (for 'twere hard that a thing should be the *less delivered* by the *Apostles*, because it was *written* by them) I shall yet continue my *hospitable* humor, and resolving this *solid sense of Christs law derived from the Apostles to our times by universal tradition to be perfectly sufficient.* (say *S. W.* what he please) to all that thus receive it, and live by it, I shall admit *S. W.* upon this *profession* to our *Communion*, and then I hope, if he be not one of those *nominal Christians*, which even now he talkt of, there might be an end of this *controversie*.

But the fit of railing seiseth him again in the next *paragraph*, and the mention of our *earnest de-* 8.
sire to have the *freedom* of *external Communion* with others, and the *addition* of a very few words of *Scripture*, the *one heart and one lip*, hath under the notion of *preaching*, so put him out of all patience, that his *Pen* never dropt *ranker gall* since the beginning of his work; and truly we that are wont not to *invite*, but to *dehort railers* from our *Communion*, are not, whilst he is in this mood, very fond of being *admitted* into his *company*. Only by the way we shall learn from him (because fits of rage bring forth Mens own thoughts *undisguisedly*, and so deliver some *truth*) what is the only *impediment* of our *readmission* to his *favour* and *Communion*. First, if *we will but reacknowledge a certainty*, and secondly, *the never erring rule of Faith*, and thirdly, the *voice of the Church*, i. e. *three* sounds to the same sense, then *we shall be received with open arms*, &c. From whence I conclude, that all our *schism* consists in not *acknowledging the Roman infallibility*, and so that we *dispute* in vain all this while, whilst we speak on any other *theme* but that.

And truly I that have written a *full tract* on that, long before, in *defence* of the *Lord* of *Falkland* 9.
against the *answer* and *reply* of the *Romanist*, did not think I was again bound to *reprint* that, and croud it into this *period*.

SECT. VII.

The Romanists excommunicate. The Liturgie their only grievance. Reformation no Schism. Our excommunicating the Romanists, how grounded.

NOW follows his attempt of *answers* to my sixth *particular*, which said that the *impediments* 1.
which obstruct external communion are only imputable to them. First, because the *Pope excommunicated all Catholicks that came to our Assemblies.*] And his *answer* is, *was it not well done, think you?*] And that is but the *acknowledging* all I there affirmed: For if they *cast us out* from all *external fraternal Communion*, and *justifie* their having done it, then 'tis not *imputable* to us, that we *separated* from them. What *motives* they had to do this, belongs only to that *other* dispute, whether or no we were *justly excommunicated* by them, and that cannot be debated here, without resuming the consideration of the several *Acts* of our *Reformation*, which is again to recite the greatest part of this *Book*; For sure it must not for ever be *supposed* without *proof*, as here he doth, that we *maintain heretical doctrines*; Or if it must, yet secondly, unless some of our *heresies* be inserted in our *Liturgie* (which now when he had most *provocation* to assume, he hath not pretended) 'tis still that *Papal Bull* that hindred their *joyning* with us in our *Liturgie*, and nothing in our *Liturgie* it self; Thirdly, all that here he pretends for the *justice* of that *Bull*, is, that *holding us hereticks they could not reasonably let the People go to be taught false doctrine, to hear the Popes supremacy rail'd at as Antichristian, &c.*] And that is in effect to *excommunicate* nothing but our *Sermons*, for those only have at any time been guilty of what is here *objected*; and then also I may demand, why the same *Bull* did not *excommunicate Pope Gregories Epistles* (or him for his *Epistles*, as *Honorius* was after his *death* condemned for an *heretick*) which makes it a *character* of *Antichrist* for any one to assume to be *Universal Bishop?* However by this arguing it is supposed, that they might have been permitted to come to our *Liturgie* when there was no *Sermon:* And yet we know their *practice* (and that is our best *witness* of their *opinion* of the *obligation*) is quite *contrary*. They can read our *Books*, where all that our *Sermons* can say, may be said, as largely, and as *bitterly*, and they can for *curiosity* be present at our *Sermons* too; And in brief, 'tis only our *Liturgie*, with which they cannot have any peace, and yet certainly this hath none of the *pretended heresie* in it.

2. Next he hath no *patience* that we should *affirm* that the *Bull in the tenth of* Q. Elizabeth *was the cause of the separation, when first*, saith he, *I have laid out knot by knot how the unity of the Church was unloosed in the time of* Henry *the Eighth, &c. in casting out the Papal authority out of this Island*] And therefore he will press this *over again*, and when he hath done so with all his *Rhetorick*, I may yet satisfie my self with what hath been already answered, that the *Pope* had never duly any *supreme power* over this, nor *universal* over all *Nations*, and that renouncing an *Usurper*, casting off a barely *pretended power*, is no rejection of an *authority*, for by that I must suppose a *real*, and not an *assumed* power to be signified.

3. The same *answer* is sufficient to the other part of his charge, concerning our *forsaking their doctrines* and *practices*; I doubt not but we *receded*, and that voluntarily from those, which we with the *Romanists* had *formerly been used to*; but *reforming* an error, will never be a *schism*, though *S. W.* be in never so ill *humor* about it; we may depart from our own ill *habits*, and yet not depart from *our selves*, forsake the *riots*, wherein we had gone on with our *intemperate* brethren, and still keep *external Communion* with them, and never need the recalling of our *youthful* sins to make our *company* the better. So that still it remains, that if *external Communion* with any other *fellow Christian* may be preserved without acknowledging the *Popes Supremacy* (and to suppose it may not, is to *beg* the *question* of the whole *Book*) and without continuing of *erroneous doctrines* and *practices* (and such we are ready to prove those to be which we have left) we never *schismatically* departed from their *external Communion*, until we were *cast out*, nor would ever *voluntarily* have gone from any thing that was *Christian in them* (such, I presume, is *external Communion* of *Christians*) if we had not been violently removed from it.

4. As for our *rejecting Roman Catholicks from our Assemblies, upon their avowed contumacy against the orders of our Church*, which he next *presseth*, that sure is no more, than every *National Church* is accustomed to do, as long as such *discipline* is like to prove to *edification*, else the *Censures* were useless in the *Church*. And when he desires to know, why the *Church of Rome might not do the like, or why she had not as great authority over those who were once hers, as our Church over those who were never ours?*] The *answer* is *obvious*, because this Nation of ours neither is, nor ever duly was part of the *Bishop of Rome's Territory*, nor can be pretended to be so, without manifest *violation* of the *Canons* of those *Councils* which the *Pope* himself hath sworn to *preserve*; whereas every native by *baptism* entred into the *Church* of *England*, is duly and by force of all *ancient Canons* a *member* of the *Church of England*, under this or that *Bishop* or *Metropolitan*, and so it is not the same *punishable* crime, to have *cast out* an undue *usurped foreign* power, as to persist in *contumacy and separation from an undoubted unquestionable just power* of our immediate *superiors*. And so still this shews on which side the *schism* truly lies *chargeable*.

SECT. VIII.

The charge of Pride averted. Confession of fallibility. Questioning the Romish infallibility, our Pride. Disbeliefs caused by pretended pride, make not all Communion unlawful, much less excusable error without Pride.

1. TO my second reason, by which I proved the *breach* to lie *on their side*, their *imposing such conditions on our Communion, that we cannot subscribe without sin against conscience*, His *answer* is, that this is a *sinful pride of our understanding, to disbelieve all our Teachers, and yet to acknowledge our selves but fallible in our contrary belief.*] By the *frame* of this *objection* compared with the *Romanists* great *principle* of *infallibility*, one would think, that if not the *main*, yet some part of this our sinful pride charged on us, consisted in *thinking our selves fallible*, or in *pretending conscience* for the *believing of any thing*, whilst we acknowledge our selves *fallible*; If this were it, then the only way to *amend* this *fault* or *error*, were to assume *infallibility*, for then 'tis certain, that this could be no *ingredient* in our *charge*, either for the *constituting*, or *aggravating* our *crime*, that we acknowledge our selves *fallible*. But what crime soever this will be deemed in us, 'twill not be *pride* certainly, and it must, if it be any thing, be our *sinful humility*. But if this be not it (as I cannot indeed suppose, that he that counts *infallibility* the *prerogative*, and peculiarity of his *own Church*, should really think it our fault that we *confess our selves fallible*) what then is it wherein our *sinful pride* consists? It must be sure set down in these words, that we *disbelieve all our Teachers, and think our selves to understand more of Gods mind than all the world before us.*] But then this *affirmation* wanted some proof, for sure we do not *disbelieve all our Teachers. The word of God written and unwritten* (such as appears to be so) and deposited by the *Apostles* in the *Church*, is certainly our lesson or διδαχὴ, and our *teachers*, διδάσκαλοι, are *living* guides, our *Bishops*, using the *assistance* of the *Priests*; and if the later *corrupted Church* of *Rome* were our *Teacher* also (as indeed it assumed that *office*) before the *Reformation*, yet sure it was not *all our Teachers*, or *all the world* before us; The *Primitive purest* times, from whence we had *confessly* our *Creeds*, and all our *necessary doctrine*, must not (to gratifie *S. W.*) be quite turned out of the *world*. So that again our *enormous pride* is crumbled away into this one *atome* of *questioning* the *Romish pretensions* of *infallibility*, of comparing and preferring the *ancient humble* before the *modern assuming Church* of *Rome*, which as *S. W.* calls *pride*, so others that are as *disinterested*

as

as he, call *necessary caution* and *prudence*, and making use of the best means that *God* hath afforded us, of *judging truth* by, and a necessary *care* neither to *violence* our *faculties*, by *forcing* them to see, what with the utmost of our *intention* we cannot *discern*, nor to *charm* our consciences, by dissembling and professing the *contrary* to our *present conviction*. As for the *Church* of *Rome* being our *Master* and *Father* and *Mother* (which is again the *postulatum*, without which his *argument* is not able to *proceed* one *step*) he knows what is the name of that *Elench*, it having, next *contumely* (to which all other must be content to yield the *deference*) deserved more of him for the filling up his *pages*, than all his other *materials* together.

2. If it were certainly *pride*, that produced all our *disbeliefs*, which brought us under the *Roman Censures*, I should not doubt to yield to him, that we are to *blame our selves*, so far as to the *occasion* of our *disunion*. But when the matter in hand is but their *surmise* of our *pride*, and when the *question* is of the *lawfulness* of their *retaining* with us *external Communion fraternal* (for that is the only thing that in this latter part of the Treatise I undertook to consider) I see no convincing reason why a *Romanist*, which may possibly be as *proud* as I, or however, not free from all other *filthiness* of the *flesh* or *spirit*, and knows more of it by *himself* than by me, may not lawfully hold *external Communion* with me, and those others, who may *possibly* be (though without *revelation* he cannot be sure they are) *guilty of pride?* Suppose a *Romanist* should be *drunk*, yea and vent some *heretical pravity* in this *distemper*, were it *unlawful* for another *Romanist* of the same particular *Dioceß* with him, before, or without his *immediate Superiors Excommunicating* him, to preserve *Christian* society, or were it necessary to *renounce* all *external Communion* with him? If it shall be said, it were, instead of exacting the *reason* of the *affirmation*, I shall again ask, but what if he only *surmised* the other to be *drunk*, and the *doctrine* he vented to be *heretical*, and this upon no other proof of the truth of his *surmise*, but only because he expresst himself to think somewhat, which was contrary to the *Romanists* sense in *religion*, which of what moment soever it were, it were yet confest, that if he did believe it without any fault of his own (if it were not caused in him by *drink* or such other *distemper*) 'twere but a *blameless*, at least *excusable mistake* in him; would that *Romanist* think himself in *conscience* obliged to *break Communion* with such a man, only by force of the *Popes Bull* for *excommunicating* of *hereticks?* If he would not, I should be glad to be shew'd the *disparity* betwixt that last case, and the case set down here by *S. W.* in these words [*If it were pride* (that [*if*] not signifying possibly any more, than that he *thinks* it was *pride* in us) *which made you think otherwise, then it is not innocency in you, or sufficient excuse for your Non-Communion*] In the mean, I suppose it is clear from his very *affirmation*, that 'tis our *antecedent pride* that makes us *schismaticks*, and neither our *subsequent doctrine* nor *practice*; for *schism* being the great *unexcusable* sin now objected against us, that which makes us *unexcusable*, must be it that makes us *schismaticks*. And then I am sure that being a *vice* of the *mind*, lies open only to *Gods*, cannot come under *S. W.* his *cognizance*, and that is all that I need reply to that *answer*.

3. On occasion of my offering to *contest our Negatives by grounds that all good Christians ought to be concluded by*, he first asks *what these grounds are?* Whether any *infallible authority?* But to that we have oft spoken already. Secondly, whether *I think our Saviours command to hear the Church, be such a ground?* And that *question* being propounded by the *Cath. Gent.* is also answered already, *Repl.* Ch. 9. Sect. 1. and what he hath added to it by way of *amplification*, hath both in that, and the *Reply* been distinctly prevented, and so there remains no more of his fourth *Sect.*

SECT. IX.

Of judging. S. W. *his pretended moderation. Our not hearing any other Church. His impossible affirmations of their infallibility. One faith.* S. Cyprians *temper.* Pope Stephanus's *temper.* Cyprians *words to* Cornelius. *The priviledge of the Roman See in* Cyprians *time.* Cyprians *behaviour to it.* Firmilian *of* S. Stephanus. S. W. *his sence of Faith without knowledge. Difference betwixt fundamentals and superstructures.*

1. HIS fifth *Sect.* is designed for *justification* of the *Romanists charity* in *judging* and *despising* us, and first for *judging*: And he presumes he hath given us *testimonies* of their great *moderation*, as well as no *uncharitableness*, that when we acknowledge no *Church* to be *heard*, he makes us only *Schismaticks* and *hereticks*, and doth not advance to those *harsh terms* which our *Saviour himself hath laid down, of accounting us Heathens and Publicans*] But first I may have leave to demand, how he which thinks those words of *Christ* to belong to us, as we stand (*truly*) chargeable *of not hearing the Church of Rome*, can avoid proceeding to that *higher* pitch, or *harsher terms*, of accounting us very *heathens and Publicans?* Or if those words do not at all belong to us, how then from them he can justifie his *milder Censures* of *judging* us *schismaticks* and *hereticks?* The *Dilemma* is obvious, either that Text of *Mat.* 18. 17. is his direction for his *judging* of us, or it is not; If it be, how can he escape accounting us *Heathens and Publicans?* If it be not, how can it justifie his *calling us hereticks?* or indeed to what purpose was it at all produced in *this* matter? Secondly, is it indeed *true*, and doth not *S. W. prevaricate* when he pre-

tends to thus much *moderation*, as to bestow on us those *milder*, and not proceed to the other *harsher* terms against us? He hath by and by these words. *How can we then, seeing evidently they heard not any Church judge otherwise, than that our Saviours words are true*, i. e. *that they are in a sad condition*] and then what that *sad condition* must signifie, 'tis easie to resolve, from the presumed truth of those words of *Christ*, thus applied to us. And I am sure we have these words in their *Canon Law*, *Peccatum paganitatis incurrit, quisquis dum Christianum se asserit, Sedi Apostolicæ obedire contemnit; He incurs the crime of heathenism, whosoever affirming himself a Christian, contemns the Apostolick See*, citing the words of *Samuel*, and the application of *Pope Gregory* the Seventh, that *disobedience* is the *sin of witchcraft*, and *non-acquiescing as the sin of Idolatry*. And it being certain on one side, that we do *profess our selves Christians*, and yet think not our selves obliged to obey the *See* of *Rome*, nor consequently have paid that *obedience* thereunto, I see not how those *principles*, which have carried *S. W.* so far as he professes, should set him down, before they had brought him home to that highest and most immoderate pitch.

2. But then thirdly, whatsoever our *lot* be, we must still insist, that the *Roman Church* hath no due claim to our *obedience* by any right devolved to them from *Christ* or his *Apostles*, or the *ancient Canons*, and so still we are really safe from the *penalty* of [*si Ecclesiam non audiverit*] though we have not paid the desired *obedience* to that *See*; And till *S. W.* hath proved the *justice* of their *claim*, and of that consequence, that he that hears not their *Church*, and yet hears his own, doth yet acknowledge no *Church* to be *heard*, he will never be able to justifie the *charity* of their *judging* us, upon force of that *text*.

3. And when he farther *extends* his words, that at our *Reformation we joyn'd not our selves with any other Church whom we might be said to hear*] the answer is obvious that a *national Church*, αυτοκέφαλος, *independent* from any other foreign *jurisdiction*, needed not to joyn with any other *Church*, as to *hear*, *i. e.* in *Christs* sence, to *obey* that; The *fraternal Communion* is all that is our duty in respect of others, the *filial*, or that of *subordination* or *subjection* was not *incumbent* on us; And sure *S. W.* that doth not pretend that the *Greek* or any other *Church*, save only the *See of Rome* hath *authority* over us, had much forgot himself, when he made this any part of our *charge*, that we joyn'd not with, so as to *hear any other Church*.

4. His second ground, on which he *justifies* their *judging* to be no *uncharitableness*, is the infallibility of their *Church*, which, saith he, *their ancestors have believed ever since Christs doctrine dawned to the dark world*] which is in effect, that the *Church* of *Rome* was *infallible* before it was, had its *inerrability* before its *being* (for without doubt *Christs doctrine* did thus first *dawn to the dark*, i. e. the *Gentile world*, before it *illuminated* the *Roman Climate*, many other *Churches* of the *Gentiles* having received the *faith* more *early* than that of *Rome*) but also that its *infallibility* was thus anciently believed; By whom, he tells us not; but hath set it in such *large* pompous terms, that it is not only not *true*, but not *possible*, by any other means, save that of *divination*; And of this we have not heard that any ancient *Augur* hath predicted, and now I suppose 'tis too *late*, so many *hundred* years after, for *S. W.* to take that office upon him. In a word, to *judge* us *hereticks*, and defend the *charity* of it, because their *Church* is *infallible*; to prove that *infallible*, because they have *believed* it so; and for the confirming of that, to vouch no one *testimony*, and yet to resolve, that so 'twas *believed* before it was *possible* either to be, or to be *believed*; is the *pregnant* and *solid* way of *probation*, by which his *charity* is *defended beyond all possible confute* in the *second* place.

5. His third way of propugning it, is that *Text of Scripture*, *One faith, one hope, one baptism*, from whence he resolves that *either they or we must erre against faith, under penalty of maintaining a contradiction*; and then by *Christs words*, *he that believes not, is condemned already*; *he that is certain he believes, and hath that one faith, cannot make conscience of judging the other, since the other is condemned already*; *Nay*, saith he, *if he judge him not to be judged already, he must judge himself to be a self-judg'd unbeliever*] And then, beyond all expectation, here is suddenly a cry raised, of the *Doctors blundring*, and *destroying all reason*, and that serves for a new *made-dish* in the *bill of fare*, to fill up the one and thirtieth *room* at his *table*: To this plea of his the *answer* were already given, if we had but as little *charity*, or so much *ill language* as he, to call him *heretick*, or any other such *ill* name, which he can *frankly* bestow on us, for then the *one faith* being as strongly, *i. e.* by our *own* words, confirm'd to be on *our* side, as it is now concluded to be on *his*, by his *own presumption*; there were no *syllable* behind to be farther answered. But without making use of such an *auxiliary*, which I so much *dislike* in him, I answer secondly,

6. That each of us may very possibly have imbraced that *one faith*, which the *Apostle* speaks of, nay 'tis most evident *each* hath; For what was that *one faith*, but those *articles* of *belief*, which were then *deposited* in all *Churches*, and into which all *Christians* were *baptized* in that *one baptism*? And 'tis certain, both they, and we have uniformly *received* that in the *Apostolick Creed*, as that from the *traditions*, which in every *Church* were to be met with, was explained by the *Nicene Fathers*, and established by that, and the following *Oecumenical Councils* to be the *one faith of all Christians*.

7. Our agreement therefore in all these *heads* of *faith*, is no doubt sufficient to give us title joyntly to that one *Faith*; and for other differences which are reconcileable with the believing of these, be they *true* or *false*, they are certainly no part of this *faith*. If they shall appear to be *true*, they are like *Gold* built on the *foundation*, and so, *superstructure*, not *foundation*; if they be *false* (as we must believe your *additions* to be, and we that have no *additions* at all, cannot be *accused* by you for what we have *not*) they are then the *combustible matter*, the *hay* and *stubble*, which will take *fire*, as soon as ever that *trial* comes. Herein therefore evidently lies the *difference* betwixt you and us. We conceive you guilty of many *foul errors*, but yet do not *pronounce* you *unbelievers*, because the *one faith* deposited in the *Church*, is received, and not *rejected* by you; but you that have no cause to *pretend*, that we have *superstructed* any such *positive errors*, and

yet

yet as little doubt, but we have received the *one faith*, as that signifies the *Apostles depositum*, or the *Nicene Fathers* explication of it, from the *tradition* of the *Church*, do yet *accuse*, and *condemn* us as unbelievers, because we receive not all other doctrines, that your *Church* (contrary to the express command of the *Ephesine Fathers*) hath thought fit to *impose* on us. And our telling you this, brings upon us a worse *censure* yet, the charge of *destroying our reason*, as well as our *faith*; He that will say what we now say, must it seems, be sent a *grasing* with *Nebuchadnezzar*, we were *Infidels* before, but now we are become *irrational*; Ere we accused you of *uncharitableness*, we were but *Heathens*, but since, we are *metamorphosed* into *brutes*. And this is the sum of *S. W.* his third *defence* or *Apologie* for his *judging us*. I see 'tis our wisest way not to complain, lest some *ruder* fate still remain for us, as the proof that he is not *uncharitable*.

His fourth *defence* is, that *their judging may indeed be error, but malice or uncharitableness it cannot*] But this having been the *Cath. Gent.* his *allegation*, hath received its *answer* in the *Reply*, *ch.* 10. 8.

What he *answers* to the words of *S. Cyprian*, *neminem damnantes, neminem à communione nostrâ arcentes*, *that he speaks of his own temper towards the rest of God's Church* (and that *about a private opinion only*) *but neither he, nor any other Father admitted to their communion, those who had been condemned by all the Churches in communion with the See of Rome*] comes now next to be considered, and to it I shall *answer* these few things. First, that my words having on purpose designed to shew the likeness of our, and the unlikeness of the *Romanists temper*, to that of *Cyprian*, and consequently, the danger of *schism* to them from judging of us, if this be granted, as necessarily it must, that this was *Cyprians temper*, and that this ought to be other mens *temper* also on the like occasions, this is all that I need ask in this matter. For that this rule should be no farther applicable than to the matter of the present *difference* betwixt *S. Cyprian* and others, concerning the *baptism* of *hereticks*, or that it is not equally (by *parity of reason*) to be extended to all other *differences* which touch not the *foundation*, there is no other *reason* here tendred, but that this of *rebaptization* was not, but these other matters of *difference* between the *Romanists* and us, are defined by the *Church*: To this then I *answer*, first, that the contrary to *S. Cyprians* opinion was at that time defined by the then *Bishop* of *Rome*, and earnestly maintained by him, and some others with him, as shall by and by appear. Secondly, that betwixt the *Romanist* and us, the *question* being principally this, whether the *Roman Church* have done well to enter so many new *articles* into their *belief*, and to exact the *profession* of them from all that are admitted to their *Communion*, quite contrary to the express *interdict* of the *Ephesine Canon* so often mentioned, and withall the matter of those *articles* being so far from *infallible* or *certain* truth, that we doubt not to evidence of some of them, that they imply a *contradiction*, and so an *impossibility* to be true, and the ground on which all are founded at once, the *Roman infallibility*, being it self far from being induced by any *infallible medium*; These things I say, being considered, I desire that *Cyprians* temper, may be compared with the *temper* of those that thus defined these *articles de fide*; and in what degree soever it shall appear, that the making those *definitions de fide*, and condemning and excluding all that cannot *uprightly* and *cordially* imbrace them, hath been *contrary* to *S. Cyprians* temper and rule for the preserving the *unity* of the *Church*, so far those decrees may be *rescinded*, and *cassate*; or if not, still I suppose it clear, that this is quite contrary to *S. Cyprians* rule, and that all the *judging* and *excommunicating* of others, that is consequent to this, is as the *principle* it self, to which it is consequent, i. e. *destructive* to the *peace* of the *Church*, and that is *schismatical*. Thus I am sure * *Firmilianus*, and the *Eastern Bishops* with him, pronounce of *Stephanus Bishop of Rome*, *lites & dissentiones*, &c. *What contentions and divisions have you caused* (saith he) *through the Churches of the whole World? What a great sin have you heaped on your self, whilst you have cut off your self from so many flocks or Churches, for you have cut off your self. Do not deceive your self, for sure he is truly a schismatick, who hath made himself an Apostate from the Communion of Eccleiastick union, for whilst you think you may excommunicate all from you, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti, you have excommunicated your self alone from all others.* And so on, much more to the same purpose. 9.

* *Inter Cypr. Epist.* 75. *Pam. Ed. p.* 117.

Thirdly, Because it is here by *S. W.* suggested, that as *Cyprian knew very well what belonged to Church-order and discipline, so neither he nor any other Father admitted to Communion those who had been condemned by the Roman See, and the Churches in Communion with that*] I desire it may be remembred, first, what difference there was betwixt the *condition* of the *Roman See* in *Cyprians*, and in these days; no one of those *doctrines* were then *defined*, which now are by them *defined*, and imposed on all *communicants*; no *infallibility* of that *Church* assumed or pretended, no *monarchick* authority over all other *Churches* and *Bishops*, as appears most evidently by those very words of *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 55. to *Cornelius*, which *Baronius* and *Bellarmine* make such use of to the contrary, when on occasion of *Cornelius*'s receiving some to his *Communion*, which *Cyprian* had censured, * he tells him that this is the great cause of *Schisms* and *Heresies* in the *Church*, *quod sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus Sacerdos & ad tempus judex vice Christi cogitatur, that the Bishop is not obey'd, that he which is alone the Bishop and judge in Christ's stead, is not considered as such*, i. e. that when *Cyprian*, and such as he, had excommunicated offenders, the *Bishop of Rome* received them to his *Communion*, as the * rest of the *Epistle* makes it evident; His words also of *Pope Stephen* in the beginning of *Ep.* 74. *ad Pompeium*, abundantly evidence the same, being written with that *sharpness*, that was 10.

* *Pamel. Ed. p.* 68.

* *Pax vera falsæ pacis mendacio tollitur, salutaris sinus matris noverca intercedente præcluditur*, &c. p. 69. *Honor ergo datur Deo, cum sublatâ pœnitentiâ nec ullâ exomologesi factâ, despectis Episcopis atque calcatis------ communicatio non communicantibus offeratur? Ibid. Cum statutum sit omnibus nobis------ ut uniuscujusque causa illic audiatur ubi est crimen admissum, & singulis pastoribus portio gregis sit ascripta, quam regat unusquisque & gubernet, rationem sui actus domino redditurus, oporet utique eos quibus præsumus non circumcursare, nec Episcoporum concordiam cohærentem sua subdolâ & fallaci temeritate collidere------ Ib. p.* 70. *Nec utilis aut consultus est pastor, qui ita morbidas oves gregi admiscet------ Ib. Nulla cum talibus commercia copulentur------ simus ab eis tam separati quam sunt illi de ecclesia profugi---* p. 71.

not agreeable from an *inferior* to his *superior pastor*. All that then belong'd to the *See* of *Rome* * *Cent. 2. Ep. Pelag. l. 1.* *S. Augustine* sets down, by * *preeminence in celsiori fastigio specula pastoralis, in the higher roof of the Pastoral watch-tower*, which he there makes reconcileable with the *communis cura omnibus nobis qui fungimur Episcopatus officio, the common care and solicitude of all Bishops*, including evidently the *Bishop of Rome* in that *number*. And as long as this *equality* of *power* (allowing the *Bishop* of *Rome* the *dignity* of place) was thus *preserved*, it could be no prejudice to any other, that none that was denied *Communion* by the *Bishop*, should be allowed it by other *Bishops*, the same *Canonical* reason obliging him, that he should not receive any, that were *excommunicated* by any other *Bishop*. But then secondly, when the *Bishop* of *Rome* did not thus discharge his duty to other *Bishops* and *Churches*, the dignity of the *Roman See* it self did not free him from the note of *schism* and *heresie*, as is also most evident in the passages betwixt *S. Cyprian* and *Pope Stephanus*, when *Stephanus* had failed in his part, *nostrum est*, saith he, *Ep.* 67. *consulere & subvenire, qui gubernandæ Ecclesiæ libram tenentes----- It is my part to consult and aid, who hold the balance of the Church----* then admonishes him of his duty, *Quapropter facere te oportet-----* and, *Dirigantur in Provinciam à te literæ*; And *Ep.* 74. he tells *Pompeius* of *Stephanus*, *hæreticorum causam contra Christianos & contra Ecclesiam Dei asserere conatur, he endeavours to assert the cause of hereticks against Christians and against the Church of God*, and, *magis ac magis errorem ejus denotabis, thou shalt more and more observe his error*, accusing him of *impertinence* and *contrariety to himself, unskilful* and *improvident passages* in his *decree*, which may serve for a competent intimation, what respect *S. Cyprian* bare to that *See* of *Rome* when the *Bishop* thereof misbehaved himself.

11. 'Twill not be amiss here to recite what *S. Augustine* resolved in this matter. In his Book *de Unic. Bapt. contra Pelag.* c. 14. he makes this comparison betwixt these two *Bishops* of *Carthage* and *Rome*, *Cyprian* and *Steven*, *Duo erant eminentissimarum Ecclesiarum Episcopi, ambo in unitate Catholicâ constituti. Quorum Stephanus baptismum Christi in nullo iterandum censebat, & hoc facientibus graviter succensebat*; *Cyprianus autem in hæresi vel schismate baptizatos, tanquam non habentes baptismum Christi, baptizandos in Ecclesia Catholica existimabat*; *multi cum illo, quidam etiam cum isto sentiebant, utrique cum eis in unitate consistentes. There were two Bishops of most eminent Churches, both in Catholick unity, Steven resolved that the baptism of Christ was not to be iterated in any, and was very angry with them that did it*; *Cyprian thought that those that had been baptized in schism or heresie, as not having the baptism of Christ* (some of those *hereticks* denying the *Holy Ghost*, as he elsewhere presseth) *should be baptized in the Catholick Church*; *many were of his mind, and some of Stephens*, &c. Here now is the full meaning of the words, which I briefly cited out of *Cyprian*, when *Cyprian* was on one side, and the *Pope* on another, in a *contest*, that divided the *Christian world* into different opinions, the *Pope* pretending *Apostolical tradition* for his side, and vehemently insisting on it, *S. Cyprian* adhered to his *opinion*, *opposed* and *refuted* the *Pope*'s position and his pretension to *tradition* (as appears by * *Firmilianus* in his confutation of *Stephens Epistle*) and never yielded to him in it, and yet would not *condemn* and break *Communion* either with him, or with those that *joyn'd* with him. Add unto this what ‖ *Firmilianus* farther affirms, *Eos qui Romæ sunt, non ea in omnibus observare quæ sunt ab origine tradita, & frustra Apostolorum authoritatem prætendere -----that they at* Rome *do not observe all those things that were from the beginning, and that they do in vain pretend the Apostles authority*; *that customs Apostolical are varied by diversity of times and places, nec tamen propter hoc ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ pace atque unitate discessum est, and yet men never brake the peace and unity of the Catholick Church for this*; *and that when they seem to oppose custom to truth, no man can be so vain, as to think that a good plea, or any better than the Jews would be for the rejecting Christianity*, or upon that account *to refuse to leave darkness when he sees the light*, telling *Cyprian* that this was the *Africans case* against *Stephen*, and that they to the *custom* of the *Romans opposed a custom also but that of truth, ab initio hoc tenentes quod à Christo & ab Apostolo traditum est, holding from the beginning what was delivered by Christ and the Apostle.*

* *Cypr. Ep.* 75. *Quantum ad id pertineat quod Stephanus dixit quasi Apostoli probibuerint, & hoc custodiendum Apostolis tradiderint, plenissime vos respondistis, neminem tam stultum esse qui hoc credat Apostolos tradidisse------*
Stephanus infamans Petrum & Paulum quasi hoc ipsi tradiderint.
‖ *Cypr. Ed. Pamel. p.* 115.

p. 117.

12. This then was another part of *S. Cyprians* temper, to prefer that which he *resolved* to be true *Apostolical tradition*, before that which the *Romans* pretended to be such, and yet not to break *Communion* with them; whereas *Stephanus* (saith *Firmilianus*) *at that time dissenting from so many Bishops over the world, brake the peace with all of them, sometimes with the Eastern, sometimes with the Southern or Africans, would not admit their Legates to any speech with him, forbad receiving them into their houses, denied them not only peace and communion, but house and entertainment.* Whereupon *Firmilian* asked this *question*, *Is this the keeping the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace? to cut himself off from the unity of charity in all things, to estrange himself from his brethren, and contra sacramentum & fidem contumacis furore discordiæ rebellare, to rebel against sacrament and faith by the fury of obstinate dissention?* and then concludes, *& tamen non pudet Stephanum, and yet Stephen is not ashamed to patronize and defend hereticks against the Church, and for the vindicating of them to divide the Church, and call Cyprian a false Christ, false Apostle, deceitful work-man.* Whatsoever *S. Cyprians* temper and practice was, it seems *Pope Stephen's* was not so *meek*. Here is breach of *Communion* on his part, and yet the far greatest part of the world held *communion* with *Cyprian*, when the *Roman See*, and those that were in *communion* with that, had thus *divided* themselves from him.

Cypr. Ed. Pam. p. 117.

p. 118.

13. All this I hope may suffice to vindicate my vouching of *Cyprians temper* and rule of *peaceableness*, against the *contrary* practice and humor of the *Romanist*; I shall be glad now to hear, whether *S. W.* take any joy in the commendation that he bestowed on that *Father*, that he *knew what belonged to Church-order and discipline*. For if he did, I hope we that have so exactly *transcribed* his copy, in this particular, have not *offended* against either. *

* [something here added, but lost.]

What

What he here adds of my *admitting all to our Church that call themselves Christians*] was formerly shew'd to be a *calumny*. And for the short but keen touch of *an opinionative faith*, which he mentions on occasion of my supposing that the *differences* between him and us, are but *differences in opinion*, saying, that he *sees no reason we should trouble our selves to write Books in defence of an opinionative faith, and adding, It were better in that case to eat and drink, shake hands and be merry, nor trouble our selves with thinking whether there be a Heaven or no, which we can never come (the ground of faith being but an opinion) to any certain knowledge of.*] I should hope this signifies that *S. W.* is advanced very near to an end of his prizes, for sure he will never be able much to *transcend* this pitch, which he hath here arrived to. 14.

To it I answer, first, that I had thought that *faith* is by all men distinguisht from *knowledge*, and that how *certain*, and *undoubted* soever the *grounds* of it are, yet being of *things not seen*, or *inevident*, *knowledge* in strict sence it cannot be; And I had thought that this was it, that made *Faith* and the *works* of *faith* so highly *rewardable*, that it is of things not *seen* or *inevident*, nay much above the *light* of *natural reason*, or *experience* of *flesh and blood*, &c. whereas the consenting to a *demonstration*, which alone is *science* or *knowledge*, hath not been thought so *magnanimous* and *heroical*, and consequently *rewardable* an act, nor (by the same reason) the state of *vision* and *comprehension*, which is our *reward* rather. And therefore it cannot but be very strange to my ears, to hear such *conclusions* as these, so bluntly, and without all *provocation* calmly delivered, that it *were better to eat* --- i. e. *turn Atheists*, than only to entertain our selves with a *belief* of *heaven*, without any *certain knowledge* of it. 15.

But passing this by, methinks it should be possible enough, that there might be some difference betwixt the clear doctrines of *Scripture* (that *Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners*, and the like, the several *articles of the Apostles Creed*) on one side, and all the *additions* and *superstructions* of the *Romanists* on the other; There are I presume, but *two* ways imaginable to make them of *equal certainty*, either their being all *equally delivered* by the same *authority* of *Apostolick tradition*, or by the same *Infallible* testifier, the *Church* of *Rome*. And as there is very little proof for the former of these, the *Apostolick tradition* being no way evidenced for the *particulars* in debate; so for the *later*, (beside *many* other) methinks the example even now brought of *Pope Steven*, should *ad hominem* at least, to *S. W.* be a competent prejudice against it. 16.

The *doctrine* which he taught against S. *Cyprian*, the *Roman See* then taught as eagerly as could be, affirmed and testified it to be *Apostolical tradition*, and *custom* of the *Church*, and as many as in this adhered to him, must be supposed to have done the like, (and S. *Austin* himself in many whole *Books* together confesseth, that the truth was on *Stevens* side, though the *charity* and *humility* on S. *Cyprians*) and so if the *Roman See* be *infallible* either in *affirming* or *defining*, or in *testifying* of *Apostolical tradition*, this doctrine of *Stevens* must be as *certain* and *indubitable*, as any *article* of the *Creed*. And yet *S. W.* himself hath even now confest, that this was but matter of *Opinion*, or about a *private opinion* only, and then I hope by *parity* of reason, I may be allowed to have learnt from him the same *language*, and to assume, that the *doctrine* of Transubstantiation, nay of the *infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome*, is no *article* of the *Apostles Creed* in our account, ought not to be so in the *Romanists*, and therefore in any reason they ought not to *damn* us, to drive us from their *Communion*, for not assenting to these *opinionative articles*, or if they do, that this is an ill κρίσις, or *indication*, that the *Schism* is on their side, (whersoever the truth should be found to be) if we may judge by S. *Cyprians* rule, or by S. *Augustines* answer to the *Donatists*, often objecting *Cyprian* in defence of their own *rebaptization*, *viz.* that *Cyprian* erring in that point, with so much, and so constant *charity* and *humility*, was to be preferr'd before *Steven* maintaining the *truth* with so much pride, and uncharitableness; And thus we also know in the *quartodeciman Controversie*, though the *truth* was on *Victors* side, (as I have no obligation now to yield it on the *Romanists*) yet was he *justly* reprehended by *Irenæus* for his *pride* in *cutting* off from *Communion* the *Asian Bishops* for the *contrary error*. 17.

What he adds in the last place, about *begging* the *question*, is soon answered, that I count it not a *begging of the question* in the *Romanist* to *call us Schismaticks when we deny and offer to prove the contrary*, but their *bare calling* us so, without any *offer* of *proof* for it, or the *supposing* it sufficiently proved, and taking it for granted, and from thence building conclusions upon it, as on a principle, when it is not proved with any *Solidity*, and when at that very time, when 'tis taken for granted, it is known to be the *principal*, if not only *question*, as in this present *controversie*, whether we are *Schismaticks* or *no*, it is most manifest. 18.

As for his good words which, before he leaves this first part of *judging* others, he must needs bestow upon my *arguing*, that it *equally favours the perfectest Schismaticks that can be imagined*] it appears before this, what truth there is in them; If S. *Cyprian* and such as he be the *perfectest Schismaticks* imaginable, then he hath aimed something right, but otherwise he hath not, for he hath been the measure, by which alone I have directed my *arguing* in this matter. 19.

SECT.

SECT. X.

Of Despising. Breach of equal Communion, when just, when Schismatical. S. W. *his notion of Tradition, useless to him. Tradition hard to be known, falsely pretended, sometimes concealed. Prosperity of the* Roman *Church. Our not casting out the* Romanists. *Our neither judging nor despising them. Schism against the Universal Church or Councils.*

1. THE answer to the second branch, that of *despising* their *brethren*, now follows, and his advantages against my arguing seem to be great, and in effect these, that no *Church must excommunicate any, lest they be guilty of despising them.*] But I answer, that this is a clear misrepresentation of my process or arguing. For first, it is evident, that in that place I spake only of *fraternal* or *equal Communion*, not of the *Governours inflicting censures* on any of the members of any *Church*, but of the *Governours* and *members* of one *Church* cutting off from their *Communion* the *Governours* and *members* of another *Church*; as when *Pope Steven* and those with him, brake *Communion* with *Cyprian*, and the rest of the *East* and *South* with him, or as the *Jewish* and *Gentile Christians*, neither of them subject to the other, but remaining in their several *cœtus*, separated the one from the other, *Rom.* 14. This therefore shews the *mistake* or *perversion* of my words.

2. Secondly, speaking of the differences betwixt the *Romanists* and us, which I must have leave to think are but of that nature, that they ought not to *break Communion* or *Charity* among *Christians*, what I thus affirm of such differences, must not, cannot with any *justice* be applied to those greater differences betwixt those that believe the *Apostles depositum* intirely, and those that *reject* any part of it; Those that do thus divide themselves from the *unity* of that *Faith*, which was by the *Apostles* delivered to all their *Plantations* to be believed, that deny any *article* of it, may without any guilt of despising, or breach of *Christian charity*, nay upon designs which are perfectly *charitative*, be rejected from our *fraternal Communion*, as in the *Apostles* times, when it was *uncharitable* walking, and such as ended in the *Schism*, for the *Gentiles* to despise the *Jews weak consciences*, who thought it unlawful for them to have those *liberties* which were really allow'd them by *Christ*; yet I doubt not but it was perfectly *lawful*, and *charitable*, and even *Christian duty*, for the *Orthodox Christians* to renounce *Communion* with the *Gnostick hereticks* and *Schismaticks*. And so there now appears more reason in my arguing, than *S. W.* was willing there should, without any appearance of *reason* to the contrary; The plain issue of it being no more than this, that they which judge on one side, and they which on the other side *despise* their fellow *Christians*, agreeing with them in all those *articles* of the *Christian profession*, which the *Apostles deposited* in every *Church*, as the only necessaries of *belief*, and the *Symbolum* or *Tessera* of *Christian Communion*, and which upon either of these accounts (mentioned to my hand by the *Apostle Rom.* 14.) either of *judging* or *despising*, i. e. either of *thinking* that those whom they *judge*, do that which is not *lawful* for them to do, or that those whom they *despise*, make not use of that *liberty* that *Christ* hath *purchased* for them, shall *break society* with those other, refuse *fraternal Communion* with them, *i. e.* will not live with them as with *fellow Christians*, only upon such an account as this, that they cannot think all those things *lawful* or *necessary*, which they think *lawful* or *necessary*, these are directly the *Schismaticks* which the *Apostle* looks on as such; and beside these, there is not any *species* that I can discern of this third sort of the second *branch* of *Schism*, that which is an *offence* against that *charity* which is due from every *Christian* to every *Christian*; and we being not guilty of either of these, and the *Romanist* being visibly guilty, it remains evident enough, on which side this last sort of *Schism* lies, and to whom it is regularly to be imputed.

3. On this head of *despising* our brethren, whom we conceive to be in *error*, I had mentiond some grounds, on which it was *rational* for us, who believe the *Romanists erroneous*, yet not to *despise* them; And as if I offended in this, *i. e.* either in not despising them, or in thinking I had reason not to despise them, I must be confuted in this also; So prompt is *S. W.* and so *equally* qualified to *contradict* every thing that can be said by me, be it never so much *for*, or so *little against* his *interests*. But the best is, here is little said, (beside expressing the *magnanimous* humour of *chastising* every one for an *enemy*, that appears before this *Disarmer*) to require any *return* from us; only I am there taught my *utter ignorance what tradition is*, which indeed I had taken (and sometimes he hath in his *tract*, given me hopes it was no *mistake*) for that which *pretended* at least to be *Apostolical tradition*, but I am now told, that (in respect of us that now are) it *signifies* no more, than *what doctrine was held by Christians ten years ago*, and in respect of *them that lived ten years ago*, *what was held ten years before that*, *and so forth.*] This *rarity* I shall not now busie my self particularly to examine, it being indeed the resolving all into the *present affirmation* of the *Roman Church* of these last *ten years*, and really making *tradition* no proof of the truth of their *doctrine*, and yet putting on the specious name of *tradition* to disguise that in, or adorn it with; All that is pertinent to my present purpose, is *equally* granted me by thus setting it, for it is still *hard for the multitude to discern by their own ears*, *what was held all the Church over* (and not only within the *pale* of the *Roman Communion*) *ten years ago*, or indeed to judge, whether what within these last *nine years* hath been *defined* in the very *Roman Church*, were *eleven years* ago held by the *Church* or no, and consequently whether that which is now held, be *tradition*.

4. For certainly some *difference* there must be, betwixt *holding* and *receiving*, betwixt *affirming* as *true*, and *affirming* as *tradition*. He that knows that *three* years ago the *Pope* and his *Conclave* made a *decree* to *confirm* some *doctrines* maintain'd by the *Molinists* against others, may be yet to seek, whether *before* that *Bull* came out, *ten* or *twenty years ago*, that *Church* held those *doctrines*; and without knowing of that, he cannot be said to know what is *tradition*, even in the *Roman Church* of

this

this last age, in that particular. And so still by *S. W.* his good leave, I shall be so far moved by the consideration of the *difficulty* for the *multitude* in the *Roman Church* to *understand tradition*, as to resolve, though I deem them *erroneous*, yet not to *despise* them.

Only let me assure him, I did not think that the *Romanists* themselves did thus industriously or *affectedly keep traditions reserved from the sight of the people, like the Ark of the Testament and* Moses's *tables*, as he expresses it; I did rather believe that they were too *prodigal* of that *treasure*, that they *communicated* to them many more *traditions*, than ever were by their *ancestors* really *received*, imposed on them many things for *traditions*, which were the *erroneous doctrines* of men. And the only things which I seriously spake of, being *Apostolical traditions*, the *distance* of the *object*, and the want of light was that, which in my conceit, rendred this search *difficult* to the *multitude*, and not only the *reservedness* of the *Romanist*, who yet I must fear hath fail'd also in this kind, keeping close some parts of *Apostolical tradition*, else the *power* of *Bishops* and *Primates* in each *nation* would appear to be greater, and the *Authority* of the one *Bishop* of *Rome* much less than now adays is pretended. 5.

What he adds sixthly for the *comparing* the *Romanists* and *our* persecutions, is founded in a willing *mistake*. The *prosperity* of the *Roman Church* I spake of, being not that of the *English Romanists* here at home, but of those every where of their *Communion*, which sure hath long been such, as to give them occasion, to describe it by the *City set on an hill*, and among the notes of the *Church*, to set down *Prosperity* for one; And that being all that was pretended or thought of by me, I deserved not his so *serious rebuke* for that, 6.

Any more than lastly, for saying they had the *literal sound of* Hoc est corpus meum *for their doctrine of Transubstantiation*, which sure if they have not, they have nothing imaginable to pretend for it; for as for the *Fathers and Councils, and perpetual doctrine and practice of Gods Church*, which he is pleased to vouch for *recommending that sence of Christs words* to him, it will want much better proofs, than that of his affirming it. 7.

After his *lastly*, he hath one *peal* against the *Doctors non-sence*, in saying we *are far from casting them out of the Church*. To which end he asks, *Whither we would have cast them?* and *how we can cast them out of a thing that never was?*] To which I answer, first, that *casting out of the Church, signifies*, I suppose, all kinds of *excommunicating*, or *renouncing communion* with any; And that I did no otherwise mention this, than that they by *having first cast us out, made it impossible for us to be guilty of it*; And I should be glad to be shew'd where the *nonsence* of that speech consists, or with what shew of *sence* he could mention my speaking of *casting* them *out*, when I distinctly said it was an *impossible thing*, and only rendred those so many *reasons* for our *not despising them*, and not for our *not casting them out?* 8.

Secondly, supposing this *Church* of *England* to be a *particular Church* (as I may have leave to suppose it) and that *S. W.* was *baptized* a member of this *particular Church* (as I believe also he was) what *difficulty* can there be in conceiving the manner, *how our Church might cast out* S. W.? 9.

Nay thirdly, it being manifest, that there is a *rejecting from Communion*, which the *members of one Church* may be guilty of toward the *members of another, viz.* the *disacknowledging* that other to be a *member* of the *Catholick Church*, and so, as much as in them lies, giving *judgment* to the *casting her out* of all the *society* of *Christians*, and it being as *evident*, that that was the thing, which this *latter* part of the discourse of *Schism* treated of, *contrary* to *union fraternal*, 'twere, I say, no otherwise impossible, but from their having done it *first*, for us thus to *cast out the whole Church of* Rome, it being no miracle for *one particular Church* thus to *break* and *refuse Communion* with another. 10.

He will have *one word more ere yet he will leave this point*; And there are *four syllables* of some length in that one word; The *breviate* of the first of them is, that *in the Reformation we judg'd and despised our Governours*; of the second, that *many of our brethren since, have writ books to shew that Governour is Antichrist*; of the third, that the *whole world before by their contrary belief condemn our new reformed doctrine*; of the fourth, that *they despise not our persons, but only our reasons*, as being on *fallible grounds* ---] fit to be railed at, to the end of the *paragraph*. 11.

To these I *answer* briefly, To the *first*, That the *Pope*, whose *power* only we *cast out*, and *judged* it an *usurpation* over us, might most justly be *discharged* from that his *usurped power*, without the guilt of *judging* or *despising* any of our *true* and *legal Governours*. 12.

To the second, that as I am none of those who have written any *Book* or line to shew that the *Pope* is *Antichrist*, so I presume they among us, that have at any time done it, have neither *judg'd* our *Governour*, the *Bishop of Rome* being not such, nor yet the *Church* of *Rome* it self, which he hath hitherto told me, that *we acknowledge* to be a *true Church*, which we could not do if we judg'd it to be *Antichristian*, but only the *Court of Rome*, in respect of some *enormous* practices, chargeable particularly on that, and not common to all those that preserve *Communion* with them. 13.

To the third, that the *Church Universal* of the *first* and *purest* times, which yet is a considerable part of that *all*, is not, cannot be pretended to have *believed* contrary to our *reformed doctrine*, and so we were far from *judging* or *despising* that *vast authority*, when we only desired to reform the errors that had crept into these *latter* and *corrupter ages*, acknowledging still the *foundation* to have remained intire among those, whom we thus desired to *reform*. 14.

To the fourth, that I no otherwise charged on them the *despising* of us, than as they rejected us from their *Communion* (which in the *Apostles* time was the noxious effect of *despising*) and that sure belongs to our *persons* and not to our *reasons*, unless it be, that without any respect to them, they still continue their *uncharitableness*, and indeed find our *reasons* such, that *despising* or *seeming* to do so, is one of their *skilfullest* arts of (*diverting* rather than) *replying* to them. 15.

After his thus *large* survey of this *second sort* of *Schism* against *mutual unity* and *charity* in the ninth and tenth Chap. of the *Tract* of *Schism*, It is strange he should think fit to close his *answer* to them with this observation, that I have *omitted the two chief branches of Schism*, first, *from the body of the Church, and* secondly, *from General Councils*] whereas the *Schism* against *mutual* or *fraternal communion* belonged expressly to the *former* of these, and the *General Council* being a *representative* of the 16.

whole

whole *Church*, any *Schism* from *Councils* truly *General*, is by me most willingly acknowledged to be *Schism* from the *whole Church*. But of this I have spoken at large in the *Reply Chap.* 3. *Sect.* 1. and so am no farther importuned by any difficulty in his fifth *Section*.

SECT. XI.

Strictures on his last Section. The stile of the late Church of England *examin'd. Christianity where no well ordered Church. Faith inferior to vision.*

1. HIS *last Section* now remains to be spoken to, to which upon several accounts it is needless for me to make any *large Reply*, particularly because his being herein but the ζωγράφησις to the *Catholick Gentleman*'s *Monogramme*, an addition of *colours* from his *Rhetorick*, but not of any *real answers*, I have in the *Reply*, *chap.* 11. prevented all but the *scorn* and *ill language*, against which there is no *Antidote*.

2. Yet if there be any *incidental* glance, which may seem to have any the least *difficulty* in it, I shall briefly take notice of it, and remove it and so conclude.

3. And first, the *objection* which I proposed from the express words of one of their *late Proselytes*, who frequently stiles ours the *late Church of England*, he is pleased to wave, and *change* it quite into another form, and then to cry out, that *I am quite out of the way.*] But sure I am not *out of the way* that was *proposed* to me to walk in, for if it were lately the *Church* of *England*, then twenty *years ago* I (and perhaps that piece of *S. W.* that wrote this *last* part of *Schism disarm'd*) was a *member* of this *Church*, and not only of this *shadow* or *Ghost* of it; To him therefore that acknowledged it the *late Church*, I address that *last Chapter* peculiarly; as to this present *S. W.* who thinks we were *never a Church* at all, I had offered the whole *foregoing Treatise* of *Schism*, to prove we were not so much as guilty of any sort of *Schism*. And then with what colour of *truth* can he charge on me the *mistaking* of their *objection*, when both this was before my eyes the very words of the *objection*, and that to my knowledge vulgarly prest by several of their party, and indeed the *principal parts* of that *Chapter* formerly written for the *private satisfaction* of some, which were *solicited* and prest with this very *objection*, and when the *objection* as he sets it anew, was the *question* of the *whole Tract* of *Schism*, and was not now to be proposed in the *last Chapter*, when it had been *answered* in all the former.

4. Secondly, I must it seems be set to teach *S. W.* his *eyes* to *discern* what is before them, he saith I *was so eagerly zealous --- that I put first and thirdly, but quite forgot secondly*] A heavy *crime* indeed, if it had been true, and not to be past without his discipline, if the *Printer* had chanced to put *thirdly* for *secondly*. But let the 177. page be reviewed, and 'twill justifie all, but my *rebuker*; For having undertaken to *answer* that *objection by degrees*, and having set down the *first*, page 175, &c. In the midst of *p.* 177. I mention a *conclusion irrefragably following from thence*, which I say is the *second proposition*, and then regularly proceed to the *issue* with a [*thirdly*] in the bottom of that *page*. What an habit hath *S. W.* arrived to, from which such *acts* as these can follow thus *glibly* and *gainlesly*.

5. Thirdly, this judgment of the *irrationalness* of our *sufferings*, *for the maintaining of an uncertain opinion*, being founded in our *doctrine* that *Councils may erre*, from whence he concludes that the *meeting where our Articles were made, may erre also*] hath oft been prevented by the account that I have given of *belief*; In a word, that which we have *believed* and *practised*, and thereby brought sufferings upon us, we are verily perswaded in our *Conscience* before *God*, and have from *Apostolical practice*, and *tradition* been by our *Church* taught, to be the *truth* of *God*; And if this be not enough rationally to infer an *obligation* and *ingagement* on us to adhere to this, though it cost us some *indurance*, or if to *S. W.* his discourse this appear *irrational*, I shall much suspect that he will never think himself obliged to suffer for the defence of the *Romish infallibility*, having no possible *medium*, besides his own fancy, which he can so much as pretend, to give him any stronger belief of that.

6. Fourthly, for the number of those that have *fallen off from our persecuted Church*, I am not obliged to give any other account, than that herein we are but parallel to the *purest* ages and *Churches*, when the *Gnosticks heresie*, of which, *compliance* with the *persecutors* was one known part, carried away so great and considerable a number from the *Orthodox assemblies*, and *profession*; and are sure yet far more *prosperous*, than the *Catholick Church* in *Athanasius*'s time, when *Arrianism* had over-spread the whole world.

7. Fifthly, when by that *series* of *faith coming by hearing*, that *from preaching*, that *from mission*, and supposing that *mission* is an *act of jurisdiction*, he will first infer that our *Bishops* and *Presbyters* have no *jurisdiction*, and then that we have neither *mission*, *preaching*, *hearing*, nor *consequently Church*] I shall make no stay to admire his *logick*, or extraordinary *concluding faculty*, but ask him in plain terms, whether a *Presbyter* ordained by an *English Bishop*, or a *child* yesterday *baptized* by an *English Presbyter*, be not as truly a *Presbyter*, or a *Christian*, as any other which was ordained or baptized by the same or any other *Bishop* or *Presbyter* of this *Church twenty* years ago? If he be not, from whence the *invalidity* or *nullity* of these *latter* acts proceed? If he be, what *concludency* then can be imagined in *S. W.* his argument? As for our resort to the *secular power*, how little that is to this matter, is shewed in the Reply *p.* 157. and hath formerly been cleared in these papers.

8. Sixthly, 'tis a little strange, that when I say of our *present persecution*, that the *same tempest hath with us thrown out all order and form*, *Bishops and Liturgie together*, which visibly belongs to *their* retaining *none* of these, who have cast us out *of our Churches*, not to *our retaining* none of them, who if we would have *forsaken* them, had not been *cast out*, he can make use of this, as *my own confession*, *that*

that now all order, &c. *is cast out*, and therein, and *not in our serving God in private families*, to *found* his *proof of the invisibleness of our Church*. These are rare *slights* indeed, to make my *accusing* a *fault* in others, to be indeed the *confession* of it in my self.

Seventhly, when upon proposing to consideration for the *future*, whether *in case Bishops stand, or it be not our faults that they do not stand, this objection can ever be improveable into a charge against us or our posterity*, he reprehends my *logick* severely, and makes it all one, as if *my body being cut into Atomes*, I should yet *conclude, that if this were not my fault, it were still a well ordered body*] I answer, first, that my *question* in this case was not whether this would be then, when *order* were *destroyed*, a *well ordered Church*, but whether it would be *chargeable* on us, or *our posterity*, that it were so *disordered?* Secondly, that in his very *instance*, in that case of the mincing my *body*, first, my *soul* might yet continue *unmangled*, and intire. Secondly, that if that *misfortune* of my *body* were befallen it, without any *default* of mine, *God* would never *charge* it on me, how loudly soever such a *charity*, as hath *S. W.* might *revile* or *triumph* over me; Proportionably, that the *soul* of *Christianity* remaining to those, who shall *out-live* those hands who *baptized* and *admitted* them into the *Church* (as he that ever was such, may sure *continue* a *Christian*, when those that brought him into the *Church*, are either *gone* or *cast out* of it) and what hath *perisht* of the *outward form* or *body* of *Government*, being lost without any *fault* or *guilt* of theirs (their *infelicity*, which they could not *prevent*, and not their *crime voluntarily* brought upon themselves) this sure will never be lookt on by *God*, as any *dangerous* want of *order*, or as that which shall be any way chargeable upon them. *Order* is required to the *well being*, but not *necessary absolutely* to the *being* of a *Church*; an *orderless*, or a *secret society* of brethren may be a *Church* still, as any *number* of *converts* in a *City*, before the *Apostle*, which was gone to some *other City*, had yet placed any *Governour* over them. 'Tis certain a *baptized* person is, and *continues* a *Christian*, if he have not by some *fault* of his own, fallen from that *priviledge* (here I speak not of those who are not *baptized*, and yet if they were *qualified* for it, and wanted it by no *fault* of theirs, it will not be *chargeable* on them neither) and a *number* of such *baptized* persons, wheresoever cast by what *tempest* soever, will never be *condemned* by *God* for not having a *Bishop* or *Presbyter* in their company, when they earnestly *desire*, but *cannot* have him. And this was the plain sence that *S. W.* had *disguised* into such an *illogical* conclusion; the *Reader* now discerns, what *logick* it was that *assisted* him to do it. 9.

Eighthly, when he saith I *have spent this whole Chapter, except the first paragraph, to prove, 'tis not our choice or fault that we are persecuted*] I *answer*, that when the whole *objection* of this *Chapter* is that which is taken from our being *persecuted*, there was nothing *pertinent* to *answer*, but that 'twas not our *fault*, nor consequently any matter of *charge*, or *objection* against us. 10.

Ninthly, what the *Catholick Gentleman* simply cited from Mr. *Hooker*, *S. W.* hath somewhat *improved*, fansying that Mr. *Hooker* did ground his speech in the *uncertainty* and *sandiness* of *our foundation*. Than which nothing could be farther removed from all *appearance* of *truth*, as appears by the *true* occasion, and *importance* of his words, set down in the *Reply p.* 154, &c. 11.

Tenthly, when speaking of their assurance of their *Churches not failing*, he calls it a *seeing with evidence, perhaps more than scientifical*] I shall not now dispute the *grounds* of his *assurance*, that the *promises* made to the *Church* in general, shall certainly be performed to the *Papacy*, howsoever they behave themselves, (to that I have spoken in the *Reply p.* 153.) but only ask what *possible sight* or *evidence* he is capable of, in this world, which is *more than scientifical*, whether indeed *faith* is, or may *perhaps be more than science*, or *vision*, which is one *branch* of *science*, i. e. in effect whether the state of the *viatores* here be, at least in *this* respect of *evidence*, more *perfect*, than that of the *Comprehensores* hereafter? Or if it be, why *p.* 303. when he comes to *magnifie Rushworths Dialogues* and Mr. *Whites Apologie*, as the means of clearing to men this point of *Infallibility*, he is yet so *meek* in his expressions, as but to say we may *see it as visibly as it is possible any thing can be made to the eye of reason*] whereas the *eye of reason*, being but an *humane eye*, and the *evidence* that is capable of, being sure no *more than scientifical*, we had our *expectations* raised to an *higher* pitch than that, and so are already *defeated* in our *hopes*, and competently *discouraged* ere we come to take a *closer* view of them. 12.

As it is, I am now once by *Gods blessing* gotten to an end of *one* long journey, and shall *breath* a while, before I *obey S. W.* his *summons* to set out a-fresh upon such *another*. 13.

The powerful Prince of peace restore that blessing of peace to his divided Church.

THE
Diſpatcher Diſpatcht:

OR,

An EXAMINATION of the ROMANISTS REJOINDER to the REPLIES of D. *H.*

Being a *Third Defence* of the Treatiſe of *SCHISM.*

Wherein is inſerted a VIEW of their *Poſſeſſion* and *Orall Tradition* in the way of M. *White*

By H. HAMMOND D. D.

THE
PREFACE:

With ſome few Reflexions on D. *Holden's Strictures* on the TRACT of SCHISM.

1. THE enſuing Defence being grown to an unexpected, and ſomewhat enormous Bulk (by a willingneſs firſt to baniſh unchriſtian *Contumelies* out of a Theological Diſpute, then to enter the receſſes of thoſe *Grounds*, on which the Names of *Ruſhworth's Dialogues*, and M. *White's Apology for Tradition* being inſcribed, were meant to proclaim them irrefragable, next by a neceſſity of dreſſing the multiplied wounds of a keen Pen; and laſtly by an attendance on the various Arts and Mines, and Ambuſhes of a wily Adverſary:) I muſt not now increaſe this length by excuſing it, or incur the reality of a guilt, by averting or accounting for the appearance.

2. His *Preface* offers me no temptation to this, being a *Panegyrick* of (and that is far above the meanneſs of an *Apology* for) his own performances, and a tender of no leſs than demonſtration and neceſſity, that in ſuch an oppoſition as this betwixt him and me, there muſt be on the one ſide or the other, a monſtrous compoſition, a viciſſitude of *nonſenſe, impertinence, extremity of weakneſs and inſincerity.* If all theſe be thus ſtudiouſly affixed on me, as by the Analogy required betwixt his Portal and his Poſtern Gate, his *Preface* and his *Index*, muſt be concluded: My Anſwer is obvious, that conſciouſneſs is the Parent of ſuch ſolicitude, and that one of theſe Gifts in him, may abundantly qualifie him to charge them all on me; but having made them alſo a part of my deſtiny, and ſuch as I cannot poſſibly avoid, till my Adverſary become ſo humble and ſincere, as to ſee and accuſe them in himſelf, he hath ſuperſeded my cares, and adviſed me not to combat (here unſeaſonably) ſuch obſtinate prejudices, but to leave the Reader to the enſuing Sheets, and my *Adverſary* to the *cool of the day*, the good Seaſons of Gods bleſſed Spirit, for their Convictions.

3. In this armature of ſo rational, as well as Chriſtian a *patience*, I may not find difficulty to *poſſeſs my ſoul*, having hereby a thouſand times greater advantages in my proſpect, than all the loudeſt laughters and profuſeſt triumphs (the noiſe of the *Hammers*, and the melody of the *Inſtruments*, artificious inventions and divertiſements, ordinarily conſequent to the going *out from the preſence of the Lord*) can pretend to yield any man. Were there no other infallible κριτήριον to demonſtrate our perſecuted Mother of *England*, a true and vital Member of the *Holy Catholick Church*, I ſhould not doubt to recommend that * ἐγκόμβωμα ταπεινοφροσύνης, 1 *Pet.* 5. 5. καὶ ἀγάπης, that *white Belt and Badge of Humility and Charity* that it binds on all her

* Τῇ ἀλλ. δόλου ἐξωμίδι ἱματισθὲν τὸ σχῆμα ἀδικεῖ, ὁ ἐγκόμβωμα λέγω. *Jul. Pol. lib.* 4. *Onomaſt. c.* 18.

her Sons and Servants, and exemplifies toward the moſt faſtidious and moſt implacable oppugners of her Faith and Peace.

4. If it were an irrefragable evidence (written with a Sun-beam, proclaimed as with an Angels Trump, and) yielded by all to the Purity and Divinity of the firſt Martyrs, that they died embracing one another, if the [*Ecce ut ſe invicem diligunt*] the warmth of their love to all of their own profeſſion were the ſpirit that impregnated their Bloud, and made it ſo prolifical: We ſhall not yet deſpair of ſome Teſtimony to the Truth and Image of Chriſt among us, that the ſame bleſſed Fountain of Grace hath not left us deſtitute of this one gift, of *bleſſing* and *praying* for our moſt contumelious Adverſaries, of ſeeking and ſoliciting their double Peace, with God, and towards their Brethren; and when we are allowed no audience from earthly Brethren, ſtill ſounding the louder in the ears of our heavenly Father; the more deſperate the Breach, incurable the Wounds and Ruptures are, in divided, bleeding, if not expiring Chriſtendom; the more frequent the Checks we have received even from Heaven, (in the Prophet *Jeremie*'s ſtile, *Thy bruiſe is incurable, and thy wound grievous; There is none to plead thy cauſe, that thou maiſt be bound up, thou haſt no healing medicines; All thy Lovers have forgotten thee, they ſeek thee not, for I have wounded thee with the wound of an Enemy, with the chaſtiſements of a cruel one, for the multitude of thine iniquity, becauſe thy ſins (O Chriſtendom) are increaſed; Why crieſt thou for thine affliction? Thy ſorrow is incurable, for the multitude of thine iniquity I have done theſe things unto thee,*) by ſo much the more conſtantly and obſtinately inſiſting in our Siege of Importunity, and never ceaſing to purſue our provoked, but moſt juſt Judge, even δυσωπουῦλες Θεὸν, as the Fathers Rhetorick, learnt from Chriſt, teaches us, preſſing on *God's baſhfulneſs*, and not fainting, till that Prophets return brought from the Oracle, become ours, [*I will reſtore health unto thee, and I will heal thee of thy wounds, ſaith the Lord.*]

Jer. 30. 12, 13, 14, 15.

V. 17.

5. And ſhould it be the portion of this Mother of ours encircled and crown'd (like that other in the *Maccabees*) with all her Children to fall a Prey or a Joy to the cruelleſt Enemy, ſhould we, as Doctor *Holden* is willing to propheſie, prove now that *Res unius ætatis*, in the ſenſe in which 'twas once ſaid of the *Populus virorum* (which the God whom we ſerve may yet, in deſpight of others Auguries, and our own Provocations, timely avert from us) yet our comfort and joy will infinitely ſurpaſs and reward, and ſwallow up the utmoſt pangs of our ἄθλησις and τελείωσις, if we may be thus vouchſafed and honoured by our βεβαίωσις, to breath our laſt in this poſture; to *die the death* of thoſe *righteous*, who, when the violence of Zeal, ſtopping *their ears*, and opening their mouths, whoſe breaſts it fills, hath caſt *them out of the City, and ſtoned them*, have made no unkinder Returns than of their Prayers, that God would not charge their ſins on them.

The preſent ſtate of the Proteſtant Church, conſiſting of Proteſtant Biſhops and their Proteſtant Flock not being likely to conninue long. Annal. of Faith, p. 470.

6. That I have had by *S. W*'s favour, no ſmall harveſt of opportunities of exerciſing ſome lower part of this Duty, is far from being matter of mutiny or complaint to me: If *Altars* be to be built, and Oblations preſented to Benefactors, it were the ſame culpable omiſſion that S. *Auguſtine* noteth in the Heathens, for not erecting one Shrine to their Enemies, in acknowlelgment of that prime ſort of obligingneſs, either to repine, or not to prepare my Preſent for him, who hath thus manifoldly engaged me. But of this I need not be ſolicitous, having ſent my *Flocks and Herds* before me, to ſeek the *face of my rough Brother*.

7. 'Tis my deſire that many others may with me receive benefit from him, and by beholding and admiring in this draught of his, the extraordinary dimenſions of that Portraicture which he hath there drawn at length, and demurely entituled, *Zeal for Souls*, and on effluxion of the *Certainty of his Faith*, ſit down and reflect ſadly, and begin in earneſt to believe Chriſt, that he *came not to deſtroy the Law*, whether of *Moſes*, or but of ingenuous *Nature* and common *Humanity*, but πληρῶσαι to *perfect* and *fill it up*, and give it the utmoſt completion, not to debauch but cultivate either the *Jewiſh* or *Heathen* World, to infuſe a ſpirit of *Evangelical love*, that ſhall exorcize and caſt out the *Boanerges*-ſpirit of *Zeal*, and (did not we ſtrangely reſiſt his workings) to plant an entire Unity of affections in thoſe that ſtand in matters of opinion divided.

8. Might but his Injunctions be obeyed, his recommendations conſidered, or his richeſt Legacies accepted by us, all which concentre in this one point of undivided peace and love among all Chriſtians; We might calmly ſeek Truth (and hope to find as much of it as is proper to our Neceſſities) not driving it from us by our importune noiſes; and one part of the Apoſtles *depoſitum* being kept entire in our Creeds, all which (in every Article) *S. W.* and I can pronounce together, and interpret, I ſuppoſe to the ſame ſenſe, and the other uniformly received from the *Decalogue*, and *Sermon* in the *Mount*, and the unqueſtioned *Neceſſity* of *Conſtant Evangelical Obedience*, (wherein I hope, when paſſion is over, and the Doctrine of *Attrition*, and ſome ſuch like reviewed, we accord alſo) We might combine our ſincere and moſt paſſionate endeavours *to add unto Faith Vertue*, and maintain our differences in other things, as the *Angels* that are aſſigned the care of ſeveral Men or Provinces, may be ſuppoſed to preſerve their diſtant inclinations and judgments toward their *cuſtoditi*, and yet never defile themſelves, or ingage in any part of that *filthineſs of the ſpirit* (ſuch is Animoſity, Faction, πικρὸς ζῆλος)

ζηλῶ.) in the purſuit of ſuch Intereſts, but continue *Angels* ſtill, in the full height of Love and Holineſs.

9. That our ſmart may become our Diſcipline, and *Satiety* at length teach men this wiſdom, ſince *Chriſtianity* cannot inſpire it, methinks we might have leave to hope from the uneaſineſs of rage, and being always in the fire of Contention, and the *Joyfulneſs* as well as *Goodneſs*, of Peace and Charity: And then the diſcovery of my thoughts that S. *Peter* had the *Primacy* among the Apoſtles, without the Supremacy over them, which hath brought ſo much of *S. W*'s Rheum into my Face, and coſt me ſome attendance to wipe it off, will be none of the *Chriſtian abominations*; That, and many other no deeper Problems, will be allowed to be calmly and amicably treated among Scholars; and Truth to carry it againſt Clamours, and thoſe will be eſteemed to have moſt of the power of Religion in them, which have the feweſt and meekeſt, not the moſt numerous and immortal quarrels, who by ſeparating from none but obſtinate *Shiſmaticks*, *Hereticks* in the ancient Churches ſtile, and vicious Livers, have as no Friends on Earth but the truly Pious and Peaceable, ſo no Enemies but the Profane and Unreconcileable.

10. Whilſt I am on this (I hope no exaſperating) Theme, and before I conclude this Preface, it may not be amiſs to allow ſome brief Reflexions on Dr. *Holden's Strictures* lately publiſhed, as an account of his Opinion of my *Treatiſe of Schiſm*, if it be but to aſſure him that I am more juſt in my Returns to his Civility (a thing my Friend *S. W.* hath not cloy'd me with) than to give him any cauſe to apprehend (what he mentions, *pag.* 421.) that *I am any way offended with the ſight of that which he wrote to his Friend in Freedom.*

11. Some things he is pleaſed to think I would not have written, if I had firſt ſeen his *Analyſis* and *Appendix*: And I take the boldneſs to Reply, that I perceive the chief things to which he excepts in my Book, are ſo fully cleared in other Treatiſes which I have written, eſpecially that of *Fundamentals*, and of *Hereſie*, the *Anſwer to Schiſm Diſarmed*, and now to the *Diſpatcher*, that I cannot but entertain ſome hopes, that if he had ſeen, and ſurveyed thoſe, all which (but this *Diſpatch*) were publick before this Tranſlation of his *Analyſis*, &c. he would not have made thoſe exceptions: What theſe are, I ſhall not trouble him to enumerate, becauſe I had rather prepare for an accord and agreement, refreſhing my ſelf a while after the Travail of this Volume, than ſeem to delight in the ſucceſſion of Combatants, by managing or deſigning any contention with him.

12. In order to this Repoſe, I have many paſſages chearfully to tranſcribe from him, by the Umpirage of which, a great part of the Controverſie betwixt *S. W.* and me, which hath thus long exerciſed the Reader, might have been very amicably compoſed.

As Firſt, *When I give*, (as he acknowledges) *a firſtneſs of Precedency and Preſidency to the Pope*, he *tells me, *he is confident I know not how much more is allowed him by the Univerſal conſent of all Catholicks, as of Divine Inſtitution, whatever I may have read in particular Authors* (I ſuppoſe *S. W.* &c.) whereby I am enabled to interpret a Parentheſis of his *foregoing, That in *allowing the Pope to be the firſt Biſhop and Patriarch in Order or Priority of Place; I come nearer to the eſſential part of the Pope's Primacy than I thought or am aware of.* *P. 430. *P. 427. P. 431.

Secondly, When he acknowledges that nothing but *Univerſal Tradition* (which is as diſtant from the *preſent Oral* of the *Romiſh Mothers*, which M. *White's* and *S. W*'s Models are built on; as an Univerſal is from ſome Particulars) *is the infallible Interpreter of Scriptures* (how it is the onely *Interpreter of Councils and Fathers*, when preſently he adds, That *General Councils are witneſſes of what we believe*, i.e. of Tradition, I ſhall not too nicely examine.)

Thirdly, That he ſaith, *I ſeem to favour a late Opinion of ſome Learned Catholicks*, who ſay, Saint *Peter* and Saint *Paul made up but one Head of the Church, and this by conjecturing that they founded two Churches both at* Antioch *and* Rome, *the one of the Jews, the other of the Gentiles, and conſequently were both Biſhops at the ſame time of the ſame City* (and then I wonder other Catholicks ſhould ſo faſtidiouſly oppoſe this.) P. 432.

Fourthly, That *there was no need in the Apoſtles times to have recourſe to S.* Peter, *nor opportunity* (ordinarily ſpeaking) *or conveniency for it.* P. 433.

Fifthly, That the *Pope's Authority is not ſo ample as S.* Peter's *was.* P. 434.

Sixthly, That the *Pope doth exerciſe no Power nor Juriſdiction in the Territories of any Sovereign without the Sovereign's leave.* Ibid.

Seventhly, That *they do not believe it as an Article of our Chriſtian Faith*, that there is Ibid.
'any particular act of Juriſdiction ſo eſſentially annexed to the Pope, and ſpecified by Divine
'Inſtitution over all Nations, as that it may not be in ſome caſes, either performed by others,
'ſupplied ſome other ways, or quite omitted; Adding, that he will not determine wherein
'his headſhip conſiſts in relation to our purpoſe; And †elſewhere confeſſing, That it is not † *Annal. p.* 227.
'eaſie to determine which be the ſpecial and particular acts of his Superiority ſetled on him by
'divine Inſtitution (and accordingly abſtaining, on neceſſity as well as choice, from thus determining.

Eighthly, *That all Cauſes and Caſes ought to be judged within the Dominions of each Sovereign*; *That they in* France *do, and have ever obſerved this, requiring in all occurrences that the* P. 435.

Bishops of their Nation may be appointed Judges of whatsoever may be questioned in Rome *concerning any of his Majestie's Subjects.* Lastly, *That some Catholicks have been and are too forward in judging of Protestants.*

P. 447.

13. I which have served an *Austere Master*, and in so long and wearisom an attendance have been vouchsafed no such *Donative*, or indulgence from *S.W.* cannot without some acknowledgment receive these so many from another as *Reverend* and *Catholick* an *Author*, as himself. Of which therefore I desire to make my thankfulness thus publick, that others may hear, and bear them in mind, thorough all the ensuing debates with *S.W.* of *Tradition*, of the *Gentile* and *Jewish Cœtus* at *Antioch* and *Rome*, but especially of the *Pope's Universal Pastorship*, not *Patriarchate* onely, but *Headship of the Universal Church*, asserted by him, as held by *Divine Institution*, and derived to the *Pope* as he was successour to *S. Peter*, of (the foundation of that) *S. Peter's* Power and *Supreme Authority* over all the *Apostles*, *S. Paul* particularly, of the rights of *Sovereign* Powers and *Primates* in their *Territories*, &c. Nothing doubting, but the concessions of this *Learned Doctor*, will be found more favourable to the *Defendant* than the *Plaintiff*; to the unworthy *Advocate* of the *Church* of *England*, than the *Triumphant Deserter* and Opposer of it.

* *Append. of Sch.* p. 389. and p. 445.

14. As for his other way of charging the *Schism* on us, from a supposed * *Separation betwixt us in necessary points of Divine Worship, namely in Sacrifice and Sacraments*, if He and I, being both *English* men, speak the same Language, and there lie not some undiscovered ambiguity in the words *Sacrifice* and *Sacraments*, I should hope, when the *Universal Pastorship* by Divine Right were discarded, and onely the *Primacy of Order* taken in its stead, the issue would be brief, seeing it is already known to all men, that till about the tenth year of Queen *Elizabeth*, the *Romanists* of this *Nation Universally* communicated with us in these acts, and that whole *Divine Worship* prescribed by our *Liturgy*, (which we still retain without any the least change) and might no doubt have done so still, if the *Pope*, for Reasons of his *Ecclesiastical State*, had not by *Bull* interdicted them, to which Interdict the *Separation* being wholly due, and They, not We, the *Separators*, how it should now be chargeable upon us, I can neither seek, nor want any other Umpire but himself, to judge betwixt us.

15. What Controversies are now risen and waged among us on these Heads, he hath in part truly enumerated; though as he omits the two principal, concerning their private *Masses*, and denying the *Cup*, their *No-communion*, and their *Half-communion*, the contrary to which maintained by us, it were a little hard, if it should render us *Schismaticks*, when the [*Take, Eat,*] and [*Drink ye all*] are so pregnantly favourable to us; so I must confess I should not have begun the List as he doth, that [*all Roman Catholicks believe and reverence the Sacrifice of the Mass, as the most Substantial and Essential act of their Religion, all Protestants condemn and abhor it.*] When 'tis visible that the *Protestants* of the *Church of England* believe and reverence, as much as any, the Sacrifice of the *Eucharist*, as the most *Substantial and Essential act of our Religion*, and doubt not, but the Word *Missa*, *Mass*, hath fitly been used by the *Western Church* to signifie it, and herein *abhor* or *condemn* nothing, but the *Corruptions* and *Mutilations*, which the *Church of Rome*, without care of Conforming themselves to the *Universal*, have admitted in the Celebration. And for our judgment of these, and of what he next names, the conversion of the substance of the *Elements* into the very substance of the *Body* and *Bloud* of Christ, &c. as we cannot imagine, how being bare doctrinal Debates, they can denominate us *Schismaticks*, (at least, any more than them, without begging the *Question*;) So for the resolution of them, we tender that Plea, that no peaceable *Christians* would doubt to accept of, by making our *Appeal* to the *Universal Tradition* of the *whole Church*, including the *Fountain* as well as the *Streams*, which how much it is preferrable to the present Oral Teachings of the *Romish Mothers*, (the sweet connatural way that God is thought and affirmed by Mr. *White*, to be obliged to have established in the World, as the ultimate resolution of all Controversies,) which are on a double account, both of time and place, very particular, one would think should be easie to determine, (to which end I have purposely afforded it a distinct consideration in the third Chapter of this *Dispatch.*) And yet I know not any other Controversie betwixt the *Romanist* and us, which is not involved in the *Fate* of this, and stands unquestionably determined by this Resolution.

16. With what truth we can be said to deny any *Sacrament* which *Christ* instituted, and thereby contract the guilt of *Schism*, I would hope should undergo no debate betwixt sober men, that will not contend for words. For 1. The *Canon* of *Trent*, *Sess.* vii. *Can.* 3. pronouncing *Anathema* against those who affirm the *Seven Sacraments* to be so equal, *Ut nullâ ratione aliud sit alio dignius*, that in no respect one is more worthy than another; what cause can there be for their displeasure, that we have desired to express our sense of this imparity, and the grounds of it? 2. The doctrine of our *Church* concerning the *number* of the *Sacraments*, being in our *Catechism* thus delivered, That *Christ hath ordained two onely as generally necessary to salvation*, she hath competently expounded, and vindicated her self from all exceptions, by confining her Speech, 1. To those that have been allowed the stile of *Sacraments*. 2. That

were

were ordained by Christ, And 3. Ordained as generally necessary to salvation. For the first, It is visible that S. *Ambrose* writing *De Sacramentis*, mentions in that whole Tract (and in a former, *De iis qui mysteriis initiantur*) no more but these two. So S. *Augustine* * *Ep.* CXVIII. *ad Januar.* resolves the *Sacraments* to be *Numero pauciſſima*, and mentions none but these two; and * *De Doctrinâ, Chr. l.* 3 *c.* 9. *Quædam pauca Dominus & Apostolica tradidit Disciplina; Sicuti est Baptismi Sacramentum & celebratio corporis & sanguinis Domini*; *a few things*, instancing in these two *Sacraments*. And then why might not these Authorities, with * *Paschasius* long after them, &c. be of more force to restrain than *Peter Lombard's* Enumeration of Seven, so very lately, to ampliate the number? For the second, it is visible, that all the rest were not ordained by Christ, not Marriage, which was before Christ's time, not Confirmation, nor Extreme Unction, nor Orders, which (to say no more in this place) are not so much as mentioned in the *Gospels* or Story of Christ, but in the *Acts* and *Epistles* of the *Apostles*, nor Penance, any farther than it is comprehended under the Power of the *Keys*, or Binding and Loosing; and so far it is unquestionably retained by us, though not under the Title of a *Sacrament* (because, among other things, there is no constant visible sign in the *celebrating* it, which the *Romanists* themselves make necessary to a *Sacrament*) but of the *Censures* and *Discipline* of the Church. Lastly, That they are not all *generally necessary to salvation, i.e.* to the *salvation* of all men that are capable of them, I shall suppose an Opinion common to us with *Romanists*. Of Mariage and Orders there is no question, they as well as we allowing salvation to Virgins and Laymen. Of Extreme Unction there can be as little, among them that profess not to use it to those that are put to death by Justice; for which *Bellarmine's Catechism* gives a Reason, which more than intimates the one true end of it, for cure of *Diseases*, but infallibly concludes the no *general necessity* of it to *salvation*, because, saith he, such are neither sick nor have hope of life; which confines it to them that are in those two capacities, neither of which have any affinity with General. For Confirmation, the Jesuites in *England* are known to have lately maintained against the Seculars, the no necessity of it. And if they account of Penance as necessary, yet I hope they do not so affix the remission and salvation to the *external*, as to deny it to the *internal* act of it, sincerely performed, though without the other. If they do, our receding from them in this, will the more nearly unite us to the *Apostolical and ancient Church*, (which so learned a man cannot but know,) makes no scruple to admit this.

* *To.* 2. *p.* 556. B

* *To.* 3. *p.* 50.

* *De Euchar. c.* 3.

P. 301. *

17. But I shall not allow my self to engage farther in this, or any other *Polemick* Subject, which his Discourse hath offered to me, being resolved that this προπύλαιον shall be wholly dedicated and inscribed to Peace, and be so far like the Temple of *Solomon*, that no noise of Hammer shall be heard in it, the rather because the whole ensuing *Fabrick* hath, on *S. W's* Summons, been prepared for War, surveyed, and modelled, begun and finished in that other manner; wherewith, because it is more than possible the Reader will be cloy'd, it was not amiss to give him this variety by way of *Antepast* and *Paraſceve*, which he will like never the worse for not being wholly *Paschal*, the *Lamb*, and *Unleavened Wafer*, without the *Bitter Herbs*.

THE

THE
Diſpatcher Diſpatcht.

CHAP. I.

Of Contumelies; in Reply to S. W*'s four firſt Sections of his Firſt Part.*

SECT. I.

The manner of his writing. The advantages and diſadvantages of it. Launoy*'s judgment of this Method; the like of* Plutarch, *and* Chryſoſtom, *and* Phavorinus. S.W*'s Defences examined. His notion of Preaching, and Saint. The Bill of Fare. His Confeſſion of Rude Blows: the Injuſtice equal to the Rudeneſs. An Eſſay of* S.W*'s Logick. Twitchings by the Beard, defended, with what truth. Of Scripture Teſtimonies againſt Contumelies, and the appliableneſs of them. His paſſages from* Tertullian *and* Auguſtine *repaid him. Six Pleas for Contumelies evacuated. His admirable Inferences. His diſclaiming all Contumelies. His definition of ſuch. Perſonal and Moral Faults. His Artifice in pretending my Confeſſion, and in concluding me a Railer.*

1. THe *firſt* attempt of our *Diſpatcher*, is to give an account of his *writing* at all; and his *ſecond*, to defend his *manner* of Treaty from the Charge or Blame of *Contumelioufneſs*. Theſe two were to march together in the *Front* and *Syllabus* of his *firſt* Section, being ſo engaged, and intricated the one in the other, that if he may not have liberty to write in that ſtile of *Scoff* and *Declamation*, he muſt not write at all, his *ovation* being the prime of his *ſtrength*, his *noiſe* and *report* of his Victories, the onely means to perſuade the Reader that he hath obtained them.

2. This *Stratagem* promiſes it ſelf many advantages; For, 1. It hath the Reputation of having gotten ſome *Conqueſts*, *routed* the unexpert adverſaries, by crying *They Flie*; (a ſtrange privilege of confident *Fiction*, by *majoration* to loſe its nature and become *Truth.*) And being thus incouraged, it (2.) likes the augury, and hopes ſtill to be in like manner ſucceſsful; the *ſlow* Ravener, whoſe ſpeed ſerves him not to overtake and ſeize his prey, on deſign to charm, doth *roar* after it: and if it thrives not, yet (3.) 'tis the putting a *good countenance* upon an ill matter, and that is the onely Relief in an irremediable miſadventure. Mean-while the admiſſion of this among other of *Polyænus*'s *Stratagems*, is ſo far from being any Ingredient in the *Chriſtian Warfare*, that it is an unqueſtionable indication of the *want* of thoſe Weapons, with which that arrays its Champions; and the *Artifice* is ſtill ſo *mean*, that they muſt be very importunate Intereſts, that ſhall be able to recommend it to any Trafficker, but ordinarily ingenious, and that can but *live* without it: There is none but the profeſs'd *Quack* or *Mountebank*, that avowedly brings the *Zany* upon the Stage with him; ſuch undoubtedly is this *Scoptical* Humour, when 'tis allowed to bear any conſiderable part in the *Chriſtian Palæſtra*, let it call it ſelf what it pleaſe, *Zeal* or *Drollery*, 'tis at beſt the *Buffon*, deſigned to aſſiſt and combine with *Sophiſtry*, (as the *Ballad-ſinger* with the *Cut-Purſe*) to enſnare and lurch the Simple. So one of your *Sorbon Doctors* lately advertiſeth the *Benedictine Monk*‖, *Convitia apud imperitos & ſtolidè credulos rationum inſtar haberi ſolent*, this kind of Treaty uſes the Reader as ill as the Adverſary, calls them *Fools* that are moved by it. The managing a Controverſie, ſaith he, *with oſtentation of words, ſecularis potius quam Monaſticæ militiæ profeſſorem decet, becomes a Fencer better than a Monk*; but for *rudeneſs* or incivility to him that had given him never an *ill* word, he muſt more ſeriouſly inſtruct the Brother what Character belongs to it. **Modeſtia virtus eſt tum omnium, tum maximè Chriſtianorum, & inter Chriſtianos vel maximè Clericorum, & Monachorum, qui cæteris virtutum omnium exemplo prælucere debent: veritas quoque non indiget patrocinio convitiorum, ipſa ſibi ſufficit, & quo nudior eſt, ac ſimplicior, eò comptior, eò amabilior, eò fortior & ad vincendum mendacium aptior. Modeſty is the duty of all Chriſtians, eſpecially of Eccleſiaſtical perſons, and Truth needs not Contumely for its Advocate, is much more lovely, and apt to convince without this Auxiliary.* This I chuſe to ſay in *his*, rather than in my own words, that it may not come to him under the prejudice of *Preaching*, or *Saint-like*; and if *Greek*, though Heathen, may not be as nauſeous as either of thoſe, I ſhall give it a perfect parallel out of ‖ *Plutarch*, Ἀνδρεία χαλῶς ἂν δεῖσθαι δόξειεν ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου, *Valour needs not Anger, having imbibed Reaſon.* Which made * S. *Chryſoſtom* conclude, μάλιστα τῶν μαχομένων θυμοῦσθαι οὐ χρή. *Of all men living they that ſtrive, (Controvertiſts) are obliged not to be angry.* And if *S.W.* will turn to a ſaying of *Phavorinus* in ‖ *A. Gellius* (which aſſures me the degree of *Praiſe* which he hath afforded me, *p.* 18, 19. was more skilfully deſigned to my * diſadvantage, than all his *Index of Contumelies*: giving this reaſon for the *Aphoriſm*, *Quoniam qui maledicit & vituperat, quantò id acerbiùs facit, tam maximè illi pro iniquo & inimico ducitur, & plerumque propterea fidem non capit. The bitterer his reproaches are, the leſs they are credited,*) he *will* have reaſon to think that what I have hitherto ſaid in theſe *wordiſh teſtimonies* (as he will call them) is more for *his* than *mine* own advantage, if his Cauſe will but allow him to make uſe of it.

‖ *Launoy de Prim. Cenomani Præſ. Epoc. p.* 167.

* *Ibid. p.* 180.

‖ Περὶ Ἀοργησίας.

* *Tom.* IV. *p.* 709. *l.* 33.

‖ *l.* 19. *c.* 111.

* *Turpius eſt exigue & frigidè laudari, quam inſectanter & graviter vituperari. Qui infœcundè & jejunè laudat, deſtituì à cauſa videtur.*

3. For my ſelf, as I muſt profeſs to believe that there is no one *ſimple Errour* in *Popery* more pernicious, nor conſequently more fit to be reſiſted and conteſted with, than are the contrarieties to *Charity*, the fermentations and paroxyſms of *Bitter Zeal*, which are here *avowed* and *juſtified* by *S.W.* ſo I have

not

not a greater obligation to any part of this *Reply*, than to proceed yet farther on this *Proemial* Theme, how *extrinsecal* soever it may seem to the main *Controversie*; and examine (with what brevity I may, being herein tied to *anothers* motions) *all* that he hath here said in *defence* of it, separating as well as I can, his *Pleas* from his *Scoffs*, his *Logick* from his *Rhetorick*, and making my rejoinder onely to the united force of the former, not to the diffused of the latter.

4. And *first* to the plain Texts of Scripture, which I produced against *Railers*, *Revilers*, *Contumelious Persons*, he replies, *A sad case, that no punishment less than Hell must be poor* S.W*'s doom, because he laid open the weakness of Dr.* H's *defence of a pernicious Cause, after the manner that such a Defence deserved*; and he *wonders I had no more charity than not to be afraid, lest I should drive* S.W. *into despair of his salvation, by denouncing and preaching to him such horrid judgments, for writing against the Saints.*] To this I reply. 1. That it is indeed a *sad case*, that God's denunciations against a sin, so *charitably*, and *affectionately* mentioned by an Apostle, as a special part of his Apostolical Office, to call all to self-examination, but the Guilty to repentance, should be entertain'd with so little of earnest, or of that temper of mind, which is due to any Apostolical denunciation. 2. I demand as *sadly*, whether if *S.W.* did but suspect that any Christian (though most unknown to him) which he had to deal with, were guilty of *Drunkenness* or *Adultery*, and should thereupon mind him of the Apostles denunciations against such, that neither the *Drunkard nor Adulterer should enter the Kingdom of God*, and the other should return, whether seriously or but *scoptacally*, that he *wondered* S.W. *had no more charity than not to be afraid of driving him into despair of his salvation*, he would think it a Christian Reply, and either an Argument of his Innocency, or a symptom of his Relenting? 3. I hence learn somewhat of his *Dialect*; 1. His notion of *Preaching*, which he so oft useth as a stile of *Scorn*. 2. That other of *Saints*, which with him is wont to sound the same way. *Preaching* is here joined with *denouncing* such *horrid judgments*, as were cited out of S. *Paul*, and can signifie no other than what S. *Paul* was guilty of, and I no otherwise, than as I transcribed S. *Paul*'s words. And let him then judge, if 'twere truly *his Art*, as elsewhere he pretends, which suggested this *Ironie*, this part of his Dialect to him. Next [*the Saints*] can signifie no more or other than Dr. *H.* for against him onely it was that *S.W.* was charged to have written that, which he here affirms *written against the Saints*: and then he that most seriously thinks himself ten thousand times *less than the least of all Saints* (and never assumed more, if so much as *this*) that knows it hath been the general practice of *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*, to call themselves by titles of this kind, the *Pure*, the *Perfect*, the *Spiritual*, the *Holy*, the *Saints*, the *Godly*, and the very worst of men, the *Gnosticks*, meant the same, when they assumed that Title) must yet be as solemnly scoff'd at under that stile, as if he had indeed assumed it. 'Tis true I had mentioned *Saints* in that Paragraph, to which he thus replies, and so also the *true Prophets of God*, but the *former* in the express Scripture notion, for those that *reign in Heaven*, and shall *judge the world*; and the *second* for those very *Prophets* whom the *Jews* defamed and persecuted; far from imagining, and as far from appearing, to include my self in either number; and if he meant to persuade any incautious Reader, that I did, then this was very injurious to us both, and an early instance of the *undue* and undeserved manner of his Replies to my *Defence*, which yet he averts in this period, and pretends no farther to vindicate *his* practices from the Apostles sentence, than he can *justly* avert it. I demand therefore, did I in the Paragraph he now Replies to, (or any where else) assume to my self or Party, the title of *Saints?* If he saith I did, I leave him to his own eyes and conscience to refute him; If I did not, then this part of my *Defence* deserved not this manner of *Reply* which he hath given it; and having nothing to pretend for it but my *desert*, he hath already lost his *onely* Plea, as soon as he hath produced it.

5. *Secondly*, He proceeds to view the *charge* of *Contumely*, how he may appear to be concerned in it, and begins with my *acknowledgment* (as if that would yield him some advantage) that it was *not he which wrote the Bill of Fare*, to which he saith he *may with truth add, that he did not so much as know of it.*] I Reply, 1. That my Confession of the *Romish Factor*, concerned onely *the Stile of Drollery and Picquant Sauce*, by him made use of, and is no farther to be extended than that the Publisher gave a *civiller Title* to his *Contumelies* than the Author himself. 2. That the List which the Publisher set in the Front of the Book, was exactly conformable to what the Author had dispersed in the Body of it, and can no more lessen by dividing and taking part of his blame, than the divulger or proclaimer of a Libel extenuates the Crime of him that Pen'd it and delivered it to be publish'd. Nay, 3. The *Bill of Fare* is so imperfect an *Index* of the *Contumelies* of the Book, that I have reason to think it set as a *Blind* rather, to *conceal* the greater variety of them, which was sure to be found in the Book, than a *Map* onely to *point* at them. 4. That as I, whose onely business it was to consider the *Contumelies*, can be no more presumed to *know*, or consequently to reflect on the person of *S. W.* than of the *Romish Factor*, the Master of the *Feast* than the Collector of the *Bill of Fare*: so nothing that I have said in this matter, is concerned in that *Enquiry*. I have indeed oft heard the Names by which both of them are known, but as I am no whit satisfied for the *Injustice* of their *Contumelies*, by my having those *imperfect* Images of them, or by their having shared it betwixt them, (the Heap or Load of Soil, smells never the more temperately, that there were more hands joined to the collecting of it) so the Apostles sentences against that Sin, were produced by me for the use of *all* that had any part of that *Guilt* on them, and meant not to raise a *suspicion* of guilt on any, that had it not. And yet 5. if *S* and *W* be characters that any one person means, or is willing to be known by, whoever it is that hath the *comfort* of being, or *vanity* of assuming to be the Author of these Answers, he is certainly responsible for all that appears from the Press under his Signatures, as a Merchant is for the Transactions of his Factor. *Lastly*, I have now no motive to incline me to affix the Collecting of the *Index of Schism dispatcht* to any other hand, than what compiled the *Book*, and that is much *more contumelious* and injurious than the former *Bill of Fare*; and so here be grounds enough to supersede and deprive him of all benefit of that *Confession* of mine, with which he begins his *Defence*.

6. But, saith he, Dr. *H. thinks he hath got a notable advantage against me from my own Confession, that my Blows were rude, and my Adversary civil, whereas I used both those Phrases as an objection of the Readers, as is most palpable.*] I Reply, 1. How he used them, must be judged by his own words, to which I referred in the *Epistle to the Reader*. *Before*, saith he, *you can have past three Chapters, I know you will be objecting, that the Blows I give are too rude for so civil an adversary.*] From hence all that I assumed was, that the *Author who was fittest to name his own Births, hath allowed them the plainer Title of rude Blows.* And what

can

can be more *palpable*, than that he hath done so? 2. 'Tis as *palpable* that when this was written to the *Reader*, to *meet him*, as he saith, in *the very entry*, the Reader, of whom he speaks, could not as yet have made this objection, or be with truth by him pretended to make it, any otherwise than as *S.W*'s *Conscience* assured him, there was place for this objection; These words [*I know you will be objecting*] being spoken by the *Disarmer*, can import no less to my understanding, than that this was a reflex'd act of his *own Conscience*, that there were in the 3 *first Chapters* competent motives to suggest to the *Reader* this *objection*, and I am not subtile enough to distinguish betwixt this signification of this *reflex'd* act of *Conscience* and his *own Confession*, which yet he here vehemently averts, with what *palpableness* or *evidence* of truth, let him now judge. 3. If the Reader indefinitely taken, *i.e. (in materia necessariâ*, which alone is the matter of *knowledge*, here mentioned) *every Reader* be by *S.W. yielded* to *object* this, then is this as *fair* and *large* a *testimony* as may be, of the truth of the thing questioned, *viz.* That *S.W*'s *Blows* were not onely *rude*, but *too rude*, which was all that I designed to conclude from this *medium*. Other collections I might have made from his mentioning the 3 *first chapters*, and no more, and his mentioning them in an undue stile, when that Book of his is not divided into *Chapters*, but into 3 *Parts*, & 13 *Sect.* in the *first Part:* but I desired not then, nor am yet fond of making *impertinent* Discoveries.

7. But he hath more to say to this Head. *Had I*, saith he, *used them, the rudeness of Blows argues not that they were not just, since none doubts but Malefactors are very rudely, yet most justly whipt, and the courteous Epithet of Civil denied not, but the oil in his tongue was accompanied with venom in his heart, and so made it more necessary to discover that, whose onely advantage it was to lurk undiscoverable.* I Reply, 1. That I assumed no more from his Confession, than that *the Blows were rude, and the Adversary civil*, and if that be granted, I have no more to demand, nor he to *quarrel* in this matter. For 2. if *rudeness* should not conclude *injustice*, much less will it conclude the *contrary*; there will need other *mediums* to prove the *Blows just*, than [*that they are rude, or that Malefactors are punished justly.*] And till those mediums are produced, and proved effectual to the end, the affirming them *just*, is the *begging the question*, and so of no force to his present Defence, and will be proved but a new *Contumely*, as oft as I shall in the process of this answer shew, that there is as much *injustice* as *rudeness in his Blows.* 3. I shall appeal to custom of Speech, the best Dictionary, whether when a *Malefactor* is *whipt* by the *Lictor*, or *beheaded* by the *Executioner*, without any addition of his own spleen to the Judges sentence, he shall be said to have *dealt rudely* or *contumeliously* with the *Malefactor?* or whether strength of Argument in a Disputant, would by the Reader indefinitely be *certain* (and so, as to be the object of *S.W*'s *knowledge*) to be stiled *rudeness?* If so, he hath not *lost* by this instance, though withall he hath not *gained* by it; but if not, let him then judge what Cause it is, that is capable of no better Defences. But then 4. I must set a remark on that piece of *Logick* that follows, [*The courteous Epithet of Civil denied not, but the oil in the tongue was accompanied with venom in his heart, and so made it more necessary to discover that* ——] The force of this consequence and propriety to its being a part of *S.W*'s *Defence*, depends on these two things; 1. That *under the outside of Civility, poison was discovered to lurk.* 2. That the *rude Blows* were some way *necessary* to the making this *discovery*; now 1. I demand, Is that presently *eo ipso* inferred and *proved*, that *every thing* else doth *not deny:* The word [*Civil*] is not pretended by me to have any force of *probation*, either as to the *truth* or the *wholsomness* of what is propounded, but neither is it any symptom of falshood or *poison*, any more than the contrary *rudeness* is of the contrary. By what means then is the discovery made, which is here supposed? The onely *medium* here mentioned, is, That [*The courteous Epithet of Civil denied it not.*] But 1. It doth as much *deny* it, as *words* signifie *things*, or *lips* are interpreters of the *heart*, (for he that treats a man *civilly*, doth at least tell him, that he means him no *hurt*) and all humane affirmations and negations are thus transacted; though it is true, there is frequently deceit in them, when *false* hearts have the managing of them. 2. Therefore, if it doth not *deny* it, what is gained toward the *discovery?* There be ten thousand propositions (which are more than single words) in the *Bible*, none of which *deny Lucifer* to be the *Messias*; will this yield him any assistance toward the acquiring of that dignity? To suppose then this *lurking poison* without any other ground of inferring it, than that the *Epithet of Civil denied it not*, is one essay of his discursive faculty that I was here to consider. And another is, the influence that this hath on the *rude Blows*, or *propriety* to be an ingredient in the Plea for them. For I must again demand, In case there were any *latent poison* in the *civil Tract of Schism*, was not *civil* reason able to search and *discover* it? Do *Physitians* use to inveigh or scoff at *poisons?* tell them they are *absurd* and *ridiculous*, and *Saint-like*; or do they not think it sufficient to furnish their Patients with *Antidotes* against them? If there were never a *Smith in Israel*, could not the true Religion be preserved, without going down to the *Philistins* Grindstones to whet their Piety, as well as their *Shares?* If all the *Romanists* were throughout good Christians, and so really the *meekest men upon the earth*, and such as would not *rail* any more than *lie* for God, were the *Infallibility* and visibility of their *Church* ascertained (or but more likely) to be lost by this means? If so, then *S.W.* need no more be *rude*, Dr. *H*'s *civility* hath ensured and prepared his own ruine, and then still, be the supposition of the *poison* never so certain, and the *discovery* never so necessary, yet *ad quid perditio hæc?* why were these loads of Contumelies brought in, which *might have been sold to* the *Jews* for some price (it matters not how great) or laid out in charity on some strong-hearted Heretick, which were like to die a lingring death, without them? If a *wordish testimony* or two may here have place against such *rigorous evidences* as these, I shall propose to him the words of *Cicero* and *Seneca*, which may deserve to be believed in their own faculties *. *Non desiderat fortitudo advocatam iracundiam; satis est instructa, armata, parata per se; Annon vir fortis nisi stomachari cœperit, non potest esse fortis? Gladiatorum id quidem est.* And ‖ *Nil aliis instrumentis opus est, satis nos instruxit ratione natura: Hæc dedit telum firmum, perpetuum, obsequens, nec anceps, nec quod in dominum remitti possit:* The *common notions* that prevailed uniformly with these, might, if consulted, have assured *S.W.* that *Reason* without the *Rude Blows*, was his best *armature*, such as would not fail to doe what he would have it, could not be *taken out of his hands, and used against him*, as all other weapons may, but especially that of *Contumely*, if the *Adversary* be no better Man than *S.W.* is a Disputant.

* *Cic. Tusc. Qu. l.* IV.

‖ *Senec. de Ira l.* I. c. XVI.

8. I shall not now further disquiet him, by examining how he could, as he saith, *discover that venom, whose advantage*, he also saith it was, to *lurk undiscoverable*, because I doubt not, but this new *tube* hath the faculty of *discovering* things which are otherwise *undiscoverable*, this *magnifying* glass hath always been able not onely to enlarge, but create, first to improve Mites into Swine, and then each single mere *no-*

thing into the largeſt *Coloſſus*, and all this by the rules of *ſevere Reaſon*, and *rigorous Demonſtration*.

9. 'Tis time we now advance from the *rude Blows*, (for which I am to account not with *S.W.* it ſeems, but with the *Reader onely*, it being *ſo palpable, that the Reader* was the man, that put thoſe words into *S.W*'s mouth, without any the leaſt conſent of his) to the *twitchings by the beard*] which he cannot, doth not deny to have been his *own* ſtile; Nay (that I may not conclude as he doth, from *not denying*) he expreſly confeſſes, he *ſpoke it*. But to this he hath ſome few things to ſay alſo. 1. That *I reiterate it to make my Reader ſmile*. 2. That the *twitching by the Beard is indeed ſomewhat too rude a carriage, if underſtood in the down right ſenſe, as*, ſaith he, *I ſeem to take it, but he ſpake it onely in an allegory, and in order to my wearing a Vizard, which he pluckt off*. 3. That *ſince he did onely ſo, let me but acknowledge that he found me attired in ſuch a Mask, and he is contented to be thought ſo unreaſonably uncivil, as to pluck it off ſo rudely*.]

10. This, it ſeems, is *all* the *ſatisfaction* that may be expected to attend on *S.W*'s *Confeſſion*, when himſelf is both the *Penitent* and the *Confeſſor*. But to theſe I reply, to the *firſt*, 1. That it were not unreaſonable in him to allow me the comfort once to ſolicit the *Readers ſmile*, when he hath the profuſer joys of entertaining him with a *loud laughter*, whole days together. Hath he the *Leviathan*'s privilege of *ſporting* alone in the *Waters*, the incloſure of Game, the Patent of having all *Mirth* wrapt up in *his* Papers? Was it an undecency in me thus to *refreſh* the Reader, once in a long weariſom journey, or was it not? If not, why is it mentioned by him, whoſe every word is preſumed to be *immediate*, and ſo to have *demonſtrative* force in it? If it was, why doth *S.W.* ſo over-imitate what he thus condemns? But 2. for the truth of what he charges on me, either that I *reiterate* it at all, or to that end of making the *Reader ſmile*, I have been at ſo much leiſure, as to reade over all I have ſaid in that matter, and find his Suggeſtion very diſtant from all appearance of truth, in both particulars. I name the phraſe but *twice*, and that at no leſs diſtance than is between the firſt part of the ſecond, and the laſt of the ſixth page, once in reciting his words, the other time in refuting them, and if this had been called *iterating*, I had not reſiſted, but I am ſure it is not *reiterating*. And when the Reader turns to the places, he will find, that as the *iteration* had no propriety to make any man *ſmile*, ſo each paſſage was delivered with as much of earneſt, and as little of *Irony*, as any other line of the Book; and then again he will judge, what credit is to be given to *S.W*'s relations.

11. To the ſecond, 1. What appearance or ſemblance is there, that *I took the phraſe in the down-right ſenſe?* or how was it poſſible I ſhould ſo take it? Could I think his printed ſheets had Fingers or Pincers, or other Inſtruments of violence or *rudeneſs*, properly ſo called? or did I expreſs an attempt to fanſie what was thus impoſſible? Nay, are not theſe my words? *Rude Blows and twitchings by the Beard, Declamation and Satyr, are none of theſe juſtifiable and lawfull means?* What could more witneſs my underſtanding his *allegory*, than my *interpreting* it? 2. If in the down-right ſenſe his *twitching* be acknowledged ſomewhat *too rude*, can it avoid being ſo in the *allegory?* Are his *tropes* ſo inartificial, his expreſſions ſo feeble and imperfect, as to ſignifie leſs than they ſound? Is not that which was *allegorically* meant by that ſtile, as really *rude* in another kind, as the *down-right twitching* would be? If it be, then what a Defence is this? [*if underſtood in the down-right ſenſe, it was ſomewhat too rude; but being ſpoken in a ſenſe* that ſignified as much as the *down-right*, it did not yet ſignifie *ſo much rudeneſs*.] If it be not, we have then loſt our *Rhetorick* too, as well as our *Logick* formerly. 3. Then, hath he mended the matter by adding, he *ſpake it in order to my wearing a Vizard?* Is a Contumely allayed by being *doubled*, ſhall Falſities imitate Negations, and two *Paſquils* become a *Panegyrick?* I muſt not blame *S.W.* but his *Art*, for this alſo.

12. Yet all theſe are but Preparatives to his *third* and laſt medicament, wherewith he hath throughly purged himſelf. Let *me confeſs that he found me in a Vizard, and he is content to be thought ſo uncivil*—. It ſeems, I muſt *juſtifie* his calumnies, and then he will bear the blame of them. My *avowed* guilts muſt evince me *injured*, and the *truth* of his accuſations demonſtrate them *unreaſonable*: Mean while, till I *deſerve* rudeneſs, he that heaps it on me, is *innocent*. Thus dear muſt a man pay for *S.W*'s repentance, for which yet there is no place, till it be confeſſed that he hath not *offended*. I may court the Readers *compaſſion*, though not his *ſmile*, when a hundred ſuch *Monſters* of diſcourſe as this, are all commenced branches of *rigorous evidence*.

13. His next Paragraph *P.* 4. and 5. is ſpent in inquiring *with what Logick I huddle together thoſe teſtimonies out of Scripture for* S. W*'s paſſport to Hell, unleſs I could evidence that they were particularly appliable to him*.] I reply, 1. That I ſhould think it *ſtrange Logick* indeed, to infer from my producing the Sentences of *Scripture* againſt railing, that I gave any man that is moſt guilty of it, a *paſſport to Hell*. I had thought denunciations of Scripture had been deſigned to *bring ſinners to repentance*, to reſcue *from Hell*, not to convey any man thither. I had thought that this was one of our Saviour's means to demonſtrate himſelf a *Saviour*, by warning of the danger of ſin, to redeem men from it, and ſo to *bleſs by turning*; and by terrors the means of *turning*. And I am ſure no man can evacuate this *Logick*, but he that reſolves he will not *amend* what is under thoſe denunciations, and till *S. W.* profeſs finally to be of that number, he will make good my *Charity* as well as my *Logick*, and when I know he is of that number, I will no more importune him with that kind of exerciſe of either. But then 2. What defect could there be in my *evidence*, that thoſe *teſtimonies* were *particularly appliable* to him? When the crime to which thoſe teſtimonies belonged, was ſo viſible almoſt in every page (of the firſt part eſpecially) of his Book, that himſelf profeſſed to *know* that the *Reader* would think him guilty of it, and as plainly acknowledges it, as *twitchings by the Beard* ſhall *allegorically* be able to ſignifie *Contumelies*, and when I had firſt laid that for the ground of my procedure, before I advanced to produce thoſe *teſtimonies*.

14. But it ſeems another kind of *particular application* he requires of me, that of ſhewing that *contumelious words are ſo perfectly damnable, that no circumſtance can render them inculpable, or at leaſt venial, if not neceſſary or convenient*.] But I reply, that if this ſtrict manner of *application* be with any reaſon required of me, to be ſuper-added to the producing of ſo plain, and general, comprehenſive *teſtimonies*, that very reaſon is alone ſufficient to evacuate the main of his *Apology*, that either in his *Epiſtle to the indifferent Reader*, or in this place, he hath offered for himſelf. For it falls out this *one* time, that he that is ſo profeſs'd an enemy to *Teſtimonies*, hath yet in *this* matter ſpecially applied himſelf to *this* Advocate; 1. In his *Epiſtle to the Reader*, in defence of his *ſmiling*, he ſends them that *are wedded to a ſeverer humour, to Tertullian*, concerning ſome paſſages of his Book that *move to laughter*, and St. *Auguſtine* of the unreaſonableneſs

ſonableneſs that *Catholicks* ſhould be bound to write in a *dull and drouſie ſtile*, reciting words from each of them, (the very ſame which the late Author of *Les Provinciales* in his eleventh Letter had done againſt the *Jeſuits*) but utterly failing of what he here exacts of me, *i. e.* neither comparing, nor conſidering the *appliableneſs* of *circumſtances*, nor ſo much as quoting the places in either of the *Fathers*, (that Author having in like manner failed herein) by help whereof his Reader might have conſidered them, much leſs deducing the parallel either betwixt me and thoſe againſt whom thoſe *Fathers* wrote, or betwixt me and the *Jeſuits*, againſt whom onely this Author of *Les Provinciales* produced them; from whom as I differ in nothing more, than in their *moral* Divinity, (which *Montalt* there principally paradigmatizes) ſo I need give no other inſtance of my differing, than that they * profeſs it *lawfull for the preſerving a man's own honour, to calumniate where there is no crime*, but I think it unlawfull to *reproach* where there is. Who now it is which is moſt guilty of the crime which he † here objects, *of laying about blindly againſt Friends and Foes*, the Reader will beſt judge, when what is produced (I muſt ſuppoſe pertinently) by his own Friends againſt others of his own Friends, he cites againſt me, whom he owns for his Adverſary, and that (I ſay not *blindly*, but upon *truſt*, without *examining*, or leaving any poſſibility to others to examine his *teſtimonies*, or ſo much as directing to the Coaſt where they are to be found. This being ſaid in general to his *two* pretended *teſtimonies*, I ſhall not add any thing more particular (though by what is recited of them, 'tis manifeſt, they come not home to *Contumelies*) till I am certainly informed by him, that they are to be found in thoſe *Fathers*, and then ſhall not doubt to ſhew him, that they belong not to his *circumſtances*. Meanwhile I ſhall pay him in part with two viſible paſſages of the ſame *Fathers*; of * *Tertullian*, *De Patient.* c.xv. *Satis idoneus patientiæ ſequeſter Deus; ſi injuriam depoſueris penes eum, ultor eſt, ſi damnum, reſtitutor eſt. Quantum patientiæ licet, ut Deum habeat debitorem? fidem munit, pacem gubernat, dilectionem adjuvat, carnem regit, Spiritum ſervat, linguam frœnat, manum continet, tentationes inculcat, nec inflatur, nec inquietatur, ſedet in throno Spiritus mitiſſimi & manſuetiſſimi, qui non turbine glomeratur, non nubilo livet--- Ubi Deus, ibidem & alumna ejus patientia ſcilicet. God is the proxy and advocate of patience; lay up your injury with him and he is the avenger, your loſs, and he is the reſtorer. What an advantage hath Patience, which hath God for its Debtor? It defends the Faith, governs Peace, helps Love, rules the Fleſh, keeps the Spirit, bridles the Tongue, reſtrains the Hand, repels Temptations, is not puffed up, is not diſquieted, ſits in the throne of the moſt mild and calm Spirit, which is not carried about in the Whirl-wind, nor diſcoloured with the Cloud--- Where God is, there alſo is this his Client, Patience.* And of St. *Auguſtine* in his † *Anſwers to the Letters of* Petilian *the Donatiſt* (I ſuppoſe as profeſſed a defender of acknowledged *Schiſmaticks* as I am pretended to be,) *Si & ego tibi vellem pro maledictis maledicta rependere, quid aliud quam duo maledici eſſemus, ut ii qui nos legerent, alii deteſtatos abjicerent, ſana gravitate, alii ſuaviter haurirent, malevola voluntate? Ego quando cuiquam vel dicendo vel ſcribendo reſpondeo, etiam contumelioſis criminationibus laceſſitus, quantum mihi dominus donat, frœnatis atque coercitis vanæ indignationis aculeis, auditori lectorive conſulens, non ago ut efficiar homine convitiando ſuperior, ſed errorem convincendo ſalubrior. If I would repay you Contumelies with Contumelies, what would the reſult be, but that we ſhould be two contumelious men, that of them that read us, ſome would deteſt and reject us with a ſober gravity, others would take down our Writings with pleaſure but maliciouſly? When I make anſwer to any by word or writing, though I am provoked by contumelious charges, yet as far as God gives me ſtrength, I bridle and reſtrain the ſtings of vain indignation, thereby taking care of the Auditor or Reader, and endeavour not to overcome the Adverſary in Contumelies, but to cure him by convincing his Errour.* And much to the ſame Theme to the end of the Chapter, which if it be not exactly applicable to our preſent *circumſtances*, it is becauſe *S.W.*'s Adverſary hath offered him no exerciſe of his *patience*, neither began to him, nor attended him in *reproachfull* language; I hope he will *forgive* me that injury, and wink at that unevenneſs in the parallel. And let this ſerve for his two *teſtimonies* in his *Epiſtle*.

* *Let.* XV.

† *P.* 5. *l.* 5.

* *Edit. Pamel.* p. 145. C. D. E.

† *L.* III. *c.* 1. *Op. Aug. Tom.* VII. *Ed. Baſil. p.* 163. D. 164. A.

14. In this place alſo *p.* 4. he appeals to *teſtimonies* (ſuch as when I produced, brought the irony of *Preaching* on me) 1. Of good *John Baptiſt*, *who called the Jews a generation of Vipers*. 2. Of St. *Paul*, *that called* Elymas *ſon of the Devil &c.* 3. *Of our Saviour, who called* Herod *Fox, the prophaners of the Temple Thieves, the Scribes and Phariſees Hypocrites.* 4. *And to come nearer the preſent circumſtances, of St.* Polycarp, *who meeting an Heretick, who began complementally to inſinuate himſelf into his acquaintance, rejected his curteſie with this rude language, I know thee to be the Firſt-born of the Devil.* 5. *Of St.* Jude, *who calls Hereticks Clouds without water, Autumnal Trees,--- And* 6. *to come yet nearer home, of God's Church, whoſe cuſtom it is to anathematize and curſe Hereticks, and of S. Paul, who bids anathema even to an Angel from Heaven, if he ſhould preach falſe doctrine.*] But in all theſe ſix, there is no evidence tendered of the *particular appliableneſs* of them to the caſe in hand; for that muſt conſiſt of two branches. 1. A *parallel* betwixt me and thoſe *Jews*, that *Elymas*, that *Herod*, thoſe *Prophaners*, thoſe *Scribes* and *Phariſees*, that *Heretick*, and others of the ſame denomination; and 2. a Parallel betwixt *S.W.* and the *Baptiſt*, S. *Paul*, our *Saviour*, St. *Polycarp*, St. *Jude*, *God's Church*, and St. *Paul* again. Either of theſe was 1 as neceſſarily his task, as it can have been mine, to evidence the words of St. *Paul particularly appliable* to him; and 2. ſo much more his, as he that *cenſures* a defect in another, is obliged to *repair* it in himſelf; yea and 3. much more difficult and impoſſible for him to repair, than mine is.

15. To ſhew him this, and at once to give him an example of perfecting incomplete diſcourſes (which I acknowledge need not be ſo perfect at firſt, that nothing can be added to them; if they muſt, the *Diſpatchers* pains were very unſeaſonable.) I ſhall now for diſtinctneſs ſake add, that St. *Paul*'s denunciations againſt λοιδοροι, are (at leaſt) in force, 1. againſt all thoſe that are confeſſed to have uſed *contumelious* ſpeeches to them who have not at all offended; 2. againſt all that have laid them out above proportion of the offence; 3. againſt all that laviſh them out indifferently upon their *equals*; who are in no wiſe *ſubject* to any authority of theirs. The two former are immediately deduced from the foundation of St. *Paul*'s doctrine, the expreſs words of Chriſt, *Mat.* v. 22. where the *old Commandment*, *Thou ſhalt not kill*, v. 21. is by him extended to the interdict of being *angry with the brother, and calling him Racha, and thou Fool*, εικη, either *without any cauſe*, or *above* the *proportion* of it; and the *third* alſo from the analogy which is there obſerved betwixt *killing* (the *original* precept there) and ſuch expreſſions of *anger* or *contempt*; for as in the *one* the *juſtice* of the Cauſe, the reality (much leſs, pretence) of a crime, is not ſufficient to juſtifie him, who hath not a competent authority for it, ſo neither is it in the *other*.

16. I ſhall purpoſely omit to reflect any farther on the *two* former, 1. Becauſe although *S.W.*'s inſi-

nuations, that all his diſpleaſures are *juſt*, and *proportionable*, are not ſufficient to prove any one to be ſuch, yet my denying it, muſt be as weak, or elſe be founded in ſome better evidence, and there is no giving that, but by the view of each paſſage, and that is too long for this *preliminary*, and muſt wait the leiſure of the ſubſequent Diſcourſe; and 2. becauſe ſtill there will remain place for *paſſion* and prejudice in this matter, and he that is already known to call one *Heretick*, whatſoever the matter of the pretended hereſie be, will think he hath this cauſe of *juſt* and *ordinate* anger on his ſide. I ſhall rather chuſe to pitch on the third, wherein the *application* will be moſt viſible and particular, and all his inſtances as yet propoſed, expreſly excluded from being argumentative for him, or againſt me. I ſhall demand then, In caſe a *private* man, without any ſignature of *Authority* upon him, ſhall take upon him to kill another, will it in the leaſt avail to his defence or excuſe, to pretend the examples of *Kings* and *Magiſtrates*, nay of *Prophets* and *Apoſtles*, and of *God* himſelf, that have done ſo before him? If it will not, then what can be ſaid for an *uncommiſſionated S.W.* who certainly is inveſted with no ſort of Authority over D. *H.* if he ſhall call him *Racha* and the like, upon no other pretence of claim to ſuch liberty, but what is deduced from this Argument, Becauſe *Chriſt*, *Prophets*, *Biſhops and Governors of the Church* have all uſed it toward their Inferiors? A *Biſhop*, 'tis certain, may excommunicate an Heretick of his *Dioceſe*; but may a *Presbyter* by that Argument doe the ſame to another *Presbyter*, or but to a Lay-man? A *Biſhop*, though he muſt not be πλικτὴν a *ſtriker*, 1 *Tim.* 3. (which the Fathers interpret of the *allegorical* ſtrokes, μὲ ἀκαίρως πλήττων τὴν ἀδελφῶν τῶν συνειδήσιν, ſaith *Theophylact*, *not ſtriking unſeaſonably the brethrens conſcience)* yet he is required ἐλέγχειν ἀποτόμως, *to rebuke ſharply*, or by way of *exciſion*; But doth this office lie in *common* to all men, or to any others that are not ſo *called?* or can it by the *Judaical* pretended right of *zealots*, belong to any *private* man, that can but pretend a *zeal* for it, which is all that *S.W.* doth at this time? If not, as certainly it doth not, then is the *application* of *general denunciations*, as *particular* as can be, and *S.W*'s cloud of witneſſes to the contrary, perfectly ineffectual.

17. If this were not in both parts ſufficiently cleared, and thereby the whole debate concluded, I would mind him further, not of the ſize, and notoriety of every of thoſe guilts, by him ſpecified to have been rebuked by *Chriſt*, the *Baptiſt*, the *Apoſtles*, *&c.* (though I hope I am not arrived to thoſe heights, am no profeſs'd *oppoſer* of *Chriſtianity*, no *Sorcerer*, no *Gnoſtick*, or *Cerinthian*, or *Marcionite*, whatever more minute name of *Hereſie* he is pleaſed to think due, and ſo to beſtow upon me) but of the *ſpirit of diſcerning*, which moſt of theſe confeſſedly had, by which they infallibly pronounced, not onely that the crimes were *crimes*, and that of a *firſt* magnitude, but alſo that thoſe, whom they rebuked, were *eminently* guilty of them; ſuch conſtantly is the Word of God, the rebukes of Scripture, κριτικὴ ἐνθυμήσεων, *diſcerners of thoughts*, and could not miſs in the propriety of the *applications* to the guilts and perſons, a privilege to which I hope *S.W.* doth not pretend, how *infallible* ſoever he ſuppoſes the doctrine, which he aſſerts; which alſo being onely ſuppoſed, not *infallibly* proved by him, can bear no kind of proportion with the *diſcerning of thoughts*, that was in *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles*. And this is all I ſhall reply to his *ſecond* offer of *Teſtimonies*, by which he will now further diſcern his main concluſion ſuperſeded, and ſee that there was no ſuch *neceſſity* *, as he pretends, of fetching the reaſon of difference betwixt theſe *cenſures of Chriſt and Apoſtles*, *&c.* and *S.W*'s *Contumelies*, from the *quality of the perſons*, *againſt* whom they were delivered; the difference of the *perſons* that did deliver them, would be ſufficient, if there were no other.

* *The Texts alledged by Mr.* H. *are very general, and he allows them here no exception at all, or if he does, the reaſon muſt be, becauſe the words ſpoken to ſuch perſons as Hereticks, the common good concern'd, made the private perſons repute not conſiderable*, p. 5. l. 4. &c.

18. I demand then, Was his † [*muſt be*] a ſign of a *rigorous evidence* and *demonſtration*, or was it not? If it was, then I learn hence the interpretation of that ſtile, *rigorous demonſtration*, that it is competible to thoſe things which are not onely not *demonſtrably*, or but *probably* true, but even evidently and *demonſtrably* falſe, (and then next to *S.W*'s *Contumelies*, I muſt except againſt his *Demonſtrations*, which till they are mended, will ſpoil him for a *Controvertiſt*, as he is willing to ſtile himſelf) for 'tis manifeſt I have aſſigned another *reaſon* of difference, beſide that which he confidently affirms *muſt be the reaſon*. But if that be not the interpretation of [*muſt be*] our language is not yet underſtood, and ſo one way or other we have our choice, to get us new *Logicks*, or new *Dictionaries*, new meaſures of *Diſcourſe*, or elſe new means of *expreſſing* our notions.

† *The Reaſon muſt be*, &c. ib.

19. The ſame ſtrain further ſhews it ſelf in the next Paragraph: [*Whence* (ſaith he) *follows firſt, that I am not excommunicate, or in the ſtate of damnation, for having uſed contumelious words, ſince the uſe of them, if taken ſimply in it ſelf, is not impious, but for having uſed them againſt D.* H. *Unhappy I, who was not aware how ſacred a perſon my Adverſary was!*] I deſire to be ſhewed the ground or bottom of this conſequence; I ſuppoſe it is this, that ſeeing *contumelious* words uſed by Chriſt, &c. againſt *Herod*, &c. are not *impious*, there can no other reaſon be pretended, why *S.W*'s *Contumelies* ſhould be thought *impious* or dangerous, ſave onely this, becauſe they are againſt D. *H.* But I have already ſhewed him another *double* reaſon, *viz.* that there is not a greater difference betwixt *Herod* and D. *H.* than there is betwixt *Chriſt* and *S.W.* both in reſpect of the *Authority* of the one, and none of the other, and the *diſcerning of thoughts*, in the one, which is not, I hope, pretended to in the other; On both which accounts, I acknowledge my ſelf enforced to yield, that if *S.W.* after he hath done with me, ſhould be divided into two *Catholicks*, and thoſe fall out among themſelves, one departing into the *Jeſuits* quarters, and t'other remaining among the *Janſeniſts*, and as in *Epiphanius*, the great Snake in the Bladder after it had devoured all the leſſer Snakes, one end of it ſeized and preyed on the other, ſo *S.* ſhould heap loads of Contumelies on *W.* or *W.* on *S.* the Texts in St. *Paul* would be then as fitly appliable to either of them, as now they are to both of them together, when D. *H.* is concerned in it. It is then the ſhortneſs of *S.W*'s diſcourſe, that he could diſcern nothing beſide his Adverſaries being a *ſacred perſon*, (as he will ſpeak) which brought the unhappineſs upon him. The incompetentneſs of his own *perſon* was ſufficient without any other.

20. As little doth it follow, which he next ſuperſtructs, [*Next it follows, that if D.* H. *evidence not his Cauſe to be no Hereſie, and himſelf no maintainer of it, all thoſe former harſh expreſſions againſt Hereticks are his due, and without ſcruple of Sin might be given him by* S.W.---] For 1. D. *H*'s Cauſe may be no *Hereſie*, though he ſhould die before he wrote one word more to evidence it to be none. 2. He cannot be bound *both to evidence his Cauſe to be no Hereſie*, and *himſelf no maintainer of it*, which are *two* diſtinct things: of which certainly one were abundantly ſufficient; for if he be no *maintainer* of it, how is he concerned, though it were evidenced to be *Hereſie?* (which yet is much more than being *not evidenced not* to be) or if

it

it be *evidenced* by him *not* to be *Hereſie* (which again is much more than not to be, becauſe all things that are, are not *by him evidenced*) why may not he blameleſly be the *maintainer* of it? 3. Every ſuppoſed *Hereſie* is not ſo *criminous*, as that abomination of the *Gnoſticks* and *Cerinthus*; nor conſequently will it follow, that all that was certainly due to that, ſhall *without ſcruple of ſin* be heaped on this, though it were not really free from all *Hereſie*. But then 4. the incompetency of *S.W*'s *perſon*, in the *two* reſpects forementioned, is a further addition of a *double* bar againſt the *demonſtrativeneſs* of his deduction. And theſe are infirmities enough in one inference.

21. And yet on the back of that, he hath made haſte to faſten another, [*Wherefore unleſs D.*H. *makes his evidence good*, S.W. *may alſo juſtly retort on him the charge of Contumelioufneſs*,—] But 1. this *wherefore* hath no more poſſible force in it, than the *ground* on which it was built gave it, and that having no leſs than *four* failures in it, cannot communicate that ſtrength which it hath not. 2. In caſe I ſhould never *make my evidence good*, yet ſo long as that were imputable to any thing elſe, ſave to the weakneſs of my *Cauſe*, yet ſtill I were freed from this charge, though all elſe were granted, which he ſuppoſes. 3. If as I did not *make my evidence good*, ſo he did not evince it *bad*, (which yet certainly he hath not) there could yet be no place for his *Contumelies*, according to his own *grounds* of the dueneſs of them, nor conſequently for retortion of the charge of *Contumelioufneſs* on me, who may lawfully warn him of the *danger*, that but *ſeems* to incur the *guilt*, much more him that hath *really* incurr'd it, and cannot on his own (and thoſe inſufficient) grounds excuſe, or free himſelf from it. But then 4. I am now actually entered upon the task of *making my evidence good* againſt all he hath ſuggeſted to the *prejudice* thereof, and if herein I do not finally fail, I ſhall then have abundantly diſproved this inference alſo, though as yet I had not replied a word to it.

22. He hath yet a third Inference behind, that [*It were eaſie*, and he ſaith *as eaſie for* S. W. *uſing the Doctor's method, to gather out of Scripture all the vigorous words and ſevere execrations againſt the wicked, and then by his own voluntary explication and application, clap them all upon the Doctor; as for example, that of Curſe ye* Meroz, &c. *and then ſay, that by* Meroz *is meant ſuch as Ma.*H. *who writes againſt God's Church.*] This Conſequence depends upon a ſuppoſed exactneſs of proportion betwixt theſe *two* things; on one ſide the expreſs denunciation of St. *Paul* againſt the *Contumelious*, applied to a Writer of *Controverſies*, ſo far proved to be *contumelious*, as his own *confeſſion* of *twitching* by the *Beard*, allegorically underſtood, amounts to; and on the other ſide, all the *Curſes* of *Scripture*, not onely againſt *Meroz*, but againſt the *Wicked* indefinitely, *i.e.* all the wicked that are execrated in Scripture, clapt on the back of one that *S.W.* hath nothing to object to, but that he is pleaſed to affirm he *writes againſt God's Church*. To make good which Propoſition, 'tis neceſſary that whoſoever is by *S.W.* affirmed to write againſt *God's Church*, be, *eo ipſo*, proved to be as guilty of *all the wickedneſſes execrated in Scripture*, be they never ſo incompetible one with the other (*i.e.* to be an *Atheiſt*, a *Polytheiſt*, an *Idolater*, a *Church-Robber*, a *Necromancer*, and ſo on, to the end of the beadrol of the *blackeſt*, and withall moſt *contrary* ſins) as *Contumelies* caſt by *S.W.* upon D. *H.* are proved to be *Contumelies*. The proportionableneſs of which two Schemes, I muſt leave to thoſe brains of the now *grown wiſer World* (as he phraſes it) that are moſt *ſublimed* with the *Mathematicks*, to endeavour to demonſtrate, and till that be done, behold with ſome kind of *aſtoniſhment*, the admirable *diſcurſive*, and illative faculties of my unparallel'd Adverſary.

23. This is the ſum of *S.W*'s *firſt* Plea for Contumelies, which was therefore neceſſary to be attended and back'd with a *ſecond*, and that I acknowledge prudently choſen [*his diſclaiming in behalf of his Book, any ſuch language toward D.* H.] *Pag. 6.*

This indeed made good, will ſoon end theſe debates; onely it will declare the Authors great leiſure, and accuſe the foregoing Pages of great impertinency and improvidence, that they had not foreſeen this guard, but preferred the *ſenſuality* of an *harangue*, before the more *ſolid* comforts of *innocence*. As it is, let us now ſee, upon what grounds his temerarious confeſſion of *twitching by the Beard*, and the Readers falſly *foreſeen* charge of the *rude Blows*, are retracted, and called in, and ſo his *repentance*, ſuch as it was, ſoon *repented of*. Why, onely upon a more adviſed deſcription of a *Contumely*, which, ſaith *S.W.* [*notes ſome perſonal and moral fault in another*] and then he asks [*Did I note any in him?*]

24. Let us ſtay here a while, 1. A *Contumely* is defined or deſcribed by *noting ſome perſonal and moral fault in another*: To this I reply, That either this is a ſufficient deſcription of *Contumely*, or it is not: If it be not, then how can it be of uſe to prove that *S.W.* is not guilty of *Contumely*, by not falling under the parts, (one or both) of *this* deſcription, as long as there be others, omitted in this unſufficient enumeration, under ſome, or any of which, he may ſtill be chargeable to have fallen? But if it be avow'd to be a perfect and *ſufficient* deſcription, then I appeal to him or his Reader, in either part of it, 1. Whether all *Contumelies* note ſome *perſonal fault*? whether the calling one Baſtard be not *contumelious*? and whether that be a *perſonal fault* in him, that is, or is thought chargeable of it? So in like manner for the reproaching a Chriſtian, of any denomination, be it a *Jeſuit* or *Janſeniſt*, with the Crimes of any of his Party, whereof he is no otherwiſe guilty, than that he herds with many, that are guilty of it, whether this be the noting of ſomewhat *perſonal* in him, in whom it is not, and whether it be not *Contumely*? That this is my caſe with *S.W.* I am not bound to ſhew, whilſt my preſent buſineſs is onely to conſider the *inſufficiency* of his *deſcription* of *Contumely*. So again, 2. Whether the faults being *perſonal*, be obliged to be *moral* alſo? or elſe the *noting* of them be no *Contumely*? May not *intellectual* faults be the matter of *Contumely*? and ſure thoſe are not *moral*. Doth not Chriſt deſcribe *Contumely*, Mat. v. by *ſaying to thy brother, Racha, and thou Fool*? And is not *emptineſs* and *folly* an *intellectual*, no (neceſſarily) *moral fault*? Thus infallibly convincing is each of the two words of *S. W*'s deſcription of *Contumely*.

25. But then 2. When he asks, *Did I note any* (either *perſonal* or *moral* fault) *in him*? I take my turn alſo of asking, whether being *inſincere*, *blaſphemous*, *weak*, *ridiculous* (all which *S.W.* avows in the enſuing words, and ſaith, *It were madneſs to expect that he ſhould not ſhew them, where his Adverſary writ inſincerely*, &c. *i. e.* writ what he will thus accuſe of theſe Crimes) be neither *perſonal* nor *moral* faults? Is not *Weakneſs perſonal*, and *Blaſphemy moral* in the higheſt degree? But I ſhall not exagitate this any further, in relation to my own concernments, but from his [*did I note any in him?*] conclude (by the help of that Art, which hath as well taught me, that an *affirmative Queſtion* doth ſtrongly *deny*, as him, that *ridiculous things ought to be expreſt ironically*) that he utterly diſclaims having noted any ſuch: And if indeed he *P. 9. l. 9.*

hath

hath not noted any *perſonal* or *moral* fault in me, the Conſequence is natural, that either all his Charges affixt on me, that have formerly made up the *Bill of Fare*, and now filled the *Index of Schiſm diſpatcht* (to the number of 356. *beſide many more ſans nombre*, and among them *blaſphemies* and *calumnies*, and *falſe dealings*; and *omiſſions of neceſſary duty*) are neither *perſonal* nor *moral*, or at leaſt that thoſe that are *moral*, are not *perſonally* mine, or thoſe that are *perſonally mine*, are not *moral*; which when the Reader hath laid up in his memory, I hope *S. W*'s *Index* would not much inflame him, though I ſhould add never another word to demonſtrate, that there is not the leaſt appearance of truth in any one of thoſe numberleſs Charges, or other imaginable deſign of framing them, than that of the perſecuting heathen Emperour *Galerius*, who made a Law that Chriſtians ſhould be *infamous*, and then by another Law, any man might *deſpoil* them that would, there being no other *real* Crime in his Adverſary to deſerve the *rudeneſs of his Blows*, ſave onely that through that *rudeneſs* his Adverſary hath been *defamed* by him.

26. But 'tis poſſible he may mean ſomewhat elſe by *fault perſonal and moral*, than vulgar language (my onely Inſtructer) underſtands by them, for as clear as he is from noting either of theſe in me, he confeſſeth, that *as a Writer, I was his and the Churches Adverſary, and as ſuch it was irrational he ſhould ſpare me.*] But I demand, are not faults objected to a *Writer*, as a *Writer*, ſuppoſed to be *perſonal*, and may they not alſo be *moral faults*? if they be *blaſphemies*, *inſincerities*, and the like: If not (as his diſtinction implies) then I begin to diſcern the one way in the World to free *S. W.* from the guilt of *Contumelies*; His being a *Writer* may ſalve them from being *perſonal* or *moral* in him, as well as the imputing *blaſphemy* to me may, by my being conſidered *as a Writer*, be freed from noting in me any *perſonal and moral fault*. This is ſtill more of the refin'd faculty, of *diſtinguiſhing* betwixt the *Writer* and *himſelf*, not ſparing the one, and yet uſing no ſeverity to the other, telling the *Writer* of his *falſifications and blaſphemies*, without noting any thing *perſonal* or *moral* in him.

27. There is more added on this ſubtile Theme, to all which, I make no other return but this, that if *S. W.* could really have ſhewed one *blaſphemy* or *falſification* in all the Tract of *Schiſm*, he needed not ſo *induſtriouſly* have defamed it; His *Logick* would have ſerved his turn, without that which he calleth his *Rhetorick*; one ſolid proof of ſuch a Charge having much more force in it, than all his oſtentation of words hath. As for the *proportionableneſs of my deſerts to the exceſs of his expreſſions*, the trial muſt be in the due place, where particulars come to be examined; mean while, he muſt not *beg* the *principle*, and have the privileges of my *Judge*, while he is but my Adverſary.

Pag. 7. 28. But beyond expectation, I am in the next Paragraph appealed to, and *S. W.* undertakes the *Doctor ſhall inform the Reader, that all his pretended revilings are no other than the proper treaty, which Reaſon grants, Religion avoucheth, and the circumſtances make neceſſary.*] This is another *Magiſtery*; let's ſee what will be made of it. The words of mine, from whence this unexpected concluſion is drawn, are affirmed to be theſe: *The Doctor complains*, pag. 2. *That the publiſher of the Book hath ſolemnly annex'd a Liſt of the Contumelies, three and thirty pickt out by ſpecialty*, &c.] Upon which he ſtraight-way infers, *Since then theſe, as he ſays, are the ſpecial or chief Contumelies, not to trouble the Reader with the whole Roll, we will onely take notice of the firſt of them, which is this; How the Doctor of Divinity hath forgotten his Accidence.*] Thus far *S. W.* at his *Limbeck*, to draw Water out of a Flint, and to yield the Reader a large *Confeſſion* of mine, overthrowing all my Defences paſt and future at one daſh, out of plain words that ſignifie not a ſyllable toward it.

29. This could not be attempted without a conſpiration of many Artifices; let us view them orderly: 1. My words are mutilated, with an *&c.* which was probably meant to doe ſome ſmall ſervice, for if he had read out, my period had thus evidenced its own ſenſe, *He hath ſolemnly annext a Liſt of the Contumelies, 33 pickt out by ſpecialty out of the far greater number.* Here then I ſuppoſed and affirmed, that there were a *far greater number* than 33. and nothing hinders, but ſeveral of thoſe omitted, might be far greater than any that were ſet down in the *Publiſher's Liſt*, and I never informed him or the Reader, that there were not. For 2. that I ſay *theſe were the ſpecial or chief*, is abſolutely *impoſed* upon the Reader, who at the firſt caſt of his eye on my words, will diſcern 'tis *S. W.* not I, that ſays it. 3. That by *picking out theſe by ſpecialty*, I ſhould mean, though not *ſay*, that theſe were the *ſpecial*, as that word ſignifies the *chief* of them, is a great violence to the words, and as great to my ſenſe, of which thoſe were the Interpreters. To *pick out by ſpecialty*, I conceived to ſignifie, *chooſing* out ſo many particulars, and ſetting them down *diſtinctly* and *ſeverally*, as in common ſpeech it hath been familiar to my ears; And what if *ſpecial* oft ſignifies *chief*, that uſe of the adjective hath no influence on the (as common) uſe of *ſpecialty*. Had I meant as he would have me, I had certainly ſaid, *pickt out as the prime or ſpecial or principal*, but becauſe I meant not ſo, theſe were not my words, but others which to any that underſtands plain *Engliſh*, ſufficiently expreſt this my *other* meaning. 4. Of theſe 33. he will *inſtance onely in one*, and his onely pretended reaſon of doing ſo is, that *he may not trouble the Reader*. But he hath not been ſo tender of the *Readers trouble*, when he hoped for advantage thereby, and I can tell him another more uſeful, and ſo not improbable *reaſon* of his *reſervedneſs*; When that one is produced, he knows it is but *one*, and that there be 32. behind in that liſt, and many more not entered into that Catalogue, every of which is as contumelious as this one, and all together, by accumulation, much above 32 times as great, as this one by it ſelf is: And yet this *one* muſt be the *onely* meaſure, by which the whole matter muſt be judged, as if he that had ſtolen many more than 33. *prizes*, or committed as many acts of *drunkenneſs* or *fornication*, ſhould make a ſlight confeſſion of *one* of them, and then were preſently free from the guilt of *that*, and of all the *reſt* alſo. 5. This one, that is named, hath not a word ſaid in *defence*, or extenuation, or *excuſe* of it, either to ſhew that it is no *contumely*, or that there was the leaſt pretence of Juſtice in it (as in my *Anſwer to the Diſarmer*, I had ſhewed there was not, *Chap.* 3. *Sect.* 2.) which alone could have had any ſemblance of force to ſupport his pretended concluſion, that this was *no other than the proper Treaty that Reaſon grants, Religion avoucheth, and the Circumſtances make neceſſary.* Hence again we ſee what kind of inferences muſt be expected of theſe *Demonſtrators*, even no other, nor more *immediate*, than this, when examined and driven to the iſſue, [*The Doctor, ſaith the Publiſher, hath ſet down 33 ſeveral Contumelies of a far greater number, one of which* S. W. *be it never ſo unjuſt, hath had the confidence again to name, though not to ſay any thing in defence of it*, ergo, *the Doctor hath informed the Reader that* S. W. *hath uſed no other contumelioufneſs, but what Reaſon grants, Religion avoucheth, and the Circumſtances of the matter do* more than

juſtifie

justifie, even make *necessary* in him.] If this be not an essay of high *Chymistry*, I know not where to direct any young Student to seek for it.

30. And in the strength of this, he goes on in full triumph to the end of the Section, 1. Saying what he had said, over again, to the *Wits of the University*, then 2. framing a *dilemma* to demonstrate it *charity in him to shew me my greatest faults*. And 3. by long beating about the bush, discovering at last, that my producing St. *Paul*'s *words against him*, concludes me the *greater Railer of the two*, and to this the *Puritanical Dame cudgelling her Maid in Scripture Phrase*,] is resolved to be appliable. *Lastly*, objecting to me, that *I flatly accuse him of falsifications, calumnies certainly, if not avouched*. To all, and first to the *first* of these, I reply, that I have replied already, when the same thing was said, though not addressed to the *Wits*, and though he seek advantage by repeating in another mode, I need it not, and therefore do not seek it. To the second, That his *Dilemma* takes for granted my *Pernicious Errours*, and confounds *Discovering of Errours* with *Contumelies*; whereas 1. I have already shewed him, that *Contumelies* are not the proper Glasses to *discover Errours*, be they never so *Pernicious*; nor ordinarily made use of by such Artists as *S.W.* but when the *Errours* are so far removed from vulgur sight, that they may well pass for *invisible*. 2. That he is not a competent Judge in this matter; Let his Reader by the direction and conviction of his *Logick* discern the *Errour* and not be born down with his *noises*. And 3. That whether there be any one such *Errour* duly noted by him, is the main question still, as confidently denied by me, as pretended by him; and as it must not be granted him for supposing it, so much less by it can any thing else be justified, that he shall unduly build upon it. To the third, 1. That producing St. *Paul*'s plain words against a sin, is far from *railing* at all, farther yet, from *exceeding him* in that language. 2. That for the parallel of his *Dame*, which is his (onely *rhetorical*) argument to prove it, it is of no force, because though I should allow the parallel to hold in one part, between St. *Paul*'s *words* produced on one side, and *Scripture phrase* on the other (which yet till I know what that *phrase* was which the *Dame* used, but *S.W.* hath not recited from her *Lecture*, I am not obliged to do) yet still the question remains, what parallel will be found for the *Cudgel*, wherein surely all the weight of the *simile* and the *Dames severity* consisted, and not in the *Scripture phrase*: To the last, That when it appears that I have accused him of *falsifying*, if I do not render a reasonable account of it, I will, as he requires, confess, and make satisfaction for the *Calumny*; but as yet he hath not directed me to the place, and my memory suggests it not; and therefore I discern not my self to be under any further present obligation. Onely I shall demand, who it is, whom he can think it possible I should have accused of *falsifying?* Is *S.W.* the name of any man, or be there any Laws of *Brachigraphie*, by which those Letters are authorized to signifie any more than *N.N.* are wont to doe? Is any person living vulgarly known, or called by that name? If not, 'tis not onely not *true*, but not *possible*, that in answering *N. N.* or *S.W.* I have *calumniated* any man.

31. And thus at length we are at an end of the *first* Section, which coming to recapitulate in the beginning of the *second*, he avoucheth to have contained *ordinary considerations, and obvious to common sense* (with what truth, hath now been examined) *letting the Reader see, that this manner of writing is very rational*, but that not absolutely, but on a double condition, *if the Cause deserve any zeal, and the truth of the thing makes good what is said*. But we have seen the bottom of these two conditions, and found 1. That though the Cause were granted to *deserve zeal*, it must yet disclaim *Contumely*, for so every true *Christian* Cause doth. 2. That the truth between Disputants is to be contested, not *supposed*. 3. That the truth of a Proposition is no competent *commission*, or *authority* for (and so cannot make good) a *Contumely*.

SECT. II.

The pretended necessity of this course, in writing Controversies, founded on the certainty of his Faith. Begging the Question. Examples of Jude, *the Fathers*, Elias, *answered. Pretence of Charity. Meekness accused of Inconfidence. The uncertainty of Protestants Faith said to be confessed. Their Vertues, their special Charge. His Praises and Rebukes, using of Greek and Testimonies.*

1. HIs second Section is yet of severer concernment, *recommended to the attentive consideration of the Reader*, and undertakes to prove upon a *fundamental ground* (as if every *ground* were not *fundamental*) that *this kind of writing*, which I have hitherto accused in him, and he laboured to vindicate, is (not blameless, but) *necessary in controversies about Faith, against the deemed adversaries thereof*, and this ground of that necessity no other than the *certainty of Faith it self*, which *certainly* is founded in his way of *universal Tradition*.] And then ere we proceed any further, what will become of all *Catholick* Writers, dead and living, which having not *S.W.*'s faculties, or temper, or being not aware of this *necessity*, have not so much as endeavoured to attain to this height of *bitter zeal*, which now appears to have been their duty? In this matter I must not admonish him of the other as severe denunciations of *Scripture*, against those, *who add to the Word of God*, or *teach for doctrines the commandments of men* (which certainly he will be guilty of, who teaches and undertakes to demonstrate that to be *necessary* which God hath never made so, especially if it be that which God hath forbidden, as he hath *all bitterness and evil-speaking Eph.* iv. 31. commanding *kindness, tender-heartedness, &c.* v. 32.) for I see he is fortified against such impressions, and the improsperous attempt will but exasperate, and conclude me again the *greatest Railer*. Wherefore I shall onely demand, whether since all Christian duties, *Righteousness* and *Temperance, &c.* are eminent branches of the *Christian Faith*, as well as believing the *Judgment to come, &c.* the acknowledging this his method to be *necessary*, and so Duty, be any part of that *certain Faith* that hath this *universal testification*; whether all the *Catholick World*, if but for these last ten years, have said, *they received from their forefathers as received from theirs*, that *Contumelies* are *necessary* to a *Catholick* Writer of *Controversies*; for otherwise I hope, be the *Faith* never so *certain*, the means to propagate or propugn it, may be those prescribed by St. *Paul* to Bishop *Timothy, gentleness, readiness to teach, patience, in meekness instructing those that oppose themselves*, and so not *contumely*, which is contrary to these. And let him not in his Answer 2 Tim. 2. 24, 25.

deal

deal with me, as Mr. *White* doth with *Monſieur Dallee*, p. 221. rebuking him for asking from St. *Jerom*, *Whether it be a part of Faith to viſit the Holy Land, as if* (ſaith he) *& adoraſſe ubi ſteterunt pedes Domini pars fidei eſt,*] *ſignified truly that to exerciſe Adoration were an Article of Faith, than which what can be ſpoken more ſenſleſly, whereas,* ſaith he, *the true meaning is, that 'tis a duty of Faith.*] Where truly, I ſhould have conceived, that a *duty of Faith* was a *part of Faith*, though not ſuch as we vulgarly call *Articles*, and ſo I ſuppoſe now, and ask of a *Duty*, not an *Article*, whether it have this *univerſal* teſtification, which all are ſuppoſed to have, which are truly *Duties*, as well as thoſe which are *Articles of Faith*. This therefore I may be allowed to have ask'd in paſſing, becauſe this Section is ſuch, as will not afford any ſtore of matter for debate, how demurely ſoever he hath offered and recommended it to our *attentive conſiderations*.

2. I ſhall ſhortly reduce it to theſe Heads, concerning 1. The *deemed or believed certainty of* S. W's *Faith*. 2. The one ground of that, *Univerſal Tradition*, together with the notion in which he underſtands that phraſe. 3. The duty conſequent to this, of *uſing the means and ways, which Wit and Art can invent to confute, and diſcredit his adverſaries harmful Sophiſtry, and diſparage his authority, as far as truth can juſtifie his words*. 4. The deemed *uncertainty of their Faith*, who rely on any other but this one deemed *certain Rule*, together with the obligation incumbent on them, and ariſing from the *deemed uncertainty of their Faith, to write without any great zeal, heat, or earneſtneſs, which in them*, ſaith he, *can ariſe from nothing but Paſſion and Intereſt*. 5. What he hath thought fit to add concerning my perſon, abſtracted from the Cauſe.

3. For the *firſt* of theſe, he is careful himſelf to propoſe it under that cautious ſtile of *deemed certainty*, foreſeeing, as he ſaith, that elſe the *Doctor would miſtake him (as his cuſtom is) to beg the queſtion, by ſuppoſing their Faith certain*.] But to this I make my demands, 1. Whether it be indeed, or poſſibly could be a *miſtake* in the Doctor, contending with *S. W.* concerning the truth of his Faith, to affirm that his *ſuppoſing his Faith certain, is the begging of the queſtion?* Might he not as well have ſaid that the Doctor was apt (as his cuſtom is) to *miſtake* in affirming twice two to be four? For is not the *ſuppoſing that certain*, of which the *queſtion* is, whether it be *true*, as evidently the *begging the queſtion*, as it is evident, that what is *certain*, is *true*, and more than *true*, *true* with the advantage of *certainty?* And is any *common notion*, or any *axiom*, or concluſion in the *Mathematicks* more evident than that? What ſemblance of truth then is there in ſuggeſting, or intimating this to be a miſtake in the Doctor? or how can *his Art*, as he ſaith, *bear him out* in thus ſuggeſting. 2. Doth *S. W.* mean to keep himſelf preciſely from the guilt of this fallacy for the future? Is he ſo ſenſible of the unskilfulneſs of it, as ſeriouſly to diſclaim having any more to doe with it? Nay, hath he indeed by this early caution ſhut it out of *this Section*? or is it ſufficient to foreſee crimes, and then preſently to ruſh into them? 'Tis the *begging of the queſtion* for him to *ſuppoſe his Faith certain*; and is it not ſo alſo, to ſuppoſe *Contumelies* a lawful means to defend a *deemed truth*, at the very time when we are in the debate, whether *ſuch* means are not utterly *unlawfull?* This certainly he ſuppoſes at this time, for elſe it is not imaginable how the *deemed certainty of his Faith* ſhould found a *neceſſity of his Contumelies*. That which is in it ſelf *lawfull*, may by *circumſtances* become *neceſſary* to ſome man, and ſo to *S. W.* but if it be in it ſelf unlawfull, neither the *deemed* nor *real certainty* of their *Faith* can make it *lawfull*, much leſs *neceſſary*. This then of its *lawfulneſs*, which cannot be founded in his *deemed certainty*, nor is endeavoured here to be inferred either by that, or by any other *medium*, and yet is neceſſary to be ſuppoſed in that diſcourſe, where the *neceſſity* is inferred from ſome *circumſtances*, is no other than the *begging* of the *queſtion*; for no doubt that is ſaid to be *begg'd*, which is *ſuppoſed*, without all attempt of proof. And ſo viſibly here is the *lawfulneſs*, though not the *neceſſity*, which yet alſo is uncapable of any ſolid proof, till the lawfulneſs be firſt proved. This is therefore that which I now charge as guilty of this fallacy (and not the *deeming his Faith certain*) at the time when he ſo ſolicitouſly averts it. And this is all I need ſay to the firſt point, his *deemed certainty*, being in charity as well as civility ready to allow him to *deem* or *believe* (whatſoever his grounds are) whatſoever he affirms himſelf to *deem* or believe. And I hope he will anon do as much for me, who believe my *Faith as certain*, as he can his, and have one ground more to believe it, (as anon will appear) than I ſee he means to have.

3. To the ſecond Head alſo, the *one ground*, on which he is pleaſed to build his *deemed certainty*, that of *Univerſal Tradition*, together with the notion in which he underſtands that phraſe, the ſame which the Author of, and *Apologiſt for* Ruſhworth's *Dialogues* hath of it, I have nothing to object in this place, knowing *de facto* that this *is* his *ground*, and allowing it as fit to ſupport his *deemed certainty*, whilſt 'tis no more than *deemed*, as any other *medium* could be; for as long as he is granted to *deem* it, it matters not to our preſent debate, on what *grounds* he *deems* it. And indeed, having firſt profeſs'd that he ſpeaks now onely of a *deemed certainty*, 'twas not needfull to add at the ſame time upon what *grounds* he built it, the *deeming* being the *onely* thing, on which the reaſon (inſiſted on in this Section) was founded, and not the *real*, or grounded *certainty*. What therefore he hath for ſeveral Pages enlarged on this Theme of the *grounds* of his *deemed certainty*, I ſhould think inſerted by another hand, and not by him that was ſo carefull to profeſs that he ſpake onely of a *deemed certainty*, but that it is poſſible it might have another deſign, the *amuſing* of the *Reader*, and the ſupplying ſome other *vacuity* in this reaſoning, or the drawing of his Adverſary from the point in hand, to this other, wherein *S. W.* *deemed* himſelf more converſant; which motives have not prevailed on me ſo far to gratifie him in this place, (having allow'd another fitter ſeaſon for it, in my next Chapter) as to forget my preſent Theme, and follow him through his whole Field of *Tradition*, ſo wide and diſtant from it, and wherein ſo few others beſide himſelf will be concerned, himſelf having here told me, that *few there are who have refined their underſtanding to this degree of diſcerningneſs, and that onely the beſt* (which in his opinion are not the greateſt) *ſort of Wits do as yet begin to own their reaſon ſo far*.

4. For the third then (which alone is pertinent to the Argument in hand) the *neceſſity*, and ſo *duty* conſequent to this *deemed certainty, of uſing the means and ways which Wit and Art can invent to confute and diſcredit his Adverſary's harmfull Sophiſtry, and diſparage his authority, as far as truth can juſtifie his words*.] I ſhall bring it to a ſpeedy iſſue by asking, Of what latitude is that phraſe [*the means and ways that Wit or Art can invent?*] Is it deſigned to take in, or not exclude *all* manner of means and ways, that the moſt

riotous

riotous Wit, or *forbidden Arts* can invent, or that the tropes of *Rhetorick*, or good managery of words (be they never so *contumelious*) can yield toward the mentioned end, that of *discrediting the adversary*, &c. onely with that *one* restraint as *far as truth can justifie his words?* or is it no further to be enlarged, than all other *Christian rules*, as well as that one of truth, *permit* one private man to treat another? If he take it in the second sense, I grant it, and he hath gained nothing by it, for I willingly yield him the freest exercise of the *nimblest wit*, and all *lawfull arts*, to *discover*, and so *discredit* any weakness in my defences, but think not a multitude of *contumelies* to be any of those *lawfull*, no nor so much as proper means toward that end, being onely a *cloud* cast before the eyes of the Reader, to hinder his discerning any difference betwixt true, and pretended discoveries, betwixt *boasts* and *victories*. But if his indefinite words [*the means and ways*] must be more largely extended in the first sense, I then deny that the greatest *justice of a cause*, be it a *deemed*, or a *real certainty*, can convert any the least or greatest *sin* into *duty*, *christianize* or consecrate *Contumely*, though it should not have *Calumny* joined with it: and I hope I shall have no need of proving what is thus obvious, when the more excellent the cause is, the more it abhors and deems it self defamed and polluted by whatever *unlawfull* arts, and can no more justifie any one of them, than either want, or be gratified with them; *Si malo religionem defendere velis, jam non defendetur illo, sed polluetur, atque violabitur*, saith *Lactantius*. *If you will defend Religion by any thing that is evil, you shall not defend, but pollute and violate it.* Should I endeavour to assist this evident truth, it would by others, as well as *S. W.* be called *preaching*.

5. This ambiguity then of his words being removed, there remains no kind of difficulty in the whole Section, as far as concerns the *argumentative* part, the *conclusion* which the *deemed certainty of his Faith* was obliged and undertook to infer; the whole question being, not whether any, or all *lawfull arts* are to be used, but whether the *cause*, whatsoever, or how *certain* soever it be *deemed* to be, can render any one *unlawfull* means, by name *Contumely*, *lawfull*; which unless it can, 'tis certain it cannot on this account become *necessary*. Here then the one condition of restraint which he takes care to add [as *far as truth can justifie his words*, and *If his adversary be found to deserve it, and the like*] will avail him nothing. 1. Because he is not the judge of the *truth* of that which he endeavours to disprove, nor of the *deserts* of him whom he thinks himself *obliged to disparage*. The Disputant must prove, and the Repliant defend, but neither assume the office of *judging*, but leave that to the Reader onely, and till that judgment be past, 'tis not yet his time to deal with his Adversary as his *captive*, to lead him in triumph, to represent him as he saith, *ridiculous*, *nonsensical*, *weak*, *blasphemous*, &c. every of which, as far as they want in *truth*, abound in *calumny*, and must not be *supposed* to have truth, whilst they are *contested* to have none, and no judgment is yet pass'd between the litigants, but what one of them, who must be supposed *partial*, gives in his own favour. Nor will the *deemed certainty of his own Faith* (the one medium of this Section) herein assist him, 1. Because a *deemed certainty* infers not a *real truth*, and to suppose that without proof in time of arguing, is the *begging of the question*. 2. Because the, whether *deemed*, or *real*, *certainty of his Faith*, concludes not the truth of every discourse which he can make use of, to demonstrate that *certainty*; Truth hath oft-times been ill defended, and so still, notwithstanding the *certainty* in the main, the weakness in the retail may be as probably on his side, who chargeth his adversary of weakness, and in some respects more probably, on this prejudice, that he already appears so *weak*, as to mistake his business, to flie to indirect means, to endeavour to forestall the Readers judgment, to vaunt of his feats, all which are the effects and known symptoms of *weakness*.

5. *Secondly*, as I said, this restraint pretends onely to guard him from *calumny*, and there be other sins of the tongue and pen beside that. He knows, I must instance in *Contumely*, for though every *Calumny* be a *Contumely* also, and most *Contumelies* have somewhat of falsity, and so *calumny* in them, and I doubt not to prove, that every one which I have received from *S.W.* is of this sort, yet I have that respect to ordinary stile, and that reverence to our Saviour, *Mat.* 5. 21, 22. who refers *Contumelies* [*Racha*, and *thou Fool*] to the *sixth* Commandment of the *Decalogue*, as to discriminate them from *calumnies*, which undoubtedly are forbidden in the *ninth*. And indeed he that shall bestow either of those titles on his fellow-Christian, and then add, that he hath *said no more than is truth*, or *than he deserves*, is so far from lessening, that he cannot use any surer means to inhance and multiply the *Contumely*. Thus far is *S.W*'s one restraint from justifying the practices, which his *wit* or *art* have suggested to him.

6. As for his examples of *Jude* to the *Gnosticks*, of the *Fathers* to *Porphyrie* the enemy and derider of *Christianity*, and *Elias*'s *scoffing the Priests of Baal*] 1. The *deemed certainty of his Faith*, the one medium in his present argument, is not sufficient to complete the parallel between them and me; the utmost that principle can assist or authorize him to deem of me, is, that I deny some few things to be true, which he *deems certain*, but neither that I deifie *Simon Magus*, nor *deny Christ to have come in the flesh*, nor *offer sacrifice to Idols*, nor join with the *Jews* to persecute the *Christians*, nor *forbid marriage*, and set up unnatural Lust instead of it, nor professedly maintain *Heathenism*, nor the worship of *Baalim* or dead *Heroes*, nor any thing which he can deem equivalent to all or any of these, which consequently are necessary to make good his *parallels*. Neither 2. will that or any other imaginable medium make that lawful to him, which was lawful to *Jude*, or the *Fathers*, or *Elias*, the first being an Apostle, the third a Prophet, and such as whose *Spirit* was interdicted the *Disciples of Christ*, the second *Governours* of the *Church*, in none of which capacities I discern *S.W.* to be placed over me, nor consequently to be commissionated or privileged to doe whatsoever they did; if he were, the *fire from heaven*, and the fate of the *Priests of Baal*, might soon become mine, and be by the same art of concluding *ab exemplo*, justified also.

7. On this Head comes in one auxiliary more, the pretence of *charity to undeceive my adherents, and preserve others from a certain believed danger, and that the greatest of dangers, eternal damnation.*] Thus hath *Gregory Nazianzen* long since told us, that *Christian Religion* was the μῆλον ἔριδος, *apple of contention*, and the pretence to enhanse it, ὅτι οἱ λίαν φιλόθεοι καὶ φιλόχριστοι, that some men were *vehement lovers of Christ, of God.* But neither will *charity* justifie the doing of any ill, on the most *charitative* intuitions, or make that *necessary* which is not *lawfull*; On the other side, what shall otherwise be approved to be lawfull, is already freely allowed him to exercise his gifts in, upon the bare pretence of his *deemed certainty*; and so sure the consideration of *charity* might here have been spared, and being used, doth gain him nothing. Especially when 'tis considered that my *adherents* (as he will call them, to whom he aims the first

fruits of his *charity*) profeſs to have never the worſe opinion of a cauſe, that 'tis perſecuted with the *Sword*, and therefore are not in much danger to be diſheartened with the meeker dangers of the *tongue* or pen, by ſeeing ſome *ſcoffs* and *contumelies* fall upon it; having learnt from our Saviour, *Mat.* 5. 11. whilſt he was in *preaching* (but I hope not to be ſcofft at for it) *that they are happy which are reviled, as well as perſecuted falſly for his ſake.* We ſee then what this grand argument pompouſly introduced, by being recommended to the *attentive conſideration of the Reader*, and fetcht from the *deemed certainty of his Faith*, amounts to, even the gaining him that which was willingly yielded him before, the uſe of all *lawfull* means to ſupport that *deemed certainty*, but not the authorizing *unlawfull*, or making that *neceſſary*, which was, *ſub lite*, depending, whether it were *lawfull* or no, and could not be proved to be ſo by that argument, whoſe whole force was founded in ſuppoſing it.

* *Pag.* 12. 8. And then what heed is due to his concluſion from hence, that **though* S.W. *may perhaps be blamed for holding his Faith certain, yet he is inculpable for proceeding conſequently to the former tenet.*] and again, *He who holds ill principles, is blamable indeed in that regard, but yet he is worthy of praiſe for proceeding conſequently upon them, ſince to deduce conſequences aright is very laudable.*] As if he had ſaid, He that is fallen into one abſurdity, is not onely to be excuſed, but *commended* for heaping the thouſand more upon the back of it, he that is once out of the way, doth very well to go on in the Road before him, though it lead him into hell; he that is once drunk, is to be reproved for that, but that Lecture being over, he is to be praiſed and ſo *rewarded* for all the Oaths, or Rage, or Murther, or Incontinence, which *that*, by a chain of conſequences, one after another, very regularly leads him to. I had thought that the one thing, which ſuch a man could doe laudably, was to unlearn his ill principle, to get to be rightly informed, and the next to that, or the moſt tolerably ill, to ſit ſtill, and act nothing upon it: Nor indeed did I ever learn, that *deducing of conſequences*, though it were not of one vice or errour from another, would preſently be of the number of things very *laudable*, for ſuch is nothing but what is *morally good*, and very good. And no doubt ſuch the nature of the conſequential diſcourſe may be, as the *picking of thrums ends*, (to which he compares the producing of teſtimonies) may be an employment as highly dignified; and praiſe-worthy as that, and yet the deducing of a *conſequential ill practice* from an *ill principle*, be ſtill leſs *laudable*, becauſe more blameworthy than that.

Pag. 15. 9. One thing more he after reverts to caſt in on this Head, that it *belongs to the Catholick who holds his Faith certain, to manifeſt the contrary to be perfectly abſurd, and non-ſenſe, and ſince the knowledge of this muſt in his grounds be held ſo neceſſary for the ſalvation of man-kind, he ought in plain terms let men know it is ſuch, otherwiſe he breeds a juſt apprehenſion in his Readers, that the contrary (elſe why ſhould he proceed ſo reſervedly) may have ſome degree of probability* —] In this place I might ask, whether the *Archangel* wanted *confidence in the infallible certainty of his cauſe*, when he refuſed to *bring any railing accuſation againſt the Devil*, as S. *Jude* aſſures us he did. But my reply to this his reaſoning will be ſufficient, if inſtead of asking more, I onely anſwer his one queſtion in the parentheſis [*elſe why ſhould he proceed ſo reſervedly?*] by telling him that there are other very pregnant reaſons of that kind of *reſervedneſs* we now ſpeak of (which conſiſts, as the *Archangels* did, onely in abſtaining from all *contumely* as well as *calumny*) beſide the *want of certainty in his Faith*, or the *apprehenſion that the contrary is in any degree probable.* As 1. a conſcientious regard to the precepts of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, which expreſly forbid *contumely*, and of which we have oft minded him. 2. A well-grounded opinion, that truth is able to propugn and evidence it ſelf by its own light, and wants not (as he imagines) *plain terms*, as thoſe ſignifie *revilings* of his adverſary, to *let men know it is ſuch.* 3. The daily experience, that reaſon is moſt expedite in its motion to any ſober diſpaſſionate mind, when it comes like *David* with the *Staff in the hand*, and the *five ſmooth ſtones*, and is not incumbred with *Saul's Armour*: And 4. an apprehenſion of that which is moſt obvious, that *ruffling* will not be interpreted ſolid *confidence*, but rather conſciouſneſs of weakneſs, as we know, he that *dares* fight, will ſeldom give any *ill words*, the *tongue* being not oft called in to the aſſiſtance, but to divert, and ſupply the place of the *hands*; and *laſtly*, a dependance on God in his own way, that the means which he hath directed us to, will in fine be moſt ſucceſsful; which till *S.W.* hath choſen to make uſe of, he can have no experience of the force of them, and conſequently muſt judge as Worldlings do, that *charity* and *liberality*, added to obſervation of ſtricteſt rules of *juſtice*, will never tend to the enriching, but impoveriſhing, and upon that account continue to apply himſelf to thoſe onely means, to ſupport his Faith, which are moſt proper to betray it. And this is all the advantage I mean to take (and not that other which he was willing to foreſee) in that Paragraph. And thus we have the upſhot of what he hath caſt in on the *third* Head for the aſſiſting his grand argument.

Pag. 14. 10. Fourthly, for the *deemed uncertainty of our Faith*, and the *obligation to write without any great zeal, heat or earneſtneſs*, —] which he here inſiſts on, I reply, 1. That his words of *Proteſtants* [*that they confeſs their Faith fallible*, i.e. *ſuch as may poſſibly be otherwiſe for any thing they know*] are either very equivocal in the phraſe [*for any thing they know*] or in the word *Proteſtants*, and ſo belong to other men, whoſe words I aſſume not to defend, or being ſingly underſtood of me, and thoſe whom I undertake to vindicate, and of a *confeſſed uncertainty*, and *fallibility of our faith*, are far removed from all degree, or appearance of truth. For this I appeal to expreſs words in my *Anſwer to Schiſm Diſarm'd*, p. 36. l. 2. *He that is in many things fallible — may yet infallibly know or believe ſome one or more other things*, (In this number I profeſs to contain *all* matters of our *Chriſtian Faith*) *either by his own ſenſes, or by the teſtimony of others, founded in their ſeveral ſenſations, which being faithfully conveighed to us by undeniable Tradition, ſupply the place of an* ἐνάργεια, *are as unqueſtionably certain, as what we have ſeen our ſelves.* And again lin. 8. *I know infallibly that I now write, --and the ſame I affirm of all other matters of Fact, teſtified by my own ſenſes, or by univerſal unqueſtionable Tradition, for that is founded in the repeated ſenſations of ſo many other men, which being communicated and ſufficiently teſtified to me, I have no more reaſon to doubt of, than of my own ſenſations.* And of *this ſort is the Tradition of the Univerſal Primitive Church, concerning the Apoſtles delivering ſome Doctrines* (here again I profeſs to mean our *whole Chriſtian Faith*) *and ſome Books* (*viz.* all the *Canonical Books of the New Teſtament*) &c. With what ſemblance of truth then can I be told, in a Reply to this very Book, where I have thus profeſt the *infallible certainty of our Faith*, that *Proteſtants confeſs their faith fallible*, i.e. *ſuch as may poſſibly be otherwiſe for any thing they know.*] Can this be ſuggeſted of thoſe things, which I ſay are as *unqueſtionable as what I have ſeen my ſelf, and that I know them infallibly?* Is this dealing tolerable in a plain matter of *fact* (for ſo

it

it is, that we, of whom I am one, and that Book, acknowledged to be mine, *confeſs our Faith fallible*) and can the *deemed certainty of his Faith* ſupport this part of his *earneſtneſs* of affirming what is quite contrary to his *own* eyes as well as mine? If ſo, then I profeſs to allow him the incloſure of ſuch kind of *zeal* as this, for I hope I ſhall never, whilſt I am in my right wits, make uſe of it: If I would, I ſhould have cut this whole Section of his ſhort, by denying the *ground* of it, not onely the *certainty of his Faith* but even his *deeming it certain*, for this is his dealing with me, contrary to what was viſible to him.

11. I cannot pertinently inſiſt longer on this Theme of *the certainty of our Faith* in this place, to which it is ſo unſuitable, and then there is is no more needfull to be added on this fourth Head, but that if *deemed certainty* of *our Faith* would ſupport, or authorize *Contumely*, I were alſo commiſſionated to make uſe of ſuch gifts, and might be as *bitter* as he; but 1. I am as confident it cannot, as *Scripture* (which is the ground of my *Faith*, as well as *Tradition*, and I hope *written* and *unwritten Tradition* both, will amount to as much as one of them, without the other) or any other ground of *credibility* which the matter is capable of, can afford me. And 2. (beſides many other motives) I profeſs to think I have no *need* of ſuch auxiliaries, and that is with me as prevailing an argument againſt, as his pretended *neceſſity* is to him for the uſe of them.

12. One thing onely I ſhall further note on this Head of diſcourſe; Otherwhiles as the *Romaniſt* can project advantages to his Cauſe from the Proteſtants *charitable* perſuaſion of them, whilſt they cannot afford any like return to us, and by this their Proſelytes are obliged to be averted from us, as from thoſe who can yield them no degree of ſafety, and to adhere confidently to them, who are not by Proteſtants denied it; On another occaſion the *Roman* is preſumed to be the *Onely infallible Church*, becauſe no other doth (*i. e.* is ſo *aſſuming*, or ſelf-opinionate, as to) pretend to that *vaſt* title. And now it ſeems *Proteſtants* are obliged to be meek, and the *Romaniſts* as much obliged to be *zealous and earneſt*, which are *S.W.*'s ſtile for the *rude Blows*, and ſo ſignifie *Contumely*. From theſe three all the concluſion I can make, is this, that we *Proteſtants* are willingly allowed the exerciſe of the greateſt *Moral* and *Chriſtian* Vertues, ſuch are *ingenuity*, and *meekneſs*, and *charity*, and the *Romaniſt* muſt have the incloſure of the *contrary*, and pretend *neceſſity* and *obligation of zeal* for all three, and if this be it, 'tis not hard to foreſee who will be the greateſt loſer by ſuch advantages.

13. *Laſtly*, for his page and half of my praiſes, he will allow me the modeſty not to make any more particular recitations of, or reply to them than this, that *Tertullian* hath long ſince told me of the Votaries of *Saturn*, who though in their *zeal* (and that alſo founded in the *deemed certainty of their Faith*) they were ſo cruel, as to expoſe and ſlaughter their moſt blameleſs Infants, yet at the ſame time they * *ſtroked* and *flattered them*, that they might not be *ſacrificed weeping*; and the like muſt I look on in *S. W.* not as an effect of his *tenderneſs* (which he thinks himſelf *obliged* to diſclaim) but of his care of averting *ill omens*, or ſome other ſuch like conſideration, on account of which, and in compliance with his deſign, I am chearfully to ſupport, and take in good part whatſoever afterward falls upon me, from the *neceſſity* of his *zeal* and *devotion*, as that is but conſequent to the *deemed certainty* of his *Faith*. And I am reſolved to doe it, having one motive more to it, beſide his commendations, *viz.* this very advertiſement of his, that 'tis *the deemed certainty of his Cauſe* a thing which I can no way help or be anſwerable for, either in it ſelf, or its conſequences) which, as he * ſaith, *concludes me certainly pernicious*, and upon † which he *doubts not to affirm that it is moſt perfect non-ſenſe, to think all the teſtimonies in my Book can bear ſo much as a ſhew of probability, if compared with that clear evidence* he deems to *ſhine in the other*. For by this I am aſſured that all the reproaches that fall upon me, are *deſerved* (and ſo ought not to be complained of) yet not by me *perſonally*, or by any avoidable miſadventure of mine, in the retail, but onely in the *general*, and the *groſs*, becauſe I am not of *S.W.*'s *Faith* in all things, from which grand comprehenſive *original* guilt, as from my *deſtiny*, and not from mine own ſuperadded miſcarriages, I am to derive all my calamities, the ſharpeſt effects of his diſpleaſure. And with this comfort his ſecond *Section*, and the purſuit of the grand argument of it, hath furniſhed me, and ſo reſolving to continue my good humour, in deſpight of his other diſcouragements, I ſhall haſten to take my leave of it.

* *Infantibus blandiebantur, ne immolarentur lachrymantes.* Apol. c. 9.

* *Pag.* 20.
† *Pag.* 17.

13. Yet before I do ſo, I am a little concerned to take notice of his more than *oblique* intimation (leſt I ſhould be too inſolent on his *praiſes*) 1. Of my *too much vanity in uſing of Greek on all, or rather no occaſion.* And 2. my *chief and almoſt onely talent lying in the way of teſtimonies.* Of both theſe I ſhall give the Reader and him this ſhort account. 1. That of citing *Greek* Authors in the language wherein they wrote, or uſing a *Greek* word or phraſe, which appeared moſt expreſſive, I never heard any man till now, admoniſhed, as of a fault, but by thoſe Readers which profeſſed their want of skill in that *Language*; and for the ſake of ſuch, I have been carefull ſo far to *tranſlate*, or otherwiſe to ſupply that want, as to leave them no juſt occaſion of *complaint*, or cauſe of *interruption*. And then for the *vanity*, poſſibly adherent to this, as to other *lawfull* and *prudentially* choſen actions, if I ever were guilty of any degree of it, I ſhall now ſure be effectually cured by *S. W.* who aſſures me, how far I ſhould be miſtaken, if I projected any mans *praiſes* by this means; and that on the contrary, I hereby give my *Readers a fair title to ſuſpect me either of too much vanity in that, or emptineſs in other knowledges.* And truly I ſhall not ſo far heed, as *ſtudiouſly* to avert the *Readers* ſuſpicion of either of theſe (though if *S.W.*'s authority were of force, I might have thus much to plead, that 'tis no more liable to the *ſuſpicion* of *vanity* in me to *uſe Greek*, than in him to ſay he *much loves it*, and *thinks it a great ornament to a Scholar*, for he that were jealouſly diſpoſed, would have temptation to ſuſpect, that he that thus ſaid, either had or deſired to *ſeem* to have a liberal portion of it; and I hope *S.W.* will *thank* me, that I make not this *concluſion*) but expect from him that *juſtice* for the future, that when I do uſe *Greek*, it ſhall be thought I am not a *Platonick Lover* of being eſteemed *vain* and *empty*, and therefore that I have ſome (with me prevailing) *reaſon*, that moves me thus far to *deny my ſelf*, and contemn my *reputation*, rather than omit to doe that which is moſt for the *Readers* profit, in my opinion. I know no poſſible way of ſuperſeding this *concluſion*, but by ſurmiſing that *S.W.* was not the reporter of any other mens ſenſe, but his own, and that his *judgment* bears not much weight with any. But I ſuppoſe he hath a better opinion of himſelf, than to ſuſpect himſelf liable to ſuch *ſurmiſes*.

14. *Secondly*, Then for the way of *Teſtimonies*, I muſt not avert or diſclaim it, or be troubled that my adverſary acknowledges *my chief talent to lie that way.* For as long as matter of *Faith* is founded not in

natural reason, but *divine Revelation*, and consequently is not determinable from *common notions*, like Problems in the *Mathematicks*, (neither hath any such close connexion with them, as that it can duly be
* *Apol. for Trad.* p. 11. said, what yet * Mr. *White* hath adventured to say, that *God must of necessity pitch upon this or this way*, resolving that *if God hath not already taken this course, certainly he should have done it*) but depends wholly on the evidence of its *delivery* from *Christ*, and his *Apostles*, and so is establish'd either by *Scripture*, or by *Oral Tradition* of the *Apostles*, or by both (and the latter of these is most surely conveyed to us at this distance, by the *writings* of those which dwelt neerest to them) so long, I say, I must think it reasonable to make my appeals to *testimonies* both of Scripture and *ancient witnesses* of *Tradition*, and if there be possibility of misinterpreting either or both of these, yet however to use them diligently, and use the best means I can, to conduct my self and others to the right understanding of them, hoping confidently that St. *Chrysostom* said true, τὰ ἀναγκαῖα σαφῆ, and that I understand his meaning, that as what is *necessary* is *plain*, so what is *unintelligible* is not *necessary*. And there being two obvious means to this end, of attaining the sure meaning of a period, by searching the notion of the *original* words and phrases; and 2. by adverting to the *rational* importance, in conjunction with *antecedents* and *consequents*, if both these will not competently assist me to conclude *inerrably* from *plain*, and not *enigmatical testimonies* (written by *pious* and *prudent* men, not to *instruct*, and not to *torment*, to *benefit* and not *amaze* and *puzzle* their Reader) I must then give over the Trade whether of *writing Controversies*, or *reading Books*, yea, and conversing with men, whose words may by this account be as great *riddles* as *sacred or ecclesiastical writings*, and so be obliged to take my leave of my *Dispatcher* abruptly, whom certainly I may not seasonably attempt to answer, till I do understand, and can no more hope that I do not err in thinking I do *understand* him, than in thinking I understand St. *Augustine* or St. *Matthew*, or in expecting their words will bear the same sense with all other men, as they do with me, when I fairly make my representation of them.

15. How unkind and fastidious soever he shews himself to *testimonies*, even to *all in my Book*, (whether from *Fathers* or from *Scripture* it self) upon the account of a *thousand Grammatical, Philological, Sophistical,*
Pag. 17. *Historical and Logical difficulties*, 'tis certain he must in the change of the Scene, when he hath no *interest* concerned, or *hypothesis* served by it, discern his mistake, or else he would not so impertinently waste his time in *reading*, and *answering*, and *writing of Books*, each of which are his silent *confession*, that *Books* are intelligible, that words and periods, *written*, as well as *unwritten*, *read*, as *spoken*, found in ancient *Records*, as delivered from the *Ancients* by Father to Son, by word of mouth, which he stiles *written in mens hearts*, are surely and equally *intelligible*; and then again I may have his leave for all this rebuke, to make use of my *talent*, of producing *testimonies*, and not to complain of my portion, if whilst the matter chiefly, if not *onely* depends on *testimonies*, my *chief*, if not *onely talent lie that way*.

16. And so much for his ἰδίαι κρίσεις (I am still very subject to this vanity of using *Greek*, when I might have lived without it) his *sweet* and *bitter cup*, his *praises*, and his *rebukes*, mixt prudently, that I might not be immoderately *afflicted* with the one, or *transported* with the other.

SECT. III.

Patterns of bitterness from S. Jerome. (*An Essay of Dispatch.*) *St.* Jerome's *dislike of it.* Vigilantius's *despising of Reliques*; *Our accord with St.* Jerome *in that doctrine*; *Our dissent from* Vigilantius. Jerome's *handling of* Helvidius. *His noting him, that he took Railing for Eloquence.* S. W. *his begging the questions. My counterfeited mistake of the Author of* Rushworth's *Dialogues, vindicated. Mr.* White's *treating of Mr.* Daillee *and others. The Bishop of* Chalcedon's *judgment of it. The honour of being opposed by Mr.* Wh. *His singular way of managing Controversies. His Apology for Tradition. Some observations on it. His interpretations of some passages in the Greek Testament, and in* Johannes Thessalonicensis.

1. HIs third Section is taken up, all but the last leaf, in fetching patterns of bitterness from St. *Hierom*, to which he willingly appeals, and pretending I have *chosen him for my Patron* (afterwards for my *Umpire*) in this point, *Let us stand*, saith he, *to his award and example, and see how he treated* Vigilantius, *Dr.* H's *and the Protestants fore-father in denying veneration to holy Reliques.*] But let us first see how I have chosen St. *Hierom for my Patron or Umpire*, which is all the appearance of reason produced by him, why I should *stand to his award or example in this point*. After the Apostles denunciations against *Contumely*, I mentioned many other unhappy *characters*, all ready to fall upon this manner of Treaty, one from the words of our *Saviour*, *Mat.* 5. a *second* from the *example of Michael*, *Jude* 9. a *third* from its *unreconcileableness to the Spirit of meekness*, *commanded by St.* Paul, 2 *Tim.* 2. 23. 1 *Cor.* 4. 21. *Gal.* 6. 1. in *opposition to biting one another*, &c. characters of the *Gnostick Heresie at that time*, and a *last* in these words, That *as this is a most unskilfull deviation from all rules of Art as well as Civility, and St.* Hierom *notes it as a great errour in* Helvidius, *that he took Railing for Eloquence, so it is not imaginable how so much learning and abilities as this Disarmer is believed to have, should admit so great a mixture of rudeness and scurrility, had it not appeared necessary to assist in the counterpoise to supply some other defects.*—Now what hath this Disputant to return to all this? Why, of the three former particulars he takes not so much notice, as to offer any the least answer, in the compass of no less than 26 pages, which are all spent on this matter; nor of the fourth, save onely in catching hold of the name of S. *Hierom*, (incidentally mentioned) who therefore is presently noised for my chosen *Patron*, and the whole Umpirage referred not to the passage in him, to which alone I referred, but to his *practice*, and that especially in his *Epistles* against *Vigilantius*, which I did not so much as *refer* to, or mention.

2. *First* then we have here an *Essay of Dispatch*, to pass over all that had the weight laid on it, and strike in with some one incidental passage, and by that inch of ground get over presently into another Region, and there triumph over his adversary in a new Scene of Pageantry. This minds me of *Trypho* and
P. 287. D. the *Jews* dealing with *Justin Martyr*, ὑ σωιέναι τὰ λεγόμενα φάσκοντες, saith he, ἀλλά τι λέγειν μόνον σπεύδουσιν ἐικῆ, *they endeavour not to understand what is said to them, onely they whet themselves to say something.* And had not S. *Hierom*'s name (which I might well enough have spared) casually fallen into that fourth branch

branch of the *Character of Contumely*, 'tis hard to divine where *S.W.* would have found a *Grindstone* to have whet his stile, or given any more edge to this part of the *fourth*, than he had to the rest, and to all the *three* former branches.

3. *Secondly*, Here is a rule, by which I shall not fear to lose much, if it may be allowed of, that whosoever names an *Author*, and reflects on some one passage in him, is obliged to *stand to his award*; and then *S. W.* having named St. *Paul*, and cited as much from him, as I did from St. *Hierom*, must sit down with St. *Paul's award*; and then *Contumelies* must be exterminated from *Christian* Disputes, and be no longer own'd any part of his *Duty*. 2. If *S.W.*'s refutation of St. *Hierom*'s words by his contrary *practice*, be of force, then though he that cites any Author's *words* to his purpose, must not expect to gain any thing by them (he hath told us * before, that *all the testimonies of my Book are subject to a thousand difficulties*) yet if that *Author* have *done* any thing contrary to his words, he that cited him must then *stand to his award and example*; and thus not onely *Christ*'s speech of the *Scribes and Pharisees hypocrites*, must be *inverted*, though they *sit in* Moses *chair, and say but doe not, ye we must doe after their works*, not rule our selves by their *commands*, but even good mens frailties or *crimes* must become our patterns, and have more force with us, than their calmest *advises*, or severest resolutions, and so St. *Peter*'s vow of *never-forsaking Christ*, must not deserve heeding by us, but be much preponderated by the *Umpirage of his actions*, the *example* of his *denying* him. 3. The short is, St. *Hierom* in the *cool* of the *day*, knew what was amiss in another, and justly noted it, and if he were sometime provoked to exceed the bounds, that his *calmer* and dispassionate reason prescribed, and exacted from others, it were more *reverence* to the *Reliques* of that holy man (of which *S.W.* pretends such care in this *Section*) to *bury* those practices, than to transcribe them, or reproach him by *appealing* to them; 'Tis evident from his words to † *Ruffinus* [*Cornutam bestiam petis, & nisi caverem illud Apostoli, maledici regnum Dei non possidebunt*, &c. (the very Text of which I minded *S.W.* and is the matter of our present debate, whether I did it seasonably or no) *jam nunc sentires*, &c.] that he observed this asperity of his own temper, and thought himself bound by that *Apostle*'s denunciation, to restrain it, and accordingly he gives him that reason of saying no more than he did, [*Sentisne quid taceam? quod æstuanti pectori verba non commodem, & cum Psalmista loquar, Psal.* 141.3.] that he considered that *vengeance belonged to God*, which concluded him conscientiously obliged not to take it into his *own hands*. On which ground he tells him, *l.* 3. *c.* 11. of railing accusations, that *non chartæ Ecclesiasticæ, sed libelli judicum debent continere*, they become not the writings of *Church Controversies*.

* *Pag.* 17.

† *L.* 1. *c.* 7.

4. *Lastly*, Here is a compendious way (and that is *dispatch* still) of making D. *H.* and all *Protestants*, *heretick*s, and fit to be reviled, because forsooth *Vigilantius for denying veneration to holy Reliques, was thus treated.*] But to this I answer more explicitly, 1. That we *Protestants* are as far from *Vigilantius*'s *Heresie*, if St. *Hierom* understood it aright, in his *Epistle to Riparius*, as St. *Hierom* himself was *. St. *Hierom* sets it down as a part of *Vigilantius*'s *charge*, that those who did *suspicere reliquias martyrum*, he called *Cinerarios & idololatras qui mortuorum hominum ossa venerentur*. Against which charge that *Father* professes, *Nos non dico martyrum reliquias, sed ne solem quidem & lunam, non angelos, non archangelos, non cherubim, non seraphim, & omne nomen quod nominatur in seculo presenti & futuro, colimus, & adoramus, ne serviamus creaturæ potius quam creatori.* And we English this with a perfect accord to it, We are far from *worshiping* and *adoring* whether the *Reliques of Martyrs*, or the very *highest Angels*, or any *creature* in the World. 2. †S. *Hierom* professes, *Honoramus reliquias Martyrum, ut eum cujus sunt Martyres, adoremus*, and we do the same, *honour the reliques of Martyrs, that we may adore God, whose Martyrs they are.* 3. He concludes against him, that by his Doctrine, he affirmed the *Reliques of* Peter *and* Paul *to be unclean, and that as oft as men entered the Basilicæ of the Apostles, Prophets and Martyrs, so oft they paid veneration to the Temples of Idols, that the Candles lighted before them were Ensigns of Idolatry*; nay further, that the *body of Christ laid in the Grave was unclean.* And these consequences we dislike as much as St. *Hierom*, and the principle whatever it was that own'd them. 4. The *honour* which he avouched due to the *Reliques of the Martyrs*, he *made good by the words of the Psalmist*, *Pretious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his Saints*, (and we believe it as *pretious*, as any) *that the bones of dead men do not pollute those that touch them, by* Elisha's *touching*, *when he raised the dead, and the like*; and we doubt not of the *conclusion*, and so need not that *medium* to prove it. All that we differ in from St. *Hierom* in that Epistle, is, 1. That we use no *reproaches* against them that charge us with doctrines that we never taught. 2. That we do not impose our own *consequences* upon the Doctrine of *Vigilantius*, or any man else, without having *seen his writings*, as * it seems St. *Hierom* did. 3. That he could think *Phinees*'s *Javelin*, *Elias*'s *austerity*, the *Zeal of Simon Cananæus*, (not *Simon of Cananee*, as *S.W.* translates it, (I desire to know by the next, whether *Cananee* be the name of a *place* or a *man*) but in plain words *Simon the Zelote*, *Luke* 6. 15. called Καναναῖος or Κανανίτης, not from the name of a *place*, but from קנאה *zeal*) *Peter*'s *severity* on *Ananias* and *Saphira*, &c. and the command of *shedding the bloud of* the *Seducers*, *Deut.* 13. any way applicable to the present circumstances, as the case then stood between him and *Vigilantius*. And *S. W.* which hath avouched these words from St. *Hierom* in defence of *Contumely*, might have done well to assure us, he would not extend them to any further liberty, than he hath already taken, (to the metaphorical onely, not real *lance*) or transcribe this more dangerous severity, this *bloudier* Copy from him.

* *Plura dictare volueram, si librorum ipsius ad nos voluisses mittere cantilenas, ut scire possemus ad quæ rescribere deberemus. Nunc autem aerem verberavimus*——

5. *Secondly*, 'Tis not duly suggested that these *harsh expressions* of S. *Hierom*, which had there been premised, *fell on* Vigilantius *for denying Veneration to holy Reliques*; In his *Book* against *Vigilantius* (which *S.W.* calls his *Second Epistle*, and produces the greatest store of the harsh expressions from thence) he might have seen other manner of Doctrines laid by St. *Hierom* to his charge, and that upon sight of his Writings, which by this time he saith he had received from *Riparius* and *Desiderius*, *viz.* that *Vigils* were to be *condemned*, that *Allelujah was never to be sung but at Easter*, that *Continence was Heresie*, that *Pudicitiousness* or *single life* was a *Seminary of Lust*. And till D. *H.* and the *Protestants* concur with him in all these, who as yet have not transcribed one of them, how can it be truly said, that these *harsh expressions*, which were poured out on all these conjoined, are *due* to us, upon that onely score, upon which, as hath been shewed, no least severity can be due to us?

Pag. 24.

6. *Lastly*, When with this matter of S. *Hierom*'s dealing with *Vigilantius*, *S.W.* compares his own *temper*, and *expects my thanks for his moderation, that he did not call me Monster, Prodigious Monster, possessed with the Devil, &c.* adding that *all these were my due, as I am in the same fault with* Vigilantius, *besides what*

accrues

accrues to me of later titles.] I shall ask him these *two* questions, somewhat distant the one from the other; 1. How he can think to excuse this his great *moderation*, that he hath not called me so many *Monsters* and *Demoniacks*, as S. *Hierom* did *Vigilantius*? how he hath made good the ingagements, under which he hath concluded himself, both by standing to St *Hierom*'s *award and example*, and by acknowledging it *necessary duty, if he hath any zeal and care of his conscience, to use the means which Wit and Art can invent to discredit, disparage — as far as truth can justifie his words*? Hath he not here resolved, that *truth* gives as much my *due*, as was paid to *Vigilantius*? with what *care of his conscience* then, if he were before in earnest, he could for the bribe of a few *thanks* (the utmost he demands) use this *temper*, and abstain from those obvious *Arts* and ways which St. *Hierom* had traced before him?] is my *first question*, not founded in what he hath *really* performed by way of *temper*, but what he *saith* he hath performed.

7. The *second* is, how he hath deserved my *thanks* for his *moderation*, when at the same time he tells me, there is as *much due* to me, on *one score*, as all S. *Hierom*'s *expressions* amount to, and yet more *accruing* to me out of other *titles*? Doth he that tells a man publickly, that the title of *Frantick Monster, Prodigious Monster, Possessed with a Devil, with an unclean Spirit, Snake, famous for Wickedness, Blockhead, &c.* (as *S.W.* hath contracted them) *are due to him for one fault, beside what accrues to him out of later titles*, deserve his *thanks*, for not *whipping him with Scorpions*? What nice distinction hath he discovered betwixt *giving* me these titles, and *publickly* telling me and all other men, they *are due to me*? 'Tis true indeed, that *money* is not *paid* when 'tis onely acknowledged *due*, but it is so in *railing*. Is it not one of the *Figures* of that *Art*, to tell his Antagonist this and this worst of *titles is his due*, yea much *more also* than that, but he is kind, and will not deal thus with him, as he *deserves*. And this piece of Art, as all others, *S.W.* was *obliged in conscience* to make use of, and accordingly hath discharged his obligation to *conscience*, to the *utmost farthing*; and I that am not the Noon-shadow of *Vigilantius*'s Pourtraiture, that assert not a syllable of all his *heretical dictates*, must *thank*, and be *obliged*, that I am thus meekly treated, and my onely question is, how these *thanks* came to be so *due* from me?

8. What he adds of his *manner of handling* Helvidius, and *calling him Snake*, and *silliest of men, made famous by wickedness, dancing Camel*,] is I hope by this time answered also, by analogie with his treating of *Vigilantius, viz.* That I mentioned his dislike of *Helvidius*'s *railing* (which if it were the * *appealing to his Authority*, was not to his *Example*, which *S.W.* unduly joins together, as if I had appealed to *both*) and if he practised otherwise himself, his *words* are certainly to be heeded before his *actions*, and the rather because though through *passion* or *weakness* he were guilty of it himself, yet it was too *foul* for him to tolerate in another. I shall not therefore any farther reply to the parallel *S.W.* makes at large betwixt S. *Hierom* and *himself*, in this matter, I had rather be like that *Father* in his other *excellencies*, than come within any distance of him in that, which hath always been looked on as his *blemish*, and is so far from excusing *S.W.* that it self is *unexcusable*.

* *P.25. l.1.*

9. It remains onely, that I add a few words in mine own defence, to clear me from the *more and more weakness* that *S.W.* discovers in me, for *construing*, as he saith, *loquacitas, to be railing*, S. *Hierom*'s words of *Helvidius* being these, *loquacitatem facundiam existimat.*] But I answer, that I cited neither these, nor any other words of S. *Hierom*, I onely said in my *own* words, that *he noted it as a great errour in* Helvidius, *that he took Railing for Eloquence*. If it be then now demanded, where he noted it, I answer, in the first Chapter of that *Epistle* against *Helvidius*, in several passages, especially in this (of which *S.W.* recites a part) *loquacitatem facundiam existimat, & maledicere omnibus bonæ conscientiæ signum arbitratur, accepta materia disputandi amplius incipit blasphemare, & quasi de sublimi loco in totum orbem ferre sententiam, meque quia veritate non posset, lacerare convitiis.* Here I not onely found mention of *loquacity*, but saw the sort of his *loquacity* expressed by *evil speaking, blaspheming, censuring, raving, rending innocent persons with reproaches*, and this is my ground for discriminating *his loquacity* from all other species of it, and interpreting it (but that is not *construing* it) *railing*. And if here I have *shew'd more and more weakness than in all the Section*, I shall thence take confidence, as far as *S.W*'s judgment will support it, to believe, I have not been very culpable, and so am not as yet much humbled by his Discipline.

10. There be two things still behind in this Section, which being heterogeneous to that of S. *Hierom*, the main subject, come now to be attended to. 1. His *dilemma* concluding the *justice* of his *rigorous expressions*. 2. My *counterfeiting a mistake that I may by that means fix a slie Calumny on a worthy Gentleman*. His *Dilemma* is in these words, *Either Doctor* H*'s cause is false, and then 'tis laudable to use zeal against him — or it is true, and then he deserves as great a reprehension, who abuses his cause by going about to defend it by such wilfull falsifications, frauds and weaknesses, as he hath been discovered.*] And this as a cure for his *begging the question*, in *supposing me an adversary of the true Faith.*] This *Dilemma* I might retort with as much force as he hath begun it, (*i.e.* I confess with little enough, but yet with as much.) Thus either my *Cause* is true, and then it is not *laudable* in him to use *zeal* against it, or to labour to oppress it with *noise* and *clamour*; or it is *false*, and then I cannot be so much reprehended for using no better means to defend it, than a bad cause is capable of. But I like not the last part of my *Dilemma* much better than I did his, and therefore having onely shewed him the no force of it, by this image; I answer, 1. That I take this cure for *his begging the question* to be palliate, and that it is still a *begging the question* to affirm, that either my *cause is false*, or that I have defended it *with falsifications*, and that I have therein been so much as once *discovered*. There is a middle betwixt these, my having defended a *true cause* without any *falsifications*, &c. and till he hath not onely said, but proved the contrary, which cannot yet be done in the beginning of this Reply to my *Discovery* of his former *Dexterities*, his saying it, is the *begging the question*. 2. In case my *cause* were *false*, and his *zeal laudable*, yet whether *Contumelies* are that *laudable zeal*, or his *twitchings by the beard, pure zeal*, and not *contumely*, is another *question*, at this present under debate, and therefore now in this Section most unskilfully *begg'd* by him. 3. Supposing the *cause* good, and some *faults* and *weaknesses* discovered, in *defending* it, yet neither would it follow that those supposable *faults* were either *frauds* or *falsifications*, or any way *wilfull* (which includes their being *known* to the Author, as to me, I am sure, they are not) any more than the *weaknesses* are, which are generally most opposite to *wilfull*, nor that they deserved as great a reprehension, be they what they can, as the like in maintaining a *bad* cause would deserve, the *badness* of the *cause* being allowable to add some degree to the guilt, when the *falsifications* or whatsoever other crimes are supposed equal, and equally *wilfull* on both sides. 4. Faults may be repre-

Pag. 23.
Pag. 27.

reprehended without *contumely*, and so still, *bare reprehensions* come not home to the point in hand, and that *S.W*'s *twitchings* are *bare reprehensions*, is another *begging of the question*; and these be frailties enough in his own *Dilemma*.

11. Then for the *Counterfeited mistake and calumny*, thus he lays it, *I had*, saith he, *upon occasion of the evidence of our Churches Infallibility, in my Schism Disarm'd*, p.20. *told him he might to his amazement see it in that incomparable Treatise of* Rushworth's *Dialogues vindicated from all possible confute by that excellent Apology for it, writ by the learned Pen of Mr.* Tho. White. Now what does Mr. *H? he tells us that* S. W. *says his arrows are beyond all possible confute, meaning that* S.W. *the Author of Schism Disarm'd, was the same with the Author of the Apology for Tradition (though I am certainly informed that he knows* S.W. *to be another person) and reports again afterwards the same phrase to the same purpose*, and so on, fansying *two advantages* that I meant *to make by this one project*.] But before we proceed to more, let us a while reflect on this.

12. His *own* words, of which there was no *doubt*, he cites from *Schism Disarm'd* naming the very page where they were, But *my* words, on which all depended, he gives his Reader no direction to find, either as he *first cites them*, or, as he saith, *I report afterward the same phrase to the same purpose*. Nor can I, who am presumable to be better acquainted with my own Writings than any other Reader, tell whither to repair for this *second report of this phrase*, and must therefore satisfie my self by resorting to the first, on which the weight seems to be laid, and that is in the *Disarmer's Dexter, Exam.p.4 l.35*. where having compared his treating me to the *Æthiopians poisoning* their *little arrows*, I added, *having thus imbibed high vertues, they make very quick work, are very killing, or in the Disarmer's phrase, beyond all possible confute*. And this it seems hath brought on me this unexpected displeasure, and censure of *counterfeiting a mistake, and fixing a slie calumny upon a worthy person*. But I demand, 1. How it is possible I should have mistaken in these words? Did not *S.W. p.20.* use this phrase [*beyond all possible confute*]? and is not *S.W.* my *Disarmer?* and might not I spell these together, and then write, [*in my Disarmer's phrase, beyond all possible confute*]. I confess, I that took [*confute*] for a Verb, should not on my own head have used it for a Substantive, and therefore using it so, cited it from my *Disarmer*, as if I should now render *Simon Cananæus, Simon of Cananee*, I would add, according to my *Disarmer*'s interpretation) but who would think there were any least mistake committed in this, when 'tis palpable there was none?

13. This indeed, to yield some support to his charge, he hath disguised into another form, affirming that *I tell him that* S. W. *says, his Arrows are beyond all possible confute*, and adding that *I mean that* S.W. *was the same with the Author of the Apology for Tradition*. But 1. It is visible that I do not *tell him* or any man, that *S.W. says so of his own arrows*, but on the contrary, that 'twas no *excellent indication of his persuasions of his own performances*, that *he deemed it necessary, geminare venenis vulnera*, (which he could not think *necessary*, if they were of themselves, in his opinion *beyond all possibility of being confuted*.) What I farther add *there*, is evidently no more than this, that the *killingness of his arrows*, the *impossibility* of his being *confuted*, comes from the *high vertues they have imbibed*, i.e. *from the contumelies* (the onely parts of his Book, which I know my self unqualified to answer in kind, or make any proportionable return to) and what is this toward *telling, that* S.W. *says this* of his *own arrows*?

14. Secondly, having affixed on me words which I never wrote, 'tis no wonder, but consequent (and in his opinion, *laudable*) that he should proceed, aud give them a meaning which I never meant: And at this rate, who can be free from *mistakes*, from *counterfeiting*, from *calumny*, from any thing that *S.W.* will say I *meant*, by words, first of his own *framing*, and then interpreting also?

15. But neither will all this (which, if allowed, hath ill luck if it cannot doe any thing) prove what he hath charged on me, (*i.e.* my *purposely counterfeiting a mistake*, &c.) without one farther aid, and that he hath furnished it with also, affirming, that *he is certainly informed that I know* S. W. *to be another person*.] Certainly I have no least obligation to make any return to this; yet I shall by these steps, to perfect the Readers observations of *S.W.* 1. I am the most competent testifier of mine own secrets, and I am sure, I do *not know* who is the Author of that Book, nor 2. what one name *S. W.* are the first letters of, nor 3. do I, or ever did I so much as believe ('tis not imaginable I should *know*) that Mr. *S.* who was once a Servant to my Lord of *D.* and hath, as I have heard, assumed to be the *Author of Schism Disarm'd*, was the Author of that *whole* Book, but onely of a part of it. How then could he be *certainly informed*, that I *knew this*, which I know I never so much as *believed*? If he was *informed* so, he neither was, nor could be *certainly informed* (which to my ears signifies the *certain* truth of his *information*) and if he was any way *informed* that I *believed* it, yet that could not signifie that I *knew* it, when in truth I neither *knew* nor *believed* it. I was told (*Sect. 2.*) that *he was much mine for the sake of some friends common to him and me*; I now demand, did any of them ever so much as tell him, that I believed otherwise than now I affirm; If any did, let him be named; if they did not, what may not he say, that thus speaks? 4. Though I have now no least inducement or obligation to tell him my *present thoughts* or *suspicions* (for above those I cannot be imagined to have penetrated the disguise) of *Schism Dispatcht*, yet as far as my present information or conjectures lead me, I shall not be nice to discover it, and it is this, that Mr. *S.* must not enclose *all* the honour (or rather just *reproach*) either of the *Scoffs*, or, which is the second principal ingredient, the *cavils* of it; And if Mr. *Wh.* be suspected by many to have brought in liberal contributions to him, I have not much greater arguments to incline my assent to it, than these, 1. That without any occasion given by me, this remote opportunity was laid hold on, solicitously to avert that suspicion. 2. That in his answer to Mr *Daillee*, or *Daillee's Arts discovered*, he hath without any disguise treated him in as much ill language, and sometimes upon as little occasion, as I am treated in either of these *Replies*, and that he may with as much honour have written either, or both of these whole Tracts, as one passage against Mr. *Daillee*, which I shall for an essay desire *S.W.* to turn to *p.* 249. usher'd in, *p.* 248. with these words, [*Here I particularly invite the eye of the serious Reader, to observe how maliciously he* (*Mr.*Daillee) *corrupts the Council of* Trent *in two very considerable passages.*] On the *second* of these he sets the remark, that *the abuse is more gross and palpable (concerning our Ladies immaculate conception)* p. 248. and in the next page, 249. he that *p.* 4. had profest, *beside his reason, to be beholding to his nature for its extreme averseness to incivilities*, and *captious proceedings*, is yet induced (by what principle I guess not, but it seems neither of *reason* or *nature*) to fasten on it all these express charges of *foul play, cheat, falseness, perverseness, want both of face and conscience, more than ordinary malice, desperate notorious absurdity, shame-*

shameless forehead outfacing the whole Catholick World, the title of a *bold Jugler*, all this and more in the compass of 30 lines) and then concludes at the top of the next page 250. in the greatest ☞ of Contumely that he could reach, [*Can any thing be answered in his defence, or any excuse made, why he should not be accounted an impudent lying Knave?*] This sure is the noting of some *fault, personal and moral* with a witness, and so by *S.W*'s description of *Contumely*, must needs fall under it. And what was it that made all this severity so necessary? Why, saith he, *He undertook to prove, that 'tis impossible so to expound the words of the Council of* Trent, *that they shall not in plain terms give the lie to all the Fathers, and to render this foul play the more plausible to such as look not well to his fingers, he translates* [in hoc decreto] *falsly and perversly* [*in this number*] *as if the Council had positively decreed the blessed Virgin not to be in the number of those who are born in Original sin.*] This then being the Crime, and the former part of it [*that it is impossible to explicate their words, En sort qu' elles ve donnent un desmenti a tous les Peres*] being in that place assumed to be proved by an argument, there following by way of *Dilemma* (to which Mr. *Wh.* hath not offered a word of answer, and till he had done so, could not reasonably proceed to any sharp Discipline on the *conclusion*) I must suppose the *second* part to be it, which alone could be thought to support the *crimen falsi*, and so be charged in such variety of language, *Cheat, Jugler, &c. viz.* that he *falsified the words of the Council, and translated* in hoc decreto, *in this number.*] But that could not be, for Mr. *Daillee* wrote not *English* but *French*, and if the *English Translator* misrendred him, without his privity, 1. That should have been wholly charged on that Translator, and 2. it would not then have amounted to those enormous crimes, of *Cheat, Jugler, &c.* that now are fastened on it, by being misplaced upon Mr. *Daillee*, who was herein most perfectly innocent. And this is the very truth of the matter, The *English Interpreter* impertinently (yet probably without any design of seducing any) added those words [*in that number*] but Mr. *Daillee* set down the words of the *Original Latine* of the *Council* most punctually, as they lay in the *Acts* of the *Council*, and gave them no other rendring but this, *Ils declarent a la fin Que leur intention n' est pas d' y comprendre le bien heuruſee et immaculee Vierge Marie mere de Diu. They declare in the end (of their Decree* beforementioned, *En leur Decret) that it was not their intention to comprehend the blessed and immaculate Virgin* Mary *the Mother of God*] adding no syllable that sounded to that sense of [*in that number.*] Now 'tis not questioned but Mr. *Wh.* was abundantly qualified to reade, at least to consult the Author, whose *Arts* he undertook to *discover*, in his own language, which if he did, he must discern him free from this charge of *falsifying*; if he did not, he knows whose fault that was, to condemn a person without due cognizance of his fact, and so from whom the reparations are due. And 'tis not his proemial *advertisement* that [*the Animadversions on* Daillee *are applied to the English Translation by* T.S. *not to the French Original*] that will justifie him, for still the title of his Book is, *Daillee's Arts discovered*] to whom the errours of the Translator (by the way, with his good leave, that was not *T.S.*) are not with the least justice imputable, much less are the casual slips of the one, any way interpretable to be the inexcusable *Lies* and *Knavery*, and *Impudencies* of the other. By the way, it may be remembred, that even that which the Translator conceived to be the meaning of the *Council*, is expresly the *definition*, in the *Romanists Catechism*, compiled for *universal* use by *Cardinal* Bellarmine, *Christ. Doctr.* p. 142. *Our Lady had never any spot of sin, neither Original nor Actual.* This one instance I have chosen to give, by way of digression from my own to another person, having truly the same dislikes to this sort of treating, when others, as when my self am concerned in it. And lest it should be thought, that poor *Hereticks* are the onely men that meet with this course usage from him, I refer the Reader to his *Ordinary* the Bishop of *Chalcedon* his Letter to him, part of which is inserted in *G.L*'s *Manifest to his Brethren residing in* England, in these words. *Onely for your souls sake I request you to leave those naughty reproaches which you give to one equal to your self in all things, I pray you forget not the words of the Apostle, Maledici regnum Dei non consequentur, or of our Saviour, Qui dixerit fratri suo, Fatue, reus erit Gehennæ ignis, such reproachfull words as you use in your Letter, become neither Christian, nor Priest, but discover too too great passion*; and again, —*To omit the taunts of Paramount Bishop, and domineering ways, and such others, which you bestow upon my self, it seems you have forgotten your solemn promise which you made at your Ordination, to give reverence and obedience to your Ordinary*, &c.

16. Ere I leave this Theme, I am yet farther to take notice of the *two advantages* which I am suggested to have *aimed at* in this *wilfull mistake*, 1. That *I honour my self in making the world believe I had so worthy an adversary as that miracle of wit and learning.* 2. That *I dishonour my pretended adversary as the vainest person in the world, by intimating that himself gave himself such an high character.* To these I answer jointly, 1. That I could have no *aims* in saying that, which, as hath already appeared, I never said. 2. That I could never foresee that the World would collect that from my words, which I neither said nor thought, and which my accuser at the same time saith, was contrary to my *knowledge.*

17. As for the severals, they now can need no reply, yet *ex abundanti*, I shall give them some, 1. That I might as reasonably be allowed thus to honour my self (if it were but to reward the patience of being
*Pag.*5. in *S.W*'s company so long) as 'tis certain Mr. *Wh.* assumes to have answered two persons of *such a quality, as the Protestant Party never produced before, and seems to have chosen them to live by, or die with, whose eloquence none were found to exceed, whose wits none will be found to equal*— adding much more in their praises, and
* *Pag.*260. thus much in Mr. *Daillee*'s, * that *those noble Lords had great reason highly to esteem him*, and yet sure he doth more than *desire to make the World believe, he had such worthy adversaries*, 'twere but a poor satisfaction this, if they were not his *Captives* too. And why might not another man have *S.W*'s pardon, if having such
*Pag.*28. an example from a person of the *profoundest humility* (as *S.W.* that best knows, assures us also) he had permitted this spark of *ambition* a while to have warmed his breast? It might perhaps have inspirited him, and raised his faculties above that meanness, that *S.W.* at every turn discovers in him, and so contributed to the glories of his *triumphs* also, which now are likely to be obscured by the despicableness of his *Captive*. But whatever just title I might have to his pardon for this insolence, I may with truth profess, I have no inclination to be guilty of it, and assure him. 1. That I am not fond of so much as seeming to enter the Lists with *Giants*, of having to doe with *Miracles* of any sort, especially those of *wit*, having been advertised long since, that *quanto ingeniosiores sunt, tanto iracundius docent*, the more *miraculously quick* their own perceptions are, the less *patience* they have for those that that do not as *nimbly* apprehend, and *submissively* embrace them; were it not for this dread of this ill attendant of his *wit*, I should

not

not diſown the *ambition* of beholding his *learning*, that I might benefit by it, which I never did in the leaſt from all my converſation with *S. W.* and therefore if he be but in the number of thoſe whom he calls the *meaneſt and youngeſt of his Scholars*, he muſt put me in mind of what *Apuleius* ſaith of the *Indians*, *ad naſcentem ſolem ſiti ſunt, & in toto corpore nox eſt*, for I yet diſcern not, that he hath conſiderably edified or improved by his nearneſs to him. *Florid. l. 1.* 2. I ſhall ask what honour it was to Mr. *Daille* that the *world knew* (which is more than *believing*) that this *worthy man had written againſt him?* Can any man be meaner, and more uncapable of true honour, than he is there (as even now appeared) repreſented to be? and yet he hath attained that *honour*; who then need *deſpair*, that were ambitious of the like? 3. What advantage were it for him, that had ſought honour from the *worthineſs* of his *Adverſary*, preſently (as *S. W.* ſuppoſes) to *diſhonour* him? were it ſtill an *honour* to combat with the *vaineſt perſon in the world*, or to have him appear thus *vain*, with whom I was to combate? Yet theſe, and thus unreconcilable are the advantages that *S. W.*'s mint would help me to. 'Tis certain Mr. *White* could not need his *own* praiſes (and ſo muſt have been impertinently *vain* in this contrivance) His friends have freely beſtowed them on him, and I heartily wiſh, that having ſo many titles to them, he may never doe any thing to blemiſh them.

18. My greateſt quarrel to him as a man, I have already expreſs'd, and ſhould not have done ſo, had it not been as legible to all under his own and anothers hand, as it is now under mine. But as to a writer of *Controverſies*, I have this other, that the anſwering of his *Apology* for the *Dialogues*, is not the way to ſatisfie the *Romaniſts*, there being few of thoſe which go on his grounds, either in the notion of *Tradition*, or ſome other particular points of *Controverſie*. In relation to the former it was, that Mr. *White* hath not onely told us expreſly in his *Epiſtle Dedicatory* before that *Apology*, that *the Doctrine of Rushworth's Dialogues takes a path not much beaten by our modern Controvertiſts*, but farther gives us (in the beginning of the *Apology* it ſelf) the firſt *riſe* of his way, from a *ſlight familiar conference between him and his Kinſman, as it were onely for exerciſe to train themſelves, and practiſe their poſtures, which now by the oppoſitions of thoſe two Lords ſeems (to him) to ſpread it ſelf into a publick and ſolemn war.*] Which though poetically ſpoken, and above the proportion of *videas concurrere bellum, Atque virum*—yet he *can make good the phraſe*, he ſaith, without *much ſtraining, ſince the eminent names on the one ſide (a private Letter* of the *Lord Digby*, and a *ſhort Reply* of the *Lord Falkland) and the great advantages of ground on the other* (one *ſingle perſon* on that *advantageous ground) may juſtly be admitted to ſupply the number of an Army in both*; I may add that that *Army* being of *two ſides*, muſt, if any, be *two armies* (and that would be news indeed, *two Armies* made up of *three* men.) That it is not, otherwiſe than in this *poetick* Dialect, and in the Author's *fancy*, grown much more *numerous* ſince, I may ſafely collect from *S. W.* who, I ſuppoſe, hath narrowly obſerved the progreſs of this doctrine, and without reſpect to his intereſt truely told me, that *few there are that have refined their underſtanding to this degree of diſcerningneſs, though he perceived* to his comfort *that the beſt ſort of wits* (himſelf, I ſuppoſe, and ſome, but ſtill *few* others) which ſure are not the moſt, *begin* (and do yet but *begin*) thus *to own their reaſon*. And for the latter 'tis no ſecret, that other of his tenets were not liked; if they had, they had not been, as himſelf in a ſecond *Epiſtle Dedicatory* before that *Apology*, ſaith, *ſo deeply cenſured even by Catholicks* (whom he there cenſures back again, as *unworthy the Function they profeſs, and highly obſtructive of the progreſs of the Catholike Faith*, noting them of *Deſtructive errors*, of *ſtriving to poſſeſs the Church of God, and break the eternal rule of Faith)* and in fine condemned at *Rome*. And then what *honour* it may be, I know not, but truly I ſee not the *advantage* would accrue from ſuch a duel, wherein ſo few beſide the Combatants, would think themſelves concerned; And that is one ſufficient reaſon (beſide the no obligation to be for ever in the *Palæſtra*) why the challenge ſo oft intimated in *Sch. Diſarm'd* and *Diſpatch'd*, to enter the liſts with that *Apologiſt*, is not yet accepted. It were not hard to make that return to him, which would ſatisfie all diſintereſted perſons of either party; but thoſe having no need of, nor demanding that ſatisfaction, there is no hope of ſatisfying thoſe *few* others, that are reſolved, it is *beyond all poſſible refute*, the *deemed certainty* of which perſwaſion lays on them a *neceſſity* of *concluding* every thing *ridiculous*, and *nonſenſical*, that is aimed againſt it. 'Tis fitter then that theſe *few* ſhould be permitted to enjoy their own humours, than that they ſhould be ſtudiouſly, but impertinently diſquieted. Another reaſon there is, which hath weight with me; The *title* of that *Apology* promiſes an anſwer to the *exceptions of the Lords Falkland and Digby*, the former of which I know hath very largely and fully refuted one anſwer of his (which therefore himſelf ſtyles * *an unlicked mola*) to that *Lord's* little diſcourſe of *Infallibility*; ſetting down the full of his argument, and well nigh of his words, and giving them ſo fair a Reply, that the *ſweetneſs* of it † *ſurprized* him, he acknowledges, *with admiration*. But to this the *Apologiſt* hath not made thoſe regular, and equal returns, that the Reader might expect, and were due (if but by way of reparation for the defects of his former, above * half of which was ſpent, before he pretends to give any *anſwer* to, or take the leaſt notice of his Adverſary) but † as he profeſſes, to *ſelect ſuch objections as he* (the onely judge in this matter) *thinks really to intereſt the Controverſie, and to handle them without relation to books or diſtinction of Authors, or citations of places, as one that ſeeks truth, not the glory of confuting, or vanity of anſwering* (when yet in the Title page, the moſt conſpicuous place in the City, it was diſtinctly proclaimed, that thoſe *Lords exceptions* were *anſwered)* ſo he hath accordingly performed, producing what objections he thought fit, not noting from whence they were produced. And if this have rendred that *Lord's diſcourſe* leſs defenſible, and his Adverſaries *beyond all poſſible refute*, this was a piece of skill in the manager, and let not *S. W.* feign to himſelf any other reaſon of it. I have now on his ſummons given my attendance and ſurveyed it a ſecond time, and find ſome things very true, and ſeaſonably obſerved, as that neither the *Chiliaſts* nor the *Arrians* had any title to *univerſal Tradition* (which if he learnt not from the *Preaching Proteſtants*, was yet ſurely no news to them, nor the leaſt prejudice to our pretenſions, nor refutation of his *Lordſhip*, as to that of the *Chiliaſts*, hath * elſewhere largely been manifeſted) that † *if impertinent curioſities be hindred from importuning the Church, her truths will undoubtedly be ſeen in her belief and practice without making new deſinitions*; that * *probable arguments have no truth in them*, nor is † a *concluſion nearer being true for an hundred unconvincing arguments, than for one*, that * *the place urged by Mr.* Daille *out of* Hegeſippus *of hereſie deflowring the Church after the Apoſtles death, belonged onely to the riſing up of hereticks againſt the Church not to*

* *Apol.* p. 3.
† *Apol.* p. 6.
* *See Anſw. to L.* Falkl. *p.* 27. *and L.* Falkl.'s *Reply, p.* 176.
† *Apol.* p. 4.
* *View of Infal. lib.* p. 87, &c.
† *P.* 111.
* *P.* 117.
† *P.* 146.
* *P.* 195.

the Churches corruption, (if he had added that the *hereticks* were there ſpecified to be the ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις, the *Gnoſticks*, he had fully confirmed his interpretation.) But in divers other particulars he hath not ſhew'd himſelf that *miracle*, that *S. W.* tells us of, eſpecially in interpreting the *Greek* of the
†P. 165. *New Teſtament*, as πεπληροφορημένων, *Lu.* 1. 1. † *in great abundance acted*, παρηκολουθηκότι ἄνωθεν πᾶσιν ἀκριβῶς, v. 3. *preſent at all things almoſt from the beginning*, δοκεῖτε ἐν αὐταῖς (γραφαῖς) ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχειν, *Joh.* V. 39.
*P. 152. * *you deceive your ſelves if you think you have life in them*, μαρτύρεμαι καὶ μικρόν τι μὴ μεγάλου εἶδον ἐκπε λέγων, *Act.*
†P. 159. 26. 22. † *teſtifying* or *proteſting to great and little that I ſpoke nothing*. So likewiſe in his account of other
*P. 233. *Greek* paſſages, as of that of * *Joannes Theſſalonicenſis*, that he ſaith no ſuch thing as *Daille* makes him ſay, [*viz.* that the *Church held Angels had ſubtile and airy bodies*] onely this, that the *Church knows Angels to be intelligent Creatures*] when yet the expreſs words are, νοερὰς μὲν αὐτὰς ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία γινώσκει, ἀσωμάτους πάντη καὶ ἀοράτους, λεπτισμάτους δὲ καὶ ἀεροειδεῖς ἢ πυροειδεῖς, *the Catholick Church acknowledges*, or *is of opinion*) *as* γνώμη *ſententia* is from γινώσκω, and as ὀρθόδοξος and ὀρθογνώμων, are exactly the ſame both in
*P. 81. the nature of the words and in uſe, though he gueſs otherwiſe * elſewhere) *that they are intelligent, not indeed altogether incorporeal and inviſible, but thin-bodyed, and airy or fiery*. Theſe I mention, as things manifeſt to every *eye*, and ſhall not here, ſo much out of the place, (anon there will be a fitter ſeaſon) deſcend to any matters of the main *diſpute* or *controverſie*, wherein I muſt not expect *S.W.* will be of my mind: But if in theſe which I have named he will not, the *Reader* will know what ſentence to paſs on *Tutor* and *Diſciple* both. And thus much for this *learned Author*, upon *S.W*'s importunity, and withall to give him the reaſon of that ſilence, which is, it ſeems, miſinterpreted *amazement*, the leaſt degree of which I know no perſon that ever was under, upon the account which *S.W.* mentions.

19. This Section concludes with a *reflexion* on *Irenæus* his words of *much laughter*, and he hath replyed to them by fiction of other words, that *Irenæus might have ſaid*, but hath not; And then paſſing them on Mr. *H.* and appealing to the *Readers* eyes, if they were not very ſutable, he hath ſhew'd him nothing, but that he was obliged to write another *Defence*, of *Calumny*, after this of *Contumely*, and then examine which were the moſt neceſſary accompliſhment of a *Catholick Controvertiſt*.

SECT. IV.

My grievous miſtakes vindicated, and the charge retorted. Contumelies the weapon onely of the conquered and deſperate. Launoy's *judgement of them. The compariſon betwixt perjury, and perverſe treating of matters of Religion. The Anſwerers obligation to prove ſome things. What dealing is expectable from* S. W. *The affinity betwixt the Epiſtle of the Cath. Gentleman, and the firſt part of Sch. Diſ. Three other charges anſwered.*

1. HIs fourth Section, the laſt on this Subject, wherein his *Defence*, in relation to contumelies, is compleated, is the charging on me a *grievous miſtake committed in even ground, in a plain Epiſtle to the Reader*. 'Twill coſt us ſome circuit and windlace, to diſcern wherein this *miſtake* conſiſts. Firſt he tells us the *deſign of that his Epiſtle*, to *render the Reader an account, why the civility of his Adverſary ſhould not hinder him from giving him his own, if the care of an eternal good intereſted his zeal to lay him open*, and then adds the two *parallel queſtions*, which he propoſed in theſe words, *How would you take it, if one ſhould ſpit in your face, and juſtifie the affront, becauſe his breath is ſweet*, &c. And then again repeating his *deſign* in the *queſtions*, he *reproaches me* for *not underſtanding it in my anſwer*, (which yet was punctual to his *queſtion*, telling him how a *Chriſtian* were bound to take it, if any *man ſhould ſpit in his face*, were the *breath ſweet* or otherwiſe) To this rebuke I anſwer, 1. That if to a *queſtion* aſked, I had given a punctual anſwer, abſtracting from the main deſign of it, this might yet be far from a *grievous miſtake*. For unleſs the particularity of the *deſign* have ſuch an influence on the *queſtion*, that the anſwer to the *queſtion* will be unſufficient, unleſs the *deſign* be explicitely taken notice of, there is ſure no *miſtake* at all in this method.

2. But then 2. the *anſwer* which I gave, was perfectly home to the *deſign*, as well as to the *queſtion*, which I ſhall thus manifeſt to him. The *queſtion* I muſt ſuppoſe pertinent to the buſineſs in hand, and that was certainly for the juſtifying of *S.W*'s dealing in *Sch. Diſ.* and that preciſely in the point of *rude blows*, or *contumelies* onely, and not as 'tis now pretended, of *giving the Adverſary his own* (which is bare *juſtice*) or *laying open, diſcovering the infirmities of his reaſoning* (which if it be no more than ſo, is *juſtice* again) This is moſt viſible in the firſt words of the *Epiſtle* [*I know you will be objecting, that the blows I give are too rude*] (not, that I *give* him *his own*, &c.) Hence it follows, that this, which he now pretends to have been his *deſign*, could then have no influeuce on the queſtion, which was to juſtifie not his *juſtice*, but his *rudeneſs*, and therefore my anſwer, which reflected onely on *rudeneſs*, not on *juſtice*, was home to the deſign. So again for another ingredient in his *deſign*, the *civility* of his *adverſary*, and the influence of that upon his *blows*, that certainly I took notice of, and by proving to him from *Chriſt*'s command, that an *uncivil* adverſary was not to be anſwered with *rudeneſs*, I inferred with advantage, that a *civil adverſary was not thus to be anſwered*. *Laſtly*, for the *care of an eternal good, intereſſing zeal*, which is the laſt circumſtance of his *deſign*, that onely in my anſwer I took notice of, and the reaſon is clear, becauſe no ſuch *care* can thus *intereſs zeal*, as to juſtifie *contumely*. No man's *eternal good* depends upon *S. W's Contumelies*; nor if it did, muſt he on that account neglect his *own*, as he certainly doth, that *ſins* in order to the *beſt* end, and that the *contumelious* doth ſo, had a little before been proved, and was not there again to be inſiſted on. Let the Reader now, or, if he pleaſe, his own conſcience judge, on whoſe ſide the *grievous miſtake* lies, on mine, who anſwered fully to the one true *deſign*, that *rude blows* were *not for any, much leſs for a civil adverſary*, or on his, that is now fain to ſubſtitute a *feigned deſign*, and convert *Rudeneſs* inhanſed by the *civility* of the *adverſary*, into exact diſtributive *juſtice*, which is known by this very form of words, *ſuum cuique tribuere, giving every man*, and ſo an *adverſary, his own*, which he could not *know*, as he ſaid he did, *his Reader* would *object* to him.

P. 30. 3. This is ſtill more manifeſt againſt *S.W.* when he ſaith, that D. *H's courteous ſtyle could not oblige* S. W. *to treat him tenderly, and favourably*.] Let him now reflect on the firſt words of his *Epiſtle*; Was the

the Reader ſuppoſed to *object* that he did not *treat the Doctor tenderly or favourably?* Or had the ſtile of the Tract of *Schiſm* courted *favour* or *tenderneſs* from *S. W.* (who could not then by any divination be foreſeen) or from any man elſe? Or, is there no middle between *favour* and *too much rudeneſs?* Whoſe now is the guilt of *totally miſtaking the common ſenſe*, not of a ſtranger's, but of his *own plain Epiſtle?* And what can be imagined more *plain*, than that he hath ſtudiouſly endeavoured to impoſe this miſtake on others, if he have not really impoſed it on himſelf, which will be believed with moſt *charity* to the *Deſigner*.

4. But that he may indeed prove, that the *Doctor's wits were not well awake*, he lays to my *charge*, that *I neither go about to grant or deny the invalidity of thoſe pretended excuſes, which onely was to be done*] To which I have already anſwered, that *Contumelies* being proved *exterminating ſins*, 'twas evident none of thoſe pretended motives of them, could be imagined to have any force to *juſtifie them*, why then ſhould I *grant, or deny the invalidity of theſe*, when upon the grounds premiſed, *all* were indifferently invalidated? When then in great vehemence he *appeals to my conſcience and reaſon, whether my anſwer taken from Chriſt's rule of bearing of injuries, be any thing to this queſtion, whether the ſweetneſs of the breath juſtifie the affront of ſpitting in ones face*, or, *civil language ſufficiently excuſe pernicious Doctrine.*] I anſwer him again, that neither of theſe were *queſtions* between him and me, or his Reader, but this onely inſtead of them, whether *rude blows were a ſuitable return to a civil adverſary*, nay even to an *uncivil*, according to the *law of Chriſt?* And I am ſure my *anſwer* (and he cannot doubt it) was *pertinent*, and more than *home* to that *queſtion*. This manner of dealing I deſire may be entered into *S. W.*'s *Character*.

5. *The anſwer to his ſecond queſtion*, he ſaith, *is yet more pleaſant, for inſtead of telling whether ſwearing demurely be any excuſe for perjury, ſo as to ſecure it from the puniſhment or treaty which otherwiſe might juſtly be given it, he tells us*, ſaith he, *in good ſober ſadneſs, that a man may uſe all lawfull means to defend his eſtate, and diſcover perjury, and blames me for accuſing him of perjurious tampering — as ſuperadding to the former errour, that I miſtake the compariſon for the thing that it is brought to reſemble*] To the ſubſtantial part of this charge, the ſame account belongs, which was given to the former. That the *queſtion* betwixt us, was not whether *civility* could excuſe from *juſtice*, but whether it ought not to *ſecure* from *rudeneſs*; and ſo proportionably, not whether the *demureneſs of the ſwearing* or *forſwearing*, could *ſecure the perjurious* from any *juſt* returns, but whether ſo great a ſuppoſed crime as *perjury* would *juſtifie the rude blows*, or *twitchings by the beard, declamation*, or *Satyr*. Of theſe onely, he knows the queſtion was, and the Readers ſuppoſed objection, to which he undertook to give ſatisfaction by this other *double queſtion, what return ſoever ſhould be made to it*: To which therefore I was ſo to accommodate anſwer, that it might appear, whether he in his ſuppoſed *rude blows* were innocent, or no; and that he was not, did irrefragably appear by theſe two ſteps, 1. That as all *lawfull means might be uſed to diſcover Perjury, and defend the Eſtate, ſo unlawfull might not, and the rude blows were of that number* (the *latter* part of which being that, whereon the weight of the *anſwer* lay, he hath wholly omitted in his recitation, with what fairneſs, let him now judge.) 2. That this of *demure Perjury* was far from the caſe of *S. W.*'s adverſary) whoſe *civility* was all that was ſuppoſed in the *objection*) and who was as free from that, or any thing proportionable to that, as from *Necromancy* or *ſacrificing to Idols*. And then, what anſwer could be more pertinent and *home* to the purpoſe, than this, that his Plea for *rude blows*, depending on the conceſſion or ſuppoſition of *two* things, 1. That the adverſary was guilty of *Perjury*, or the like; 2. That *rude blows* were a juſtifiable return to that; neither of theſe had any degree of truth in them. How this, that was thus plain, made a ſhift to be diſguiſed, I leave the Reader to conſider, and account with *S. W.* for it.

6. And when for the inflaming of the Bill, he adds, that I *miſtook the ſimilitude for the thing it is brought to reſemble*, I wonder how he came to be ſo far of my counſel; If I repeated the words which he ſpake, and made anſwer in the ſame Dialect, and there was an *allegory* in his words, it is ſtrange I may not be allow'd to have had the ſame in mine; Is my keeping *cloſe* to his *words*, an evidence that *I forſook his ſenſe?* If it be not, I am ſure he hath no other from which to infer it. Nay, is it not yet more evident, that I began that period (now accuſed of this errour) thus, *'Tis certain and viſible that as the defending the Church of* England *from Schiſm, bears no proportion to the ruining* S. W's *eſtate, ſo neither is there any oath incumbent on us* — and purſue it in like manner, that *his ſtile, which was robuſt in the mention of Perjury, becomes much fainter when he comes to the* ἀνταπόδοσις —— Now if I had *miſtaken the ſimilitude for the thing it was brought to reſemble*, how could I mention *proportion*, and ἀνταπόδοσις? Doth not *proportion*] expreſly ſignifie the *compariſon*, and though ἀνταπόδοσις be a *Greek* word, to which *S W.* hath a pique, yet ſure it is, in plain *Engliſh*, the *ſecond part of a compariſon*, or the *thing reſembled* by it, and having noted it *twice* in ſo few lines, why muſt I be obliged to note it a *third* time, to præclude, what I had not the ſagacity to foreſee, *S. W.*'s diſcovering of my *errour?* Let the Reader now adviſe, whether it were any great debaſement to *S. W.* to be ſet to *pick thrums-ends out of over-worn garments* as he is pleaſed to ſtile his examining of *teſtimonies* produced out of *Scripture* and *Fathers*) who when he is not ſo imployed, ſets himſelf to the *picking of holes*, where his fingers meet not with the leaſt temptations. *Pag.* 18.

7. Of the ſame thred exactly is the next that follows, and *is*, ſaith he, *greater than all the reſt, that when he made it his onely Plea to the Reader for ſome blows — that our controverſie was about things concerning mens eternal ſalvation, and therefore the Reader knowing that he (as all Catholicks) hold their Faith certain, he had no reaſon to expect that* S. W. *ſhould favour an opponent in an act of ſuch a nature, as is publickly harmfull to mens ſouls, yet the Doctor takes no notice of this his Plea*] But I anſwer 1. That I did take notice of it, and aſſured him that I took it for a plain *begging the queſtion*, to *ſuppoſe that guilt which he was to prove, to aſſume ſo early, what he muſt, but hath not yet ſo much as attempted to demonſtrate*. 2. That if I had not taken notice of it, I had not in the leaſt offended, as long as I had proved that *Contumelies in a Controvertiſt* were ſimply unlawfull, for then no ſuppoſed truth, or weight of the cauſe could juſtifie them. The more *Chriſtian* and important the *cauſe* were, the more it ſhould confine it ſelf to the uſe of means exactly *Chriſtian*; and *Contumelies* were not ſuch, and of theſe onely the *controverſie* was, though he now ſoftens the matter, and asks whether he *ſhould favour an opponent in an act of ſuch a nature, and that he would have little contention with me, were the difference in things of leſs concernment than eternity*. But ſure, 'twas not his *favour* was courted, nor his *not contending*, nor any thing expected of him, in return to *civility*, but what was ever under obligation of ſtrict *Chriſtian* duty to thoſe who are *uncivil*, and if without all temptation

he will break through those *rational*, as well as *religious* ties, and *pretend* piety for doing so, and care of souls, and challenge me of wilfull mistakes, for not attending to his pleas, when he thus forsaketh his question, and substitutes another, which was never controverted, I foresee not, when I shall attain to any ordinary degree of his favour.

8. So when he saith, *I transfer the matter from the publick injury to mens Souls, to the case of private injury* and then asks, *Whether if a man be certainly held to have ruin'd some souls eternally, Christ bids him let him ruine more?*] He is doubly mistaken; for 1. I onely shewed from *Christ*'s word, that even *Injuries* are not to be repaid with *Injuries*, much less *Civility* with *Contumelies*, and this must hold in the most *publick* Concernment, as well as in the most *private*, unless *Contumely* be proved to be in the number of those things that are allowed in *God*'s *Cause*, or in the *Cause* of *Souls*, though not in *Man*'s *Cause*, or the matters of his *Body* and *Estate*; which as it is most untrue, so 'tis not here pretended to be proved to have truth in it. 2. I do not endeavour to perswade him, that he that can hinder that which he deems the *ruining of any Soul*, shall be blameless in permitting it, or that *Christ*'s *precept*, of *turning the other Cheek* belongs to him; but 1. That *unlawfull means* are not to be used for the most *glorious end*; and *Contumely* is such: And 2. That it hath no propriety to the pretended end, being but the Weapons of those that are desperately worsted, and not rationably supposable to be made use of by any other. One of their own * *Sorbon* Doctors, formerly mentioned, in his dispute with the *Carmelites*, about a supposititious *Bull*, gives for the *seventeenth*, or *last reason* to prove it such, the *Contumelioſus ſcribendi modus*, that the *Advocates of the Bull* used against their Adversaries, when they wanted *Arguments substituting reproaches*; and concluding in those words, which may be competent to conclude this matter. *Quis autem nescit cordatos & eruditos viros in ea versari sententia, ut omnino putent calumnias argumentum esse desperatæ causæ, ac perditæ quam certissimum? Calumniæ siquidem arma sunt eorum qui vincuntur.* The Argument appeared to him of so much force, that he makes use of it again upon a like occasion, and in the same words, *de Bull. Alexand.* V. *c.*12. *Undecima suppositionis ratio ex contumelioso scribendi modo.* And again, *de Bull. Clem.*VII. *c.* 3. *Id est primo manifestum ex contumeliis, quæ bonarum rationum vices obeunt. His very first reason*, and that sufficient to *manifest the matter* in hand, he takes from the Disputers *Contumelies which supply the place of good reasons*. And once more *de Bull. Alex.*V. *c.* 13. *Ad convincendam fraudem accedunt probra & maledicta, quibus Cheronius & Aquinas enervia responsa, & aridas emaciataſque rationes contegunt, ac veluti ſaginant; ſperant fore, ut ſic bene curata responſionum & rationum ſuarum prima cutis tentura ſit lectorum oculos, & impeditura, ne in ipſam ſaniem earum & vitium penetrare poſſent.* I leave *S. W.* to english it, and observe that it is not an *heterodox-protestant-doctrine*, this, to think that *Contumely* is not *necessary to a Controvertist*. What then shall be said of (that *Shepherd*) that care of Souls, which by its own ill managery tends so regularly to the *betraying* of them, and interpretatively joins with the *deemed Wolf against the Sheep*.

* D. *Launoy de Bull. Sab. Johan.* 22. p. 117.

9. *Nec dum finitus*--My *weaknesses* are not yet at an end; I said, that *if he mark it, his Stile that was robust in the mention of perjury, is grown much fainter, when he comes to the* ἀντιθέσις, *pretends to no more than perverse meaning and abusive treating matters of Religion*. And this is heavily charged upon me, that *I make account that abusive treating matters of Religion, which is able to plunge millions of Souls into eternal damnation, is of less moment than perjury against ones temporal estate.*] But I answer, that the phrase *against ones temporal estate* is here put in by *S.W.* above what my words yielded him. 'Tis evident the Comparison I observed, was betwixt *Perjury* on one side, and *perverse meaning and abusive treating* on the other side, and yet neither simply considered, but supposing the matter, *viz. Matters of Religion*, referred to, both in the comparison and the thing signified, to be the same. This I was to suppose in all Justice to his words, who used that mention of *Perjury*, as a *resemblance*, (and even now rebuked me, when he conceived I had not so understood it) and then could not confine it to his *temporal estate*, (as now to found his rebuke he hath chosen to doe) because on that he could not think my Tract of *Schism* had any influence, but indefinitely mentioned *ruining their estate by* Perjury; where I supposed there was a *spiritual* as well as *temporal estate*, and accordingly ('tis visible *p.* 7.) accommodated my answer, *in relation whether to his earthly or heavenly possessions*. Thus hard is it to forestall *S.W*'s severities, when one while I am accused for *not* taking notice of his *similitude*, and after when I do take notice of it, and ground my answer upon it, I am then fetcht back to the *letter*, as if it had not been a *similitude*, and rebuked for my *weakness* in that also. But this artifice (by the interposition of [*temporal*] both to mine, and his own words) being now discovered, I appeal to him, whether it be not a *growing fainter*, when his stile, that began big, with *ruining by Perjury*, and, if it observed *decorum*, ought to be answered by somewhat as high and criminous as *Perjury*, and as noxious to the *souls*, as that which ruines the *temporal* estate, is to that, is yet dwindled into *perverse meaning*, which is not so much as *perverse speaking* (no man being able to affirm of anothers *meaning*, which is not expressed) when yet *perverse speaking* is not near so much as *ruining by Perjury*, and into *abusive treating*, which again supposing the matter the same (as it is manifest I supposed) is much less than *perjurious ruining*.

10. Having triumphed over this piece of conquered Air of his own creating, he asks very demurely if *this Doctor be fit to have the charge of souls, who professes to set more by his temporal, than their eternal felicity?*] And I as seriously demand, whether any the least heed be due to the observations of one, that can thus put words in his Adversaries mouth, and then accuse him for the ill consequences of them, which if he hath so little charity to *hereticks*, as to believe him guilty of, he will hardly have so mean an opinion of his skill, as to expect he should profess it, if he were guilty. 'Tis not long since I was rebuked for *professing an earnest desire to speak the full truth of God*, and then that was an indication of *Pharisaical hypocrisie*; and now I am brought on the Stage, *without* any *disguise* (and so my *hypocrisie* is dropt off) supposed to make *open profession of profaneness*, and no crimes fit enough for me, but those which are *unreconcileable* with one another, so that I shall have the honour to be a *miracle* of something; How much more then, will be owing to *S.W.* who hath the *creative* power to make me so?

Pag. 28.

11. The Reader will be glad of the news, that we are now coming to the last part in his charge in this matter. And what is that? *That I complain he begs the question, to suppose that guilt which he was to prove, to assume so early in the Epistle to the Reader what he must (but hath not yet so much as attempted to) demonstrate.* Where first he will *note*, *that Doctor* H. *would have men believe that he made account that the Epistle to the Reader is to be writ by the Author before he writes the Book*; *next that he pretends that* S. W. *who*

was

was to answer his Book, ought to prove and demonstrate, i. e. oppose and object, which are saith he, two very good counterfeited and affected mistakes] And granting that they are so, my onely question is, who 'tis to whom the reward of them is due? to me, who onely supposed that an *Epistle* was *prefixed* before the Book, and would first be *read*, though written last, and could not desire to *appear* to *think it written before the Book*, when in my whole discourse I supposed it to be an *Apology* for the Errours of the Book; or to him that feigns me thus to mistake, when he could not but see I did not, and had no temptation to affix it on me, but that I said he *begged the question* in it, and *assumed what he had not yet in that Epistle attempted to demonstrate*, which whensoever 'tis done, be it before, or after the writing of the Book, is the guilt of that *Elench*, and must needs be so, unless being not attempted to be demonstrated in the *Epistle*, it were more than *attempted* in the Book, which I shall still avouch, and in due time make apparent, that it was not.

12. His other note, or branch of *charge* is more notable, making it an *errour* in me, to pretend that he who was to *answer, ought to prove*, &c. But I hope the Reader may be allowed to remember, what it was that I thought him bound to *prove*, even nothing else, but his charge of *falsifying*, which I deemed the lowest, which could bear any proportion with that of *ruining his estate by Perjury*. Of this 'tis evident I spake, when I said, *I trust it shall appear, that there is not one single falsity in that whole Tract of Schism, and his supposing the contrary, was the onely petitio principii*, which there I charged on him. And if now it be the privilege of an *Answerer*, that he may charge of *falsifying*, without *proof* of his charge, and may not have his charge denied, or the proofs of it required, (which is all that is meant by telling him, he *begs the question*) and this upon the prerogative of an *Answerer*; and because to *prove* or *demonstrate*, is to *oppose* and *object*, then I see there be other grounds to authorize *Calumnies* and *Contumelies*, beside that of the *deemed certainty of his Faith*, and he might but have said he was the *Answerer*, and superseded all this large trouble of any farther justification.

13. From these thus specified weaknesses, the Reader is advised to *consider what a pitifull spectacle the Doctor would prove, if* S.W. *were but at leisure to pursue him.*] And I believe so too, for it cannot but extort some degree of *compassion*, to see any man set to so sad a task, of wiping off all those *phasms* of guilt, which *S. W*'s representations can fix on him. By this I suppose the Reader sees, what he is to look for, and that the watery colours which are said to be in the Rainbow, are onely in *S.W*'s eye, and produced by it. And so we are at an end of his *defence* of the *Blows* which the Reader, he *knew*, would *judge too rude*, till he had timely met, and disabused him; with what *rigorous evidences*, he will now discern, better than through *S.W*'s *Optick*.

14. What he adds, in conclusion of his *fourth Section*, concerning my opinion of the affinity betwixt the *Epistle of the Catholick Gentleman, and the first part of Schism Disarm'd*, I shall no farther reply to, than that I was cautious to set this down, as my *opinion* onely, wherein as I may be mistaken, so I may still be in the right, notwithstanding the argument drawn from the *stile*, which is not the same in a Letter, and in a *Discourse*, in haste, and on greater deliberation, when the Author desires to disguise, and when to discover himself. In either of these cases, more probable judgments are made by *lesser* characters, which are not so sure to be guarded by the Disguiser, as are those, which he knows are most visible. But I know such judgments to be deceivable, and the sagacity that *Cæsar* had in discerning any period of *Cicero*'s, to have been far greater, and more unerring, than I ever aspire to have of *S.W*'s lines, and that upon many reasons of difference. If I shall now upon his bare word change my mind, and persuade my self that the Author of that Epistle was *one of my old acquaintance*, I am sure I shall be prest with the same difficulty, not discerning it by the *stile* to be penn'd by any such, and having other arguments of so much more force to the contrary, that unless Mr. *Cressey*, which really is one of mine *old acquaintance*, tell me he was the Author of that Letter, or some other, whom my memory hath quite lost, remind me that he was of my *old acquaintance*, it will still be my wisest course to advise of it, and remember how extrinsecal to the arguments, and how impertinent it is, who is the *Penner*, or who the *Suggester* of them.

15. But ere this Section concludes, I must once more be rebuked, for stiling my *Answer to Schism Disarm'd, an Appendix to the Reply to the Catholick Gentleman*, and a *Gleaning after the Rake*, when the *former consisted of* 303. *pages, and the latter but of* 165. *as if Husbandmen*, saith he, *used to rake armfulls, and leave Cart-loads to be gleaned.*] But 1. I was not obliged to be a good *Husbandman* by that or any equal necessity, which is affirmed to lie on *S.W.* to render all that his Adversary saith, *nonsensical*. 2. My *ill husbandry* was not yet of that degree, as to qualifie it for *his* rebuke, who at the same time made the proportion of 165 to 303 to be parallel to the proportion of *Armfulls* to *Cart-loads*, which concludes less than *two Armfulls* to make a *Cart-load*. 3. I now see it was not really so *great*, nor so *pleasant an errour* (which *p.* 31. was in me accused as such) to *mistake the comparison* or *similitude*, *for the thing it is brought to resemble*, or else 2. that *S. W.* is a mortal, and subject to *errour*, like other men, or 3. that some kind of Creatures are refreshed with those plunges in the Water, which would drown others; for 'tis certain, had not *S. W.* here thus *mistaken*, he might well have understood, that I onely meant by the *similitude* of *Gleaning*, to express my care (in the second Answer, that to *Schism Disarm'd*) to *gather* up, and make returns, to all, were it *much*, or *little*, which I had not taken notice of in the *Reply to the Catholick Gentleman*. And yet 4. if he review that third Section of mine, to which he makes this Answer, he shall find that it was but the *First Part of Schism Disarm'd*, which I thought penn'd by the same hand that wrote that *Catholick Gentleman*'s *Letter*, and consequently that my farther answer to *that* part, was it, which would have but the nature of an *Appendage*, and so it had, being evidently much shorter than the former Reply, amounting to no more than 74 pages, which notwithstanding, there remained still the two other parts, and those might be allowed to have many fresh passages, the answers to which might, with *S. W*'s good leave, be bound up with that *Appendix*.

16. And yet there are two things more to be charged on me, 1. *That I said he had time to have taken notice of my Reply to the Catholick Gentleman.* 2. That *I apprehended not all truth, because not that of* his *occasions.*] I answer, 1. That if at the *Printing of Schism Disarm'd*, he had not seen, or heard of my *Reply* to that Letter, it must be through some circumstances, which I could not then, nor can now after his admonition apprehend. For where-ever he were, the *Reply* might reach him as well as the *Original* Tract of

Schism

Schism. 2. I might also say with perfect truth, that *he had time to take notice of it*, it being competently certain, that the space of many months, which intervened between the one and the other is called *time*, and that that was afforded *him*, as well as any other; so that these two rebukes are of the strain of the many fore-going: Yet if in this *Dispatch* of his he shall be found to have made *full* returns to that *whole Reply*, the matter is not great; if he shall not, (as certainly I may have his leave to assume he hath not, having not offered any syllable to the latter half of it) then I have, under his hand here, his leave to conclude, that he *deems it not likely to endamage those dear souls of his brethren*; And so all may be *safely believed*, which he hath not attempted to refute, and that will prove a far *greatest* part of that Book; which is all I have need to say to these *concluding* charges. It is now somewhat more than time that I should set a period to this *Theme* and *Chapter*, whose length may yet usefully serve the Reader, and help him to some variety of *experiments* concerning *S.W*'s manner of managing *Controversies*, over and above the satisfying of the main engagement, (the first perhaps that was ever solemnly written on the Subject) examining his *Plea* for *Contumelies*.

CHAP. II.

A View of S. W. *his Eight first Grounds.*

SECT. I.

S. W*'s diversion. His grounds generally reflected on, and therein the state of our Controversie. Demonstration promised. His pretension. Ours. The necessary* credenda, *or whole Faith, stated from* Athanasius, *from the grand design of the Gospel, consent of all the Apostles. The* Ephesine *Canon, Testimony of* Cyril, Gregory, *the Council of* Florence, Jeremias, Socolovius, *the Council of* Trent. *The second* Nicene *Council, of the six foregoing.* Bellarmine *and the Bishop of* Triers *Catechism. The pretended self-evidence of* S.W*'s Grounds.*

1. THE Scene is now altered, and *S. W.* from an *Advocate* of *Contumely*, having a while retired, comes out in a more venerable shape or dress, as an invincible Propugner of his *Infallible Church*, and speedy *Dispatcher* of *Schism*, and of all *Protestants* under that title. But before he thinks fit to enter the Lists, to set close to the one proper task, of frustrating all my attempts of *Reply* to his former *Answers* in *Schism Disarm'd*, he is resolved (as * elsewhere the manner is, and, it seems, it is the most usefull course in their esteem, else it would not be so *constantly* resorted to) to begin with a *Diversion* of some length, erecting a Fabrick of his own, therein to intrench and fortifie himself, but more distinctly designed to prepossess his Readers with some *Grounds (summ'd* up in *possession*, and Tradition of the *present Roman Church)* which when they have taken up on trust from him, and so imbibed no less than the very quintessence and Elixir of all *Rushworth*'s *Dialogues*, he doubts not but they will be fit to give up their names with him, in perfect resignation to the dictates of the *Apologist*, and then I confess I am not likely to find any eminent favour from them.

* *In the first six Chap. of Answer to the L.* Falkland *of Infallib. In the first encounter of the Apol. for Trad. in Schism Disarmed. Part.* 2. *Sect.* 10, 11.

2. Should I now refuse or omit to take notice of this counter-work, he would easily be tempted to *believe* himself, and perhaps to *persuade* some others, that 'twere another *invincible* piece, and withall, out of this *Trojan Horse* once admitted, find no difficulty at every turn to draw out Instruments for his advantage both of Defence and Battery, which they that had entertained his *grounds*, would not know how to resist: On the other side, if I should be thus led out of the way, or but stopt, to make this halt at the entrance, and treat with him about these his *grounds*, it must, I see, be a business of some length (such is the ploughing up of *Foundations*) which yet with the Readers leave, I shall not avert or decline, hoping that the same advantages which he projected to himself from some mens embracing of his *grounds*, receiving his *tinctures*, may be really acquired to others, by discerning the *faintness* and fadingness of his *best colours*, the feebleness and unconcludency of the *mediums*, whereby he hath recommended them.

3. In order whereunto, if, in imitation of him, I should set out with another as large a *digression*, draw out also my parallel lines, and pitch my Camp over against his, and to his strong hold of *Possession* and Tradition (meaning by the *latter*, that which is *retrograde*, from this present Age, by way of ascent, to the foregoing, and so back to the Apostles, which for distinction sake, I shall know, by the stile of *Tradition Revers'd*) oppose ours of *Scripture*, and *Tradition* in the vulgar notion, *progressive*, and descending from the Apostles to their Successors, and from them to us; though I doubt not, the Parties thus intrenched would be so opposite, and withall so near, as to denounce Wrath, and War, articulately and audibly the one to the other, yet it will be impossible (by the nature, and the known demonstration of *parallel* lines) that they should ever *meet*, to trie out the Controversie, by entering the Lists, and combating the one with the other; I shall therefore no farther transcribe *S.W*'s method of *laying foundations*, than to point out the clear and brief state of both our pretensions, which lies thus.

4. On the one side, *S.W.* puts in his claim, fetcht from a pretended *possession*, and the *Tradition of the present Roman Church from Father to Son*, upon which he undertakes to conclude, 1. The right of the *Papacy* to *supreme universal Monarchy*. 2. The *Infallibility* and *Apostolicalness* of every Article of the modern *Roman Faith*, and both these with that irrefragable *evidence* of conviction, that belongs to *grounds*: So that if in this his whole Scheme there shall appear to be any one line, which neither carries this *evidence with it in its own terms*, (as he most commonly pretends) nor receives it immediately from *S.W*'s assistance, the whole Fabrick must necessarily fail, a *demonstration (less* than which he pretends not) being made up of nothing, that is either *untrue*, or *onely probable*, but all uniform, and like it self, *evident*, *convincing*,

vincing, and *demonstrative*, Mr. *White* having with great truth assured us of *probable arguments*, that there is * *nothing more certain than that they have no truth*, i. e. *no truth of an argument, no force of concluding in them*; and *grounds*, in the vulgar notion of *grounds*, being equivalent with *principles*, of which there can be no dispute, or doubt of the truth of them. * *Apol.* p. 117.

3. This then being the state of *S. W's* pretensions on one side, his *Protestant* Adversary on the other side, not onely pretends, but (for his security) is by *consent* of parties acknowledged to have all the same *grounds* of assurance for *all* the parts, and for the intire body of *his Faith* (*i. e.* for all that he *believes* to be *necessary* to be *believed for his souls health*) which *S.W.* pretends to for his, viz. *Possession* and *Tradition*, yea and both in *S. W's* notion of them, 1. Present acknowledged (which is more than pretended, but not acknowledged) *Possession*, and 2. *Tradition Oral*, and that of the *present Church*, and of *all* the *Churches* of the *Roman Communion*, and that *as received from our immediate ancestors, as received from theirs*, and so up to the *Apostles*, and not onely thus much (which is all that *S. W's* pretensions really amount to) but much more than this.

6. *First* the like *acknowledged* (and not onely *pretended*, or by questionable deduction inferred) *Possession* through *all ages* of the *Church*: This is apparent, and cannot be denied of the *Crede*, and that evidently is the *intire body* of *our Faith*.

7. *Secondly Tradition Oral*, truely and unquestionably *universal*, both for time and place, of the *East*, as well as *West*, of the *Greek*, as well as the *Latine* Church, and that of all ages, including the *Apostles*, not any *one*, or *more*, but *all the Apostles*, and their immediate successors in the *Churches* of their plantations. That I add [*all, and not onely one or more, Apostles*] is in compliance with *S. W's* good friend Mr. *White*, who having defined *Tradition* by *delivery of Christ's Doctrine*, and express'd his notion of that phrase, for * *that which was generally preached by the Apostles*, doth after pronounce of a *Tradition* affirmed by St. *Augustine* (yea and Pope *Innocentius*) to be *Apostolical* (communicating of Infants) that *it was* so indeed, *we*, saith he, *are of his mind, but with this qualification*, it *was a Tradition begun by some Apostles, not all, in some Countries not all, in some circumstances not all*, and on this one account concludes, that as it was *no superstition to use it*, so it *was no sacrilege to leave it off*; which reasoning if it have any force in it (as with *S. W.* I shall presume it must) it will then conclude, *first* that no *Tradition* is sufficiently *testified* to be (not onely free from *superstition*, but withall) obligingly *Apostolical*, and so as it may not *without sacrilege be left off*, but what is *testified* to come from more than *some*, even from *all* the *Apostles*, and therefore 2. that nothing but the *Crede* is thus *obliging*, even by *S. W's* own rule, that of the *Oral Tradition* from *Father* to *Son*, as *delivered generally*, and not onely from *one*, or *some*, but from *all* the *Apostles*. * *Apol.* p. 7.

8. *Thirdly*, the *written* word of *God*, which *Vincentius*, the great acknowledged assertor of *Catholick Tradition* against *Heresie*, affirms to be the * *prime*, if not † *onely way* of *propugning the Faith*, as that which was by the *Apostles* (for the *confirming* at least of their faith, to whom they wrote, and for the instructing of others) *delivered* to the *Churches*, and which is by * *Bellarmine* himself acknowledged to be the *most certain and most safe rule of believing*, and by *Roffensis*, † (even when it was least his *interest*, in his dispute of *Purgatory*) *Conclave quoddam omnium veritatum quæ Christianis scitu necessariæ sunt, a certain repository of all verities which are necessary to be known by Christians*. * *Duplici modo munire fidem, primò scilicet divina legis authoritate* —*contr. Hæres.* c. 1. † *Quascunque antiquiores vel Schismatum vel hæreseon profanitates nullo modo nos oportet convincere, nisi aut solâ, si opus est, Scripturarum authoritate* —*Ibid.* c. 39. * *De Verbo Dei*, l. 1. c. 2. † *Cons.* Luther. *Art.* 37. *de Purg.*

9. *Fourthly*, the *writings* (which are somewhat more steady and * *creditable*, than the bare *Oral* Traditions) of *Apostolical* men, *Fathers* and *general Councils*, which not onely assure us by way of † unquestionable *testification*, that all these *Articles* of *Faith*, which we receive, were by *Christ*, and not *one* but *all* his *Apostles*, *orally delivered*; but also teach us, 1. That they were delivered as their *depositum*, carefully to be kept, and believed, *i. e.* as the *Faith* of the *Christian Church*, and foundation of special efficacy for the planting of *Christian life* in the world: and (not onely so, but) 2. as the *whole Faith*, or doctrine thus designed, *intire, and wanting nothing*, *vera & unica Christiana fides, the true and onely Christian Faith*, say the *Greeks* in their *censure* of the *Germans*, Ch. 2. and to which (consequently) no *new Article* might lawfully, or reasonably be added, *Regula fidei una, sola, immobilis & irreformabilis, the one, sole, unmoveable, unreformable rule of Faith*, says * *Tertullian* of the *Crede*, the repository of these; which *two* last particulars being the things principally considerable, on which as I expect, so I desire the Reader would lay the *greatest* weight, and of which when (formerly, in the † Tract *of Schism*) I made my profession, the *Catholick Gentleman* told me, that *truly he knew not what a Catholick professed more*, intimating his wish, that I would *speak it aloud*, and *S.W. Schis. disarm'd*, p. 233. resolved, that I *was become a plain Papist*, I shall therefore be as pliable as they can wish, and with some advantage repeat the grounds here, on which I have * elsewhere establish'd them, and so speak out as distinctly, and *aloud*, as is possible. * Ὅτα πίστιν ἀπισότερα εἶναι ὁδαλμῶν, *Pallad. Laus. Hist.* p. 966. B. † *Literæ sunt una custodia fidelis memoriæ rerum gestarum, Liv.* l. 1. * *De Veland. Virg.* c. 1. † *Ch.* 8. § 5. * *Reply*, p. 136.

10. *First*, that in St. *Athanasius* his judgment, those heads, (wherein we profess the Faith to be compleated) are αὐτάρκεις *sufficient* in *themselves* (without any *additions*) πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν πάσης ἀσεβείας καὶ σύστασιν εὐσεβείας, *for the averting of all impiety* (and so of all *heresie*, if *heresie* be any sort of impiety) *and for the establishing of piety* (that again by the force of indefinites, and by the laws of opposition, must be of *all piety*) *in the Church*.

11. And if *Athanasius* in this said true, or if we have a far greater *testimony* of it, than the affirmation of any one or more *Fathers* of the *Church*, even the one grand ruling design of the whole *Gospel*, the one end and aim of all divine *revelations*, and *institutions*, as of the very death of *Christ*, to *purchase to himself a peculiar people zealous of good works*, to advance our *obedience* to his *precepts*, and in order to this one end, the *unerring* because divinely directed judgment of the *Apostles* themselves, who being by *Christ* sent out as his great *Commissioners*, particularly intrusted, and instructed for this purpose, to *call* home *sinners to repentance*, and convert a world of *Jewish* and *Heathen* unbelievers to the *Christian faith* and *obedience*, did questionless know what was generally usefull or necessary to this design, and cannot be supposed to have been deficient in necessaries, and yet by joynt *consent*, *all* and every of them ‖ contented themselves with those *few* heads, which are summed up in their *symbol*; If, I say, this be thus ‖ *Nobis curiositate opus non est post Christum Jesum, nec inquisitione post Evangelium. Hoc enim prius credimus, non esse quod ultra credere debemus.* Tertull. *præscript. adv. Hær.* c. 8.

thus far unquestionable, the consequence must needs be so also, that either the *Christian Doctors* have now somewhat else in their design, than that one great end of their preaching proposed by *Christ*, the *Reformation* of *Lives*, that they have indeed (as Spectators are tempted to believe) converted their *power* and *office*, designed for ends purely *divine*, into an engine of *state* (the greatest *pollution*, *violation* and *sacrilege* imaginable) or else have received revelation of some new expedients toward that end, above what the *Apostles* thought such, in order to that same design, (the latter of which can as little be pretended, as the former will be owned by any sober man) or else it may be irrefragably concluded against them, that they ought to avoid all *new* definitions, and still allow the *Apostles Crede* to contain a compleat *Catalogue* of *Fundamentals*; all other Doctrines, how true or probable soever, being prejudged from being *Articles* of the *Christian Faith*, or *tesserae* of *Communion*; the *Peace* and charity and unity of *all* Christians, which eminently depends on this, being much more prizeable, than the *uniform* profession of any, or all those other doctrines, which have either none, or but an accidental, or questionable influence on *good life* (the *one* end of *Christ*'s coming into the world) and the imposing of which unnecessarily, is experimented to be the occasion, if not the cause of the many breaches in *Christendom*, of the lessening of that *reputation*, and inward esteem which was wont to attend the *institutions*, and *Ministers* of *Christ*, of the same scandalous neglect of the *one* great *necessary*, and so the most direct contribution of strengths and aids to the subtilest and most vigilant and implacable enemy of our souls; for if by this, or any other arts of diversion (such certainly are *passionate*, and *eternal disputes* about things *not necessary*) he can either wholly wear out, or but abate the edge of our *zeal* to that, which is indispensably our duty, and is of such weight and fruit, and obligation to all, as to exact and deserve our utmost diligence, the united vigour of all our whole *heart*, and *soul*, and *mind*, and *strength*, and then convert those weapons to the *disquieting* at least, if not *wounding* and *destroying* one another, which are all little enough for the guarding our selves from his enterprises, 'tis easie to divine, if we did not already daily discern, the inlarging of *Satan*'s, and the too scandalous decay of *Christ*'s *Kingdome*, (that *not in word*, *but in power*) in the *hearts* and *lives* of the far greatest number of *Christians*.

12. *Secondly*, that when this *Faith* ἅπαξ παραδοθεῖσα *delivered once*, or *at once*, was by the *Council* of *Nice*, and *Constantinople*, not *inlarged* in any *new* article, but onely somewhat explained, on occasion of *heretical* disturbers of this *depositum*; the great and general *Council* of * *Ephesus*, which came after that of *Nice* 106 years, solemnly decreed, and enacted, what was in it self thus highly reasonable, and what (if we may believe the †*Romanists* citation out of an *Epistle* of *Liberius* the *Pope* to St. *Athanasius*) the *Nicene Council* it self had before determin'd in the same words, though we find it not in the *Acts* of that *Council*, that it should *not be lawfull for any man to produce*, *or write*, *or compose any other Faith*, *beside that which was defined by those Nicene Fathers*, *and that they that should dare to compose or offer any such to any*, *that would from Gentilism*, *Judaism*, *or whatsoever heresie*, *convert to the acknowledgment of the truth*, *if they were Bishops* (such sure is the *Pope*) *should be deposed*, *if Lay-men* (such for ought I know is *S. W.*) *anathematized*.

* Can. 7. Ἕτερα πίστιν μηδενὶ ἐξεῖναι προφέρειν, ἤγουν συγγράφειν ἢ συντίθεναι παρὰ τὴν ὁρισθεῖσαν ——

† *Stanisl. Socol. Ann. in Cens. Or. c.* 1.

13. This is abundantly confirmed to us by *Cyrill* of *Jerusalem* * (who flourished between the sitting of the *Nicene* and *Constantinopolitan Council*, and accordingly the *Crede* which in the *Barocian Manuscript* is set down Κατηχ. Ε. concludes at εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα, *in the Holy Ghost*, as at *Nice* it did) who commands his *Catechumenus* to *receive and keep the Faith*, and not onely so, but μόνην τὴν ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας the *Barocian* Copy leaves out νυνὶ) σοι παραδιδομένην, τὴν ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς ἐχυρωμένην, *that onely Faith which hath been delivered thee by the Church*, *that which is fenced or fortified from all the Scripture*; adding that by way of provision for *unlearned* and *sloathfull* persons, that could not, or were not at leisure to *reade* the *Scriptures*, ἐν ὀλίγοις στίχοις τὸ πᾶν δόγμα τῆς πίστεως παραλαμβάνομεν, *the whole Doctrine of the Faith was comprehended in a few lines*, which they were therefore ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σπουδαστέον, *to ingrave in their heart*, their *memory* (so the *Barocian* Copy reads it intelligibly, ἐν καρδίᾳ τῇ μνήμῃ) this they were, saith he, to *have for their* ἐφόδιον, *viaticum*, *all the time of their lives*, καὶ ἀπὸ ταύτης μηκέτι δέξασθαι, *and never to take any other beside this*, no not if he himself *should change his mind*, *and contradict what he now said*, applying that of St. *Paul* that *if an Angel from heaven* shall εὐαγγελίζηται παρ' ὃ νυνὶ παρελάβετε, *preach to them any Gospel beside what they have now received*, *let him be anathema*, and again that the Articles of *Faith were not composed*, *as it pleased men*, ἀλλ' ἐκ πάσης γραφῆς τὰ κυριώτατα συνελθόντα μίαν ἀναπληροῖ τὴν τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίαν, *but the chiefest being collected out of all the Scripture compleated the Doctrine of Faith*, and *this Faith in few words*, πᾶσαν τὴν ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ καὶ καινῇ τὴν εὐσεβείας γνῶσιν ἐγκεκόλπισαι, *involved as in its bosome all the knowledge of piety in the old and new Testament*. And then requiring them to *look*, and *hold fast* the *Traditions*, *which they then received and write them as on the* † *plate of their hearts*, the *Barocian* Copy immediately adds (to assure us what *Traditions* these were) Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα θεὸν —— *We believe in one God*, and so on to the end of the *Nicene Crede*, and this as the *depositum* and *Tradition*, which must be kept ἄσπιλον, *unspotted unto the day of Jesus Christ*.

* *Edit. Morell.* p. 115, 117.

† τὸ πλάτος.

14. To which in respect to the *Romanist*, I add the express ground, whereupon Pope *Gregory* the first, exalted the *four* first *General Councils* so high, as to * profess of them, that he *received and reverenced them as the four Books of the Holy Gospel*, † *because*, saith he, *on these*, *as on a square stone*, *the structure of the Holy Faith riseth*, *and the rule of every life and action consists*.

* *Sicut sancti Evangelii quatuor libros, sic quatuor Concilia suscipere & venerari me fateor, Nicenum scilicet* —— l. 1. Regest. Ep. 24. † *Quia in his velut in quadrato lapide sanctæ fidei structura consurgit, & cujuslibet vitæ & actionis norma consistit.* Ibid.

15. Thirdly, that when the authority of that *Ephesine Canon* was by the *Greeks* press'd to the *Latines*, in the *Council* of *Florence*, with this weight set on it, that * *no wan will charge the Faith* (there spoken of) *with imperfection*, *unless he be mad*, all the answer the *Latines* there give, is no more but this, that the *Canon* forbad not † *another exposition agreeable to the truth in that Crede*, confessing it did forbid διαφορὰν καὶ ἑτερότητα, *a difference and contrariety*, and so *difference*, as well as *contrariety*, and even for the bare *explication*, they esteemed not that *lawfull for any to attempt*, *but the Fathers convened in Oecumenical Councils*. And this they there cited from * *Aquinas*, adding their sense of his words, that they belonged to, and held of † *any Crede whatsoever*, *which was common to the whole Church*. And again, they there avouch it from the *Epistle* of *Pope Celestine* to *Nestorius*, that * *the faith delivered by the Apostles requires neither addition nor diminution*.

* ὑμεῖς ἐγκαλεῖτε ἀτελείαν πίστεως, εἰ μή τις εἶη μανησόμενος. Conc. Tom. 7. p. 642.

† ἑτέραν ἔκθεσιν συμφωνον τῇ ἀληθείᾳ ἐν τῇ πίστει, p. 644. B.

* 2ª 2æ *qu.* 1. *art.* 10.

† περὶ ἕτερος ἓν συμβόλῳ, ὅπερ ὡς κοινὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας, p. 641. D. * ἡ πίστις ἡ παραδοθεῖσα ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὅτε προσθήκην, ὅτε μείωσιν ἀπαιτεῖ, p. 644. D.

16. So

16. So when the *Eastern Church* in their *Censure* written to the *Germans*, set down the † *Constantinopolitan Crede*, as *that treasure of the true uncorrupted Faith, sacredly sealed by the holy Ghost, that nothing should be taken from it, nothing aliene, or adulterine added to it, as that divine, most holy, perfect and universal Tessera of the Christian people diffused over all the world, the common Confession of all the Holy Fathers, the most certain boundary of the whole Christian Faith* —— the * *Romanist* publisher, though considering the *Western* interest in the point of *Filioque*, he think himself obliged to shew that this *Ephesine Canon* excluded not such interpretations as *that* († adding that it was made by the *Roman Synod* assembled by *Damasus* at the very time of the *Constantinopolitan Councils* sitting, and of that *Pope's confirming* that *Council*) yet he doubts not but it hath force against all that shall * *aliam fidem conscribere, write any other faith*, instancing in our latter unhappy age, and not onely in some followers of the *ancient Heretick*s, but in the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, who, saith he, *do not blush to compose another Faith:* when yet he knows they teach nothing *repugnant* to the *Nicene*; which therefore infers his *confession*, that all *additions* (not onely *contrarieties*) to the *Nicene* rule of *Faith*, are contrary to the *Ephesine Canon*. Nay the *Council* of *Trent* it self hath not denyed to give us its suffrage; for † being willing so far to transcribe the *ancient* copies, as to begin with the *Crede*, they give it the title of *Scutum fidei in quo possunt omnia tela nequissimi ignea extinguere; the shield of faith by which they may extinguish all the fiery darts of the most wicked one.* And again, that *the more sacred Councils were wont to set this up in the beginning of their Actions, Scutum contra omnes Hæreses, A shield against all Hereses, quo solo aliquando & infideles ad fidem traxerunt, Hæreticos expugnarunt, & fideles confirmarunt, by which alone heretofore* as *they drew the Infidels to the Faith*, and *confirmed the faithfull*, so *they overcame the Hereticks* (which sure they could not, if those doctrines might pass for *Heretical* which were no way *contrary* to this *Faith*) and in brief, that it is *fundamentum firmum ac unicum, the onely*, as well as *firm foundation, against which the gates of hell shall never prevail*, an argument that either *Heresies* are no parts of the interpretation of the *Gates of hell*, in *Christ*'s promise, or that there are none such, but which are *contrary* to the doctrine of the *Crede*, against which (and which *onely*) the *promise* is that they *shall not prevail*.

† *Cens. Or. c. 1.*
* *Stan. Socol. ad Greg. XIII. Pontif.*
† *P. 17.*
* *P. 22.*
† *Sess. 3.*
Ibid.
Ibid.

17. *Fourthly*, that in the *seventh Council*, the *second* of *Nice*, which hath full authority with a *Romanist*, speaking of the *six Councils* foregoing, we have these words, * *They have confirmed and establisht all that from the first times have been delivered in the Catholick Church, written and unwritten*, (and yet I suppose it will easily appear to any that will look, that no one of those *additionals*, which are taken in by the *Romanist*, and denied by us; was so much as named, or any way *confirmed* in those *six Councils*.) ἐκκλησίᾳ καὶ ἐγγράφως καὶ ἀγράφως ἐν τῇ αρχῇ τὸν χρόνον αὐτοῖς καὶ βεβαιώσας, καὶ ἐστήριξαν.

* *Act. 6. Conc. Tom. 5. p. 732. A.* Πάντα τὰ ἀδιαθέτως ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ

18. To all which may be annext the plain words of *Cardinal Bellarmine's Catechism*, that * *in believing and professing these two mysteries* (1. the *Trinity* and *Unity*. 2. the *Incarnation*) † *we manifest our selves distinct from all the false Sects of Gentiles, Turks, Jews and Hereticks* (and so *from all the false Sects of Hereticks*, as well as the other three) under these four names (as soon * after he declares) comprising *all the enemies of the holy Church*. Which renders it less necessary to have added in the last place, that the *Catechism* collected out of the Works of *Costerus, Petrus à Soto*, &c. and published by the command of the *Bishop* of *Triers*, hath these words, † *There was never any Heresie which might not be condemned by the Apostles Crede*. Which resolutions so *expres* of so *considerable Romanists*, would give us some ground of hopes, if we saw them not too largely and daily confuted, that we should not be *Hereticks* for this, which is the first, and signal part of our *pretension*, not admitting into our Crede any more than the *Apostles*, *Fathers*, and *first Councils* have taught *de fide*, and recommended to the *Church* as such; which therefore by these *precedents* we desire may be judged of, in the first place.

* *Ample Decla. Chr. Doct. ch. 2.*
† *P. 12.*
* *P. 14.*
† *Neque ulla unquam extitit Hæresis, quæ non hoc Symbolo damnari potuerit. Resp. ad 2. qu.*

19. *Secondly* then, the *Protestant* which thus pretends, doth also solemnly oblige himself to stand to, and acknowledge the *infallible* truth of all, whatsoever shall be regularly deduced, and avouched from any, or all of these *grounds* of *necessary belief*.

20. *Thirdly*, having gone thus far, he demandeth it, as part of *Christ*'s *depositum* to him (as to all) and every *Christians debt* of *peace* and *charity* to every *Christian*, that he may not be *anathematized* and *exterminated*, adjudged to the *fagot*, and to *hell*, for his not farther believing, what is not thus avouched to him, and which consequently he hath no solid unerrable ground, on which to believe it, and for which the *Romanist* doth not pretend to offer him any but those, which in the very first proposal of the *question* he knows are not acknowledged (with what reason, he now sees) but renounced by him.

21. *Fourthly*, he professeth his incapacity of apprehending, how, or that he should be obliged to affirm any thing as *de fide*, which on either of these grounds, common to him with all *Christians* (*Scripture* and *Apostolical Tradition*) he can find no cause to believe.

22. And *lastly*, having been instructed and assured by *Christ* and his *Apostles*, that the condition of *Evangelical* obedience is not onely an *easie yoke*, but a *reasonable service*, and that no man shall be required to doe, what he *cannot* doe, or *believe* what he hath no *sufficient* motive to believe; he hopes his mistake, if there should *lurk* any, will be pardonable, if having repentance for all his sins known and unknown, of wilfulness and weakness, he onely refuse to *profess*, what he doth not *believe*, and cannot force, or incline his *belief* to the accepting of all the *Roman* Additionals, without some other and better grounds and motives, than that of their pretended *possession*, and *infallibility* of their *Church*, the former of which he believes to be a *pretension* without force and reality, and the latter he more disbelieves, and upon greater strength of evidence, than any of their particular *doctrines*, which yet he hath no least colour of motive to assent to, but what is fetch'd from those least credible (which is far from *infallible*) grounds.

23. This then is the *sum* of that which comes to be debated betwixt *S. W.* and me at this time, Whether it be tolerably reasonable on his part, what is by *him*, and whether sufficient to affix on us the guilt and condemnation of Schism, what is by *us* thus pretended. And herein I desire not to forestall or incline the Reader's sentence, or to lay *ambush* for his favour by any circuit of words, or aid of *Rhetorical* exaggerations, but to leave him disingaged to pass it for himself, according as the *demonstrative grounds*, which *S. W.* promises him, and which alone by consent of parties deserve to be attended

to, ſhall in the iſſue appear to be ſuch, both in themſelves, and in counterpoiſe with that, which we thus barely offer to him, as the true ſtate of our pretenſion, without boaſting either of the *ſeverity*, or *rigorouſneſs* of our *demonſtrations*.

24. Having thus prepared the field, ſet down the terms on which this debate is to be managed betwixt us, let us ſet forth to a view of thoſe *weighty grounds and deductions emergent thence*, which *S. W.* thought fit (as he ſaith) to *ſet down in moſt manifeſt and evident terms, from the bare poſition and explication of which* (it ſeems they need nothing elſe; but as *principles*, will be granted, as ſoon as by *explication* they are rendred intelligible) he *doubts not to gain ſo far upon the rational Reader* (he then that will not thus be *gained* on, muſt, by his award, be content to lie down with the herd of *irrationals*) *that he ſhall confeſs he ſees the queſtion truly ſtated* (that I hope he doth, by what hath been already ſaid) *and* not onely ſo, but (he adds) *according to plain reaſon* (this the *Authour* of *Ruſhworth*'s *Dialogues* calls the *judgment of common ſenſe*) *reſolved*] alſo: which again aſſures us of *S. W*'s opinion, and undertaking, that his *Grounds* are to every the plaineſt, if *rational*, man, *evident*, as *principles*, in themſelves, and the undoubted parents of the *deductions* he hath brought from them. So * elſewhere he ſaith of *Grounds*, that the *nature* of them is to *intrench near on the firſt principles*, and that *their terms for the moſt part are unqueſtionably true*; And that you may not conclude leſs from thoſe fainter words [*near*, and *for the moſt part*] hear the *layer* of *grounds* himſelf, † Mr. *White*, ſpeaking of a *Romaniſt*, *He* (but with a [*perhaps*] which ſure was not meant to *ſignifie*, and ſo *deſtroy* the whole period) *would have offered you choice either of faith or knowledge; produced in order to this as perfect demonſtrations, as* Ariſtotle *is adored for, and towards that, ingaged you in the moſt evident directours of humane life, and clearly evidenc'd by the principles of common ſenſe, that if you refuſe the authority of the* Roman *Church, you renounce all the certainties on which you build every ſerious action of your life, and in a word conſtreined you to deny or affirm ſomewhat, that your ſelf in another caſe will confeſs a mere madneſs to deny or affirm.*

P. 36. * P. 96. † Daille's *Arts Diſcov. p.* 191.

25. This then I deſire may be taken notice of, concerning his *Grounds* in *general*, the irrefragable evidence which they undertake to bring with them: The *Reader* ſhall judge of their performance, by the more *particular* view of them.

SECT. II.

The firſt ground examined. What meant by the Pope's Authority. What acknowledgment it had before the Extinguiſhing Act. The Judgment of the Univerſities (Patriarches and Primates all one in reſpect of power) of Eraſmus. *Three arguments propoſed, to prove the non-acknowledgment. The firſt taken from the opinion of no power given by Chriſt to* Peter *over the reſt of the Apoſtles, by* Tu es Petrus, *and* Paſce oves. Lyra, Durandus à Sancto Porciano, Abulenſis, Cuſanus, Victoria. Adolphus *and the Biſhops of the Province of* Colen. John *of* Antioch. Cuſanus *from* Auguſtine. Bellarmine's *πρῶτον ψεῦδος derided at* Trent, *as new. The Biſhop of* Granada, *and of* Paris. Cuſanus *again. The ſecond argument from the authority of Councils above the Pope, unreconcilable with his univerſal Paſtorſhip from Chriſt. The number of great Authours for it. Of the then Church of* England, *of* France, *of* Germany, *Pope* Martine *the fifth. The Fathers of* Baſil. Leo *the tenth in the* Lateran *Council. The quarrel wide, between* Jeſuites *and* Sorboniſts, *as wide as between either of them or us. The* Sorboniſts *concord.* Gerſon's *Tract.* Bellarmine's *rejecting of his ſtating. Some Neutrals.* Picus Mirandula. *The third argument from the Supreme power of Princes, in oppoſition to the Pope. Proofs of it in* England. *Arguments from reaſon. The proof of his* Ground *reduced to Syllogiſm. The Major examined. What force in the word* Reformers, *to prove* S. W's *demonſtration. Aſſuming, no proof of acknowledgment. A Dilemna on ſuppoſition of* Rome's *Reforming. The Minor examined, the* Greeks *equal with us in denying the Supremany.* Gregory *the ninth of the* Greek *Church of the fourth Century.* Henry *VIII. no Reformer. The propriety of that word for Doctrine, and Manners.* Enormous *encroachments invite oppoſition.* Leo *the tenth the Schiſmatick. The ſtrange miſcarriages of* S. W's *firſt ground,* 1. *in point of truth, as to the Concluſion,* 2. *of demonſtrativeneſs, in both the propoſitions.*

1. THe firſt then of theſe *ſelf-evident Grounds* is this, *That the firſt pretenders to reform in the point of the Pope's authority in* England, *found* England *actually ſubject to that authority in Eccleſiaſtical matters.*] *And this*, ſaith he, *carries its evidence in its own terms, ſince they could not be truly ſaid the firſt Reformers from it, unleſs before, that authority had been there acknowledged, for the word Reformation, which they pretend, argues that tenet was held there before.*

2. If the Reader ſhall here obſerve what is introduced with [*ſince*] and [*for*] the ordinary dialect of probations, he will indeed ſoon diſcern the *ſelf-evidence* of this ground, as far as concerns *S. W*'s *perſuaſions* of it, all the ſtrength which he hath lent it, being but that which is proper to *principles*, the proving the queſtion by *it ſelf*, or a demonſtration, which is made up of thrice repeating the *ſame* thing in words lightly varied, uſing this his *firſt ground*, as *Balak* did *Balaam*, when he did not his buſineſs in one, removing him to another place of advantage, from the *high places* of *Baal* to *Piſgah*, and again from *Piſgah* to *Peor*, and then 'tis an ill-natured unimprovable ground, a very *ἀδικωτάτη γῆ*, a *reprobate ſoil*, in the husbandman's ſtyle, if in none of the thrice-varied appearances, it will afford or yield what he would have it, become *ſelf-evident*, and *demonſtrative*, to the bringing down *curſes upon* Iſrael, *anathema's* on the poor *Proteſtant*.

3. But to ſhew that this great luſtre is not in the object or *medium*, but onely in *S. W's Optick* nerve, or fancy, I ſhall briefly demand, what he means by [the *Pope's*, and *that Authority*] If onely the *Primacy* and dignity of the *Patriarch* of the *Weſt*, introduced by the *Canons*, or Cuſtomes of the *Church*, or any other acquired, or aſſumed precarious and mutable authority, or power in *ſome Eccleſiaſtical* matters, depending wholly on the conceſſions of *Princes*; and revocable at the pleaſure of them, or their ſucceſſours;

ceſſours, I may ſafely grant the *acknowledgedneſs* of that in *England*, at what time ſoever he ſhall date the firſt pretending to *Reform* in the point of the *Pope's* authority, that yielding no advantage to *S. W's* pretenſions, who (in his *ſecond ground*) defines this *authority* to be that of *the head of the univerſal Church*, and (in his *third*) *derived to the Pope as ſucceſſour to* St. *Peter*, and cenſures it in me for *frivolous and impertinent to talk of the King's power to change Patriarchates, when*, ſaith he, *they are queſtioning an authority above Pacriarchs, and pretended to be conſtituted by Chriſt himſelf*; and again, *as held then of Chriſt's inſtitution.*

4. If then (as muſt hence he aſſumed, and his *ſecond* and *third* inſuing *grounds* expreſs) he here means, 1. this *ſupereminent* tranſcendental, far more than *Patriarchal* power, as it is *pretended to be conſtituted by Chriſt himſelf*, and 2. the *ſelf-evidence*, that this was *acknowledged* in *England*, when the *firſt pretenders to reform* appeared, I ſhall then *firſt* conſider the *truth* of what he here concludes; [*that the firſt pretenders to reform found* England *actually ſubject to it in Eccleſiaſtical matters*] and again, [*that that authority was acknowledged, that tenet held there before* (that muſt be immediately before) *the firſt Reformers*] And 2. I ſhall examine (what he ſo confidently pretends) the *ſelf-evidence* of it.

5. In examining the *truth* of his concluſion, I may firſt take notice of his interpoſing that reſtrictive phraſe [*in Eccleſiaſtical matters*] not that I have any diſlike to his moderation therein, becauſe I ſuppoſe he meant by interpoſing it, to make a difference between the acknowledgment of the *Pope's ſupreme* power over this Nation in *Eccleſiaſtical*, and in *temporal* matters, and that he was ſo poſſeſt of the *former*, as he was not of the *latter*, which indeed very well agrees with what he adds of *this power* being *conſtituted by Chriſt himſelf*, by the line of St. *Peter*; for that muſt needs be confined to that ſort of power which alone was given to St. *Peter* by *Chriſt*, viz. a *regiment Eccleſiaſtical.*

22. This then being ſuppoſed to be the expreſs ſenſe of *S. W's. firſt ground*, that the *Pope's ſupereminent* authority or plenitude of power over *all* Churches, and ſo over the Chruch of *England*, as *conferred on him by Chriſt*, was here acknowledged before (and if his inference have any force, *immediately* before) *the firſt pretenders to reform in the point of the Pope's authority*, I ſuppoſe it will be brought to a ſpeedy iſſue, if we ſhall inquire, and obſerve, what was the declared opinion in this point in the years immediately preceding the rejection of the *Papal* power in this Nation.

6. Who it was that ſignally rejected it, is ſufficiently agreed, *Henry* VIII. by *Act* of *Parliament*, *Anno Dom.* 1536. in the 28 year of his reign, called *An Act of extinguiſhing the authority of the Biſhop of Rome, and preſcribing an Oath to all Officers Eccleſiaſtical and Lay, of renouncing the ſaid Biſhop and his authority.* Here then is the point of time to be faſtened, as the date of the *firſt Reformers*, to which *S. W's firſt ground* refers, and then 'twill coſt us little pains to diſcover what immediately before that, was the acknowledgment of *this Kingdom.*

7. Herein I refer him to one competent κριτηριον, (though formerly mention'd) the deciſion of the *Univerſities* and chief *Monaſteries*, in the XXVI year of his reign, *i. e.* two years before the fore-mention'd date, a Record fitted to the point in hand, and a proof that at that time it was not thus acknowledged. For when *Henry* VIII *May* 18. 1534. willing to be duly adviſed how he might fitly behave himſelf toward the *Pope*, applyed himſelf, after the *example* of his *Predeceſſours*, to the faithfull Council of the *Engliſh Church*, and diſpatch'd his Letters to the *Univerſities*, as to men of *virtue* and *profound literature* (and ſo likewiſe to the chief *Monaſteries*, and the reſt of the *Clergy*) requiring their *opinion* of a certain *queſtion, in writing, under their Seal, according to the mere and ſincere truth of the ſame*, and propoſing the queſtion in no higher a ſtyle than this, *Whether the Biſhop of Rome have in this Kingdom any greater juriſdiction in holy Scripture conferred on him, than any other foreign Biſhop?* they after *mature deliberation*, and conſideration of the whole matter, returned anſwer, *Jun.* 27. expreſly in the Negative, *Romanum Epiſcopum majorem aliquam juriſdictionem non habere ſibi à Deo collatam in S. Scr. in hoc regno Angliæ, quam alium quemvis externum Epiſcopum. That the Biſhop of Rome hath not any greater juriſdiction conferred on him by God in holy Scripture, in this Kingdom of England, than any other foreign Biſhop.* Theſe were the words of the *Anſwer* of the *Univerſity* of *Oxford*, as appears in their *Regiſter.*

8. If it be here ſuggeſted by any man elſe (for *S. W.* is not capable of receiving advantage by it) that this deciſion of the *Univerſity* ſet down in thoſe large terms of *non majorem quam alium quemvis*] was in prejudice alſo to the *Patriarchal dignity*, as well as to the *Papal Monarchick power* of *Rome*, the bare *Patriarchal dignity* being ſuperiour to that of *other foreign Biſhops*, the anſwer is obvious, that the deciſion is peculiarly of *majorem aliquam juriſdictionem, any greater juriſdiction*, and not of *ſuperiour dignity*, and ſo that the *Patriarch*, which in reſpect of power was no more than a *Primate*, and had nothing of *juriſdiction* annext to him, farther than in relation to the διοικησις (*Diœceſe* in the ancient notion of it for a joynt adminiſtration of *more* Provinces, of which the *Patriarch* was *Primate*) but onely a priority of dignity, was not touched or violated by this deciſion.

9. To which purpoſe I refer the Reader to the *Corpus Juris Canonici* (formerly cited) *Decret. Par.* 1. *diſt.* 99. c. 3. *Primæ ſedis Epiſcopus non appelletur Princeps ſacerdotum, vel ſummus ſacerdos. The Biſhop of the firſt See*, i. e. the *Patriarch*, *is not to be called Prince of the Prieſts, or ſupreme Prieſt*, nor (as the * *African Canon* adds) *aliquid hujuſmodi, any other thing of the ſame kind* under another title. And the practice was agreeable, as hath appeared (*Reply* to *Cath. Gentl.* p. 39.) from the *Milevitane Council* where St. *Auguſtine* was preſent, *Can.* XXII. forbidding under pain of Excommunication any *appeal* from the *African Councils* or *Primates of thoſe Provinces, to any foreign Councils or Judicatures*, and this again (as there appears) conſonant to the V. *Canon* of *Nice*, and (before that) to the XXXIV. *Apoſtolick*, where the *Primate in every Nation is to be accounted their head.* But this is by the way. * *Afric. Conc.* *Can.* VI.

10. *Teſtimonies* of other Writers of that time we cannot fail of. *Eraſmus* alone will furniſh us with ſufficient, who thereby hath brought that *character* upon himſelf, *Neminem probè Catholicum dicimus, qui Eraſmo nimium delectatur, He that is exceedingly delighted in his writings, may not be deemed a good Catholick*, though he himſelf lived and dyed a member of the *Romiſh Communion.* How far he was from owning the *Divine right* of the *Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, appears ſufficiently by that one ingenuous confeſſion of his, of the *firſt* ages, *Certè nomen hoc nondum illis temporibus erat auditum, quantum ex veterum omnium ſcriptis licet colligere*; *Tituli iſti, nempe Univerſalis Pontifex, Caput Univerſalis Eccleſiæ, Chriſti in terris Vicarius, Princeps Sacerdotum, non vulgò recipiebantur ante Bonifacium tertium: Surely*

that name, as far as we can collect from the writings of all the Ancients, was not heard of in those times. Those titles, Universal Bishop, Head of the Universal Church, Vicar of Christ on Earth, Prince of Priests, were not vulgarly received before Boniface the third. But instead of such particular, personal, (or such as may by *S. W.* be deemed *partial) affirmations* (which yet are competently qualified to supersede the pretended *universal* acknowledgment of those times, immediately foregoing the *extinguishing Act)* and for the farther clearing of this matter I shall assume to prove this proposition (by as undeniable evidences as a matter of this nature is well capable of) that the *universal Pastorship* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, as it is explained, and interpreted by *S. W.* to be derived to him by St. *Peter* from *Christ*, was not held as *Catholick* Doctrine generally in the *Christian* Church of the *West*, more particularly in the *Church of England*, at the time, when *Henry* VIII. abrogated the authority of that *Bishop* in this Nation.

11. My first argument shall be drawn from the *opinion*, that was had of the *equality* of the *power* given to the *Apostles*, in *Tu es Petrus*, *Thou art Peter*, and *Feed my sheep*, *&c.* For the *first* (to omit the current of the *ancient Fathers* in this point) I shall insist rather on those that are nearer hand, such is *Lyra* on *Mat.* 16. *Durand. à St. Porciano in* 4. *Sent. dist.* 18. *qu.* 2. both which wrote in the *fourteenth Century*. Thus *Abulensis* in the *fifteenth Century* argues vehemently more than once, that none of the *Apostles* did understand that any *supremacy* was given to *Peter* by those words of *Christ*; for saith he, afterward they *contended for superiority*, *Matt.* 18. Again, the *two Sons* of *Zebedee* have their desire of *Preference* promoted by their Mother, *Matt.* 20. At the last Supper, the *contention* is up again, *which of them should be the greater*, *Luke* 22. and *ista contentio fuit omnium duodecim*, * saith he, *that contention was of all the twelve*, and † again, *Quilibet Apostolorum dubitabat, quis eorum esset major, & istud dubium mansit usque ad diem mortis Christi, nam in cœna ultima Christi inceperunt inter se conquirere quis eorum major videretur*, *Luke* 22. *Et tamen non facerent publicè istam disputationem, si putarent Petrum per collatas claves eis præpositum. Ideo adhuc putabant se æquales, cum nescirent quis eorum esset major. Every of the Apostles doubted which of them should be the greater, and that doubt remained until the day of Christ's death, for in his last Supper they began to enquire among themselves which of them should seem the greater, Luke* 22. *and yet they would not publickly have made that dispute, if they thought Peter by the collating of the Keys preferred before them, therefore they yet thought they were equal, when they knew not which of them was greater.* * Again, *dicendum verisimilius quod valdè ambiebant omnes discipuli mutuum Primatum, it is to be said with more probability that all the Disciples vehemently desired Primacy one over another*, which they could not doe, if *Christ* had declared for St. *Peter*. † *Cusanus*, his contemporary, argues thus; *If Prelates derived their jurisdiction from the Pope, verum foret, Petrum aliquid singularitatis recepisse, & Papam in hoc successorem esse, It would be true that Peter had received somewhat of singularity, and that the Pope were in this his successour, but we know*, saith he, *quod Petrus nihil plus potestatis à Christo recepit aliis Apostolis, that Peter received no more power from Christ than the other Apostles, Nihil enim dictum est ad Petrum, quod etiam aliis dictum non sit; nonne sicut Petro dictum, Quodcunque ligaveris super terram, ita aliis, Quæcunque ligaveritis? For there was nothing said to Peter, which was not also said to the rest. As it was said to Peter, whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, so was it not said to the rest, whatsoever ye shall bind?* So * *Franciscus à Victoria*, about the year 1500. *Quilibet Apostolus habebat potestatem Ecclesiasticam in toto Orbe, & ad omnes actus ad quos Petrus habuit, Every Apostle had power Ecclesiastical in the whole world, and to all acts to which Peter had*; And he proves it by *this*, as well as *other* Texts, *Whatsoever ye shall loose*——

* Abulens. *in Matt.* 18. *qu.* 7. † *Id. in Matt.* 20. *qu.* 83.

* *Qu.* 84.

† *De Concordant. Cathol.* l. 2. c. 13. & c. 34.

* *Relect.* 2 *de Pot. Eccl. Concl.* 2.

12. This is the common interpretation also of the *Doctors* of *Paris*. So it was of *Adolphus* Archbishop of *Colen*, and of the *Bishops* of his *Province*. * They recite the promise made to St. *Peter*, *I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdome of heaven*, *Matt.* 16. and say, *Quam promissionem non ad unum Petrum pertinere, sed in omnes Apostolos transmissam alio loco insinuat ubi dicit, Amen, dico vobis, quæcunque alligaveritis*——*Which promise that it belongs not to Peter onely, but was transmitted to all the Apostles, he insinuates in another place, where he saith, Verily I say to you, whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth*, Matt. 18. This *Synod*, and all the *Decrees* thereof, were ratified by *Charles* V. and injoyned to be observed *in omnibus suis punctis, clausulis, articulis, sententiis, & verborum expressionibus, in all the points, clauses, articles, sentences, and expressions of words*; And this *Adolphus*, saith † *Surius*, was so *addicted to the Roman Church, that when the Pope had removed* Hermannus *out of that Bishoprick, he was placed in his stead.*

* *Bin. Concil. Anno.* 1549.

† *Chron. Anno.* 1547.

13. For the second, *Feed my sheep*, (to omit again the ancients, *Ambros. de Dignit. Sacerd.* c. 2. *August. de Agone Christiano*, c. 30. *Theophyl. in Johan.* c. 21.) it appears by the *Opusculum* of *John Patriarch* of *Antioch*, publickly pronounced in the *Covent* of the *Fryers Minors*, to be subscribed by as many as were willing. In his answer to the several arguments for the *superiority* of the *Pope* above *General Councils* (taken from some ancients) he saith, * *They are founded on the words spoken to Peter by Christ, which being understood aright, according to what was above-said, are not a foundation for the Pope's having any presidency above the body of the universal Church; neither*, saith he, *do those words*, [*Feed my sheep,*] *withstand; which if they be understood de pascuo spirituali, of spiritual feeding, that*, saith he, *is comprehended under the power of binding and loosing, quæ data est Ecclesiæ principaliter, which was given principally to the Church.* And † *Cardinal Cusanus*, who lived at the same time makes them *words of Precept, not of institution of authority, and equally spoken to all the Apostles, Et si Petro dictum est, Pasce oves, tamen manifestum est, quod illa pascentia est verbo & exemplo, though it were said to Peter, Feed my sheep, yet it is manifest, that that Feeding is by word and example.* And so, saith he, according to St. *Augustine* in his *gloss upon that word, omnibus idem est præceptum, ibi euntes*——*the same is commanded all in that place, Go into all the world, and preach*——in the *last* of *Matthew* and *Mark*. *Nihil reperitur Petro aliud dictum, quod potestatem impertit aliquam; ideo rectè dicimus, omnes Apostolos in potestate cum Petro æquales, There is not found any thing else said to Peter, which imparts any power; therefore we truly say, that all the Apostles were equal in power with Peter.* Nay *Bellarmine* himself did * sometimes understand the words of *Christ*, *Feed my sheep, confirm thy brethren, whatsoever thou shalt bind*] to be *said to all Pastors*. And to this day the † greatest *Advocates* for the *Papacy*, say that no *more* was given in *Feed my sheep*, than was promised in, *I will give thee the Keys*, so that all those that said that the words *Matt.* 16. belong to *all* the *Apostles equally*, must be interpreted (on this account) to apply [*Feed my sheep*] to them likewise.

* *Concil.* Basil. *Append. Fundantur super verbis dictis Petro à Christo, quæ sanè intellecta juxta jam dicta supra, non fundant Papam Præsidentiam habere supra corpus universalis Ecclesiæ; nec obstant illa verba Pasce oves meas,*——

† *De Concord. Cathol.* l. 1. c. 23.

* *De Rom. Pontif.* l. 2. c. 12. *Edit. Ingolstad.* 1586.

† Baron. *Ann.* 34. *n.* 201. *Rhemists Annot. in Matt.* 16. 19. *See also the* Dispatcher, Par. 3. Sect. 2.

14. One

14. One thing onely more I shall offer on this head. *Bellarmine* is under some considerable difficulty in supporting his *Hypothesis* in this matter; for in * one place he saith, *Summa potestas Ecclesiastica non solum data est Petro, sed etiam aliis Apostolis, the Supreme Ecclesiastick power was not onely given to Peter, but also to the other Apostles*; and † again, *Omnes fuerunt capita, & Pastores Universa Ecclesia, They were all heads, and Pastors of the Universal Church*; and * again, *Omnibus fuit collata summa potestas, the supreme power was conferred on all.* But in each place he brings in an *adversative*, which if it be observed, *contradicts* rather than *excepts*, † *Sed ita tamen ut Petrus esset caput eorum, & ab illo penderetur, quadam subjectione ad Petrum, but yet so as Peter should be the head of them, and that they should depend on him, with a kind of subjection to Peter.* Where if any shall say, that the *supreme power* and *headship* given to *all*, and yet *Peter*'s being the *head* of *all*, and their *depending* on, and *some kind of subjection to Peter*, is a kind of *contradictious subjected Supremacy*, *inferior headship*, and *unequal equality*, I must not wrong the *Cardinal* so much as to conceal his σφοδρὸν φάρμακον, his way of answering and reconciling this difficulty (and that indeed is the onely thing I designed for the Readers observation at this time) the way of escape is, *Sed Petro ut ordinario Pastori cui perpetuò succederetur, aliis verò tanquam Delegatis quibus non succederetur, This was given to Peter as to an ordinary Pastor, who should be perpetually succeeded to, but to others as to Delegates to whom none should succeed.*

* *De Rom. Pont.* l. 1. c. 9.
† *Ibid.* c. 11.
* c. 12.
† *Ib.* c. 11.
* c. 12.

15. Here I shall not be so impertinent as to confront to him the suffrages of ancient *Fathers*, which, in perfect opposition, affirm the *Bishops* in the *Churches*, to be the *Successors* of these *Delegates*, the other *Apostles*, which, he saith, were to have *no successors*; My present business leads me another way, to advertise the Reader, that *Bellarmine* was not the *author* of this artifice, *Cajetane* and *Victoria* had made use of this exquisite remedy before, and being derived from them, it had the honour to come into the *Council* of *Trent*; Onely the unluckiness of it was, that the *Bishop* of *Granada* in that *Council*, made bold to *deride* them that said the *supreme power was personal in the Apostles, and descended not to their successors*, and then demands confidently, * *Quo fundamento, qua authoritate, qua ratione in assertionem adeo audacem prorupissent, On what ground, what authority, what reason, they had broken out into an assertion so audacious*, and says it was invented but *fifty* years before, (I desire *S. W.* will observe that.)

* *Hist. Concil. Trid.* 13. *Oct.* 1562.

16. And this was not onely the opinion of *that Bishop*, but soon after the † *Bishop* of *Paris* doth there expresly affirm, that *Cajetane fifty* years before did *first* devise it, to obtain a *Cardinal's Hat*, that it was unknown to *former* ages, and at the first broaching *ignominiously censured* by the *Divines* of *Sorbon*. Yet farther, the *Bishop* of *Granada* refuted it from *Scripture* appositely, *Christ*, saith he, *promised to all the Apostles, that he would be with them to the end of the world, which could not be understood of their own persons, but must be of their succession, and so it had been understood by all the Fathers and Schoolmen.* The same * *Cusanus* concludes from the words of St. *Augustine ad Esitium de die Novissimo. The words*, saith he, *which Christ spake to the Apostles, must be understood of their successors, as that speech, Ye shall be hated by all, and ye shall be for witnesses to me, and behold I am with you always to the end of the world, which who understands not that he promised to the Universal Church, which should continue, some dying, and others being born, to the end of the world; as also that is said to them (which belongs not to them, and yet is so said, as if it belonged to them alone) when ye see the abomination of desolation——and when ye see these things, know——* From these words *Cusanus* infers this consideration, *quod verba Christi ad Apostolos, trahi debent ad Ecclesiam, that the words of Christ to the Apostles, ought to be drawn to the Church*, i. e. Not *confined* to their *persons*, but applyed to their *Successors*; And then what becomes of *Bellarmine*'s expedient, to reconcile his *contradiction*, or of *S. W*'s *Oral Tradition* and *possession* of this interpretation of *Christ*'s words to *Peter*. And let this serve for the confirming my *first argument*.

† *Ibid. paulo post.*
* *Concord. Cathol.* l. 1. c. 11.

17. My *second* is, in consequence to that, drawn from the *contestation* about the *superiority* of *authority* and *power* of *General Councils* above *Popes*. For I shall suppose it undeniable, that the *supreme Pastorship* vested in the *Pope* by *Christ*'s donation to St. *Peter* (as *S. W.* maintains it) is not reconcileable with his being *inferior*, or subjected to any other person or persons in the *Church*, nor to the whole *Church* it self either *diffused*, or *collected* in the *Representative*, any more than a *Prince* by *God* immediately set over a people (I say, as the case here lies, not by *Man*, but by *God*) shall be inferior to those, over whom he is set. And therefore * *Bellarmine* doth with great reason say, that *to hold that a General Council is superior to the Pope, is to make the Pope as the Duke of* Venice, *or the General of an Army.* And † *Gregory de Valentiâ* argues, that to give the *supreme* and *infallible judgment to an Universal Council, is* * *repugnant to the Primacy of St.* Peter *and the Bishop of* Rome, *for*, saith he, *if Councils should judge infallibly, the Pope himself were bound to accept their decrees, or there should be two supreme powers in the Church, which is impossible.*

* *De Concil.* l. 2. c. 14.
† *Analys. Fid.* l. 8. c. 7.
* *Pugnat cum Primatu——*

18. And yet 'tis certain that *Universal Councils* have exercised authority over *Popes*, one while deposing *Popes*, and disposing of their Sees, as the *Council of Constance* did lately *three* together, another while making *Canons* in opposition to their pretensions, witness that of *Chalcedon*, for the (ἴσα πρεσβεῖα) *equal privileges* of *New* to *Old Rome*, witness the XIII of the *sixth Council* in *Trullo* made expresly and * by *name*, in opposition to a *Roman Canon*, but in compliance with an *Apostolical*; And though 'tis true the *Romanists*, as it is their interest, † *reject* those *Canons*, yet the *seventh Council*, strongly propugned by the *Romanist*, hath no higher authority to pretend to, than that of this *sixth* Council, see * *Act.* 6. and accordingly asserts the *Canons* thereof, and cites the LXXXII. for their turn, which therefore founds an argument (*ad hominem*, at least,) from this *Canon* of that *Council*. And if some flatterers of the Popes have undertaken, and asserted their cause against *Councils*, yet (which is sufficient to our present argument) we know a very great number, if not much the greater, who were reputed true *Catholick* members even of the *Roman Church*, did constantly assert the *power* and *authority* of *General Councils* to be superior to that of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, to exercise *authority* over him, to give *Laws* to him, and to *censure* him.

* Ἐπειδὴ ἐν τῇ Ρωμαίων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν τάξει κανόνος φέρεσθαι δοκεῖ ὑγκωμιὸ ἡμεῖς τῷ ἀρχαίῳ ἐξακολουθοῦντες κανόνι τὰ Ἀποστολικῆς ἀξιοβεῖα——
† *Conc. Tom.* 5. p. 8. *and* p. 311.
* *Conc. Tom.* 5. p. 732. E.

19. Of this number was the *Pope* himself, † *Adrian* VI. who was *Bishop* of *Rome* but seven years before *Henry* VIII. was acknowledged here *Supreme*. Of this were * *Petrus de Alliaco Cardinalis Cameracensis, Eccles.*

† *Quæst. de Confirm.*
* *Ir. de authorit.*

† *De Concord. Cathol.* l. 2. c. ult.
* *Ca. Significasti. extr. de electione.*
† *Ibid.*
* *In Matt.* 18. *qu.* 108. & *in Defensor.* par. 2. c. 69.
† *Tract. de Potest. Eccl.*
* *Relect. de Potest. Papæ & Concil. Propos.* 3.

Cameracensis, † *Nicol. Cusanus Cardinalis*, * *Panormitanus Cardinalis*, † *Florentinus Cardinalis*, * *Alphonsus Tostatus Episcopus Abulensis*; And, in the same time of *Henry* VIII. † *Joannes Major*, and *Jacobus Almainus*. And * *Franciscus a Victoria*, who stood at the same time *doubtfull*, gives us a large and fair account of the *question*, that there were *two opinions* of it, one of *Thomas Aquinas, and many of his followers, and other Doctors learned both in Theology and Canon Law, that the Pope is above the Council*; *the other the common opinion of the Parisians, and also of many other Doctors both in Theology and Canon Law, as* Panormitane *and others, that the Council is above the Pope*; and his resolution is, *Puto utramque esse probabilem, I think that both are probable*; and if so, then sure this on the *Pope's* side was not by him taken to belong to him by any *divine* right, devolved to him by St. *Peter*. To the same purpose

* *In C. Novit. de Judiciis Notab.* 3. *num.* 84.

* *Navarre, There is*, saith he, *a great dissension between the* Romans *and the* Parisians, *to whom the Ecclesiastical power was more principally conferred by Christ, whether to the whole Church, or to St.* Peter; *the Roman pretension was favoured by St.* Thomas, *and* Thomas a Vio, *the Parisian by* Panormitan, *whom, frequentiùs nostri sequuntur, our men more frequently follow, as* Decius *saith*. This *James Almain* a *Divine* of the *Sorbone*, constantly defends, and answers *Thomas a Vio* in a full Tract, and so doth *John Major*, saying, that *at Rome no man is permitted to maintain the* Parisian *Doctrine, and at* Paris *none suffered to assert the contrary*. To this number must belong Sir *Thomas More*, whom the *Romanist* and particularly † *S. W.* hath most confidence in, next the *Bishop* of *Rochester*, of any man in those times. His words are expres in his * Letter to *Cromwell* (the Original of which is in Sir *Robert Cotton's* Library) that upon perusing the *King's* book against *Luther*, he dissuaded him so much to exalt the *Papal authority*, lest it *diminished his own*; and though he denyed not the *Pope* a *Primacy*, yet *he could not hold it such, as that the authority derived to him thereby, was to be preferred before a General Council.* (Of *Bishop Fisher* I have † formerly spoken as to the point of the *Primacy.*) And that it stood as the received opinion of the *Church* of *England*, thus appears. The *superiority* of the *Council* above the *Pope*, being decreed by the * *Council* of *Constance* ending *Ann.* 1418. *Archbishop Chichley* † summoned a *Convocation* of the *Province* of *Canterbury* to be holden *Octav. Apost. Pet. & Pauli* 1422. and recites, that *whereas it was decreed in the holy Council of* Constance, *lately congregated with the holy Ghost*, that another *General Council should be holden in May* 1423. *Nos decretis* —— *We resolving as far as belongs to our person, to obey the decrees of that said Council, and desiring that all our Suffragans and Prelates and Clergy of our Province of* Canterbury *would obey them* —— Then they met according to his *summons*, chose *Procurators* for the *Church* of *England*, raised a Tax for the support of their charge, and that *Council* met at *Pavia* according to the * decree of the Council of *Constance*. In that Council of *Constance* the *English* appeared, and as † *Platina* tells us, affairs were carried by the Suffrages of five Nations, *Italy*, *France*, *Germany*, *Spain*, and *England*, and the * *Orator* from the *Council* of *Basil* to the *King* of *England*, saith, that in the *Council of Constance this renowned and most learned Nation was present with honour to it*. And in the *Council* of *Basil*, (by the interposition especially of those two famous *Lawyers*, *Abbas Panormitanus*, and *Ludovicus Romanus*, Legates from *Alfonsus* the *great*, *King* of *Arragon*) the same being decreed, and often urged, as was before at *Constance*, and † sworn to be observed by the *Legates* of the *Pope Eugenius*, after he had three years opposed it, as to this point, the *English Church* received it, as it had formerly in *Constance*. And the particular inclination of the *King* of *England* toward the *Council* of *Basil*, appears by his * Letter sent to *Pope Eugenius*, telling him that he *intends to conform to them as he ought, and exhorting the Pope to promote the proceedings of the Council.*

† *Sch. Disarm.* p. 187.
* *See L. Cherb. Hen.* VIII. p. 394. *and Sir Thom. More's works in the end.*
† *Answ. to Sch. Disarm.* p. 218.
* *Sess.* 4. & 5. *Concilium œcumenicum immediatè à Christo potestatem habet, eique subest Pontifex Romanus.*
† *Regist. Hen. Chichl.*
* *Concil. Const. Sess.* 44.
† *In vit. Johan.* XXIV.
* *App. Concil. Basil.*

20. If we look out into *France*, we shall find it most vigorously † asserted in the *Council* of *Bourges*, *Ann.* 1438. *Let the authority of the Council of Basil* (say the Fathers) *and the constancy of the decrees thereof be perpetual, which none, not even the Pope of* Rome *shall presume to take away or weaken.* And the narration of the acting for the *Pragmatick Sanction*, by * *Duarenus*, saith as much. *Charles* VII. *King* of *France*, saith he, yielded to the *Orators* of the *Council* of *Basil*, that the decrees of the *Council* should be *received and defended in his Kingdom*, having first *assembled at Bourges a Synod of Nobles, Prelates, and other most learned and grave men, by whose authority and counsel he was lead to receive and confirm the Decrees of that Synod, and set forth that noble Constitution, called ordinarily the Pragmatick Sanction, than which*, saith he, *nothing was more popular, nothing more received with the applause of all good men, being usually styled the Palladium* of *France*.

† *Concil. Bas. Sess.* 16. & 17. *in Append.*
* *Ep. Synod. Consil. Basil.*
† *Binii Not. in Conc. Bitur. ex Gaguino.*
* *De Benefic.* l. 5. c. 11.

21. This *Pius* II. laboured hard with *Lewis* XI. to get repealed, *Cardinal Balva* acting earnestly for him, and obtaining the *King's* command to the *Parliament* of *Paris*. But this was strenuously resisted, and the attempt very gravely and prudently repressed by the *Court*, and a book by them exhibited to the King, to convince him that nothing could be more *destructive to* France, *than that he should grant the Pope's desire in this matter, and to this he consented, though greatly devoted to reverence the Pope's authority*. Afterward the *Council* of *Tours* assembled by *Lewis* XII. and consisting of * all the *Bishops* of *France*, and many *learned* men, decreed that the *Pragmatick Sanction* was to be † *kept throughout France*. And when *Francis* I. in his distress yielded to the *abrogation* of it, and ratified the *Concordate* in the *Lateran Council*, he * professeth he did it being *constrained by his necessity*, and so *Rebuffus*, one sufficiently addicted to the *Roman* greatness, in his interpretation of the *Concordate*, makes the † *necessity* of that *King* an *excuse* for the abrogation of the *Pragmatick*. Notwithstanding, this abrogation was protested against by the *University* of *Paris*, *An.* 1517. *Mar.* 27. in these words, * *Leo the tenth in a certain assembly in the City of Rome congregated we know not how, but not in the Spirit of the Lord, thought fit that these so wholesom Statutes should be abrogated, and going against the Catholick Faith, and the authority of the sacred General Councils, hath condemned the sacred Council of Basil*, Therefore they *appeal* from their *Lord* the *Pope not well advised, and from his infringing the sacred Council of Basil, and the Pragmatick Sanction*, to the *next Council* that shall be *lawfully* and *freely called.*

* *Genebr.* l. 4 *Chronol. omnium Episcoporum Galliæ* ——
† *Chronic. Massæi, An.* 1510.

* *Concordat. Quando ita ferebat ratio difficultasque temporis, rerumque nos circumstantium necessitas.*
† *Temporis difficultas aliquando permittit non concedenda. Ca. Licet de feriis. Necessitas rerum circumstantium, quæ non habet legem.* l. 1. ff. de *Offic. Cons.*
* *Orthwinus Gratius fascic. rer. expetend. Bochell.* l. 8. *decret. Eccl. Gall.* c. 4.

22. The *Germans* stood after the same manner affected; whatsoever was done in the *Councils* of *Constance* and *Basil*, was done chiefly under the *protection* of the *Emperor Sigismund*. Afterward

† *Maximilian*

† *Maximilian* I. joyned with *Lewis* XII of *France*, to call a *General Council* at *Pisa*, for reforming the enormities of *Julius* II. and * *Ann.* 1525 *Charles* V. appealed from *Clement* VII to a *General Council*. † *Sabellic. & Onuphr. in vit. Jul.* II. * *Rescript. Caroli* V. *ad Crimin. Clement.* VII.

23. In brief, † *Nauclerus* shews how *universal* this opinion was of the *authority* of the *Councils*; the *Germans*, saith he, *the King of* France, *and of* England, favoured the *Council of Basil with all their power*, and the *Council* of *Basil* pronounces, * *Nec unquam aliquis peritorum, Never any skilfull man doubted but the Pope was subject to the judgment of General Councils in matters which concern the Faith.* What he saith of the *periti, skilfull*, hath an eminent and signal truth in the *Jurisperiti*, the *Lawyers* and *Canonists*. *Panormitan*, as was said, in his *Tract de Concil. Bas.* where he demonstrates that the *Council's power* is *above the Pope's*, that the *Pope hath no power over a Council*, but may be *questioned, coerced, removed* by it, so likewise *Lud. Romanus*, a most eminent person of his age, of whom *Æneas Sylvius* (that was in that *Council* of *Basil* with him, and was after *Pope*) † saith, *Vir non Româ tantum, sed cœlo dignus, a person worthy not onely of Rome, but of Heaven*, who affirms in his answers, that it is * *lawfull to appeal from the Pope to the Church*, † that *to the Pope dismissing the Council no obligation was due*, that * *he might be deposed by the Council*; see *Card. Zabarell Cons.* 150. *Ancharanus Cons.* 181. *Felinus* ad c. *super literis*, n. 21. *de Rescript. Joh. Roias de hæret.* n. 518. *Fr. Marc. decis.* 944. and others (noted in the margin of *Archbishop Chichley*'s life) as long as they were permitted to deliver their minds with *freedom*. † *Generat.* 48. circa An. 1438. * *In fine Sess.* 45. *Conclus.* 5. † *L.* 1. *de Act. Concil. Bas.* * *Cons.* 521. † *Cons.* 522. * *Cons.* 523. *P.* 101.

24. Thus then stood the opinion of the *Princes* of *Europe*, which continued *communion* with the *Bishops* of *Rome*, concerning the subjecting them to the *authority* of such *Councils*, as then in the *title* and *style* of the *Western European Churches*, were reputed *General*, and above an hundred years before *Henry* VIII. in their several Dominions, by the advice, suggestions and assistance of *National Synods*, *Peers* and *People*, they proceeded in vigorous attempts to bring under *Order* and *Reformation* the *usurpations* of the *Bishops* of *Rome*, as appears by the † *Schedule* of *enormities* in the *Pope* and *Court* of *Rome*, &c. drawn up by *Petrus de Alliaco, Bishop* of *Cambray* and *Cardinal*, by the appointment of *Sigismund* the *Emperour*, in the *Council* of *Constance*, though the new *Pope Martine* V. delayed and evaded it. The like might be manifested in many other instances; see *Theodoric à Niem* in *Nemore Unionis, Tract.* 5. and *Quintinus Heduus Repetit. lection. de Aristocr. Christ. Civitat.* † *Orthuin Gratius in fascic. per expetend.*

25. How the dissenting parties may be reconciled, so as to be *one Church* and *communion*, is not easily set down. * *Martine* V. with the consent of the *whole Council of Constance*, by his *Letters gave Order to all Bishops and Inquisitours, quod est de necessitate salutis credere Generale Concilium habere supremam authoritatem in Ecclesia, That it is of necessity to salvation to believe that a General Council hath supreme authority in the Church.* The *Fathers* of that *Council* of *Basil* do oft repeat, that it is *de necessitate salutis, of necessity to salvation*, and they † call it *Veritas Fidei Catholicæ, Truth of Catholick Faith*, and *whosoever pertinaciously opposes it, censendus est hæreticus, is to be deemed an heretick.* * *Leo* X. with his *Lateran Council* first saith, that the *Pope* hath *authority over all Councils*, and afterwards adds, *cum de necessitate salutis existat, seeing it is of necessity to salvation that all that believe in Christ should be subject to the Bishop of Rome.* The difference indeed extremely wide, and the *Fathers* of the *Society*, and the *Doctours* of the *Sorbon* continue the contest betwixt these *two Councils* to this day. * *Concil. Bas. Epist. Synod.* † *Concil. Bas. Sess.* 33. * *Concil. Later. Sess.* 11.

26. The *Jesuites* earnest propugners of the *superiority* of the *Pope*, speak contemptibly of the *authority* of *Councils* without him, and give that virtue to the *Pope's* sole direction, that by it, every Plebeian may be rendred *Infallible*. But all this, both in the *fountain* and streams, is as earnestly oppugned by the *Sorbonists*, who will have a *General Council superiour* to the *Pope*; Neither hath the *Jesuit* reason to accuse the *Church* of *England* as *Schismatical* in this, any more than to accuse the *Sorbonist*. And on the other side, the *Sorbonist* hath more reason to forbear *censure* on the *Church* of *England* as *Schismatical*, than on the *Jesuite*; because a *General Council* (which is of so little weight with the *Jesuite* without the *Pope*) is acknowledged by us to be the *supreme external, living* determiner of *Controversies*, and we, together with the *Council* of *Basil*, do hold a *Pope Schismatical*, that pertinaciously opposeth, and divideth himself from a *lawfull General Council*.

27. And if after all this, the *Doctours* of the *Sorbon* will have the *Pope Universal Pastour*, yet is not our argument hereby weakned, as far as I now intend to press it, *viz.* against the *universal* acknowledgment of the *supreme Pastourship*, as from *Christ* to St. *Peter*, because neither do they so maintain his *supreme Pastourship*, as *de fide* to be *jure divino*, nor is their Doctrine of the *superiority* of *Councils* any way reconcileable with that stating, being utterly repugnant to the *Papal Primacy*, as *Valentia* told us.

28. The accord which the *Sorbonist* makes, is set down by *Gerson* in his Tractate called *Concordia, quod plenitudo potestatis Ecclesiasticæ sit in Pontifice, & in Ecclesia*, in this manner, *Est ntrobique, & principaliùs in Ecclesia suo modo, The plenitude of power is on both sides, and more principally in the Church after her manner.* And what is that manner? Why, saith he, *Quadruplici respectu, scil. indeviabilitatis, & indefectibilitatis, extensionis, regulationis, & generalis obligationis, cui subjicitur etiam ipse Papa, tanquam Imperatrici Sponsæ Regis summi, quæ potest condere Canones, & definire etiamsi fuerit Papa præsens, In a fourfold respect, to wit, of indeviability, and indefectibility, of extension, of regulation, and of general obligation, to which even the Pope himself is subject, as to the Imperial Spouse of the supreme King, which can make Canons and define, although the Pope be present.* But this, as it is perfectly contradictory to the *Supremacy* of the *Pope*, as given to St. *Peter* by *Christ*, both over all the *Apostles*, and over the *whole flock*, so * *Bellarmine* utterly rejecteth it, and will not allow the *Church* to have the *Supremacy* either *formally*, or *suppletivè*, or *principally*, but places it *absolutely and immediately in the Pope*, and so is every one obliged to do, that derives it from *Christ's* donation to St. *Peter*, which therefore the *Sorbonist*, for all his *concord*, and his *titular* acknowledgment, must still be presumed to deny, as placing the *plenitude* of *Power principaliùs, more principally* in the *Church*. *Concord. Concl.* 3. * *De Concil. l.* 2. *c.* 16.

29. But beside these eager litigants on both sides, of whom we have hitherto spoken, and therein founded our argument, there is yet a *third* sort, and many no doubt there were, and are of it, *viz.* of the judgment of *Navarre* and *Victoria* forecited, that *each opinion is probable, and no faith to be grounded in either* (and that is as much to my purpose, as others *contesting* it on the *Councils* side.) So we find in the

the *Synodical Epiſtle* of the *Synod* of *Baſil*, that when the contention was ſo fierce betwixt that *Council* and *Eugenius*, ſome *remained neuters*, and *adviſed the obſerving a neutrality of obedience.* And *Picus Mirandula* * goes farther, *liquet varias — It appears that the Doctours have delivered divers ſentences of the firmneſs of the judgment of Councils, and the Pope, nor*, ſaith he, *is there any thing that he knows promulgated, by virtue of which we may be bound to believe either.* To conclude, the † *Council* of *Baſil* calls *Eugenius Schiſmatick* for not *acknowledging their authority above him*, and denounces the *cenſures* of the *Church* againſt all *that adhere to him, as favourers of ſchiſm and hereſie.* And * *Leo* X. doth as much againſt all the *Prelates* of *France*, that maintain the *Sanction* made and injoyned at *Baſil.*

* *Theorem. 4. de Fide & Ord. Credendi.*

† *Seſſ. 34. & 41.*

* *Concil. Lateran. Seſſ. 11.*

30. Thus much may ſerve for a *Mixis* of the conteſting of this point, before, and about *Henry* VIII. his times (wherein onely, and not in the reſolution of either ſide, my *ſecond* argument is founded.)

31. My *third argument* ariſeth from the acknowledged *ſupremacy* of *Princes* within their *own* Dominions. In this *Kingdom* of ours, the *caſe* is clear; when *Henry* VIII began his *Reign*, the *Laws* were *fixed*, and unrepealed, which aſſerted the *King's ſupreme* authority in *cauſes* and over *perſons Eccleſiaſtical.* The *Papal* uſurpations growing exorbitant in the Reigns of *King John* and *Henry* III. produced a law for *reſtraint* thereof, in the XXV. year of *Edward* I. which was ratified in his XXXV. year. The incroachments of *Rome* continuing, the law was ſtrengthned in the XXV. of *Edward* III. and again in the XXVII. and again in the XXXVIII. and the XII of *Richard* II. and afterwards more † expreſly in the XVI of his *Reign*, where complaining of *proceſſes* and *cenſures* upon *Biſhops* of *England* made by the *Pope*, becauſe the *Biſhops* made *executions* of the *King's commandments* in his *Courts*, &c. they expreſs the *miſchiefs* hereupon *growing*, the *open diſinheriſon of the Crown, the deſtruction of the King, his Law and his Realm*, that *theſe things are againſt the Crown and Regality* — And the *Commons* aſſert, that the *Crown of* England *hath been ſo free at all times*, that it hath *been in ſubjection to no Realm*, but *immediately ſubject to God*, and *to none other* — And as they oblige themſelves to aſſiſt the *King and his Crown in the caſes aforeſaid, to live and to dye*, ſo every of the *Lords Temporal anſwered by himſelf*, that the *caſes aforeſaid are clearly in derogation of the King's Crown, as was well known, and had been long time known, and that they will ſtand with the Crown* — And the *Biſhops* and *Prelates* did *every one ſeverally* (after *Proteſtation* that it was not their mind to deny, or affirm, that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* may not excommunicate *Biſhops*, nor that he may make *tranſlation* of *Prelates*, after the *law* of the *Church*) ſay, that if any *Cenſures made againſt any for the execution of the commandments of the King's Courts* — that is *againſt the King's Crown*, they *will and ought to ſtand with the King in thoſe caſes*, and in *all other touching his Crown*, as *bound by their Leigeance.* The *Biſhop* of *Rome*, 'tis true, did much contend againſt theſe *Statutes*, * *Gregorie* XI. wrote earneſtly to *Edward* III. and ſaid, To make ſuch a law, as that of the *Proviſoes*, was nothing elſe but to *divide Chriſt's Church, to deſtroy Chriſtian Religion* (the *Schiſm* and noxious effects which *S. W.* is now preſſing on us, in the behalf of his *ſucceſſours*) but the *King* reſcinded them not. And though *Martine* V. wrote more ſharply to *Henry* VI. yet the *King* kept up the force and execution of the *laws*, † *Humfrey Duke* of *Gloceſter*, *Protectour* and *Uncle* to the *King*, burnt the *letters*; and when that *Pope* made *Archbiſhop Chichley Legate*, * he proteſted it was not his intention to exerciſe, without the *King's* permiſſion, the *Legatine* power, which he had received, nor to derogate from the *rights, manners, laws, priviledges, liberties and cuſtomes of the King* and *Kingdom*, in any thing, but to *conſerve, defend* and *ſtrengthen* them. The inſtances are continued by † *Sir Edward Coke* through ſucceeding times. And in the VII. of *Henry* VIII. it was reſolved by all the * *Judges*, that *Canons Eccleſiaſtical* may be allowed, or refuſed, by the *conſent* or *rejection* of the *King* and his *people.* And in fine, the abſolute *Supremacy* of the *King* was in the *Articles* againſt *Cardinal Wolſey*, aſſerted by all the *Lords* of the *Council*, * *Sir Thomas More Lord Chancellour* firſt ſubſcribing, and this in expreſs oppoſition to the † *Pope's Holineſs*, and as *uſed* and *injoyed without interruption for the ſpace of above two hundred years by the Kings of theſe Realms.*

* *Walſingham Hiſt. An.* 1374.

† *An.* 1. *Hen.* 7. *fol.* 10.

* *Antiq. Brit. p.* 284.

† *Cawdry's Caſe.*

* *Ibid. fol.* 326.

* *Lord Cherbury Hen* VIII. *p.* 266, 274.

† *Ibid. p.* 266.

32. And it is yet farther obſervable, that although attempts and incroachments were oft made by the *Popes* againſt theſe *Laws*, yet it was the reſolution of our *Laws*, that no *right* could thereby accrew to them, and that no *preſcription* of time can be a bar to the *Supreme Power*, but that for the *publick* good it may revoke any *Conceſſions, Permiſſions*, or *Privileges*; Thus 'twas declared in * *Parliament* in *Edward* III. his reign, when reciting the *Statute* of *Edward* I. they ſay, *The Statute holdeth alway his force*, and that the *King* is bound by his *Oath* to *cauſe the ſame to be kept as the Law of his Realm.*

* *Ch.* 25.

33. And as thus it was in the *Laws* and *practice* of this Kingdom (which is ſufficient to have been confronted to *S. W.*'s contrary ſuggeſtion) ſo it will be found in the more *Univerſal Reaſon* of all Nations. For if *Supremacy* be examined according to the inſeparable *properties* of it, the *pretenſion* or *acknowledgment* of it, will appear incompetible to the *Biſhop* of *Rome* in this or other *Prince's* Dominions, by the *Rules* and *practice* of the *Chriſtian Church*; For,

34. *Firſt*, the *Supreme Power* gives force and power to all *Laws*, made in *Convocations*; and without aſſent thereof, though all in the *Convention* beſides concur, yet it hath not the virtue of a *Law.* † *Johan. de Turrecremata* diſtinguiſheth betwixt *honorary Preſidency* (ſuch as would be allowed the Biſhop of *Rome*) and *authoritative*; It is, ſaith he, the part of *authoritative Preſidency*, jus habere non modo dirigendi, ſed regendi — *to have right not onely of directing, but ruling their actions, and of pronouncing ſentence of affairs, out of his own judgment, though it be not approved by the greater part of the Council, yea though it be approved by none.*

† *De. Eccl. l.* 3. *c.* 28.

35. That this hath not been thought to belong to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, the *fourth* and *fifth General Councils* are inſtances: The *fourth*, that of *Chalcedon*, ordered *Eccleſiaſtical Government* without, and againſt the conſent of *Pope Leo* and his *Legates*; And the *fifth*, at * *Conſtantinople*, decreed a matter of *Faith* contradictory to the determination of *Vigilius* in his *Apoſtolical conſtitution*, ſubſcribed by himſelf and *ſixteen* other *Biſhops* adhering to him; whereas a true *Supreme* power can not onely invalidate a *Law* made by an *Aſſembly*, but alſo by a ſole edict make a *Law*, unleſs it pleaſeth to limit it ſelf by taking in an admixtion of *Aſſiſtants* in *Council* (which the *Romaniſt* acknowledgeth

* *Baron. An.* 553. *n.* 209.

not

not of his *Pope)* But neither then can it *(salvo contenemento)* so debar it self, that it should be overruled by *plurality* of voices, and thereby forced to consent to the *major* part. 'Tis the *Civilians* doctrine of *Summum Imperium*, that it is of that nature, † *ut parte amissâ, substantiam suam amittat*, that *by losing a part, it loseth its substance* or *essence*. † *Grotii Apolog. c. 2.*

36. *Secondly*, Though *Supreme authority* may limit it self in some particulars, yet can it not be restrained, and limitted by *subjects*; And yet 'tis evident, the *Bishops* of *Rome* have been limited both by *Councils* and *Princes*; which assure us, those are not his proper *subjects*.

37. *Thirdly*, *Supreme authority* is the *fountain* of all *Jurisdiction*, which must consequently be derived thence by *emanation*. Yet it is evident, the *Power* of *Ecclesiasticks* is not thus derived from the *Pope*. * *The Power of Excommunication is the onely coercive Ecclesiastical power, that is by divine Right*; and this is not derived from the *Bishop* of *Rome*, but was conferred on all the *Apostles* together, *Joh.* XX. 23. and belongs to *all Prelates* as their *successours*; and accordingly it is a received opinion among the *Romanists*, that *Bishops* have the power of *binding and loosing Jure divino*; † *Alphonsus à Castro* saith, that *the opposite opinion is contrary to all the Doctours*: * *Gabriel Vasquez* concurs with him; And this power, saith *Alphonsus*, given *the Bishop by virtue of his consecration, is not onely of Order, but Jurisdiction* also; and it is no less than *Schismatical*, not to acknowledge the *power* residing in every *Bishop*. The *Nicene* † *Canon* being therein grounded, τὸς ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθέντας, ὑφ' ἑτέρων μὴ προσίεσθαι, that *those that are cast out by any, are not to be admitted by others*. To which * *Synesius*'s suffrage is express, that *if any neglects his authority* ὡς μικρόπολιν, *as the Bishop of a small* City, and receives into communion *Andronicus* and the other, as if there were no *necessity* to *obey* a mean *poor Cities Bishop*, ἴσω ὄχους, *Let that man know he causes a Schism in the Church, which Christ would* have to be *one*; And this unity proceeds from *co-ordination* in this power of *excommunicating*; whereupon St. *Cyprian* oft speaks of *Episcopatus unus*, the *same office* in so many several *Bishops*. In the exercise of this power there is indeed *subordination* according to *Canons* or *Custome*, but, as *Suarez* saith, the *censure* of *Excommunication, i. e.* the *actual* exercise of that *power*, in any infliction of *penalty*, is not *jure divino*, but *humano*, being ordered or temper'd according to the prudence of the *Church*, and so that makes no difference.

* *Gerson de Origine Juris.* † *De Justa Hær. pun. c. 24.* * *L. 2. Disp. 152. c. 3.* † *Can. V.* * *Epist. 58.* *Tom. V. dis. 2. Sect. 1.*

38. And so likewise the *regulating* or *legislative* power *Ecclesiastical*, in making *Canons* or Decrees, is *co-ordinate* also, all *Bishops* having their votes in it. Accordingly the *Bishops* of *Rome* and their *Legates*, were wont to *sign* Decrees as well as other *Bishops*, whereas in *every polity*, as the same * *Suarez* affirms, the *legislative* power is constantly *Supreme*, † *it extends to Universality of Subjects, to Universality of Actions, and in all these must have an immutability*, quia nec augeri, nec minui potest, *because it is capable neither of augmentation nor diminution.*

* *De leg. l. 4. c. 4.* † *Ib. n. 17.*

39. Thus much I hope at this time (he shall have much more * anon) will satisfie *S. W.* of the truth of his *first ground*, or if not him, yet his less interested *Reader*, which hath not so unreconcileable a quarrel to *written Testimonies*, thou h these have not wanted the suffrage of *Reason* also, which is one sort of *unwritten*, for the evidencing matters of fact of *elder* ti es.

* *Answ. to the IV. Ground.*

40. *Secondly* then, for the pretended *self-evidence* of his *ground*, wherein doth that consist? why, saith he, *it carries it in its own terms*; what are *its own terms*, which are thus illustrious? *The first pretenders to reform found* England *actually subject*———But this is onely his *affirmation*, by others *denied*, and no shew of *self-evidence* in it. Yes, in that *they pretended to reform, They could not be said to reform in this point of the Pope's authority, if they had not found* England *actually subject to it*; This he insists on over and over again, *They could not be truly called the first Reformers from it, unless before, that authority had been there acknowledged*; and again, *for the very word Reformation, which they pretend, argues that tenet was held before.*]

41. But to this I answer, 1. That it is very strange a writer of *Controversies*, as *S. W.* desires to be esteemed, as also a great pretender to *demonstration*, and immediate connexion of terms, and a profest enemy to *wordish testimonies*, even of *Scripture* it self, because they are subject to so *many sorts of mis-understandings*, should yet lay the *foundation* of all his impregnable fabrick, the whole weight of his first pretended *demonstration*, on the most uncertain unconsiderable use of the word *Reformers*, [*they could not*, saith he, *be truly said the first Reformers, unless*——] and [*for the word Reformation, which they pretend, argues*——] When 1. it appears not, that they were at all *called Reformers*, and then what is become of his foundation? 2. In case they were *called Reformers*, it might be by *others* a nick-name imposed, and not by themselves; Or, 3. if by themselves, it might be assumed *hypocritically*, when they establisht and setled by a law, what before was more modestly and sparingly practised, (Such *Reformations* we have heard of from *Trent*, and from other coasts) or else, 4. they might be casually adopted to that title, when they neither looked for it, nor did any thing to deserve it. If any of these be affirmed by his adversary, or if not, because it is *possible* some one of these *might* be the truth, what then is become of his *demonstration*? And truly if *S. W.* be as he intimates, a disciple of that great *Master*, of whom he saith [*It is worthy of him to write grounds*] and consider that now they are *some previous grounds*, which he is proposing, he will have reason to think with others, that it must reflect on some body beyond himself, that his *first ground* should so very ill deserve that title, being but a *Topical argument* at most, drawn from a *title* or *appellation*, which seldom agrees to them on whom 'tis bestowed, and certainly doth not signifie by *nature*, or by any such necessity from whence any can pretend to conclude *demonstratively*.

P. 27.

42. Secondly, If we should pass over this, and acknowledge his *demonstration* valid, as far as it *pretends*, yet 'twill be far from inferring what it ought to infer, the acknowledgedness of the *Papal* power, in the modern notion of it, (for the *Universal Pastourship* and *Vicarship of Christ*, by him constituted in St. *Peter*) for they might *reform* from many other things in *the point of the Pope's authority* without *reforming* from that.

43. But I shall not need to exact thus much from it, above what *in terminis* it proposeth to perform: It is indeed far from doing what it *pretends* to doe, far from *demonstrating* any the barest, meagerest conclusion: It will be visible; if taking it in the looser terms, wherein he hath (as to his own interests) most advantageously chosen to set it, we shall reduce it to *Syllogistical* form, thus,

They that uſe, or pretend to the word Reformation, in point of the Pope's authority, acknowledge that tenet was held before in England, *or that* England *was actually ſubject to it.*

But they that diſclaimed the Pope's Supreme authority in England, *called themſelves Reformers, or pretended to the word Reformation, Ergo.*

44. In which proceſs, as it pretends to be *demonſtrative*, if upon due examination, either of the propoſitions ſhall be found to fail of *ſelf-evidence*, 'tis certain his whole fabrick is demoliſhed. But if beyond expectation both ſhould prove to do ſo, *S. W.* muſt even go for a *Saint* or *Preacher* in his own dialect, *i. e.* for a moſt ſad unfortunate *demonſtrator*, let the iſſue teſtifie of the juſtice of this intimation.

45. And at firſt view 'tis diſcernible, that there is no evidence in, or neceſſary connexion between the terms of the *major* propoſition, *i. e.* between *pretending Reformation in that point*] and *acknowledging that tenet was held before in England*] or even that *England was then acknowledged to be actually ſubject to the Pope's authority*. 'Tis on both ſides granted, that the *Pope* aſſumed, or claimed this authority at that time, and I need not deny but ſome of the people, nay *Prelates* of *England*, once acknowledged and willingly ſubmitted to this *claim*, and in reſpect to one, or at leaſt to both of theſe, the uſe of the word *Reformation in that point* might be very proper, without *Englands being found actually ſubject to it*, which is far diſtant from either of theſe, yet is the *one* thing which the words of this *ground* exact.

46. In the former reſpect, the *Pope's aſſuming*] that I hope doth not infer that the *Nation acknowledged* his claim; The man that ſtood upon the Strand, firſt phanſied, and then aſſumed that all the Ships in the Haven, and then in the *Ocean*, were his, but ſure this had no ſuch influence on the minds of the true owners, Pilots and Mariners, as irreſiſtibly to work, or infallibly conclude in all them an *acknowledgment* of his *claim*; Nor was it needfull they ſhould ſet out any ſolemn manifeſts to vindicate their title againſt this Hypocondriack, their taking no notice of his dreams, was a ſufficient refutation of them, whilſt they went no farther than his *own phancy*. But ſhould the ſame man in one of his Paroxyſmes, in the full tide of high phancy, have attempted to board one of the Ships, not as a Paſſenger, nor yet as a Conquerer, but as one that had the *Original* and *unqueſtioned* right of dominion over it, the true owners denying him admiſſion, or (in caſe of entrance undiſcerned) the telling him his miſtake, that he was gone aſtray into another man's quarters, and ſhewing him the way home again, had been a very fair and charitative attempt of *reforming* and rectifying him, no man elſe in this caſe needing any *reformation*.

47. But when to this we add, that ſome of the good people of *England* were ſeduced, and abuſed by this his claim, and withdrew part of their obedience from their *lawfull* ſuperiours, to ſubject it to him, though this cannot be termed the *ſubjection* or *acknowledgment* of *England*, (for *ſome* are as diſtant from *all*, as a particular from an univerſal) yet here is a proper place for *Reformation*, to diſabuſe the ſeduced, and reduce them to the conſcientious diſcharge of their unqueſtionable duty; as when *Jehoſophat*, at a time when *Judah* was far from any *univerſal* defection, (*Aſa* his immediate predeceſſour having * *entred them into a Covenant under pain of death to ſeek the Lord God of their Fathers*) is yet reported to have † *gone through the people from Beerſheba to Mount Ephraim, to bring them back to the Lord God of their Fathers*.

* 2 *Chron.* XV. 12, 13.
† *Ch.* XIX. 4.

48. In this point 'tis of no force for *S. W.* to deſcend to the examination and balancing of the *number* of the ſeduced, what proportion it bare to the reſt which were not ſeduced, 1. Becauſe what is thus to be examined, is not evident *before*, and perhaps will be as little clear after examination; and 2. it can be no ingredient in the *ſelf-evidence* of this his *firſt ground*, which from the bare *pretending* to *reform*, concludes that *England was acknowledged ſubject*, and not from the *number* of thoſe that yielded this *ſubjection*; and 3. 'tis not the great number of particular men, that makes a nation, but either the whole *collective* body, or their *legal Repreſentatives*, or the *Kingdom* ſpeaking by its known eſtabliſh'd *Laws*. And I need not now inquire into each or any of theſe, whether they acknowledged what *S. W.* would have them, becauſe 1. if it were not notorious that they did not, yet ſure it is not *evident* that they did, (the leaſt that will ſerve *S. W.*'s turn) or if it were, yet ſtill it could not be inferred from the uſe of the word *Reformation*, and that is prejudice enough to the *ſelf-evidence* of his *major* propoſition, which is all we have now under conſideration. So that unleſs *S. W.* will acknowledge his arguing guilty of that ſtrange *amphibology*, that by [*held in England*] he meant either *held* onely at *Rome*, or onely by ſome *particular* perſons in *England*, and then from thence aſſume to infer the *poſſeſſion*, viz. that *England was actually ſubject* to it, as afterwards from the bare *poſſeſſion* he infers a *right* (three rare ſteps of *ſevere* diſcourſe) he muſt acknowledge the feebleneſs of the connexion betwixt the terms of his *major* propoſition, and that certainly is ſufficient to ſuperſede his concluſion, and prejudge the ſelf-evidence of his *ground*.

49. Before I leave this, I ſhall ask *S. W.*'s opinion of one queſtion, What if the *Pope* ſhould attempt to *reform*, retrench the abuſes of the *Court* or *See* of *Rome*, whether in *Doctrine* or *Government*, would that infer the *Church* of *Rome* to have been formerly *ſubject* to that from which the change ſhould be made? If it would, then either it was in *errour* before, or muſt become erroneous by the change, and ſo neither way be *infallible*. There is but one thing poſſible for him to anſwer upon *his* principles, *viz.* that it is an *impoſſible* ſuppoſition. And if without conſidering whether the *Reformation* be to the better or to the worſe, it be reſolved impoſſible for the *Pope* to doe it, then 'tis not the *promiſe* of *Chriſt* to his *Vicar*, by which he is become *infallible*, but the *ſyllogiſm* of *S. W.* not the *privilege* of the *Paraclete* (to which *Tertullian* imputed it, * *quod diſciplina dirigitur, quod intellectus reformatur*, ſuppoſing, that the *Apoſtles Creed* remaining firm, *cætera admittunt novitatem correctionis, other things are capable of Reformation*) but the inmoſt nature of the thing, an *impoſſibility* of its being otherwiſe, whereby the *certainty* becomes as irrefragable, that the *Church* of *Rome* cannot *amend*, as that it cannot *fall*, nay, the former the greater certainty, being a part of *S. W.*'s *ſelf-evident ground*, whereas St. *Paul* ſuppoſes it *poſſible* that the whole *Church* of the *Gentiles* may be cut off, which is ſomewhat more than the *Church* of *Rome* onely; and Mr. *White* being preſs'd with the poſſibility of the latter, thinks fit to wave that queſtion, *Apol.* p. 114. contenting himſelf to have told my L. of *F.* that

* *De Veland. Virgin.* c. 1.

their

their Writers intend to prove her indefectibility, which differs much from having *rigorously demonstrated* it. Mean while, as that *Miracle of wit* had never a word to say to another parallel part of that *Lord's* question concerning the *possibility* of *Schism* among the *Churches* now adhering to *Rome*, but pass'd it over insensibly, so I will not importune *S. W.* in that matter, but content my self with having said thus much on the *first* part of his *demonstration*.

50. But what if the *Minor* prove as little *self-evident*, and so as feeble a supporter, as the *Major* hath shewed it self to be? What stability then shall be hoped for to the *Conclusion*? The *Minor* was this, *They that disclaimed the Pope's supreme authority in* England, *called themselves Reformers*.] But where is the ἐνάργεια or *self-evidence* of this? Is this a principle, or a fact so notorious, as to be assented to, as soon as proposed? Certainly it hath no *universal* truth in it (and that is necessary to render it an ingredient in *demonstration*) for the *Greek Church*, which deny the Pope's *universal Pastorship*, pretend not to have wrought any *Reformation* in this point, but to follow all their *Ancestours* in it, and then by this argument we are no more *Schismaticks*, than they.

51. I speak not now of the *Greek Church* of the *last three hundred years*, who I know are by the *Pontificians* concluded under the same guilt with us, but of the *fourth* age of the *Christian Church*, when the *Grecians* were most flourishing in *piety* and *learning*. For *Gregory* IX. sticks not to charge *those Churches* even in that age, with *schism*, because they acknowledged not the *Supremacy* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*. * It is in an *Epistle* of his to *Germanus Archbishop* of *Constantinople*, where he compares those *Churches* with the *Schismatical* and *Rebellious ten Tribes* of *Israel*, that divided themselves from the *house* of *David*, *Præsumpta divisio Tribuum patenter signat Schisma Græcorum, & multitudo abominationum Samariæ, diversas hæreses multitudinis à veneratione veri Templi, Romanæ scilicet Ecclesiæ, & reverentiâ separatæ. The division of the Tribes openly signifies the schism of the Greeks, and the multitude of the abominations of Samaria, the divers heresies of the multitude, which is severed from the veneration and reverence of the true Temple, the Church of Rome.* Adding, to make the parallel complete, that *whereas Chrysostome, and Nazianzene, and Cyril, and Basil the Great, were eminent in the assembly of the Revolters, this was the same height of the heavenly counsel, by which he would have Elias, and Elizæus, and the sons of the Prophets, to live among the Idolaters.* This was the liberal concession of a *Pope*, † that *Pope*, who by the help of *Raimundus* his *penitentiary* compiled the *Decretal Epistles*. But this by the way.

* *Mat. Paris, Ann.* 1237.

† *Platina in vit. Greg.* IX.

52. But neither hath his *Minor* any more particular limited truth, in relation to this *our* Nation. *King Henry* VIII. and the Houses of *Parliament* disclaimed the *Pope's supreme authority* in *England*, and are the first that *S. W.* can probably accuse for doing so; but where did these style themselves *Reformers*? was *Stephen Gardiner*, in delivering and publishing his Latine Oration *De vera Obedientia*, and Dr. *Bonner* that prefixt the *Preface* to it, fit to be styled *Reformers* by themselves or others? Or they that put men afterwards to death upon the score of the *Six Articles*, did they call themselves *Reformers*, or would a *Protestant* of this age style them so, for burning those then, which believed, as he doth now? When *Cardinal Poole* had written his Book *De unione Ecclesiastica*, inveighing against the *King's supremacy*, and soon after advised the *King* to redintegrate himself with the *Pope*, and accept the *Council* then offered, he used this as an argument to inforce his advice, that * *thereby he might have the honour of being the cause of a Reformation of the Church in doctrine and manners.* That title then of *Reformation* in those days, had no propriety to the point of denying the *Pope's supremacy*, nor was that express'd in other dialect, than of *declaring the supremacy to be invested in the King*—(which sure in no-wise concluded, that it had *not* been so invested) yielding him the title of *Supremum caput Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, which *Bishop Fisher* subscribing with this temperament, [*quantum per Christi legem licet*] was not sure beholding to that, for his rescue from the title of *Reformer*. The clear truth is, the word *Reformation* began with respect to *doctrine* and *manners* (as *Cardinal Poole* used it) and was frequently in the mouth of all *Christian Princes*, and *Prelates* too, in this notion, who desired and press'd long for a *General Council*, peculiarly to this end of *reforming* and rectifying what was amiss in either of those respects, and no farther concerned the point of the *Pope's supremacy*, than as that was conceived to be either *unjustly* assumed by him, or *Tyrannically* exercised.

* *L. Cherbury, Hist. Hen.* VIII. p. 350.

53. The truth is, *Leo* the *tenth*, with his *Laterane Council*, made at that time an exorbitant incroachment upon the *authorities* both of *Councils* and *Princes*, † expressly defining the *Papal supremacy*, *solum Romanum Pontificem authoritatem super omnia Concilia habere, That the Pope alone had authority over all Councils*, and that it was *de necessitate salutis, of necessity to salvation, that all believers should be subject to the Pope*, and reprobated the *Council* of *Basil* as a *Conventicle*. And as when injuries grow to the highest pitch, they then invite a strenuous opposition (thus as was said, the unreasonable oppression of *Innocentius* the *third*, and *Innocentius* the *fourth*, and some other *Popes*, that pursued the Dictates of *Gregory* the *seventh*, caused *Edward* the *first*, *Edward* the *third*, and *Richard* the *second* to awaken and maintain their and their peoples rights, and in like manner the Schisms of *Rome* and *Avinion*, that pester'd the *Church* for *fifty* years, caused the *Christian Princes* and *Churches* to vindicate and execute their authority in the *Council* of *Constance* upon the *Pope's*) so 'tis not strange, if so enormous an attempt of *Leo* the *tenth*, met with a semblable opposition from a *Prince* of a known courage. Herein I shall appeal to S. *W*'s acknowledged Master, *Thomas de Albiis*, if that *Pope* were not the *Schismatick*, when he wrote and defined against the *sacred authority* of *Councils*, and whether all they are not so too, who pursue the same attempt?

† *Conc. Later. Sess.* 2.

54. And then (to return to the point in hand) a complete *Reformation* being long desired both *in capite & membris*, in the *head* and the *members*, the design of *Reforming* in this point of the *Supremacy* had respect to the former of these, and was to be acted by the *Pope* on himself, or by the *Council* on the *Pope*, or by *Sovereign Princes* with the advice of their *Clergy* in their several Dominions, and so still onely implies what he formerly *assumed*, not what had been formerly *acknowledged* his *due* by those who sought *Reformation*.

55. Here then we have a clear and candid view of *S. W*'s *self-evidencing* and *demonstrative* faculty, his *first ground* (*chief stone in the corner* of his impregnable Fabrick, which all our ἐλέπολεις, or engines of battery must never have the confidence to approach) 1. being considered as an *affirmation*, or assertion of a matter of fact, hath appeared to have no *truth* in it, in the sense wherein alone he is

concerned to have it true; then 2. as a *concluſion*, aſſumed to be *demonſtratively* inferred from *two ſelf-evident premiſſes*, both of theſe (could a man with any charity ſuſpect it?) have proved diſcernibly *falſe*; And then why ſhould not every propoſition in the *Alcoran* ſet up for *ſelf-evident*, when ſome one (which but half ſo much as two) falſe *prolepſis* would certainly be able to infer it? The Reader therefore muſt needs be obliged to *S. W*'s ſuperabundant mercy, that having poſſeſs'd himſelf of this enormous gyantly faculty of concluding or atchieving any thing, whatſoever he had pleaſed, that twice two were but three, or the like (for I ſhall beg but one falſe *prolepſis*, to infer many millions of ſuch) he hath uſed theſe powers ſo *temperately*, as to conclude no more from two ſuch vaſt advantages, but that the *Pope's authority* had once *poſſeſſion* in *England*, diſtinguiſhing mean-while between *poſſeſſion* and *right*, and rebuking me that I * did not diſtinguiſh between them, a fault, which if I had been guilty of, I ſhould readily reform, and then leave him to make his advantage of it, which will ſure be ſmall, as long as he is ſo far from having proved the *right*, that he hath thus ſtrangely and above once miſcarried, in attempting to prove the *poſſeſſion*.

* *The Dr. miſtaking, and not diſtinguiſhing between Poſſeſſion and right*, p. 37.

55. Yet in the ſtrength of this, thus deplorably improſperous onſet, he makes no delay to ſet up his Trophees, and prepare for the ſolemneſt triumph, *Hence*, ſaith he, *all the evaſions of* D. H. (no leſs than *all*) *are concluded vain, who when we* (the *Romaniſts*) *plead that the Pope was found in poſſeſſion of this authority in England, flies off preſently and denies it* (who elſe would have call'd down-right *denying of the* adverſaries propoſition, a *flying off?* but it now alſo appears, I had ſome ſmall reaſon to *deny* it) *ſaying he had no title to ſuch an authority there; and miſtaking and not diſtinguiſhing betwixt poſſeſſion and right, ſaith, we beg the queſtion, when we onely take what is evident, that he was in poſſeſſion, and thence infer a right, till the contrary be proved.*] How far I now am, or formerly have been from *miſtaking in denying the right*, and charging him of *begging the queſtion*, when he hath no other way of inferring the *right*, but from the *poſſeſſion*, and that by us was alſo *denied*, and not formerly attempted to be proved by him, and now forſooth is propoſed as a *ſelf-evident ground*, a *principle* taken for *granted*, which alſo being now pretended to be inferred from *demonſtrative premiſſes*, both thoſe *premiſſes* are *demonſtrably falſe*, is, I ſhall now ſuppoſe, as manifeſt, as that the *begging the queſtion* is the *Engliſh* of *petitio principii*, or that the *Latine* of *taking* that for *ſelf-evident*, which is ſo much leſs than ſo, as to have neither *evidence* nor *truth* in it. He hath now but one Reſerve left, *viz.* to accuſe me for *ridiculous* and *ſenſeleſs*, that I can charge that *Elench* upon an *anſwerer*, whoſe *part* it is not, to *object* or *diſpute*. But it falls out unfortunately, that there is no place for that forlorn χρησφύγετον at this time when he is a laying of *ſelf-evident grounds*, for thoſe being equivalent to *principles*, if they fail of the native evidence, and borrow none from his Armory that produced them, that *Sophiſm* muſt be daſht out of *Ariſtotle*'s *Elenchs*, or *S. W*'s proceſs will inevitably fall under it.

SECT. III.

His ſecond Ground, evacuated from the Anſwers given to the firſt. Patriarchal power affording the Pope no authority over England.

1. HAving ſpent ſo much time in a large but neceſſary ſurvey of his firſt ground, we ſhall reap ſome ſmall fruit of it, in the brevity of the next. For the *ſecond ground* being by him propoſed in theſe terms, that *This authority actually over* England, *and acknowledged there, was acknowledged likewiſe to be that of the Head of the Univerſal Church, and not of a Patriarchate onely*] and his *Epiphonema* affix'd to it, this, that this *Ground is no leſs evident than the former, by our adverſaries confeſſion, ſince that*, i. e. the authority of the *head* of the *Univerſal Church*, above *Patriarchs*, and (as he adds in the cloſe of the *Paragraph*) *pretended to be inſtituted by Chriſt himſelf, is the authority they impugn as lawfull, and from which they reformed, which laſt word implies the actual acknowledgment that Authority had before*] the *Anſwer* is briefly this, That we have already ſuperſeded every the minuteſt part of this pretenſion, in what hath been ſo largely returned to the former ground, having there ſhew'd him, 1. That the *Pope's pretended authority*, as of an *head* of the *Univerſal Church*, and as *conſtituted by Chriſt himſelf*, was not actually over *England*, and acknowledged there (though it is true that the *Pope* did then pretend it, and ſome *ill ſubjects* owned, or at leaſt *ſeemed* to own and ſubmit to thoſe his pretenſions) 2. by the way, that the dignity of a *Patriarch* includes not any authority over more than the *Province* or διοίκησις that belongs to him as a *Primate* or *Metropolitane*, and therefore infers no kind of authority over all thoſe that belong to the circuit of his *Patriarchate*; which ſhews the impropriety of his ſpeech, that ſpeaking of an *Authority over England* (which is no part of the διοίκησις of the *Primate* of *Rome*) he ſaith it was *not of a Patriarchate onely*] as if that of a *Patriarchate onely*, were ſome *authority over* all whoſe *Patriarch* he were, though not ſo great as that of the *head* of the *Church*, whereas indeed the word *Patriarch*, as it differs from *Primate*, or in relation to any that are not his peculiar διοίκησις, hath no connotation of *authority* or *juriſdiction*, but onely of *primacy* of *order* and *dignity*. 3. That *S. W*'s adverſaries *confeſſion* hath afforded him no advantage, their impugning the *Papal* pretenſions as unlawfull, no way implying the *actual acknowledgment* which that *authorty* had before; and 4. that they that diſclaimed the *Pope's pretended authority* in *England*, did not call themſelves *Reformers*, ſo that *S. W.* is far from a *ſevere*, as that is more moderate than a *rigorous demonſtrator*, in all that he pretends from that word [*Reforming.*]

2. All that can with any colour of right be yielded him in this proceſs, is, that this *ſecond Ground* is *no leſs evident than the firſt*, and that he hath indeed by his *adverſaries confeſſion*, who withall aſſigns his reaſons of believing, that *neither* hath the leaſt *evidence* in it.

3. So

3. So happy is *S. W.* in building of *bulwarks*, so hugely prosperous in the art of prepossessing his Readers, he might sure have vindicated his old answers as successfully, and demolished all the *Doctour's Replies* to his *second* and *third* part, from which he was diverted by this more inviting employment of laying of *grounds*, if he had maturely considered and timely foreseen the advantages he hath reaped by it.

SECT. IV.

His third Ground. What is meant by the [*then Roman Church*] *The Romanists confession that 'tis no point of Faith. The contestations of the Gallican Church. Of Germany. Some testimonies fetch'd from the histories and pretensions of the ancient Popes themselves*, Julius, Melchiades, Leo. Gregory, *exclaiming at the title of Universal, setting down the steps of Ecclesiastical judicature, acknowledging his own subjection to the Emperour. Of* Agatho. *The subjection of* Canterbury *to* Rome, *as of* York *to* Canterbury, *onely on the title of receiving the Faith thence.*

1. HIS *third Ground*, like the continued attempts of rebuilding *Jerusalem*, falls presently under the unhappy presages of the two former. It is but this, that *the Papal authority actually over the Ecclesiastical affairs in England was held then as of Christ's institution, and to have been derived to the Pope as he was successour to St. Peter.*] This I took to be his meaning in his *first Ground* (it now appears I did not mistake or misrepresent him) and accordingly evidenced his *self-evident ground* to be not onely infirm, but false, and that contrarywise the whole Kingdom professed that the *Bishop of Rome had no greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in Scripture, in this Kingdom of England, than any other Bishop.* If this had not real truth in it on our part, or if on his part any more force could be now given his pretension by a hand so *able*, and so *liberal*, as is that of *S. W.* this were now the season of it, and it were in reason to be expected from him at his more explicite proposal of his *ground* in these terms [*held then as of Christ's institution, and as derived to the Pope as he was successour to St. Peter*] but it is a little remarkable, how he hath served this *third ground* of his, or rather how he hath disserved the two former, by the very few words he hath here added concerning the *evidence* of this *third*. *The truth*, saith he, *of this appears by the known confession of the then Roman Church, and the self same controversie perpetually continued till this day.*]

2. This is all he hath produced to clear up the *self-evidence* of this *ground*. And the ambiguity of the phrase [*the then Roman Church*] being removed, there will be no more colour of truth in this *ground*, than I acknowledged in the two former, when I refuted them. For either the phrase [*the then Roman Church*] must signifie what we vulgarly call by that name, the *particular Church of Rome*, as then it was, together with all those that acknowledged the authority, and submitted to the *Bishop* of *Rome* in all things, particularly in his assuming to be *Christ's sole Vicar* by him authorized over the *Christian Church* of the *whole world*; or it must signifie in the more *Catholick* notion, all the several *Churches* of *Christendom*, that then lived in *communion* with the *Church* of *Rome*, and neither voluntarily parted, nor were excommunicate, or separated from that, yet without any connotation of any such *acknowledgement*, or giving up their names to his *Universal Pastourship*.

3. If it be taken in the *former* sense, then I now acknowledge again what in answer to his *first ground* I willingly yielded, that this *Papal authority in England, held then as of Christ's institution — was confess'd by the then Roman Church*; But what hath *S. W.* gained by this? nay what hath he advanced either by his *first* or *second ground*, if they were both granted him, *viz.* that the *Pope's authority*, and that not as of a *Patriarch* onely, but as of the *head* of the *Universal Church*, was acknowledged, and acknowledged in *England* before the *Reformation*, meaning still by the word *acknowledged*, no more, than *acknowledged* by the *Roman Church*, the *Bishop* of *Rome*, and those that were marked by his *signature* submitted to this his assumed power, for that is no more than that this present power of his, was acknowledged by *himself*, and all others (every where, and so consequently in *England*) that did *acknowledge* it. This therefore as I must in charity to *S. W.* believe was not his meaning, so I have reason to complain in behalf of his two *former* grounds, that having before with some confidence pretended the *acknowledgedness* of the *Papal power in England*, indefinitely, his *third ground* should pretend to no more than the *confession of the then Roman Church*, which is interpretable to a sense thus far removed from that of *England* indefinitely, or all *England*. This therefore I think was either the *disserving* his own grounds, or the *Reader*, that had but a shadow of *grounds* given him instead of *grounds*, for, such are all such as are proposed in such ambiguous terms, that he that hath taken them on trust, in the more obvious sense, shall lose them again, when he comes to build on them.

4. But if he take the phrase [*the then Roman Church*] in the second sense, 'tis then most manifest, that as his *first* and *second*, so now his *third ground* hath no shew of truth in it, for it is visible, in the matter of fact, that the *then Church* and *Kingdom* of *England*, whilst it lived in *communion* with the *Church* of *Rome*, and neither voluntarily *departed*, nor was *excommunicated* by that *Church*, did yet *protest* their *joynt and most constant perswasion*, that *this Papal authority over Ecclesiastical affairs in England* was *not held* as of *Christ's institution*, or *derived to the Pope* as *successour* to *St. Peter* (which is the direct contradictory to what is assumed in *S. W.*'s *third ground*) but contrariwise that he had no greater *power* conferred on him by *Christ* in the *Scripture* (and there is no more pretended to by the *Pope* from *God*, than what is deduced by him out of *Christ's* words set down in *Scripture*) than any other *foreign Bishop* had, and therefore that he that was born in *England* had nothing to doe with *Rome*.

5. So in the year 1534. the same with the date of the *Universities answer*, and two years before the *extinguishing Act*, the book *De vera differentia Regiæ et Ecclesiasticæ potestatis*, was written by the *Bishops* of *London*, *Duresm*, *Winchester*, &c. The first part of which clearly evidenceth their sense of three things, 1 That the *texts* of the *Gospels* have no appearance of *conferring* this *supreme authority upon*

the Pope. 2. That the *decrees* and *practices* of the *ancient Church*, yea and of *pious* and *modeſt Popes* were expreſſely againſt it. 3. That this power is evidenced from *Scripture* to be intruſted to *Princes* in their own Kingdoms, and that in *all* ſorts of cauſes. This then being the acknowledgment of thoſe very times to which his *third ground* belongs, he hath, it ſeems, acquired no great advantages by appealing to their *confeſſions*, as his *firſt proof*. But of this I have ſpoken more largely in *Anſwer* to his *firſt Ground.*

6. The other ſlender proof of his aſſertion is conformable; *The truth* ſaith he, *appears as by the known confeſſion of the Roman Church, ſo by the ſelf ſame controverſie perpetually continued till this day.*] I muſt ask, Betwixt whom continued? The *Reformed*, I ſuppoſe on one ſide, but whom on the *other* ſide? All thoſe that live and are allowed, as good *Catholicks*, to live in *communion* with the *Church* of *Rome?*

7. That he muſt mean, if he do not again avowedly betray the deceitfulneſs of all his *three* grounds. But in this ſenſe his proof will it ſelf want confirming: For it is not a *principle* indiſputable, that all that defend the *Pope*'s power in the *Church*, hold it as of *Chriſt's inſtitution*, and derived to him, as he was *ſucceſſour* to *St. Peter*. I have * elſewhere ſhewed from his *Ordinary*, the † *Biſhop* of *Chalcedon*, at a time when he was defending the *Pope's power*, that he yet acknowledged, that whether the *Biſhop of Rome be St. Peter's ſucceſſour, jure divino*, or *humano, is no point of faith*] and *Bellarmine's two* conceſſions conclude no leſs, *de Pontif.* l. 4. c. 4. *Non eſſe de fide, divino & immutabili præcepto Romæ ſedem Petri eſſe conſtitutam, & forte non eſt de jure divino Romanum Pontificem Petro ſuccedere. That it is no point of Faith that Peter's See was by divine immutable law ſetled at Rome*, and *perhaps it is not of divine right that the Biſhop of Rome ſucceeds Peter.* And he cannot but know 'tis the common opinion of the *Doctours* of *Paris*, (who ſure defend the *Pope's* power againſt thoſe of the *Religion*, who deny it) that the *Pope* hath not *univerſal juriſdiction jure divino*; I ſuppoſe he may have heard of the no ſmall collection of *Catholick* Writers made by *Melchior Goldaſtus*, in his three Volumes *De Monarchia*, which will ſhew him, that all that live in the *communion* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, and acknowledge his power in the *Church*, do not yet acknowledge the *divine right* to *ſupreme Paſtourſhip*, and this will not be refuted, or loſe any part of its truth, by ſuggeſting that *Goldaſtus* himſelf was not of that number. And he may alſo remember the *Tracts*, and *proofs* of the *liberties* of the *Gallican Church* not long ſince publiſhed, and not be wholly ignorant alſo, by *whom* they were publiſhed.

* *Anſw. to Schiſm. Diſarm.* p. 237.
† *Anſw. to Bp. of Derry*, p. 69.

8. But inſtead of theſe looſer references, I ſhall add to what hath here lately been ſaid of the judgment and practice of the *Gallican Church*, (witneſs'd by the *Pragmatick Sanction*) theſe two or three inſtances. The former out of *Bochellus*, *Ann.* 1484. That whereas by *ancient cuſtome of France, no Legate of the Pope, nor Reſcript or Mandate of his, might be received, but by conſent of the moſt Chriſtian King, and unleſs he did exhibite his Letters of Delegation by the King's Procurator, to be viewed and allowed by the Court of Parliament, limited ſo as no diminution ariſe to Regal right, immunity of the Church, or authority of Laws*; *Contrary to this Law, Cardinal* Balva, *entring* France *as Legate, without advertiſing the King, the King's Procurator entred action againſt him, the Court of Parliament decreed that he ſhould be accuſed by two Advocates, and interdicted him the exerciſe of his Legatine power.* Is this reconcilable with their beleif or *acknowledgment*, that the *ſupreme univerſal Paſtourſhip* (including *France* as well as *England*) was by *Chriſt's inſtitution* derived to the *Pope* as *ſucceſſour to St. Peter?* The *ſecond* is that of the * *Council of Tours*, which concluded and decreed that *Lewis* XII. might not onely with *ſafety of conſcience contemn Bullas abuſivas injuſtaſque, the abuſive and unjuſt Bulls of Julius* II *but he might withdraw himſelf from his obedience.* So when the *Pope* laboured with *Lewis* XI. to have the *Pragmatick Sanction* abrogated, the *Court of Paris* exhibited to the King a † *defence of the Gallican liberties* branched into many Articles, the *third* to this ſenſe, *that the King their ſupreme Lord, the chief Founder and Defender and Keeper and Vindicater of the Churches when their rights are violated, hath power to convocate the Prelates and other the like Eccleſiaſtical perſons of his dominions, to obviate their attempts and beginnings who ſhall have dared to indeavour any thing againſt this liberty.* The *Fourth*, that in theſe *Aſſemblies anciently indicted by the King's authority, many things are recorded to have been excellently conſtituted, and not without great deliberation of the Princes of the bloud, and the Eccleſiaſtical Order, &c. obviating the vexations, moleſtations and injuries which were offered by the Court of Rome to the great damage of the people; and theſe Conſtitutions were of great authority.* The *ſixth*, that theſe *Conſtitutions being long obſerved, when the Court of Rome in proceſs of time attempted many things againſt the liberty of the Gallican Church, Charles* VI. *by the advice of his Nobles, Prelates, Colleges, Univerſities, Ann.* 1408. *ſet out a Conſtitution which vindicated the Church to the ancient liberty, and was publiſhed ſolemnly, and recorded in the Acts of the Court of Parliament.* The *ninth*, that *decree was made by the Court of* Paris *againſt papal exactions.* The *tenth, that ſoon after, that decree was confirmed by the King's Edict, and publiſhed in Court, Ann.* 1408. *May* 15. Whereupon the *Pope* ſending out his *Bulls of excommunication againſt* the *King and Kingdom*, * the *Univerſity of* Paris *cauſed it to be torn in pieces, and declared the Pope* Benedict *himſelf to be an heretick, ſchiſmatick, and diſturber of the peace*, (in which particular † *Carolus Molinæus* addes from the *acts* of the *Court* of *Paris*, that *two officers* of the *Pope's*, which brought with them his *Bulls* of *Excommunication*, * were *dreſs'd* in *paper Mitres*, and *carted through the City ignominiouſly*) which will hardly be competible with the acknowledgment of the *divine* right of his *ſupreme univerſal paſtourſhip.* The like inſtances are not hard to be found in other *Kingdoms.* When *Pius* II. ſent his *Legate Cardinal Cuſanus into Auſtria*, † *Cum veniſſet——When he came to his own Church of* Brixia *on the* Alpes, *and would have diſpoſed of that, according to the ancient right of the Popes*, Sigiſmund *Duke of* Auſtria *permitted not, that any ſuch cuſtome ſhould be brought into Germany*,

* *Maſſæi Chron. Ann.* 1510.

† *Pro lib. Eccl. Gall. adverſus Roman. Aulam Defenſio Pariſ. Cur. in Duareni Append.*

* *Theodoric. à Niem in nemore Union. Tract.* 6.
† *De Monarch. Franc.* n. 140, 141, 142.
* *See the life of Archb. Chichley*, p. 15.
† *Paralipem. Abbat. Urſperg.*

9. In like manner, when the * *Princes of Germany repreſented* to *Maximilian* the *Emperour* ten grievances in matters *Eccleſiaſtical*, the *Emperour* for redreſs of theſe, called a *Council* at *Triers* and *Coloine*, *Ann.* 1512. There it was decreed neceſſary, that the *Emperour* and *Princes ſhould conſider of means for redreſs of thoſe grievances.* Whereupon † *Maximilian* ſet forth a decree, That though of his

* *Paralip. Abbat. Urſperg.*
† *Orthuin Gratius Faſcic. Rer. Expet.*

his *clemency he had tolerated the Pope and Clergy herein, as did his Father* Frederick, *yet becauſe by that favour the ſervice of God had fallen to decay, it appertain'd to his duty that Religion decay not, that the worſhip and ſervice of God be not diminiſhed.* And immediately *Maximilian* with * *Lewis* XII. of *France* with ſome *Cardinals* called a *Council* at *Piſa.*

* *Galli ſucceſſu rerum elati Cæſare & Cardinalibus authoribus Pontificem ad Concilium---citant. Onuph. in vit. Julii II.*

10. But I ſhall now carry him a little higher (that he may have the fairer proſpect of this matter) to the practice of ſome of the ancient *Popes* themſelves. 1. *Pope Julius* who was willing enough not onely to defend, but to take advantage to exalt his power, and accordingly took upon him in caſe of diviſion among *Biſhops*, to abſolve *Athanaſius*, and was therein oppoſed by the *Oriental*, not onely *Euſebian*, or *Semi-arian*, but *Catholick Biſhops*, (who in the *Council* of *Antioch* † reſolved that *Julius*'s abſolution was not to be admitted) doth yet in his *Epiſtle* written on that occaſion, defend the right of his act by * *ancient* cuſtome eſpecially, and by the *Canon* of *Nice* (which yet 'tis plain would not juſtifie it) and not by pretence of any *divine authority*, or in any ſuch dialect, that could ſignifie or intimate his pretenſion, that from St. *Peter* this belonged to him, which ſure he would have done, and thereby have ſilenced all *Catholick* oppoſers, if thus it had then been believed by them, or even by himſelf, to have belonged to him. For the injuſtice of their dealing with *Athanaſius* and with him, he ſaith in the cloſe of the *Epiſtle*, † Οὐχ ὅπως δὲ Παύλου διατάξεως——*Paul's ordinances are not thus, the Fathers have not thus delivered, 'tis a new courſe, this that they have taken*; and again, Ἃ παρειλήφαμεν ἀπὸ μακαρίου Πέτρου ——*What things we have received from the bleſſed Apoſtle Peter, thoſe we ſignifie to you.* But in the debate of the queſtion of right of the *Pope's* drawing a buſineſs to himſelf from the *Oriental Biſhops*, he pretends not to juſtifie his act from any divine right or ſupreme juriſdiction devolved to him from St. *Peter*, but onely from the authority of the *Nicene Canon*, and ancient cuſtome, and that not for any *Papal* right in him, but upon the ſcore of *appealing* from one *Council* to another, and yet neither of theſe truely appliable in that cauſe, which made it more neceſſary to have appealed to his *ſupreme Paſtourſhip*, flowing from *Chriſt*'s donation to St. *Peter*, if he could with any opinion or appearance of juſtice have pretended to it.

† See *Socrates, l.* 2. *c.* 11. *Sozom. l.* 3. *c.* 3. & *Jul. Epiſt. in Athanaſ. t.* 1.

* Οἱ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Νικαίαν—*Ep. Jul.* p. 741. A.

εἰδὲ τὶ πιθανὸν ἔθος παλαιὸν συγχωρεῖ, καὶ γενέσθαι ἐν τῷ μεγάλῃ σωτῆρι ὑμεῖς παρ' ὑμῖν ἰσχύειν ὁ δὲλεγε, ἀφεπὼν μὴ ἡ παράδοσις παρείπησε. *Ib.* B. Η ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι τοῦτο ἔθος ἦν——*Ib.* p. 753. C.

† *P.* 753. D.

11. So in that *African Council* where St. *Auguſtine* was preſent, and the *Pope's* pretenſions were diſputed, and his power in their *Churches* denyed, he made no ſuch challenge from *Chriſt*'s donation to St. *Peter*, but from the *Canons* of *Nice*, which yet were ſo far from juſtifying his pretenſions, (*no* ſuch *Canon* being found upon examination) that if he could have thought that other pleadable, he would certainly have diſcerned cauſe to make uſe of it.

12. In that buſineſs of the *Africans* heretofore largely inſiſted on, theſe farther paſſages are conſiderable (beſides thoſe many which I then offered him, *Anſw. to Schiſ. Diſarm. ch.* VI. Sect. 13. and to which I have yet received never a word of *Reply* from him) 1. That at the firſt, Pope *Melchiades* had never had cogniſance of the *Africans* affairs, had they been able to accord them themſelves, and had it not been by the *Africans* own permiſſion and allowance brought to him for a *brotherly* not *authoritative* deciſion, *pergant ad fratres & collegas noſtros tranſmarinarum Eccleſiarum Epiſcopos, Aug. Ep.* 162. and ſo no act of *authority* or *juriſdiction* in him, for that depends not on allowance of the *Subjects*. 2. That the ſame *Auguſtine* much doubts whether *Melchiades* with his Collegues ought to uſurp to themſelves this judgment, which had before been determined by *ſeventy Africans*, * *An forte non debuit*—by this his doubt aſſuring us, that if he had done it without their *allowance*, it had been unqueſtionably an uſurpation. 3. That the *Pope* did not exerciſe that power † himſelf, but had *Biſhops* joyned to ſit *Judges* with him. 4. That the * *Emperour* ſent or commiſſionated thoſe *Biſhops* to ſit with him. 5. That this was no uſurpation in the *Emperour* (as it muſt be, if the *Pope* were by *Chriſt*'s *Law* above the *Emperour*, *Univerſal Paſtour*) but, if we will believe † St. *Auguſtine*, that which *belonged to his office, of the diſcharge of which he was to give account unto God.*

* *Ibid.*

† *Necipſe uſurpavit.*

* *Rogatus enim Imperator judices miſit Epiſcopos, qui cum eo ſederent, &c. Aug. Ib.*

† Ep. 162. *Ad cujus curam, de qua rationem Deo redditurus eſt, res illa maxime pertinebat.*

13. Add to this 3. that other inſtance of *Pope Leo* in the great cauſe of the ἴσα πρεσβεῖα in the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, of which we have * formerly inlarged, and ſhewed. 1. That that *General*, and one of the *four General Councils*, acknowledged the *Pope* no ſuch *primacy* or ſupremacy of juriſdiction at all, but defined the *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople* ſhould have *equal privileges* with him. 2. That the Pope interprets the injury done in that *Council*, to have been a breach againſt the *Nicene Canons*, and diſpoſitions of *Eccleſiaſtical affairs*, without mention of any other. 3. That through the *Epiſtles* written on that occaſion, he deduces not his *primacy* from St. *Peter*. 4. That he takes no notice of any injury done to himſelf in that *Council*, but onely to the *Biſhop* of *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, and other *Metropolitanes*. 5. That the reducing the dignity of the *Roman See* from the greatneſs of that *Imperial* City, which was more than pretended by that *Council*, was never ſo much as quarrel'd at by the *Pope's Legates* in that Controverſie, which ſure is a competent prejudice to the deducing it from *St. Peter*.

* *Anſw. to Schiſ. Diſarm.* p. 96.

14. Add 4. that of *Gregory* ſo vulgarly known in his *Epiſtle* to *Eulogius Biſhop* of *Alexandria*, telling him *that he had prohibited him to call him* † *Univerſal Father, that he was not to doe it, that reaſon required the contrary, that it was derogatory to his brethren, that this honour had by a* * *Council*, *that of* Chalcedon, *been offered to his predeceſſours, but refuſed, and never uſed by any.* A manifold teſtimony that this did not in his opinion belong to him by the law of *Chriſt*, for then 1. According to *Chriſt*'s own pronouncing, *Joh.* XIII. 13. *Ye call me Maſter and Lord, ye doe well, for ſo I am*, they ſhould *doe well* who gave that title to him, and he alſo that took it to himſelf; 2. it could have been *derogatory* to none, 3. reaſon could not have forbid it, 4. he could not have averted it with an *abſit, recedant*, (any more than *Peter* could the ſufferings of *Chriſt*) without even fighting againſt God

† *Ep. ex Reg. l.* VII. *Indict.* 1. *c.* 30.

* See again *l.* IV. *Indict.* 13. *c.* 72. & 76.

15. Much

15. Much leſs could he have told † *Mauritius*, that *whoſoever* (not onely if the *Biſhop* of *Conſtantinople*, but *whoſoever*) *calls himſelf Univerſal Prieſt, or deſires to be ſo called* (either, or both) *in elatione ſua Antichriſtum præcurrit, is a fore-runner of Antichriſt by his pride.* And again to the *Empreſs*, l. IV. *Ep.* 34. *In hac ejus ſuperbia quid aliud niſi propinqua jam Antichriſti eſſe tempora deſignatur, his pride was an indication of Antichriſt's approaching.* And to *John* himſelf he ſets it higher, that 'tis * *imitating none but the Devil, who I pray in this perverſe fooliſh proud title is propoſed for imitation, but he that deſpiſing the Legions of Angels which were ſocially created with him, endeavoured to break out to the top of ſingularity, that he might ſeem to be under none, and above all?* And ſo on at large, makeing it to be the tranſcribing of *Lucifer*'s act of *arrogance* to aſſume to be *Univerſal Paſtour*. And again, † that the *King of pride is at hand, and the deſtruction of Prieſts prepared, becauſe they cervici militant elationis, qui ad hoc poſiti fuerant, ut ducatum præberent humilitatis, God*, ſaith he, *having decreed to reſiſt the proud, and humble him whoſoever exalts himſelf*; * elſewhere he calls it *Blaſphemiæ nomen, the name of blaſphemy*; and † again, that to *conſent to that wicked title, is fidem perdere, to deſtroy the faith.* And that *S. W.* may not have ſo ill an opinion of *Gregory*, as to imagine that he ſhould declaim againſt this as *Antichriſtian* and *diabolical* in *another* that he might have the monopoly of it himſelf; beſides that what was cited from his *Epiſtle* to *Eulogius*, looked on it onely in reſpect of *himſelf*, he may alſo hear him in the application ſpeaking in the *firſt perſon plural*, and ſo including himſelf, * *Quid ergo nos Epiſcopi dicimus, What then ſay we Biſhops, who have received our place of honour from the humility of our Redeemer, and yet imitate the pride of his enemy?* and again, that the *Council* of *Chalcedon* had offered it to the *See* of *Rome*, but † *none of his Anceſtors would receive it*, and * elſewhere that he *pleads not his own cauſe, but the cauſe of God, of the whole Church, of the laws, the venerable Councils, the commands of Chriſt, which are all diſturbed with the invention of this proud pompatick ſtyle of Univerſal Biſhop*, that † *the care of the whole was by Chriſt committed to the chief of the Apoſtles, St. Peter, and yet he is not called Univerſal Apoſtle*; which ſhews evidently that whatever title belonged to *Peter*, yet not that of *Univerſal Paſtour*, and that *Princeps Apoſtolorum* was not ſo to be underſtood.

† L. VII. *Ep.* 30. *Fidenter dico quia quiſquis ſe Univerſum Sacerdotem vocat, vel vocari deſiderat*—

* *Quis, rogo, in hoc tam perverſo* (before *ſtulto ac ſuperbo*) *vocabulo niſi ille ad imitandum proponitur, qui deſpectis Angelorum legionibus ſecum ſocialiter conſtitutis, ad culmen conatus eſt ſingularitatis erumpere, ut & nulli ſubeſſe, & ſolus præeſſe videretur.* Greg. Ep. ex Reg. l. 4. *Ep.* 38.

† *Ibid.*

* *Ibid. Ep.* 32.

† *Ibid. Ep.* 40.

* *Ibid.*

† *Nullus unquam tali vocabulo appellari voluit, nullus ſibi hoc temerarium nomen arripuit. Ibid.*

* *Ib. Ep.* 32.

† *Voce dominicâ ſanctâ & omnium Apoſtolorum Petro principi Apoſtolo totius Eccleſiæ cura commiſſa eſt, & tamen Univerſalis Apoſtolus non vocatur. Ibid.*

16. From the ſame *Gregorie*'s confeſſion we have it, that the whole matter of *Eccleſiaſtical judicature* is to be concluded in this manner according to the words of the *Novelle*, * that if *any complaint be made againſt a Biſhop by any, the cauſe ſhall be judged before his Metropolitane, ſecundum ſanctas regulas & noſtras leges, according to the Canons and ours*, i. e. (for they are the words of the *Emperour*'s *Novelle*) the *Imperial laws*; *If the party ſtand not to his judgment, the cauſe is to be brought to the Archbiſhop or Patriarch of that Dioceſe, & ille ſecundum Canones & Leges ei præbeat finem, he ſhall give it a concluſion* (a finally *concluſive determination*) *according to the Canons and Laws aforeſaid.* Here then is the laſt appeal to the *Archbiſhop* or *Patriarch* of the διοίκησις, and as yet no notice taken of the *Biſhop of Rome*, unleſs in his own *Patriarchate*, which is abſolutely excluſive of his *univerſal juriſdiction*; onely now he addes, which I muſt not conceal, *Si dictum fuerit, quia nec Metropolitanum habuerit nec Patriarcham, dicendum eſt, quia à ſede Apoſtolica, quæ omnium Eccleſiarum caput eſt, cauſa hæc audienda ac dirimenda fuerat.* Here then is the place for the *Pope*'s cogniſance and deciſion to interpoſe, according to his opinion, *viz.* in this one ſingle forlorn caſe, that the *plaintiff* hath neither *Metropolitane* nor *Patriarch*; and then, *Exceptio firmat regulam in non exceptis*, this one *exception* of thoſe *incognite corners* of the world (which where they lie, I leave *S. W.* to diſcover) that have a *Biſhop* but no *Metropolitane* or *Patriarch*, confirms his rule as far as *Britain*, which certainly hath been always eſteemed one of the *ſix Dioceſes* of the *Weſt*, and hath had a *Metropolitane*, more than one, and a *Primate* or *Patriarch*, the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury* (acknowledged by the *Pope* himſelf to be ſuch, *alterius Orbis Apoſtolicus & Patriarcha*, ſaith *Urbane* II. of † *Anſelme*) and ſo by this *Novelle* of the *Emperour*'s, cited and approved by *Gregory*, it is moſt evident that in his time, and his opinion, the *Pope* had neither by *divine law*, nor *humane*, nor by his own pretending, any ſuch *univerſal juriſdiction.*

* *Greg. Ep. ex Reg.* l. XI. *Ep.* 54.

† *Guil. Malmeſbur. de Geſt. Pontif. Angl.* p. 223.

17. The ſame *Gregory*, ſure more than in complement, addreſſes himſelf to *Mauritius*, in the ſtyle of *Ego indignus pietatis veſtræ famulus*, and in the greateſt expreſſion of *ſubjection*, *Ego hæc dominis meis loquens, quis ſum niſi pulvis & vermis*, his *unworthy ſervant*, nothing but *duſt and aſhes*, in Compariſon, and relation to him; and having declaimed againſt a law of the *Emperour*'s, that *Soulaiers* ſhould not become *Monaſtikes*, ſaith, * *Ego juſſioni ſubjectus, eandem legem per diverſas terrarum partes tranſmitti feci*—— *I being ſubject to the Imperial command, have cauſed publication* of the *law*, though he took it to be *impious*, onely adding, becauſe the *law* is not agreeable to the *law* of *God*, *Ecce per ſubjectionis meæ paginam ſereniſſimis Dominis nunciavi, Behold, I have written to my Lords of it.* Thus 'tis ſure the *Edict* of *Wenceſlaus* the *Emperour*, underſtood his language, affirming, *Noſtrum jus patronatus, ne vitium ingratitudinis incurrerent, plures antiquitus ſummi Pontifices agnoverunt, Auguſtos Dominos appellantes, & eis in re & nomine reverentiam tanquam ſuis* **P**atronis *exhibentes, ut diffuſe in Regiſtro Magni Gregorii habetur*——*Many of the Popes anciently have acknowledged our right of Patronage, that they might not incur the crime of ingratitude, calling us their Imperial Lords, and both in deed and words performing reverence to the Emperours as to their Patrons*, citing thoſe *Epiſtles* of *Gregory* in many places throughout, and referring to other *teſtimonies.*

* *L.* 2. *Indict.* II. *Ep.* 61.

18. Add 5. that of *Pope Agatho* in his † Letters ſent to the *Emperour* concerning a *General Council* to be holden at *Conſtantinople*, who there plainly declareth and confeſſeth his *Primacy* to extend * onely to the *Biſhops* of the *Weſt*, and not to the *Eaſt*, and ſo as it is evident that at that time the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, neither by the words of *Scripture*, nor by the *conſent* of the whole *Catholick Church*, had any ſuch *Univerſal Primacy* as he now requireth.

† In *Sexta Syn. Act.* 4.

* Ἀγάθων σὺν πάσαις ταῖς συνόδοις ταῖς ἀνηκούσαις τῇ συνόδῳ τοῦ Ἀποστολικοῦ θρόνου, Concil. t. 5. p. 60. B. Ἡμῶν πάντες—ἐντὶ δούλοις καὶ ἀρκτοῖς μᾶλλον τυγχάνοντες—. Ib. F. vid. & p. 64. E. & 65. B.

19. I shall conclude with that ancient resolution at the ordaining of *Paulinus Archbishop* of *York* by *Justus*, the *third Archbishop* of *Canterbury* after *Augustine*, cited by our *Britannicæ Antiquitates* out of *Radulphus de Diceto*, and briefly set down in the *Abbreviationes Chron.* of the said *Radulphus*; *Sicut Cantia subjicitur Romæ, quod ex ea fidem accepit, ita Eboracum subjicitur Cantuariæ, quæ eo prædicatores misit, As Kent is subjected to Rome, because it received the Faith from it, so is York to Canterbury, which sent Preachers thither*, making the * *reception* of the *faith* from *Rome*, and not any *title* from *Christ* to *St. Peter*, the onely ground of any kind of *subjection* to it; and then (to omit many other observations, which that passage would suggest) that is distant enough from *S. W.*'s onely tenure, the *divine* right of *Universal Pastourship*, on the account whereof he utterly rejects that other of receiving the *Faith* from *Rome*, as we have formerly seen. From all these, let the Reader now judge, if there were ever such a layer of *self-evident grounds*, as *S. W.* hath thus far acquitted himself to be.

* *Sicut—prima fuit in fide, prima sit in honore, Radul. de Dic. Ibid.*

SECT. V.

The fourth Ground invalidated. Regal power of force against all but what is of divine right. Sacra Individua. The Adversaries grant how unjustly pretended by S. W. *The verdict of our English Laws, and ancient practice from Henry the* VIII. *backward to the Conquest.* Stapleton's *confession.* Bracton. Quintinus Hæduus. *Sir* Roger Twisden. *The Bishops Book de Vera Differentia, &c.* Stephen Gardiner's *Oration. Practice of other Nations.* S. W's *argument from* Augustine *the Monk's carriage to the Abbat of* Bangor, *considered at large, with reflexion on what had been formerly objected by Mr.* H. Turbervile.

1. HIS fourth ground, *that this actual power the Pope then had in England had been of long continuance, and setled in an ancient possession*] is necessarily lyable to all the feebleness of the three former, amass'd together, and so is incomparably inefficacious to support *S. W's* pretensions. For, remembring from the former discoveries, what was the utmost that *the power* the *Pope* then had in *England*, amounted to, a power by *himself assumed* to be *divine* and over the *whole Church of Christ*, but not so acknowledged by the Nation, nor by *S. W.* attempted to be proved with the least probability, that it was thus acknowledged, it follows that if it were true, or in liberality granted, that *the actual power* which the *Pope* then really had in *England*, (and no greater) had been *of long continuance and settled in an ancient possession*, it would never stand *S. W.* in the least stead. For still it might be but a *Patriarchal* power, and that is not the power of the *Universal Pastour*, or it might be but a power extorted from some one, or more *Kings*, or by them voluntarily *granted*, or but *permitted* and *winked* at, without any formal *concession*, and all such personal acts or indulgences of *Kings* are temporary, and revocable by themselves, and no way binding to their successours, and none of these hath so much as a *pretense* to *divine institution*. Nay on the contrary, the * *Romanists* themselves confess, that those things which are *intrinsecally* due and proper to the *Prince*, as to *punish offenders*, to make them *subject* to his *laws*, for subjects to *appeal* to him from *inferiour Judges*, paying *Tributes*, and the like, cannot by any other, by *possession* of never so long time, be *prescribed*. These, saith † *Baldus*, are *incommunicable*, *sacra individua*, they cannot be * *usurped*, or *prescribed*, or *aliened*, or *absolutely exercised* by any other than by them who bear the *supreme Majesty*. And if so indefinitely, then chiefly in the most considerable matters, those of *religion*, which most pertain to the end of *Government publick* good and *happiness*. And accordingly they acknowledge also, that it is the *duty* of the *Prince*, to *command*, and *exact* the observation of *divine law*, and of the *Canons* of the *church*, that he onely can make them obliging under *exteriour* penalties, mulcts, imprisonment, exile; as when *Justinian* decreed the *Canons* of the *Code*, † ὡς νόμους φυλάττεσθαι, *to be observed as laws*, i. e. so as might constrain the *unwilling*. And as the * suggesting these to be *derived* from the *Church*, or *Pope*, as acts of *obedience* in *Princes*, and *execution* of the *Churches commands*, is but a *begging* the *question*; so it shall, when we come to the 12th. *Ground*, be farther examined. Meanwhile the very possibility of any or all of these, is enough to keep his contrary affirmation from being a *ground*, which cannot be such, unless either it be by some *prosyllogism demonstrated* to be true, or else the contrary be impossible.

* *Molina de Just. Tract. 2. disp. 69. & 74.*

† *In Authent. Hoc amplius c. de sid. Commiss. & Felinus Rubric. de Præscript.*

* *Alex. in l. Filia quam de lib. Imola in Rubr. de verbo Oblig.*

† *Novell. 131.*

* *Twelfth Ground. p. 52.*

2. For the *truth* of it, *that*, he saith, is *evinced*; but by what *medium*? Why, saith he, both *from our Adversaries grant, the evidence of the fact it self, and even by the carriage of St. Austin the Monk.* What [*even the carriage of St. Austin the Monk*] will evince, shall anon be considered. At the present let us examine the *eviction from the adversaries grant, the evidence of the fact.*

3. But doth the *adversary grant* indeed, that the *Pope's Universal Pastourship*, as held by *divine* right from *Christ's* grant to *St. Peter*, had been *of long continuance and setled in ancient possession* in *England*? Nay, doth not *S. W.* know, that the *adversary* doth *not grant* it? and that the *evidence of the fact* is so far from being on his side, that 'tis on the *contrary*? Hath he never heard of the *Statutes* of the *Kingdom* before the *Reign* (that sure is before the pretended *Reformation*) of *Henry* VIII. which are competently to the prejudice of this *Papal* Pretention, and can he dream that his *adversaries* will *grant* so much to their own prejudice, what is so much contrary to their own *senses* also? From a small piece printed lately at *Bruges*, *De Antiqua Ecclesiæ Britanicæ libertate*, besides the evidence that his *advarsary* denyes, what he here pretends him to *grant*, he shall find in the margin in one place, a collection of many Statutes of the former times, which may in part help to illuminate him in the point of his *adversaries concession*, and *evidence of the fact*; I shall give him them, with *addition* of some more.

4. In the first year of *Henry* VII. *fol.* 18. we reade, *The King is a mixt person*, having *Ecclesiastical* as well as *temporal jurisdiction*; In the same year *Fol.* 20. The *Pope cannot erect any privilege of Sanctuary in England.*

In the same year, *fol.* 23. 25. the *Act of King Kenulphus in exempting the Abbat of Abingdon* from *Episcopal jurisdiction*, was judged regular and lawfull.

In the 6th. of *Hen.* 7. 13. *Union to a Priory cannot be without the King's consent.*

In the *second* of *Richard* III. *fol.* 22. *Excommunications* and *Sentences* of the *Bishop of Rome* are of no force in *England.*

In the twelfth of *Edward* IV. *fol.* 16. *A Legate landing in England was obliged to take Oath that he would attempt nothing* to the *derogation* of the *rights* of the *King* or *Crown.*

Under *Henry* VI. his nonage, when his *Unkle* was made a *Cardinal* and sent *Legate* by *Martin* the fifth, the *King's Attorney Ri. Cawdray* made *protestation* against him, that *none was to come as Legate from the Pope, or enter the Kingdom without the King's appointment*; and this by *singular privilege of our Kings, who had enjoyed this right from all memory.* On which, that *Cardinal publickly promised* conformity. Yet that this *privilege* was not so *singular* to our *Kings*, but that in like manner it belonged to *others*, particularly to the *King* of *France*, see *Ludovicus Servinus* his † Plea before the *Parliament* of *Paris, An.* 1590. when *Cardinal Cajetane* was sent *Legate* to *Henry* IV.

† *Anx. Ploid. vol.* 4.

In the same *King's* Reign, not onely the * *Clergy* refused *obedience* to the *Pope's Mandate* for money, and disposal of the *Archbishoprick* of *York*, to *Ri. Fleming*, but the *Pope's Messenger Jo. Opizanus*, for acting against the *King's Laws*, in getting money for the *Pope*, was *cast into prison.*

* *Vit. Henr. Chichley* p. 86.

So in the Reign of *Henry* V. when *Pope Martin*, whilst the *King* was busied in the affairs of *France*, had assumed some powers which were interdicted by the Laws of *Edward* III. and *Richard* II. the * *Bishop* of *Lichfield* and *Dean* of *York*, the *King's Legates* in the *Council* of *Constance*, were sent to him for redress, which they had promise of in some things; And at the same time, other *Ambassadours* were dispatcht to demand that he meddle not with *disposing of those Benefices in England*, which both by *pacts*, and *jure Regio* belong to the *King's disposal*, and for divers other things; with instructions, upon the *Pope's* refusal, to *profess, Regem in iis singulis jure suo usurum, That the King will use his own right in each of them*, and to make *publick protestation thereof before the Congregation of Cardinals.*

* Vid. *vit. Hen. Chichley Arch. Cant.* p. 56.

Vit. Arch. Chi. P. 78. 80.

In his Reign also, the design of sending a *Legate* from *Rome*, though it were the *King's* own *Brother*, was opposed, as appears by *Archbishop Chichley's Letter* to the *King*, and the consequent of it, the desisting from that *enterprise* whilst that *King* lived.

In the second of *Henry* IV. 'twas enacted, That the *Popes Collectors* had, by virtue of their *Bull's*, no *authority or jurisdiction in England*, but that the *Archbishops* and *Bishops* of *England* are the *King's spiritual Judges.*

In the eleventh of the same *King*, *fol.* 37. The *Pope* cannot *alter the Laws of England.*

In the same year *fol.* 69. 76. the *Judges* pronounce with one voice, that the foregoing *Statutes* were onely *declarative of the common custome of England*, and not *introductory* of any new Law.

In the Reign of *Richard* II. *Ch.* 5. 'Twas enacted, That because the *King of England* holds the *Crown immediately from God*, therefore if *any man shall follow in the Court of Rome any translation of suit, or excommunication*, he shall incur the *loss of his Goods*, and *forfeit the King's protection.*

In the sixth of the same *King* (*M.* 6. *R.* 2. *Rot.* 8. *en lescheq.*) *The Pope on complaint of the Bishop of* Coventry, *of one* Moses *a Prior there, ordained, that there should be no more Prior there, Mes que ferra, but that he or it should be ad mensam* (perhaps it should be *ad mentem*) *Episcopi. Upon which the Prior and Convent assaulted the Bishop, and beat him, and brake his head with a Cross: And afterward an Assise was brought, and it was held that the dissolution of the Pope was not good.*

In the sixteenth of *Edward* the *third*, the *excommunication* of the *Archbishop* of *Canterbury* is judged valid, notwithstanding the *Pope's* sentence to the *contrary.*

In the seventeenth of the same King, *fol.* 23. The *King* by his *Sovereign power* exempted the *Archdeacon* of *Richmond* from *Episcopal Jurisdiction*, as also all *Colleges* or *Monasteries* founded by the *King* are exempt by the same Law.

In the twenty fifth of the same *King*, it was enacted. The *Pope* had no *right* in *England* to *confer any Archbishoprick, or Bishopricks.*

In the twenty seventh of the same *King*, *fol.* 84. The *King*, as *supreme Ordinary*, presents by *lapse.*

In the same year, whosoever shall by *citation*, or impleading draw any of the *Subjects of the King of England* out of the *Kingdom*, shall incur the *loss of all his goods*, which our Law calls incurring a *Præmunire.*

In the thirty third of the same *King*, *fol.* 103. *Kings* being *anointed with Oil* are capable of *Spiritual jurisdiction.*

In the same *King's* Reign, the *dissolution* of the *Order* of *Templars by the Pope was not good, untill confirmed by the King. Walsingham* 59. and 46 Ed. 3. 28.

* *Goldast. monarch.*

In this *King's Reign* I refer the Reader to *Peter Cassiodor's* complaint * *De tyrannide Pontificum Romanorum in jura regni & Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ. Of the Tyranny of the Popes on the Rites of the Realm and Church of* England.

In the fourth of *Edward* 1. One that had brought a *Bull* derogatory to the right of the *Crown*, was therefore condemned to *banishment*, and the Fact adjudged to have the nature of *Treason.*

In the Reign of *Henry* the *third*, the *Lords* and *Commons* complain of the great sums carryed hence into *Italy, above four hundred thousand pounds yearly. Epist. Angl. ad Innocent.* which sure was mentioned by them as a *gravamen*, and *usurpation*, and is not by me designed to be farther *argumentative*; yet may, by the way, mind us, what may possibly incite and accend so much *zeal* in dispatching their *Missaries* at this time, to reduce this stray *Island* to the fold of their *universal Pastour*, and interpret in part, the *affectionateness* of *S. W's* harangues so frequently interlaced to his *dear Countrymen*, there being other motives imaginable to *found zeal*, besides the *deemed certainty of his faith.*

5. *Henry*

5. *Henry* II. ſaith *Mat. Paris, An.* 1164. gave out Orders to be obſerved by the *Archbiſhop, Thomas Becket*, and *Biſhops, tanquam avita*, i. e. *received under his Grandfather Henry* I. and his *Predeceſſours*; Theſe *Surius* interprets, *ab avo Regis inſtitutas, enacted by his Grandfather*, but that is a deceit, for *Mat. Paris* ſaith, they were the *Inſtitutes* of his *Predeceſſours*. And

6. *William Rufus* telling *Anſelme*, that he had *promiſed to keep* all the *Cuſtoms of England*, commands him thereupon, that he ſhould not make any *appeal* to the *Pope*, (*Guil. Malmsb. de Geſt. Pontif. Angl. l.* 1.) and *Eadmer* an Acquaintance of *Anſelme's*, affirms, that the *King* required of him to *promiſe* the ſame under *Oath. de vit. Anſel. l.* 2. On which occaſions, that eſpecially of *Henry* II. *Stapleton* (*de tribus Thomis, in Thom. Cantuar.*) cryes out, *Quid aliud hic Henricus ſecundus tectè poſtulavit, quàm quod Henricus VIII. completâ jam malitiâ apertè ſibi uſurpavit, ut ſupremum Eccleſiæ caput in Anglia eſſet? What difference was there betwixt that demand of Henry II. and the more open uſurpation of Henry VIII. when he aſſumed to be head of the Church in England?* And again, *Quid hoc aliud rurſum eſt, niſi ut Rex Angliæ ſit apud ſuos Papa? What is this other than to make the King of England Pope among his own Subjects?* A competent teſtimony of the practice from the mouth of an Enemy, and irrefragable to him, that concludes the *right* from the *poſſeſſion*.

7. Thus 'tis not onely reſolved in the *Novells*, that the *King* hath *ſupreme power over* † *all perſons in all*, and ſo *Eccleſiaſtical affairs*; and by our own Law, that the *King hath no equal*, as * *Bracton* ſaith, ſpeaking of the *Pope*, and *Archbiſhops*, and other *Prelates*, and giving this reaſon, for elſe the *King might loſe his precept and authority of commanding, becauſe an equal hath no rule over an equal*. But the matter is yet more clear by another Argument which † *Bracton* gives, taken from the practice of the *Courts* in *England*; That when an *Eccleſiaſtical Judge* hath received a *Prohibition* from the *King, ſuperſedere debet, in omni caſu, He is in all cauſes bound to ſuperſede*, at leaſt till in the *King's Court* it be reſolved, to whom the *Juriſdiction* belongs, becauſe if the *Eccleſiaſtical Judge* might reſolve of this queſtion, whether it were his *Juriſdiction* or no, he would in *all caſes* indifferently proceed, notwithſtanding the *King's prohibition*.

Novel 132.

† *Nihil non pervium ad inquiſitionem Majeſtati extitit Imperatoriæ, quæ communem in omnes homines moderationem & principatum percipit.*

* L. 1.

† L. V. *de exception.* c. 15. Sect. 3.

8. In ſum, 'tis among the *Laws* of *Edward* the *Confeſſour*, *Chap.* 10. that the *King is appointed God's Vicegerent to rule the Kingdom and people of the Lord, and above all, the holy Church*.

This concurrence of our ancient *Laws* in this matter minds me of † *Joannes Quint. Heduus*, who flouriſhed at the ſame time when *Henry* VIII. abrogated the *Papal* pretenſions in *England*, and was alſo of the *Roman Communion*, and attributed much to that See. He lays for his ground. *In ſolo principe omnis eſt poteſtas. All power is in the Prince alone*; and from a learned *Lawyer Lotharius* aſſerts, *Principem eſſe fontem omnis juriſdictionis, that the Prince is the fountain of all Juriſdiction*: citing the *C. Quando vult Deus, Cauſ.* 23. *qu.* 4. Thence he ſaith, the *Reaſon* is, *why it is lawfull for the Prince ſometimes to determine thoſe things which concern the Church, leſt the honour of the Mother* (the *Church*) *ſhould in any thing be violated. If any* thing, ſaith he, *be an Eccleſiaſtical matter, that of convocating Councils is certainly one; and yet 'tis the opinion of many learned men, that the Emperour may call a General Council, ſo oft as he ſees the Pope and Cardinals be noted of any ſuſpicion, and neglect to doe their duty, either for want of skill, or out of ſiniſter intention, or peradventure of both, or when there is any ſchiſm.* He puts a particular caſe, *The Pope calls the Biſhops to* Rome, *or to ſome other place; the King forbids them to go, or commands them to come to his Court or Council: The Biſhops muſt*, ſaith he, *obey the King's precept; and not onely in this, but in any other matter whatſoever, beſide ſin; for he that doth not obſerve his bounden fidelity to the King, whether Biſhop, Prieſt, or Deacon, he ought to be ejected from his degree.* This he proves by many *Canons*, and concludes his opinion to be, when the *King calls together the Prelates to a Council, and to reform the State of the Church, they are bound to obey, yea though the Pope forbid it*. But this by the way.

† *Joan. Quint. Heduus Juriſconſult. & Lutetiæ Profeſſor publicus in Repet. lectione de Chriſtianæ Civitatis Ariſtocratia, defendit Ariſtocratiam Chriſtianæ Civitatis, qua deſcriptio Pontificii & Regii Imperii continetur.* Poſſevin.

10. 'Twere not difficult farther to purſue this through the ſeries of times, and evidence it out of our *Hiſtories* of almoſt each former Age from the beginning of *Chriſtianity* in this *Iſland*, to thoſe days of the *extinguiſhing Act*: But for a fair view of that, I refer the *Reader* to our *learned Countryman*, Sir *Roger Twiſden*, in his *Hiſtorical vindication of the Church of* England, in *point* of *Schiſm*, who hath of late fully and ſatisfactorily performed that part.

11. All that I ſhall here farther inſert concerning our own Affairs, I ſhall chuſe to tranſcribe out of *two* of our firſt pieces, which the *Biſhops* ſet out on this ſubject, in *King Henry's* days (the former, two years before, the latter in the year of the *exterminating Act*) that it may at once appear, that not the *luxuriant* enormous will of the *Prince*, but the diſpaſſionate judgment of the *Prelates*, and the conviction of ſolid reaſon, uſher'd in this (*change* in the *outward* face of things, or rather) *vindication* of the *intrinſick* Rites, and Liberties of the *Anglicane Church*, that *extinguiſhing Act* being, as hath been ſaid, from a competent Authority, *not introductory of a new Law*, but onely *declaratory of ancient cuſtome*, which had prevailed through all times, and was refreſhed and revived, as often as occaſion demanded.

12. In the ſame year then, as hath been ſaid, with the *deciſion* of the *Univerſities* forementioned, *An.* 1534. was written the *Book*, *De vera differentia*——where beſides what was even now mentioned thence, 'tis punctually demonſtrated, that thoſe powers which by S. *W.* are ſuppoſed to have been of long continuance and ſetled in an *ancient* poſſeſſion in the *Papacy*, were acknowledgedly veſted in the *Kings of England*. Their proofs I have elſewhere pointed at, I ſhall now more largely ſet them down.

13. Firſt from the *Statute of Appeals*, and the method of them from *Biſhop* to *Archbiſhop*, *& poſtremo ad Regem, in the laſt reſort to the King, ut præcepto ipſius in Curia Archiepiſcopi controverſia terminetur, ita quod non debet ulterius procedere ſine conſenſu Regis, That by his Commiſſion the Controverſie may be ended in the Archbiſhop's Court, ſo that there may be no farther proceeding without the conſent of the King*. 2. By the *Statute* againſt any *Biſhop* or *Archbiſhop*, his *going out of the Kingdom* without the *King's licence*, and giving *ſecurity*, that neither in *going* nor *ſtaying perquirant malum vel damnum Regi vel Regno, they will cauſe any damage to King or Kingdome*. (Either of which, what a deſtructive influence it muſt have on all foreign, and ſo *Papal* authority, is moſt viſible.) 3. By the *Example*

of Thurſtan Archbiſhop of York, who when he obtained the *King's licence* to go to the *Council* called, by *Calixtus*, he was required firſt to *take Oath*, *give faith* (and ſo did) *that he would not receive Epiſcopal benediction from the Pope.* (Another clear evidence that the *King's* power over *Eccleſiaſticks* 1. In impoſing *Oaths* on them, 2. In *prohibiting* them all acknowledgment of *Papal juriſdiction*, was then in full force againſt the *Pope's* pretentions.) 4. By our *Kings*, *Canutus*, *Ethelred*, *Edgar*, *Edmund*, *Æthelſtane*, *Ina*, *Alfred*, making of Laws in *Eccleſiaſtical matters*, the ſeverals whereof are there recited. 5. By their authority of *inveſting of Biſhops*. 6. By the *exemptions* from all *Epiſcopal* authority given by them, as they pleaſed; for example, by *William* the *Conquerour* to the *Abbat* of *Battaile*, by him inſtituted. 7. By the Letter and *Proteſtation* of that *King* to the *Pope*, that if he did not *reform* the *abuſes*, which he minded him of, he would himſelf take a courſe to doe it, with a *Torpeſcere non valemus, quin (ut tenemur) tanta diſcrimina pro viribus evitemus. We cannot be ſo ſluggiſh, as not to doe our utmoſt (as we are obliged) to avert ſo great dangers.* 8. By the *Oration of King Edgar* to his *Clergy*, requiring them to cauſe a *Reformation* by the *conjunction of his and their power. Epiſcopali cenſura & Regia authoritate, committing* the matter to ſo many *Biſhops*, as are there named. 9. By the *Letters* of the *Parliament* to the *Pope*, when he took upon him to diſpoſe of the *Kingdom* of *Scotland*, which our *King* claimed. This certainly (being the work of the *Biſhops* at that time) was another large teſtimony of the acknowledgment of the *Kingdom* at that time (which is ſomewhat more than of his *preſent* adverſaries) And the force of it was ſo great, and the truth ſo generally acknowledged then, that *Stephen Gardiner* one of the compoſers of it, in an Oration of his, ſoon after delivered on this matter, makes no ſcruple to ſay, *Omnes planè conſtantiſſimo conſenſu in hoc convenerunt docti pariter atque indocti, viri atque fœminæ nihil ei cum Româ eſſe negotii quem Anglia genuit, All are moſt conſtantly agreed, learned and unlearned, men and women, that he that is born in* England *hath nothing to doe with* Rome, *nothing which can be claimed from him by any tenure of right humane* or *divine* by *Chriſt* in *Scripture* or out of Scripture.

De Ver. Obed. p. 731. 18.

14. That Oration of his, *De vera Obedientia*, written *Ann.* 1536. the year of that *Extinguiſhing Act*, is the other piece which even now I mention'd, the *Penman* whereof being far from *a Reformer*, living and dying an eminent perſecuter of ſuch, his name poſſibly may add ſome weight to his obſervations; From one * *Paragraph* of that *Oration*, the *Book* being not in every man's hands I ſhall give the *Reader* a *ἔκθεσις* of the whole diſcourſe, and a repreſentation of the intire truth in this matter.

* P. 726.

15. To this very objection then, that we have now before us, that the *Biſhop of Rome had been by our Princes acknowledged the head of the Univerſal Church, honours given, ſubmiſſions performed to him, his authority acknowledged, ſo that if right be judged by fact, the advantage will be on the Pope's ſide*, he accommodates this anſwer, that in thoſe times and paſſages which ſeem moſt to *derogate from the right and authority of our Princes*, ſome *light* of the truth was yet always *diſcernible*, by which he that will look cloſe, and carefully, ſhall eaſily find that the *acknowledgments* that were made them, were not *ſolid* and *intire*, and built on any foundation of *right*, but *ſpecious* rather than true, acts of *civility*, not of *duty*, and * *arguments* that the *honour was lent for advantages, not paid them for any obligation.* For if our *Princes* had been reſolved that the *Biſhop* of *Rome* was *Chriſt's Vicar* on earth whom all were *bound* to *obey*, and without whoſe *intervention* nothing could be *firm* or *valid*, or if the *Popes* themſelves had been really thus perſwaded, 'tis not to be imagined, that *they* ſhould have uſed humane arts and policies, yea and plain *terrours*, and aſſociations of *ſecular* force to gain this power in this Kingdom (but have made their appeals to the *ſolid teſtimony* of *divine truth*, if they had any ſuch to produce) or that the *Princes*, ſuch eſpecially who after their death were honoured as *Saints*, would by facts openly have diminiſh'd that their authority, which by words and titles they ſo acknowledged; Had they believed that the adminiſtration and care of the whole world was committed to the *Pope* by *God*, with what confidence could they have made ſo many † *Decrees*, contrary and derogatory to this principle, expreſſing their diſlike of his *fatherly care*; diſclaiming the *exerciſe* of his *piety*, and forbidding him to *meddle* with their *affairs*, or have inſpection of them, whom they deemed to be ſet in the *Watch Tower* by *God* for this purpoſe? Beſides, the doing this, had been ſtrangely irregular, it being not in the power of *Inferiours* to make *Laws* for, or againſt their *Superiours*, or to reſtrain them in their adminiſtrations, and yet this our *Princes* (not paſſionately in their *Courts*, but) on mature advice in their *Parliaments* frequently did, making laws againſt the *Popes* interpoſition in ſuch or ſuch things; to which alſo the *Popes* were ſo far from expreſſing any *diſlikes*, or returning their *rebukes*, that they took no leaſt notice of them, but liberally *commended* the actours for their *faith* and *obedience*, imitating the *ſubtleſt Merchants*, when they have made any very circumventing advantageous bargain, they ſit down contentedly with *half*, and preſs not rigorouſly for all, eſteeming it perfect *gain*, whatſoever they can get by ſuch arts, when they know nothing is due to them. 'Twas from the *benefit* they received by it, not from any opinion of his being the *Vicar* of *Chriſt*, that our *Princes* allowed him any *authority* in their *Realms*, and that * *cum moderamine*, ſo ſoon as they could relieve themſelves from ſuffering any conſiderable damage by it, and could caſt it out when they pleaſed, their *authority* being but *precarious*, † as long as the *Princes* judged it beſt for their own *intereſts*, and as ſoon as they thought fit to ſtand on their certain right, the *Pope's* authority was preſently retrench'd; till then, they *prudentially diſſembled*, and took no notice of his uſurpations, and ſatisfied themſelves, that they, as well as he, were the *gainers* by it. Thus it was for the main, and if there were any *ſingular* inſtances, which ſeemed contrary to this, yet the conceſſions of *weak*, and *maſter'd*, or *deluded*, or *temerarious*, or negligent *Princes* can have no force to prejudge the powers which are given to *Kings* by *God*. They called them *Fathers*, and *heads*, and dignified them with many titles, but this was no prejudice to

* *Honoris fœnerati potius quam ſolutiargumenta.*

† *Quamvis corona Angliæ & jura ejuſdem coronæ ipſumque regnum fuerunt ab omni tempore retro actо adeo libera, ut nec Dominus ſummus Pontifex nec aliquis extra regnum ſe intromittere debeat, de eiſdem---- Act. Dep. Rich.* II. *M. S. citat. ab Ad. Reutero.* p. 4.

* *Salvis nobis & hæredibus noſtris juſtitiis, libertatibus, & regalibus noſtris. Inſtrum. Conceſſion. & obligation. à Joanne à Rege fact.* ap. *Guil.* Paris.

† *Foraſmuch as the King hath ordained theſe things to the honour of God and holy Church, and for the Common-wealth, and for the remedy of ſuch as be grieved, he would not that any other time it ſhould turn in prejudice of himſelf or of his Crown, but that ſuch rights as appertain to him, ſhould be ſaved in all points. Stat. Edwardi* I. in his 3d year, *Weſtm.* 1. *cap.* 48. tit. *Conceſſ. fact. Eccleſ. ſemper ſine præjud. Coron.*

their

their *Monarchick* prerogatives; Again, the *ancient Church* of *Rome* was for the *luſtre* of their *ſanctity*, and *amplitude* of *power*, not onely of great name in the *Weſtern Church*, and particularly in ours, but of eminent authority, in the ſenſe, that *Cicero* uſeth *authority*, when in giving of *teſtimonies*, he attributes *authority* to men of *parts* and *wealth*, not that they are always in the right, but becauſe the *multitude* are willing to be *lead* by ſuch, and do not eaſily diſtruſt them; But for any *Divinely* eſtabliſh'd *authority*, the *Pope* neither hath, nor hath had among us any more, than any other *Biſhop*. What *Princes* have done for their *intereſts*, or from the *neceſſities* of their affairs, or through ignorance, or circumvention, or on any ſuch other reſpect, can be no *prejudice* to the truth, or to the *native* rights of the *Diadem* veſted in them by *God*; and therefore if it were the cuſtome at any or all times, to adviſe with the *Biſhop* of *Rome* in governing the Church, and to doe nothing without conſulting him, and if *Princes* permitted their Subjects to repair to him, this was far from freeing their Subjects from their *own juriſdiction*, which being committed to them by *God*, could not without violation of the *Paternal* care due to their *Subjects*, be abdicated by them. As on the other ſide, when they had no need of the *Pope*, when his interpoſitions grew inconvenient, the *Prince* might as ſafely, and without *violation* of *religion*, diſmiſs him, as a *Lord* may do his *Chaplain*, (they are his own words) whom he had formerly received, and hired to officiate in his Family, eſpecially if he diſcerned him to aſſume beyond his bounds, to exact *ſubjection* from him and his Family.

16. Thus far that *Great Biſhop*, who profeſſing that he had formerly ſworn to defend the *Papal* power and authority, and ſince to have been convinced with the evidence of the contrary, may be an example to others to doe the like, on the conviction of his reaſons; nor can it much prejudice his teſtimony (if we ſtood on that, as we do not, but on the truth of his obſervations, and the *evidence*, that *S. W*'s adverſaries do not grant what he would have them) that in *Queen Maries* days he returned to the *Papacy* again; Whatſoever he thought of the Original right pretended from *St. Peter*, he might think it lawfull for the *Queen* by *Act of State* to ſet up the *Pope's* power in ſome degree, and then when it was ſo, account it his *duty* to ſubmit to it.

17. Meanwhile it may be added, *ex abundanti*, that what in that *Oration* he maintained, is in very full accord with the declared judgment and practice of other Nations through all times; *Alciat*, whom * *Baronius* juſtly ſtyles *doctiſſimum*, moſt *learned*, reſolves it in general, † *Nemini dubium eſſe quin in primitiva Eccleſia de rebus & perſonis Eccleſiaſticis jus dicerent Imperatores*, *That no man doubts but in the Primitive Church the Emperours had juriſdiction over Eccleſiaſtical matters and perſons.* * *An.* 534. † *Cod. Rubric. de ſacr. Eccle.* §. 3.

18. *Matthias Corvinus King* of *Hungary* puniſhed *Biſhops* and *Prieſts*, when they *offended*, &c. *Laurence Roborella* the *Pope's Legate* not diſallowing it. *Ant. Bonfin. Rer. Hungar. Decad.* IV. l. 1. & 3.

19. *Charles the great*, *Capitular.* l. 1. *Præf.* deſires that no man will think he took too much upon him, that in *Eccleſiaſtical matters* and *perſons he took care to correct what was amiſs*, *defending himſelf by the example of Joſias.* The *ninth Council* of *Toledo*, c. 1. c. filiis. 16. q. 7. admoniſhes the *Curatours* of the goods of the *Church*, that if a Miniſter fraudulently *imbezille* any of them, he complain to the *Biſhop*, but if the *Biſhop* be the *offender*, to the *Metropolitane*, if the *Metropolitane*, to the King. And many the like, which I ſhall not now (*extra orbitam*) inſiſt on.

20. And thus much to his firſt *mediums* of eviction, his adverſaries grant, and the *evidence* of the *fact* it ſelf, of the *ancient poſſeſſion* and *long continuance* of *Papal* power through the Reigns of our former *Kings*, that the Reader may diſcern the diſtance betwixt *S. W*'s *ſelf-evident grounds*, and plain matters of *fact*.

21. It remains that I take notice of his other *medium* of *eviction*, the *carriage of St. Auſtin the Monk*, *and the Abbat of Bangor*, *expreſs'd*, ſaith *S. W. in that counterfeited teſtimony alledged by Dr. H. whence we ſee it was the Doctrine St. Auſtin taught the Saxons.*] But it would even move ones compaſſion to think, how many fruſtrations he will here meet with alſo, in this attempt of *eviction*.

22. For 1. how can he evince that *Monk's* carriage from a teſtimony, which the ſame time that he appeals to it, he charges of being *counterfeit?* Can he think fit to found *Principles* on the quick-ſand, and pretend to *evince* demonſtratively, when he confeſſes his *medium* not onely to be *fallible*, but fallacious, and actually *counterfeited?* 'Tis not enough to ſay that *Dr. H.* alledges it, and ſo, that *ad hominem* it is convincing; for an *argument ad hominem* is at moſt but a *probable* argument, and ſo cannot be ſufficient for the *evincing* of a ground or *ſelf-evident principle*, (which mankind, and not onely *hic homo* is concerned in) eſpecially when 'tis uſed by him that doth not himſelf believe it, but on the contrary charges it for *counterfeit*, when he thus produces it for *evincing*. This is ſtill the ſame rate of *demonſtrating*, that we have oft minded him of, ψευδώνυμος γνώσις, *ſcientifical* falſely ſo called, a *teſtimony* acknowledgedly *counterfeit*, yet fit to be a *medium* of a *ſevere*, if not *rigorous demonſtration*.

23. But then 2. I may be allowed to think that there is no truth in his *Epithet*, and that that *teſtimony* was not *counterfeited*, having had the leiſure particularly to examine and invalidate all the ſuggeſtions of ſo learned a man as *Mr. H. T.* is commended to be by no meaner a perſon than *Thomas de Albiis*, very elaborately and pompouſly offered, in a peculiar diſcourſe, againſt that one teſtimony. And as if there had never paſs'd any ſuch thing, or at leaſt as if ſome kind of *reply* had been made to it, this can yet obtain no more than a faſtidious mention of [*that counterfeited teſtimony*] I deſire *S. W.* will for once ſo far take notice of the rules of *common juſtice* among men, that the brand of *counterfeit* be not affix'd *ad libitum* to whatever comes in his way, unleſs he be at leiſure to prove his charge, or be reſolved to take a fit opportunity to prove it; and if in order thereto he will in ſome earneſt reflect on that buſineſs betwixt *H. T.* the *Romaniſt* and me, he ſhall ſoon find who was the gainer by it, it being viſible in the entrance, how ſafe I ſtood, and how firm the concluſion which I inferr'd from that teſtimony, it being no other but a matter of fact, of *known truth*, and no more but what, from all ſorts of writers that ever dealt in that ſubject, I except not *Baronius* himſelf, is notorious, and confeſs'd by the *Romaniſts*, viz. that the *Britans*, thoſe of *Bangor* particularly, denyed to yield obedience to the *Pope*, upon *Auſtin's* demand of it.

24. Whether *S. W*'s concluſion be of this kind, that it can receive *benefit* by this teſtimony, if it be *valid*, and no *prejudice*, in caſe it be *counterfeit*, let us next conſider; and in order to this, I will be good natured, and afford him this odds, that what paſs'd for utterly *invalid* (becauſe *counterfeit*) when urged againſt *him*, ſhall be of full force and validity, as far as it can be argumentative againſt *me*, which I mean for an eſſay how happy *S. W.* would be, if he might have all the *gains*, and none of the inconveniences of his own *wiſhes*.

* *Tr. of Schiſ.* p. 111.

25. What then was this carriage of *Auſtin the Monk*, and the *Abbat of Bangor*, as it is * there ſet down? Why, that when *Auguſtine required ſubjection to the Pope and Church of Rome*, the *Abbat anſwered, Notum ſit vobis*—— *Be it known unto you that we are all ſubject and obedient to the Church of God and the Pope of Rome, but ſo as we are alſo to every pious and good Chriſtian*, viz. *to love every one in his degree and place, in perfect charity, and to help every one by word and deed, to attain to be the Sons of God, and for other obedience I know none due to him, whom you call the Pope, and as little do I know by what right he can challenge to be Father of Fathers*, or (as it is * better rendred from a due punctation of the *Welſh*) *and any other obedience than that, I acknowledge not to be any man's, or to belong to any man, whom ye name Pope or Father of Fathers, to challenge and require. As for us we are under the rule of the Biſhop of Caerlegion upon Uske, who is to overlook and govern us under God.*

* *See App. to H. T.* p. 184.

26. Now with this teſtimony let us, in the name of truth and ſobriety, compare *S. W*'s concluſion, which he ſaith is evinced by the *carriage of St. Auſtin* and that *Abbat*, expreſs'd in this teſtimony: The *Concluſion* is, that *this actual power the Pope then had in England, had been of long continuance and ſetled in an ancient poſſeſſion.*] But from what part of this teſtimony can that be drawn? ſure not from the *Abbat's* telling him they are *all ſubject to the Church of God and Pope of Rome*, for ſubjection is expreſs'd to be no other than what he pay'd to every pious and *good Chriſtian*, and then every good *Chriſtian* by this argument is equally inſtated in this power. No more ſure will it be inferred from his *denying* him all other *power*, but this. It remains then neceſſarily, that it be inferred from *Auguſtine*'s requiring the *Abbat*'s *ſubjection* to the *Pope*, or it cannot be evinced from this teſtimony. But, 1. doth *Auguſtine* the *Monk* his *requiring* it, when it was as roundly denyed him, and never afterwards granted him, evince the *poſſeſſion* thereof? Doth he poſſeſs what he never had, and is finally rejected from his claim of it?

27. But ſaith *S. W. Hence we ſee it was the Doctrine Auſtin taught the Saxons.* In good time, *Auſtin taught* it the *Saxons*, therefore the *Pope* was ſetled in an *ancient poſſeſſion* of it. The argument is of force the quite contrary way; the *Abbat* of *Bangor* refuſed it, and in the name of the whole *Britiſh* Church renounced all ſuch right as he pretended, therefore infallibly he had it not. Doth not the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* include the *Britiſh* as well as the *Saxons*, and can then the *teaching* it the *Saxons* conclude him poſſeſs'd of it among the *Britans*, when 'tis evident he is not poſſeſs'd of it? Doth not a *particular negative* deſtroy an *univerſal affirmative*? if then he were not poſſeſs'd of this power over the *Britans*, he was not at that time, nor had ever been (as far as can from that, I ſhall add, or from any other unſuſpected teſtimony appear) *poſſeſs'd* of an *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, or acknowledged to be poſſeſs'd of it in this *Kingdom*. Such evictions are *S. W*'s, which unavoidably evince the direct contrary to the concluſion he projected from them.

28. But let us for once endeavour to forget the difference betwixt *Univerſals* and *Particulars*, and take the *Saxons*, thoſe few that were then converted by *Auſtin*, to be this whole Nation, what hath *S. W.* gained toward his unimproveable concluſion by this great liberality? all that he pretends to, is but *Auſtin*'s *teaching* it. But 1. the teſtimony is for no more than *petens ſubjectionem Eccleſiæ Romanæ, demanding or requiring ſubjection* to that *Church*, which differs from *teaching*, and can never be any ſeeming proof of *poſſeſſion*.

29. Secondly, ſubjection to the *Roman Church*, doth not neceſſarily import that ſupereminent power of *headſhip* of the *univerſal Church*, and that as derived to him from *Chriſt* as St. *Peter*'s ſucceſſour. This is the leaſt that can ſerve *S. W*'s pretenſions; and *teaching* or *requiring ſubjection* indefinitely, can never come home to that, any more than the *Abbat*'s anſwer did, that they were *all obedient and ſubject* to him, which we know ſignified the quite contrary. *S. W.* muſt pardon me this ſtrictneſs, that I allow him no more, than the *teſtimony* (his onely proof) exacts; for beſides that this ſtrictneſs, were it never ſo great, is no more than is neceſſary to a *demonſtratour*, (and ſuch the layer of *grounds* aſſumes to be) the *Records* from *Bede*, and ſuch other *Hiſtorians*, as the *Romaniſt* moſt depends on, in this matter, amount to no more than this, that *Auſtin* finding the *Britans* to retain ſome practices different from the *Roman uſages*, as in the celebrating of *Eaſter*, &c. laboured to conform them to the *Roman* way, under the title of *Catholick peace*, and ſo to bring all to an *uniformity*; but the *Britans* conſtant to their own *Traditions*, were not moved with the mention of the *authority* of the *Roman Church* or *Pope*; ſo *Bede* ſets down his ſpeech to them, *In multis quidem noſtræ conſuetudini imò univerſalis Eccleſiæ contraria geritis, In many things ye doe contrary to our cuſtome, yea to the cuſtome of the Univerſal Church* (where by the way, ſome difference there is betwixt *our* i. e. the *Roman*, and the *Univerſal* Church. And ſo in the *Pope*'s anſwer to his third *Interrogatory*, he tells *Auſtin*, that if he found any thing that might be more *acceptable to God* * whether in the Church of *Rome* or of *France*, or any other *Church*, he ſhould infuſe it into the Church of *England*) and then all that is thence concluſible is, that the practice of the *Church* of *Rome* being conſonant to the reſt of the whole Church, was uſed by *Auſtin* as an argument to draw the *Britans* to the like practice, but ſure that differs much from his *teaching* his *Supremacy* of power by *divine* right.

* *Sive in Romana, ſive in Galliarum, ſeu in qualibet Eccleſia aliquid invenîſti quod plus omnipotenti Deo poſſet placere, ſolicitè eligas & in Anglorum Eccleſia*—*infundas. Bed.* l. 1. c. 27.

† *Bed.* l. 2. c. 2.

* *Ut Paſcha ſuo tempore celebretis, ut miniſterium baptizandi juxta morem Romanæ ſanctæ Eccleſiæ & Apoſtolicæ Eccleſiæ compleatis, ut Genti Anglorum una nobiſcum prædicetis. Bed.* Ibid.

30. And this is yet more manifeſt, for the difference ſtill continuing among them (what difference? Why, that the *Britans* would not † *priſcis abdicare moribus, leave their old cuſtoms*) *Auſtin* in fine demands their accord with him but in theſe *three* particulars, * the time of *celebrating Eaſter*, the miniſtering *baptiſm* according to the manner of the *Roman Church* and the *Apoſtolick Church* (which again one would not take for the ſame, being ſo *ſevered*) and the *preaching the word of God together with them*; adding expreſſely, *Cætera quæ agitis quamvis moribus noſtris contraria, æquanimiter*

nimiter cuncta tolerabimus, Other *things which ye doe, though contrary to our manners, we will bear them all patiently.* Where it is moſt manifeſt, that *Auſtin* preſſes not, nor demands a *ſubjection* to the *Papal* authority, as that ſignifies *juriſdiction*; but *ſubjection* to, or rather complyance with a few *cuſtoms* of the *Roman*, being alſo the practices of the reſt of the *Church*; to which the *Britiſh* thought they had no reaſon to yield, knowing that they were not under the *Pope's juriſdiction.*

25. One thing more is here to be obſerved, that *Auſtin* being now *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury*, expected to have the *Britans* acknowledge him as their *Archbiſhop*; but as *Balæus* tells us, * the *Britans* thought it not for their profit to admit either the pride of *Rome*, or the known tyranny of the *Anglo-Saxons*, and ſtrongly defended the juriſdiction of the *Archbiſhop* of St. *Davids* in the affairs of their *Churches*, ſo *Bede* expreſſely adds, *Neque illum pro Archiepiſcopo habituros eſſe reſpondebant, they anſwered, that they would not have him for their Archbiſhop.* All which is very remote from inferring the *Pope's poſſeſſion* of *England* at that time; yea if he were yielded to be poſſeſs'd of all that *Auſtin* did but *petere*, *demand*, or *deſire*, yet it would yield *S. W.* no more advantage toward inferring the long continuance, and ſettledneſs in *poſſeſſion*, than the *Pope* hath here had ever ſince he was diſclaimed, for the *Britiſh Biſhops* have all that time been ſubjected to the *Biſhop* of *Canterbury*, the Succeſſour of that *Auſtin.* This I ſuppoſe is not enough to ſatisfie *S. W*'s appetite, and yet from the moſt favourable repreſentment of this hiſtory, there is not a crumb more to be had for him, not the leaſt news of *Univerſal* Paſtourſhip by *divine right* here ſo much as pretended to, (and for the title of converſion from *Rome*, beſides that this is peculiar to the *Saxons*, and the *Britans* are not concern'd in it, *S. W.* diſclaims building any thing on that title) and this cannot appear ſtrange to any, that remembers this was in the time of that *Gregory*, who diſclaimed that *wicked*, *faſtuous*, *monſtrous*, *blaſphemous*, *Antichriſtian*, *Luciferian* title of *Univerſal* Paſtourſhip, which therefore 'tis not ſoberly imaginable that *Auſtin* ſhould challenge for him, much leſs that he was thus *anciently* ſetled in this *poſſeſſion.* Thus much for his *fourth Ground*, exact in nothing, but its conformity with the other three, All equally capable of, and furniſhed with his *Demonſtrative evictions.*

* *Dion* — *fortiter tuebatur Menevenſis Archiepiſcopi in Eccleſiarum ſuarum rebus ratam juriſdictionem, concludens non eſſe in Britannorum commodum futurum, in communionem admittere vel Romanorum faſtum vel cognitam Anglo-Saxonum tyrannidem. Balæus.*

SECT. VI.

His fifth Ground how far from having any leaſt force in it againſt us. No poſſeſſion, and no validity of it, if there were. S. W*'s proofs ſpent on that onely which wanted them not. Some force of Poſſeſſion acknowledged. No breach on our part, and ſo no need to conſider cauſes of diviſion.* S. W*'s unſucceſsfull acts.*

1. HIS *fifth Ground*, that *No poſſeſſion ought to be diſturbed without ſufficient motives and reaſons, and conſequently it is it ſelf a title, till thoſe reaſons invalidate it, and ſhew it null,*] is long ſince, as far as it is appliable to our queſtion, diſappointed and invalidated, not onely by the evidences formerly produced, for an *Original* right to an αὐτοκεφαλία, or *independency* from all foreign *juriſdiction*, parallel to that of the *Africans*, and conſequent to that, the unlawfulneſs of all intruſions, and the obligation of reducing *unjuſt poſſeſſions* to what it was ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἄνωθεν, *from the beginning*, by the force of the *Epheſine Canon*, in caſe of the *Cypriots*; but now farther by conſidering, what power it is, which is by *S. W.* pretended to have been in *poſſeſſion* ſo long, viz. that of *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* by *divine right*, which till he hath proved *demonſtratively* to have been in *poſſeſſion* among us, he muſt no longer aſſume; and I ſhall flatter my ſelf that I have abundantly evinced in the four former Sections, that he hath yet been very far from all *appearance* of thus proving it.

2. Had the *four* former *grounds* been ſolidly evinced, had this of *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* approved it ſelf to have been really in *poſſeſſion*, the one acknowledged *Doctrine* for many hundred years, and the *Scepters* of this and all other *Kingdoms* willingly ſubjected to it, as to the undoubted *Sceptre* of *Chriſt*, there might then be a reaſon for the *fifth* ground, though ſtill there would be juſt place alſo for *Writers* of errour, and *right* once evinced (as ſoon it would be) muſt have the deference from *unjuſt*, though aged *poſſeſſion*, eſpecially when the minds of men were the *poſſeſſion*, and *pride* on one ſide, and *errour* on the other the evil Spirits (little better than *Devils*) that *poſſeſs* it, for ſure *humility* and *truth* can never be forbidden by the moſt inveterate contrary *cuſtome*, to return *jure poſtliminii* to their due habitations.

3. But when the *poſſeſſion* it ſelf, as it is by *S. W.* ſtated, is the πρῶτον ψεῦδος, the *firſt thing* that is *ſuppoſed*, but not duly *evinced* by him, and all the ſlight offers of proof for that, already ſhewn to be uneffectual (for which I refer the Reader to the *four* former Sections) 'tis viſible that there is no farther conſideration due from me to this his *fifth ground*: which having a *general* truth in it, till it be applyed to our *hypotheſis*, and ſo being *in theſi* by me moſt willingly, and ſecurely granted to his firſt demand, is yet by *S. W.* beyond all the former, whoſe *wants were* more viſible and importunate, allowed a liberal proportion of proofs from *Nature*, *Morality*, *Policy*, *Common Law*; but all theſe pains, as now appears, miſplaced by him, like the *charity* which the *Phariſee* was warned of, the calling in onely of his *rich neighbours* to his *Feaſt*; It had been well if in complyance with that Text, any of the *four* former, the *poor*, the *maimed*, the *lame*, and the *blind*, had been thought capable of it.

4. Briefly

4. Briefly therefore, I cannot affix any probable ſenſe to this propoſition *in theſi*, wherein I have any concernment to deny, or queſtion it; All the queſtion is of the *hypotheſis*; I ſhall never pretend the diſturbing of any ſort of *poſſeſſions* without ſufficient *motives* or *reaſons*. I, as readily as he could wiſh, acknowledge *poſſeſſion* it ſelf a *title*, till *reaſons are produced to invalidate it*, and farther, I have no diſlike to his *proofs*, but diſcern reaſon to conclude, that that part of *S. W.* which wrote this *Paragraph*, is very well inabled to *demonſtrate* a *truth*, and conſequently that his former faileurs have not with any juſtice been imputable to him, who had ſagacity enough to invent, but to the matter, which was too barren to yield arguments, other than *Topical* or *Sophiſtical*. Onely I cannot ſay of him, as *Zeno* of himſelf, that he *ſometimes wanted opinions, but never arguments*; for if I may judge by theſe *five* propoſals of ſo many *grounds*, I muſt reſolve he hath more *opinions* than *arguments*; *concluſions* than *premiſſes*, *five grounds*, but no tolerable *mediums* of eviction, ſave for *one* of them.

5. All that I have to reſiſt in his deſcant on this fifth ground, is his *Corollary*, that *I was very little adviſed in ſtating the queſtion rightly and clearly*, *Sch.* p. 10. *Where I tell him that the motives are not worth heeding in this controverſie, but onely the truth of the matter of fact.*] For the rebuke in this Corollary of his, the reaſon he aſſigns, is, [*for the matter of fact, to wit, that there was then an actual government, and that we broke from it, being evident to all the world, and confeſs'd by the Proteſtants themſelves, if there be no reaſons to be examined, I am convinced to be a Schiſmatick ſo flatly and plainly, that it is left impoſſible even to plead a defence.*

6. But he was certainly told long ſince, and need not be now reminded, that we do not confeſs any *breach* on our part, that we ſtill are where we ever were, under our *lawfull Paſtours*, of whom the *Primate* of *England* reſiding at *Canterbury*, is the chief, whom the *Pope* hath himſelf look'd on. * as it were his *Compeer*, and *Patriarch* of this *other* little *world*, from whom having never ſeparated, nor from our immediate *ſuperiours* under him, we have no need to conſider cauſes of *diviſions*, or *breaches* of that kind, which as upon mature advice we know they cannot be juſt, ſo we are without all ſcruple perſwaded that we have not been *guilty* of them, nor can, ſave by one of theſe three ways, either by caſting off our *Biſhops*, or calling in and ſubmitting to ſome *foreign power*, or *ſeparating* from other ſiſter Churches, who are not before hand with us herein, to cut us off from their *Communion*.

* *Quaſi comparem velut alterius Orbis Apoſtolicum & Patriarcham.* Eadmer. *apgrav. in vit. Anſelmi.*

7. In managing this part of his cauſe, where *truth* wholly *deſtitutes* him, 'tis ſtrange to ſee, what arts he reſorts to, one while preſſing me to change my method, and inſiſt on the *cauſes* of our *ſeparation*, when I aſſure him of the deliberate choice of *this* part of my method, and (which he of all men hath no pretence to complain of) my perfect concurrence with him in an unextorted profeſſion, that no cauſe can *juſtifie* a ſeparation (and that therefore we have much rather choſen to preſerve our ſelves from this guilt, than to incur firſt, and then palliate it, to injoy innocence, than to forecaſt and ſtudy Apologies) Another while telling us, that the *breach is viſible to all the world*, and by us *confeſs'd*, when he knows that all the *magnifying* glaſſes in the world cannot help any the ſharpeſt ſight to ſee what is *not*, and that there is nothing we more *deny*, than what he ſaith we *confeſs*, *viz.* that we have ever broken off from any; Our lot having conſtantly been that which *Chriſt* foretold the earlyeſt *Chriſtians*, to be *caſt* out *of the Synagogue*, in which we had elſe remained, and now to have the πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα from thoſe that have *caſt* us *out*, and ſo made it *impoſſible* for us to be guilty of what they charge us; Let him but take notice, what I inſiſt on this *third* time, that we confeſs no *breach* on our part, but are ready, if yet they pleaſe, to redintegrate *ſecundum Canones*, and that if herein we are proved liable, we ſhall contentedly fall under the guilt, and entertain no *advocate* to plead our cauſes, and he will be forced to confeſs his *Corollary* had as much injuſtice, as I willingly acknowledge his *fifth* ground (conſidered, as here it is, onely *in theſi*) to have *truth* in it.

SECT. VII.

His ſixth Ground, ſafely, denyed, or granted. What demonſtration required to our denying their Poſſeſſion. S. W's demonſtration producible by us, Oral Tradition of a preſent age, that of Gregorie's. *Tradition reverſ'd. The Pope's whatſoever poſſeſſion far from Divine right, S. W's reaſons examined. The Papal authority being held of Faith, Univerſal Tradition, Neceſſity of acknowledging it in order to Unity. The no force of reaſons barely probable, (On whoſe ſide the Schiſm is) Of teſtimony-proofs; The argument from the title of Reformers. The true foundation of their poſſeſſion. Multitude of learned on which ſide. No pretence for continuing in Schiſm.*

1. IT now from the premiſſes ſufficiently appears, what weight or ſolidity there is in his *ſixth ground*, or what benefit he is likely to receive by it, whether it be *denyed* or *granted*. The *Ground* is, *That ſuch a poſſeſſion as that of the Pope's authority in England was held, ought not to be changed or rejected upon any leſſer motives or reaſons, than rigorous and moſt manifeſt evidence that it was uſurp'd*] Now, I ſay, *S. W.* hath ſo imperfectly managed the former part of his undertaking, ſo far from deeply or ſubſtantially, laid and ſettled his former *grounds*, that this, which is but the improvement and advancement of them, may be indifferently, either *denyed*, or *granted* by me, yet upon diſtant accounts.

2. If I grant it, it is upon this ſecurity, that we have *evidences* as manifeſt, as matter of *this* nature will bear, and as *rigorous* as *S. W.* hath reaſon to exact of us, that the *authority* which the *Pope* pretended to, but was never *poſſeſs'd* of, in *this* Kingdom, viz. that of the *Univerſal juriſdiction* held to be conferred on him by *Chriſt*, was by him unduely pretended to, i. e. uſurp'd; *Mathematical*, or *Phyſical* demonſtrations, we ſuppoſe, the matter is not capable of; for there is no *natural* repugnancy in the terms, no *common notions* reſiſted, by affirming that the *Pope* ſhould have ſuch an *authority*; nay, if it could appear that *Chriſt* ever promiſed him ſuch *authority*, 'tis not onely juſt that he ſhould have it, but as neceſſarily concluded, that he hath had it, as it is concluſible that *Chriſt* cannot but perform his *promiſe*.

3. And

3. And yet even of this sort, if *S. W*'s *rigorous demonstrations* might really pass for such (as *ad hominem* to *S. W.* they ought to pass) I doubt not to affirm that we can thus *demonstrate* also, being readily able to produce more than one age, wherein this *authority* was not onely *not acknowledged*, but *disclaimed*; I instance in that of *Gregory* I. where the *Pope's* own repeated confession, that the title of *Universal Pastor* was *wicked*, *monstrous*, *blasphemous*, *Antichristian*, *Diabolical*, and by his *Predecessors* of duty *rejected*] being testified to us by his own *Epistles ex Registro* to the *Emperour*, the *Empress*, the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, and of *Alexandria*, are a competent and undenyable evidence of the *possessions* not being held in that age; from whence it will follow by *S. W*'s laying of *grounds*, and way of *demonstrating possession*, that if in *Boniface*'s time, or before that, in any year, between *Gregory* I. and *Boniface*, i. e. in *Sabinianus* his time, it were assumed by the *Pope*, that *Pope found the Church of God actually possess'd of a freedom* from, and the *Papacy* not *possess'd* of that *authority*.

4. I may add also his other way of demonstrating by *Tradition Reverst'd*, for if the *Church* of *Rome* believe nothing but what they receive from their *immediate Ancestours*, as *received* from all *former*, ascending in a continued line to *Christ*, then neither the *Church* in *Sabinianus*'s nor in *Boniface*'s age could believe the Doctrine of the *Universal Pastorship*, which it is visible was not derived to them from their *immediate* Ancestour, *Gregory* I. much less from their more remote *Ancestours*, the *Apostles*, or *Christ* himself. But I believe not *S. W*'s *rigorous*, to be *just* demonstrations, and therefore pretend not to prove matters of *fact* by any other *mediums*, than those of *testimonies divine* and *humane*, and am thereby sufficiently insured, that neither *S. W.* hath pretended, nor any other performed, what is necessary to the establishing his affirmative, that the *Universal Pastorship*, as from *Christ*, is by the *Pope* duely pretended to, and on the contrary, that we can evidence by undenyable *testimony*, that the *Pope* hath not through all ages been possess'd of this *Authority* in *England*, as from *Christ*, in the notion of *possession*, which we have expres's'd, and which *S. W.* must accept it in, or else his pretensions will signifie nothing towards *his*, or against *our* advantage. What our evidences are, I must not here recite, That were to transcribe what I have so lately set down, in answer to the *former* grounds, in the foregoing *Sections*,

5. On the other side, if I shall deny what is affirmed by him in this his *sixth ground*, it will be *sub hac forma*; That the *possession* which the *Pope* had of *Authority* and *jurisdiction* in this *Kingdom*, was so weak and precarious, acquired by means so distant from, and unlike that of *Christ*'s *donation*, from time to time maintained by the like, yielded with such a *moderamen*, and kept always so dependent from the *wills* of our *Princes*, that we need no stronger motives or reasons for *rejecting* or *extinguishing* it, than that they that either *granted* it, whether willingly or unwillingly, on *fear*, or other *prudential* considerations, or even on designs of *piety*, or that onely *permitted* and *winked* at it, did still retain their liberty, they or at least their Successours, to recall their *concessions* or permissions, and could no more be prescribed against by their *own*, or their *predecessors* acts, of this kind, than they were formerly bound up from making such *concessions*, whensoever they *first* made them, or than grants made by the *Crown*, with reservation of power to recall them, or *grants* unduely made to the *prejudice* of the *Crown*, are to all succession *immutable* and *irrevocable*.

6. I have therefore no obligation solicitously to *examine*, because no least concernment to *deny* the force of those his reasons, which are here produced also, the same I commended on the *last* Section, onely reprinted in a smaller letter, from *Nature*, from *Morals*, &c. Onely in the application of the *thesis* to our *hypothesis*, recur all the *sand-stones* that were laid in his *four first grounds*, and those as I have already shewed to be very infirm, so I need not again take them up, and evince their *soft* parts.

7. Such were, 1. that the *authority was held of faith*, as *constituted by Christ*'s *own mouth*, and *acknowledgedly accounted for such by multitudes* (it should be, if he kept to his *grounds*, and would infer any thing, the *Universality*, and not onely *multitudes*) *of pious and learned men*, *in all Countries of the Communion of the Roman Church* (it should be again, *in all Countreys* absolutely, for else some particular *Churches alone*, will found but a very *Topical* argument) *whereof England*, saith he, *was one*. But the contrary, I shall suppose as yet, hath sufficiently been manifested.

8. Such again 2. the claim of *Universal Tradition*, and the *heynous Schism* in *rejecting* it, which though not yet insisted on in these *grounds*, and so is here an *abortive*, broken out before its time, yet hath already incidentally by the testimonies of the contrary belief, been forestalled and superseded also.

9. Such 3. the charge of *unknitting the frame of the whole Churches government*, which yet by *Pope Gregorie*'s own verdict (lately produced) is so perfected in the upper stories by the *hierarchy* and *subordination* of *Bishops*, *Metropolitanes* and *Archbishops*, i. e. *Primates* or *Patriarchs*, that where such are, there is neither need nor place for any other, nor consequently for that of *Monarchick Universal Pastorship*, which is it self, if we may believe that *Pope*, a name of *Schism*, and *division* in the *Church*; and a prejudice to other *Bishops*, *If one*, saith he, *be Universal*, *it remains that you be not Bishops*; and therefore though he admitted the *Responsalis* of the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* to *his Communion*, yet he permitted not his own *Responsalis* to communicate with *Cyriacus*, because he *assumed* the title of *Universalis*, l. 6. Ep. 30. & 31. and again he saith *istud nomen facere in discissionem Ecclesiæ*. l. 7. Ep. 69. *that that name tended to the cutting the Church asunder*, which sure is not to the *uniting* of it.

10. Such again 4. the *comparing* the force of *reasons* barely *probable*, and *rejecting an Authority of so long continuance*, *held sacred and of Christ*'s *institution*, *of such importance to the peace of the Church*, *in rejecting of which if one happen to mistake*, *he is lyable to the horrid sin of Schism*, *and its condign punishment*. All this is an heap of misapplyed exaggerations, when he knows our *reasons* for what we have done, pretend to more than *probable*, to arrive as high, as, considering the matter, can be expected, that the *authority* according to its pretended *sacredness*, and *descending from Christ*, is not of that long continuance, that the *peace* of the *Church* was long secured without it, and may be so again, if they would please to come out of the fire of contention, to prefer the life of an *Angel* or *Saint*, before that of a *fiend* or *Salamander*, to *doe justice*, and *love mercy*, and *walk humbly with God*,

rather than inlarge their *borders*, ſow definitions, like *teeth* of *Serpents*, and fence them in with a *wall* as high as *heaven*; that the *Schiſm* is not on their part, that are blameleſly *caſt out* by thoſe that have no *authority* over them, but on theirs, that *Diotrephes*-like *caſt out their brethren*, and then accuſe them for not joyning with them, transform their unjuſt *ſufferings* into their haynous *crime*, break *unity*, and then bitterly complain of the *breach* of it.

11. Such again 5. that they *muſt not be common ſlight teſtimony-proofs which will ſerve our turn, which compared with the tenour of their Government, Univerſal Tradition, vaniſh into air, or nothing*] When the queſtion being of a matter of fact, there is no poſſible deciding it, but by *teſtimonies*, which the *commoner*, and more known and viſible they are, the more *force* and *eviction* they have with them (and ours are carefull not to deſerve the Epithet of *common*, any other way) and the more they are *ſlighted*, if not ſatisfactorily invalidated by the *adverſary*, the more they are preſumable to be conſtringent to him; and when on the other ſide, the *Univerſal Tradition* rightly deduced from the *Apoſtles* through the *purer* ages downward, is not *their*, but *our tenure*, inſtead of which their *retrograde Tradition* being invented (and reſorted to, as the *Mountebank* newly arrived) is a ſhrewd *ſymptome*, that the other regular, *deſcendent Tradition* was not proper for their *diſeaſe*, or diſcerned ſufficient for their *ſafety*.

12. Such again 6. the doughty argument drawn from the notation of the *title* of *firſt Reformers*) and which is equivalent, of *new begun disbelief and diſobedience*) which we ſhewed both to be *unappliable* to our matter, and to be no fountain of *eviction* or evidence, a moſt ſlender *Topical* argument at beſt, if it were appliable.

13. In a word, it hath been the attempt (I hope not improſperous) of the foregoing Sections, to ſhew, that that *Government* which he hath eſpouſed, was not in the ages he ſpeaks of, generally *held of faith*, or *acknowledged to be received upon the ſame ſole rule of faith, which aſſured men that Chriſt was God*, (which are, he knows, his meaneſt *beggings of the queſtion*, and nothing elſe) but onely as a *voluntary*, *mutable*, whether deemedly *pious*, or but ſimply *prudential* politick conceſſion, or onely *permiſſion* of *Princes*, and ſo never found in *poſſeſſion*, as *ſacred*, or as *held from Chriſt*,* nor *Univerſal Oral Tradition*, (meaning ſuch from the *Apoſtles*) with any appearance of truth, ever found pleadable for it; And when we have actually produced plain *teſtimonies* of *Tradition* the other way, to tell us, we *cannot* be imagined to *produce* ſuch, becauſe then we muſt diſclaim the title of *Reformers* in this point, is a ſymptome of a moſt *forlorn* deſtituted cauſe, that which Mr. *White* would ſeverely chaſtiſe in any but a friend or a *Diſciple*, and tell him that a *probable argument* againſt an evident fact is *nothing*, becauſe *no argument*, and ſuch certainly is that thin *Topick* from the notation of a pretended name, which we neither own, nor would affix any real guilt on us, if we did, there being another *innocent* notation of it, which we ſhall be ſo wiſe to chuſe, now we know there is one, which is deemed ſo tranſcendently *criminous*, as to bring the *heinous* brand of *Schiſm* on us, from which otherwiſe we have full confidence to guard our ſelves.

14. To conclude, the ſome kind of *change* in the *outward* appearance of things, made in *Henry* VIII. his days, was ſo far from being ſuch a *Reformation*, which, as *S. W.* thinks, *concluded millions of Doctors, which had been in that Church, to be ignorant in compariſon of themſelves*, that if we may judge by both the *Univerſities*, *Great Monaſteries*, and *Clergy* of *England*, the *multitude* of *learned men* was on the ſide which I now defend, as appeared in my Anſwer to his *firſt* ground; And let me add, the *Biſhops* and *Prelates*, by whoſe aſſiſtence he began and finiſh'd this work, were men of ſo great wiſedom and learning, as *this Kingdom* had never ſeen, neither at that time had *Europe* the like, if we may credit *Eraſmus*, a moſt competent judge, who tells us ſo in ſeveral *Epiſtles*. And ſo 'twere to be wiſhed, that what *S. W.* aſſumes and propoſes for *evident* and *demonſtrative*, might, at ſome one time at leaſt, be ſecured from the moſt *oppoſite* fate of being *demonſtrably falſe*.

15. But I ſhall take it for a good *Omen*, that he hath concluded his *harangue* on this *ſixth* ground, with ſome appearance of truth, but that ſtill, which our *hypotheſis* is not concern'd in, being granted alſo by us moſt willingly, that if *thoſe*, whom he calls the *firſt Reformers*, *could have no juſt lawfull evident ground to begin their diſobedience to that Government, neither can their Proſelytes and Succeſſours have any pretence for continuing in it.* This, I ſay, we willingly ſubmit to, as far as they then could be ſaid to *begin* their *diſobedience* to that *Government*, or if inſtead of that phraſe we may be allowed to inſert this other, in *declaring*, *as they did, againſt the Pope's pretended Univerſal Paſtourſhip, deſcended to him from Chriſt.* And on theſe terms of ſome kind of agreement, I ſhall part with his inlargements on his *ſixth ground*.

SECT. VIII.

His Seventh Ground very confounding to Proteſtants. Impoſſibility pretended againſt evidence. Reaſons muſt be allow'd to have ſome force, againſt all but Rigorous demonſtrations. Such pretended but not performed by S. W. *Five problemes left in one Demonſtration. Many faileurs found in a ſecond. Force of Teſtimonies to oblige belief that the Pope's authority was uſurp'd. Canons in force at* Rome. *Perſpicuity of their deciſions. Lawfulneſs of the matter. Liableneſs to miſinterpretation cauſeleſly objected. Words heard as liable to miſinterpretation as Read. Who are* S. W's *indifferent part of the World.* S. W's *retractation. The demonſtration fallen into a bare probability. The different ſignifications of words. Wordiſh Teſtimonies. Authorities, whence to produce Teſtimonies. Apoſtolick, Nicene, Epheſine, Chalcedon Canons.*

1. COme we now to his *ſeventh* ground, in theſe words [*No evidence can poſſibly be given by the Proteſtants obliging the underſtanding to believe that this authority was uſurp'd.*] The whole weight of this ground is laid on theſe words [*can poſſibly*] This indeed, if made good, lays us flat before him; and I humbly conceive, if not made good, it concludes *S. W*'s attempted *uſurpations* upon his Readers minds, *intolerable uſurpations*.

2. Till this *Magiſterial* principle appeared, we *Poteſtants* might with ſome chearfull proſpect, reade the *Scrip-*

Scriptures, ſtudy the *ancient Records* of the *Church*, lay up in our minds what we find in the diffuſed body of the *Fathers* writings delivered us by themſelves (which if we may believe our eyes, do really ſupport our pretenſions, and from whence we fetch our *Doctrines*, and at once diſclaim all that we do not thus fetch, and not onely labour to fetch *colours* of *proofs* for them) and compare theſe with what *Baronius* or *Bellarmine* have collected from them, and given us with *Romiſh* deſcants or tinctures on them; Till then, we had liberty to uſe the natural talents and faculties of intellect, &c. which *God* had given us, and from *Gregorie*'s affirming, that *Peter* himſelf was not called *Univerſal Paſtour*, that the title was *Antichriſtian* and *Diabolical*, and many the like, to conclude irrefragably, that he neither pretended to the title, nor derived any right to it from St. *Peter*. Till then, it was to ſome purpoſe to cull out the moſt unanſwerable records of the *pureſt antiquity*, and to expect from a *Romaniſt* fair words, and vouchſafements of ſo much patience, as to conſider, whether they indeed proved, what we undertook them to prove, and as long as reaſon weighed down the *balance* on our ſide, to think *our underſtandings*, if not *his* alſo, regularly *obliged* to *aſſent*, and *believe*, what without *violence* to our underſtandings we were not able to *disbelieve*. Till then, matters of *Doctrine*, and of faith (which are no more born with us, than revealed to us by daily *voices* from heaven, or oracular *reſponſes* out of the *cave*, no more by (the ἐγγαστρίμυθος) *natural reaſon*, or *common* notions, than (the ὑπαθήλης) the *private ſpirit*, (or *Enthuſiaſm*) were left to be concluded regularly, by that one medium, *divine Revelation* from *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, by any ſufficient means (uncorrupted Conduits, i. e. impartial *teſtifications*) conveyed to us. And this left us ſome faint gleams of *hopes*, that however the *Romaniſt* deemed his *Church infallible*, yet having alſo admitted this teſt of *Univerſal Tradition*, the real and placid vigour of that, might ſo far prevail, againſt the but *gives*, and *tyranny*, and ſimulated force of the other, that a temper by mutual *condeſcenſions*, a ſuſpenſion, if not compoſure of impertinent diſputes and controverſies, might at leaſt be prayed for with *faith* (which is not competible to *impoſſibilities*) and attempted with *charity*, and expected with *patience*, when *God* ſhould ſee the *Chriſtian* world tolerably qualified for ſuch a bleſſing. But as ſoon as this *fatal* thred of *S. W*'s *ſpinning* came out, to inſnare, and intangle our ſteps; as ſoon as it commenced *Ground*, and *ſelf-evident Principle*, not that no *evidence is* (that had left us ſome *hopes* of rallying our forces, or coming off with *life*) but [that *no evidence can*] and yet that not killing enough, but [that *no evidence can poſſibly be given by the Proteſtants, obliging the underſtanding to believe*——] we are left either to attempt *removing of mountains*, or to fall into fits of *deſpair*, to force *nature*, or to yeild up our *throats* to our *immortal combatant*.

3. But in ſober earneſt, I think not all the *Contumelies* in both his books ſo enormouſly *inhumane*, as this one *ground* of his, that [when a matter of *fact* being *ſufficiently teſtified*, reaſon requires our belief of it, when upon the ſtrength of this ground in *reaſon*, our underſtandings are actually ſwayed with ſuch prevailing arguments, and ſo *obliged* to aſſent, *drawn with the cords of a man*, convincing reaſons] will yet bear down and out-face us, that this is *impoſſible*; undertaking to *demonſtrate* againſt our *ſenſes*, to evince that what we *ſee* in *matter* of *fact*, or have teſtified to us as infallibly by others repeated ſenſations, cannot *poſſibly* be; which is not to remove us into the *field*, but the *quarry*, not to ſentence us to *Nebuchadnezar*'s, but to *Niobe*'s transformation; whilſt ſhe had her *animal* faculties *unpetrified*, ſhe was able by walking to confute the *Mountebanks* demonſtrations againſt *motion*, and believe the *ſnow white* in deſpight of the other as demure artificers *evictions* that it was black, but when no *evidence can poſſibly* be given to *oblige* her *underſtanding*, then certainly her ſoul both *ſenſitive* and *rational*, hath undergone its ἀπαλλοίωσις, And *Arrian* hath but abuſed, in telling us, that none but the *Practical* faculty is capable of that *metamorphoſis*. But I hope we may plead our cauſe before we be thus more than *condemned* to the *mines*, even to be *parts* of them our ſelves, and treatably propoſe our caſe to any other *Romaniſt*, and deſire him to be *Umpire* between us.

4. What if the *Proteſtants* (I may make ſuppoſitions for arguments ſake) ſhould undeniably prove, that the *Popes* themſelves for *four Centuries* did not ſo much as pretend *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, that all the *Texts* of *Scripture* which are now brought for it, did in their opinion conclude no ſuch matter, that the *four firſt General Councils*, the *authentick* conſervatories of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, did inſtead of atteſting or favouring, give manifold prejudices againſt it; were it now utterly *impoſſible* that theſe, and innumerable ſuch like (joyned with this advantage, that no argument of any ſolidity were after *ſixteen* hundred years leiſure of ſearch, produced to the contrary) ſhould *oblige the underſtanding to believe that this authority were uſurp'd*? I ask not whether theſe are actually produced by us, nor if they were, whether *S. W.* would *believe* them, not whether (ſuppoſing his pretended *demonſtration* to the contrary, to be before-hand by himſelf aſſented to) it were poſſible for whatſoever *evidence* to *oblige his underſtanding*; I know not what withes can hold, or bind *Sampſon*, before his *locks* are cut, whilſt his *new* kind of *Nazarites-vow* is on him; But, I ſay whether there may not ſome tolerable *underſtanding* be found, which ſhall not be able to reſiſt, and ſo ſhall be bound and *obliged* to believe ſuch *evidences*.

5. If this be poſſible, there is then no truth in his *ſeventh ground*; If it be *demonſtratively impoſſible*, he is obliged in charity to his *ground*, to perfect his *demonſtration*, if it be but by way of additional ſupply to the defects of *Ruſhworth*'s *Dialogues*, which I think hath not had leiſure to demonſtrate fully this vulgar *problome*. This I am forced to importune, 1. becauſe 'tis certainly of concernment to me, who would not always be a combating with *gyants*, battering *impregnable* forts, attempting *impoſſibilities*, and ſhould hope my fondneſs to the *Gallies* were ſo moderate, that I might be content to be *manumitted*, and not defie or diſclaim that *reſt*, and acquieſcence of underſtanding, which a *rigorous demonſtration* ſhould commend to me; 2. becauſe in the two pages, which are here annex'd for the proof of this *ſeventh ground*; my *underſtanding* doth not diſcern its *obligation* to *believe* that it is yet evidenced. I muſt be fain to give an account of my dulneſs in this particular, leſt it be thought affected.

6. His firſt proof is taken from the *caſe of the Reformers, whoſe words*, ſaith he, *could not in any reaſon be imagined evident againſt ſuch an univerſal verdict of the whole Church they left, and particularly of all the learned men in it, incomparably and confeſs'dly more numerous, and as knowing, as any have been ſince*. But I take it, this is far from a *demonſtration* in many reſpects. *That*, if it be truely ſo called, muſt

consist of nothing that is not *true*, *immediate*, and so *necessary*; whereas here be no fewer than five *questions* which may very *problematically* at least be *disputed*.

7. As 1. if those whom he calls *first Reformers*, were actually and properly so styled, yet 'tis, questionable, whether they *left* the *whole Church*, or indeed any part of it, untill (and 'tis impossible they should, after) they were inexorably sentenced, and cast out of it. 2 Whether for the *Universal Pastourship* as constituted in St. *Peter* and his *Successours by Christ*, an *Universal Verdict* of the *whole Church* were then produced to them; it being not demonstrated, 1. that all that was *producible*, was *produced* to them; nor 2. that the *verdict* of the *whole* was with any truth producible this way, for that must imply, that either the *Greek* Church was of this mind, or that it was no part of the whole *Church*; nor yet 3. that the *Negative* decision of the *Universities*, *Monasteries*, whole *Clergy* of *England*, and the united profession of all *men* and *women* in this Kingdom, that by the *Laws* of *God* and the *Nation*, the *Bishop* of *Rome* had no such right in this Nation] was reconcileable with the *whole Churches verdict* for the *Affirmative*. 4. That the *French Church* was then included in that *universal verdict*, (not to mention others also.)

8. *Thirdly*, whether *S. W*'s meaning, when he saith, [*whose words could not in any reason be imagined evident*] be this, that their *bare words*, without any authority of *reason* to back them, *i. e.* their bare confirmed affirmations, could not be imagined evident; or whether 2. by *their words*] may be understood the *Testimonies* against the *Pope*'s pretended authority, produced by the *Bishops* about the time of the *extinguishing Act*, and that he resolve that those *could not in any reason be imagined evident*; or whether 3. his meaning be somewhat else, which I cannot divine at? If it be the first, then though I doubt not but *their words*, if but *bare* words, might be *evident*, as that signifies *intelligible*, yet supposing that not to be his meaning of the *Predicate*, I shall onely mind him of the *subject* of his proposition, that I imagine not the *evidence* to belong to their *bare affirmations*, but the *Testimonies* by them produced to confirm their sense; *Secondly* then, if by *their words*] he mean plainly these their *testimonies*, then what *impossibility* is there in *imagining* those *testimonies might* be *evident* (I say not *were*, but *might* be) which being not taken into consideration at all (not so much as produced) by *S. W.* may possibly have more force in them of *evidence*, than he can yet, before he *consider* them, be qualified to imagine. But if his meaning be somewhat, which I cannot divine, then how can that be *demonstrative* to me, which is not to me, perhaps no more to others, *intelligible*?

9. *Fourthly* whether both the *Universities*, the *Greater Monasteries*, and all the *Clergy* of *England* that then were, before the *Extinguishing Act* came out, were no greater barr to the extensive style of [*All the learned men in the Church*] than they were before to the supposed *verdict* of the *whole Church*, for though they were no considerable part of the one, they might be of the other.

10. *Fifthly*, whether in the comparison here proposed between the *number* and *knowledge* of *learned* men in that age, and since, wherein, for the *number*, that age is said *incomparably and confess'dly* to carry it from all *succeeding* ages, and for the *knowledge* to *equal* them, his meaning be of those of that age in this Nation that asserted the *Universal Pastourship* compared with all others of the same, since that time, that have profess'd *learning* among us? some ground there may be for this slight *question*, because the learned men of *one* age, are not probably so numerous, *cæteris paribus*, as of *many*, at least the *learned* men, which were neither members of the *Universities*, chief *Monasteries*, and whole *Clergy* in *Convocation* (who were unanimous against the *Pope*'s pretensions) are not readily supposeable to be quite so *numerous*, as the whole diffused society of *all* the *learned* men of an age together.

11. If he will consider these questions, he will find that something may possibly be said by a good manager on each of them, though I, whom *S. W.* hath *sent to preach*, and not to *dispute*, be resolved incompetent for it, and therefore shall not take that task upon me. But still because another *may*, and the *matter* appears not uncapable, here are competent prejudices against the *demonstrative* efficacy of this first proof of his.

12. But he rests not in this, he hath another eviction for it. *They pretend not*, *saith he*, *to any evidence from natural principles*, *concluding demonstratively that the former Government was usurp'd*, *nor yet from Oral Tradition*, *since their immediate Forefathers delivered them other Doctrine*, *else the Reformation could never have begun*, *against our common supposition*; *their grounds then must be Testimonial proofs*, *from Scriptures*, *Fathers*, *or Councils*, *which being manifestly liable to be interpreted divers ways*, *no sufficient assurance can be pretended hence*, *without evidencing either more skill to fetch out their certain sense*, *or more sincerity to acknowledge what they knew*, *than was in the Church they left*———] Here again we must apply the *tube*, and work very narrowly, ere we shall discern the *demonstration*.

13. For 1. I suppose 'tis not a fault that we pretend not to *natural principles* for a matter of divine *Revelation*; that we must leave to *Rushworth*'s *Dialogues*, which hath the Monopoly of *demonstrating* all the *Romanists Religion*, from *common notions*, for which we short-sighted *preachers* must content our selves with the directions of one Text of *Scripture*, that *Faith cometh by hearing*, and that by *the word of God*, and nothing else, i. e. *divine Revelation*.

14. *Secondly* for *Oral Tradition*, as that is distinguish'd from what we fetch from *testimonial proofs*, 'tis no otherwise *impossible*, that they which extinguish'd the *Papal* power here, should be able to avouch that, than because that were not reconcileable with their *beginning the Reformation*; but this hath already appeared to be a very *wateriſh* colour, far from real and *demonstrative*, when neither they that *extinguish'd* the *Papacy*, were called *Reformers*, but the *Act declaratory* of *former right* and *common custome* of *England*, not *introductory* of *new Law*; nor 2. if they had been called *Reformers*, would it follow, that their *forefathers taught them other Doctrine*; they might retrench the *Pope*'s pretensions, and undeceive some seducible followers, without teaching contrary to the *doctrine* of their *forefathers*.

15. *Thirdly* then, for *Testimonial proofs* of *Scriptures*, *Fathers* and *Councils*, if those were the onely

evidences

evidences our *Forefathers* made use of, there is yet no *impossibility*, but they might be so tendred, as to *convince* and so *oblige* the *understanding*.

16. For example, if the *Apostolical Canon* shall tell us, that the πρῶτον ἐν ἑκάστοις ἔθνεσι, the *first* or *Primate among the Bishops of every Nation* shall be accounted ὡς κεφαλὴν, *as their head*, and that every one of those *Primates* shall ἐκεῖνα μόνα πράττειν, *doe onely those things* ὅσα τῇ ἰδίᾳ παροικίᾳ ἐπιβάλλει, καὶ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὸν χώρας, *which belong to his province and the Regions under it*, and that *God shall thus be glorified through the Lord Jesus Christ in the holy Ghost*; and again, that he that is *excommunicated in one City, shall not be received in another without commendatory Letters from the former*; and again, that it *shall not be lawfull for a Bishop leaving his own Province*, εἰς ἑτέραν ἐπαρχίαν, *to invade another's*, unless there be a *sufficient cause forcing him to it*, and this too, ἐξ ἰδίου ἐκκλησιαστικοῦ, *not of himself*, but by the κρίσιν πολλῶν ἐπισκόπων, καὶ παράκλησιν μετὰ σπουδῆς, *the judgment and vehement exhortation of many Bishops*, where if κρίσις *judgment* do signifie, as the *Scholiast* reasonably resolves, συνοδικὴν γνώμην, *a Synodica sentence* then the *many Bishops* must be no less than a *Council* of *Bishops*; and if in pursuance of these grounds Apostolical, and καλὸν τὸν κανόνα τὸν διαῤῥήδην τα, *according to the Canon thus pronouncing*, the first *Nicene Council* shall decree, τοὺς ὑπ' ἑτέρων ἀποβληθέντας ὑπ' ἐτέρων μὴ προσίεσθαι, *that they that are cast out by some shall not be received by other Bishops*, and that this must be observed κατὰ τὰς καθ' ἑκάστην παροικίαν ἐπισκόπους, *by the Bishops through every Province*; And when in a farther harmony of *accord*, the *Milevitane Council* shall expressly prohibit all appeal from their *Bishops*, *but to the African Councils, and Primates of their own Provinces*, and that *they which shall appeal to any foreign whether Bishop or Council, shall not be received to Communion by any in Africk*; and when the practice of all this is visible in the *Synodical Epistle* of the *African Council* to *Pope Celestine* (as is to be seen both in the *book of Canons of the Roman Church*, and the *Greek collection* of the *Canons* of the *African Church*) where they beseech him τὸ λοιπὸν, *for the future*, that he will not receive to his *Communion*, those that come to him from them, being *excommunicate*, ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο καὶ τῇ ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδῳ δεδεῖχθαι εὐχερῶς εὕρῃ, *because he may easily find it defined in the Council of Nice*; If, I say, upon one such collection of *Testimonial proofs*, from the most unquestion'd and *obliging Canons*, and the like concurrence of innumerable *Primitive* writers, our Ancestours did actually conclude, that there lay no place for *appeal* from the *Bishop* of any *Diocese* in *England*, but to the *Primate* of *Canterbury*, that the *Pope* was not to meddle among us, but upon the sentence and importunate *intreaty* of a *Council of Bishops*, and that 'twere a crime censurable with *excommunication*, to acknowledge any *foreign* (such was the *Papal*) *Jurisdiction*, my question now is, whether this *evidence cannot possibly oblige the understanding to believe, that authority was usurp'd*, which was assumed by the *Pope* in direct opposition to all these *Canons*?

Apost. Can. 34. *Ap. Can.* 12. *Can.* 14. *Nic. Can.* 5. *Can.* 22. *Non provocent nisi ad Africana Concilia, vel ad Primates provinciarum suarum, ad transmarina autem qui putaverint*——

17. If it *cannot possibly oblige*, that impossibility must proceed either 1. from some abrogation of the *Canons*; or 2. unintelligibleness of the *obligation*; or 3. unlawfulness of the *matter* arising from a contrariety to some other *valid Law*, or from some *repugnance* in *nature*) or 4. from some other hindrance of equal (or greater) weight with any of these; but there is no place for any one or more of these pleas, therefore I may conclude, no foundation for this pretended *impossibility*.

18. For the *first*, the *Canons* recited are all *received* and continue in force, in the very *Roman Codex*, and so cannot by them be pretended to be *invalid*, and to some of them the *Pope* himself makes *Oath*, that he will *inviolably observe* them, see the *Diurnal Book* of the *professions* of the *Bishop of Rome*, in *Corp. Jur. Can. Decret. par.* 1. *dist.* 16. c. 8. And from that very *Oath* of the *Pope*, our *Bishops* then made this very conclusion, that *the Popes*, that *exercised a primacy over any other Bishops but those of their own Province in Italy, transgress'd their own profession made in their creation*, as hath been * elsewhere shewed from the *institution of a Christian man*, in the year 1537.

* *Tr. of Schism.* p. 105.

19. For the *second*, the *intelligibleness* of the *obligation*, that hath already appeared from the *Nicene Fathers* citing it from the *Apostolick Canon*, and the *African Fathers* from the *Nicene*, which they could not have done, and withall advertised the *Pope*, that he might εὐχερῶς very *readily*, and with a wet finger find it there, if like the *Sybills* or other enigmatical *Oracles*, the words had no obvious sense belonging to them, or such as an ordinary understanding *could not possibly receive* and assent to.

20. *Thirdly* for the *unlawfulness* of the *matter* in any respect, that can no otherwise be pleaded, than by charging the Writers of the *Apostolick Canons* whether *Apostles*, or *Apostolical* persons, and so again the *Council*, for enacting *sacrilegious Decrees*, yea and the *Pope* also for *swearing* the *inviolable observation* of them. As for any *fourth* kind of hinderance beyond these, all that I can say is, that I cannot foresee nor consequently forewarn my Reader of any such. And here it may be worth adverting which of these *hinderances*, or obstructions to the obliging the understanding it is, which *S. W.* hath chosen to pitch on, even that which all others would by some men have been least expected of him, as being most extremely void of the least *probability* (the reason I suppose, not because this was seemly pretensible, but because his seats of arguments are most of them this way, as some men have vehement *prejudices*, and arguments against any science they have not much dealt in) *viz.* that these *testimonies are most manifestly lyable to be interpreted divers ways*, *as*, saith he, *appears de facto.*]

21. But 1. where doth any such *fact* appear, both for these, and for all the like *Testimonies*, that have here formerly, or elsewhere been produced by us? Or to omit that, because I know 'tis in any ill man's power to attempt to deceive, and so to misinterpret, I demand, Is that unjust, irrational fact (a precedent for the confounding of all that is most sacred, whether *divine* or *humane*) able to prove *demonstratively*, that the *testimonies* are really lyable to it? Nay, are they not as secure from it, as plain words that have no *ambiguity* in them can make a plain matter of ordinary practice? May not I as well say, that the plainest proposition in *Euclide*, when 'tis read there, is lyable to be *misinterpreted*; nay, that the most *common notion*, when 'tis once put into words, is so too, as [that *twice two makes four*] &c. For if a man should come out of *Bedlam*, and say that *four* in his *Dictionary* denotes but *three unites*, or that *two* signifies *two decads*, but *four* is

four unites, it is certain that this propoſition is then de facto *miſinterpreted*, and by the ſame proportion may theſe, and many the like *Teſtimonies*, of which without hyperbole I may aſſume, that by the ſame arts, that *S. W.* ſhall be able to reconcile them to the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, as in his *four* firſt *grounds* he hath ſtated it, any man ſhall be able to interpret *S. W.*'s words wherein he doth this, to ſuch a ſenſe, as ſhall render him extremely *oppoſite* to the *Papacy*.

22. Meanwhile I ſhall lay it up among my Obſervations, though it be no more than this, that the *univerſal liableneſs to be miſinterpreted*, not of theſe onely which I have been ſo *weak* to produce, or of any particulars, but of *Teſtimonies* at all adventures, of whatſoever *Teſtimonial proofs wordiſh Teſtimonies*, as he * ſtreightway calls them, is the *one* medium of *S. W.*'s *demonſtration*, that *no evidence can poſſibly be given by the Proteſtants obliging the underſtanding*—— 'Tis, it ſeems, onely the *Oral Tradition*, the Child's hearing his *Father* ſay it, that his *Father* hath *ſaid* it, and not *reading* it out of an hundred *books* of all his firſt and moſt *creditable* anceſtours, that is of any conſiderable authority in this matter. But why a man may not *underſtand*, what he *reads*, as well as what he *hears*, or *miſinterpret* what he *hears* as well as what he *reads*, and why frequent *fact* makes not this *apparent*, as well as the other, I foreſee another opportunity ere long to examine with him.

* P. 44.

23. At the preſent I demand in behalf of him that ſubjects his *underſtanding* to the force of eaſie words, and by that means *believes many ancient teſtimonies*, brought againſt the *Pope's ſacred authority*, (which is no more arrogance, than to *believe* what he thinks *evident*, and knows not how to diſbelieve, without queſtioning the truth of the *teſtifier*, which alſo he hath not the leaſt reaſon to *queſtion*) what neceſſity ſhould be incumbent on this man *to evidence either his own greater skill, or that his ſincerity is greater than was found in the Church (that leaves* him, or he is forced to *leave*) or in any one *ingaged* advocate of that *Church*? that he muſt be thus inſolent, that he is by his very undertaking obliged to *aſſume* one of theſe, and having aſſumed, to *evidence* it, is the laſt part of this *demonſtration*, which *S. W.* hath not yet perfected, though it want his hand, as much as any of the former, whereon his pains were laid out; at his beſt leiſure I preſume to expect his *ſevere evidences* for it, not diſcerning, as yet, the force it hath to *oblige my underſtanding*.

24. An Appendix to this *demonſtration* he thinks fit to caſt in, to add ſome weight to it, that *their late Doctors and Controvertiſts have not feared to anſwer all theſe teſtimonies, and produced a far greater number, and not ſo behaved themſelves therein, that the indifferent part of the world have held them nonſenſical, which ſurely they would, had they deemed the other a perfect and rigorous evidence.*] But ſure neither is this *demonſtrating*; It neither appears to *S. W.* what the *indifferent part of the world think*, nor to me, whom he will allow to be the *indifferent part of the world*; ſure not the whole *Eaſtern Church*, whoſe Delegates in the *Council* of *Florence* charged the introducing of *new articles* of downright *madneſs*; none that they have caſt out of their *Communion*; none that living within it, diſlike (as the *French* have been long ſuſpected to do) the *Jus divinum* of the *Papacy*; Who then are left to be the *indifferent* umpires? Of neceſſity either thoſe which have received it as an *Article* of their *Faith*, all the faithfull adherents to that *Apoſtolick See*, their ὁι κατὰ πάντα ὀρθογνώμονες, who are of their *opinion* in *this*, elſe could not be *orthodox in all things*, and theſe are very *fitly* pick'd out, as *indifferent* men to judge it on their ſide, or elſe it muſt remain that we fetch them from the *Turks*, or *Heathens*, or *Jews*; and bating onely that *firſt* ſort, thoſe that are, and muſt be of *his mind*, I might, I think, ſafely, (as once the *like* was done in a great *Council*) adventure my part of the controverſie to any indifferently choſen *Umpire* of any of the three other *denominations*, that doth but ſpeak the ſame language that we do, and underſtands our ſeveral *pretenſions*, to judge, whether the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* is more clearly inferred from *Tu es Petrus*, and *Feed my Sheep*, or the contrary from the *Teſtimonies* I have here and elſewhere tendred to him againſt it.

25. By the way he muſt be admoniſh'd, that all *indifferent* men do not preſently call that *nonſenſical*, which they do not aſſent to, any more than they fall into other parts of *S. W.*'s ſtyle, when they are not perſwaded by his *pretenſions*. They that ſay he is a *Cunning* Merchant, and ſo far from *nonſenſical*, have as ill an opinion of his *practices*, and would be more unwilling to be *he*, than any of the beſpattered *Preachers* that have had to deal with him.

26. But this is not all he hath to ſay in defence of his important *ground*; For though he have ſome remorſe, and ſo be forced to *confeſs*, that *if they would demonſtrate by evident and unavoidable connexion of terms from ſome undenyable authority, that this Government was unjuſt, their underſtands would in that caſe be obliged to aſſent to that inference.*] Yet leſt upon ſuch a vaſt *liberality* as this, I ſhould make ſhift to conclude, that what *may* be done in ſome caſe, is not utterly *impoſſible*, and ſo that his *Ground* had confeſs'dly fail'd under him, that [*no evidence can poſſibly be given by the Proteſtants*——] his method obliges him to draw back his alms, before I had ſup'd it up, and ſo I behold my faireſt hopes ſoon blaſted again, *for*, ſaith he, *this is not to be hoped as long as divers words have divers ſignifications*] This is ſomewhat hard indeed, to be thus irremediably *diſappointed*, when I was ſo *near* my *prize*, to loſe all *ſcent* ſo ſoon, when 'twas at the *hotteſt*.

27. But methinks, 'twere yet poſſible to recover it again, for I may thus argue, that what is *poſſible* upon an *hopeleſs condition*, is at moſt but *hopeleſs*, not *impoſſible*; and therefore *S. W.* is really grown *meek*, hath for once retracted the [*No evidence can poſſibly*] upon which *one* term depended the whole *demonſtrativeneſs* of his ground, which if it be ſuch, conſiſts *ex neceſſariis*, and ſuch is not that, which may *poſſibly be otherwiſe*, the phraſe [*not to be hoped*] is a *milder* ſtyle, and ſuits well with a *Topical* argument, and a thouſand ſuch, as Mr. *White* hath taught us, will no more amount to a *demonſtration*, than a thouſand *mild writers* will make one *ſevere* or *rigorous*.

28. If this will not ſtand me in ſtead, to avert this diſcomfiture, I have no other reſerve, for 'tis impoſſible to except againſt his *proviſo*, that *divers words have divers ſignifications*] I cannot but be convinced of that, for [a *man*] is capable of ſignifying either one of the *gueſts*, or part of the *furniture*, him that ſits, and *eats* at the Table, or that *hangs* by, and is pourtrayed in the Arras, and ſo in like manner [*a rigorous demonſtration*] may ſignifie either according to *Ariſtotle*'s, or *S. W.*'s meaſures, and import no more in the latter notion, than either a *probability*, or a *Sophiſm*, a well aſſured, yet demonſtrably *infirm* argumentation.

29. But

29. But neither is there any such πολύσημον, or *ambiguous* word in the *Testimonies* which I humbly have offered him; If there be, I beseech his directions, where the ambush is to be look'd for, where the *ambiguous* enigmatical part of the *Oracle* lies; I confess I cannot divine, but *S. W*'s gifts lie this way, in making a plain *testimony* as perplexed as he can, and therefore if *single words* will be obstinate, and resolve not to be unintelligible, yet it seems by his suggestions, that *sentences are great jugglers* and *Stage-players*, never come abroad but with Vizards, or Periwigs, or false sets of teeth about them, they, saith *S. W. put on different faces*, or if they are not thus fully provided, yet, saith he, by *relation to several circumstances in history they give us occasion to raise several conjectures*, and so still though the whole matter in the issue amount to no more but this, [*occasion*] not *just cause* [to *raise*] though with never such violence to plain words and senses [*several conjectures*] several, all equally pretending, i. e. equally groundless, and when all is done, but *conjectures* still, yet this is enough with *S. W.* to preclude the *poor Protestant* all *hope* of ever *obliging* any others, or his own *understanding* by any *wordish testimony*, to *believe* any thing that *S. W.* will not make it lawfull for him to *believe*. Had this *Demonstratour* but a *calling* to his gifts, what miracles would he, nay what would he not be able to doe?

30. *Lastly*, If all this will not establish one *ground*, He hath still a reserve behind, *If evidence were easily producible from such kind of wordish Testimonies, yet they would still be as far to seek for an authority whence to alledge those testimonies comparable to that of the Church they left.*] But 1. what is his dislike to *wordish Testimonies*, i. e. (as he opposes them to *Oral Traditions*) *Testimonies* written in *words*? Is not this *Oral Tradition*, *wordish Tradition*, and is not that equally *wordish*, that is *spoken*, as that which is *written* in *words*? and may not that be *written* in my *heart* (as he will have it phrased also) which is transcribed thither out of the *Records* of a *Council*, as what is stored up there from my *Father*, or *Mother*, or *Romish Catechists*?

31. *Secondly*, What difficulty is there to have as good an *authority* as the *Church* of *Rome* is, from *whence to alledge Testimonies* against her? I shall make short of this difficulty; The *Universal Council* of *Nice* is as good an *authority* as the *Church* of *Rome* can be, or (that I know of) pretends to be, and 'tis no hard thing, as *de facto* hath appeared, to *alledge testimonies* from thence, as much as an enemy could wish, to *Rome's* prejudice. Nay the *Church* of *Rome* diffused in its amplitude, or collected in a *Council*, or contracted into a *Pope*, is sure of as *good authority*, as the *Church* we *left*, or rather cast us from them; And I doubt not to bring *Testimonies* that will fit my turn, from those, that are avowed, and allow'd an authority, by the *consent* of this *Church* in all these capacities; As when from the *genuine Apostolick Canons*, from *General Councils*, approved by the *Pope*, the *Nicene* and the *Ephesine*, yea and that of *Chalcedon* too (for as far as 'tis from the *Pope's* pretensions, he is by *Oath* bound to observe it inviolably) and in like manner from the *Popes* themselves (by the token, that *Gregory* wrote so many *Epistles* against the *title* that *Boniface* soon after him assumed) 'tis manifest we are provided with ample *testimonies*, which will by *necessary connexion of terms* infer all that we would have infer'd from them. And then what is thus visible to have been actually done, we will not be so *tame*, as to imagine *impossible* to be done, nor consequently attend to him any longer, whilst by a collection of *little* colours he again attempts to perswade us, against our *senses*, that 'tis impossible. And so much for his *seventh ground*.

SECT. IX.

His eighth Ground yet more severe. His notion of Testimonies. Wits to play on them. Some place sometimes for other than rigorous demonstrations. The Romanists pretended veneration of Fathers and Councils, and skill in them. S. W's *unkindness to Testimonies, obliging him to think their Doctors studyed them not. The truth examined, first for veneration of Fathers. Mr.* White's *notion of Fathers, Cardinal* Perron's *censure of them. Secondly, for skill in them. The way of the Schools no friend to all the Fathers and Councils. The fends in* Oxford *between* Grecians *and* Trojans. *The* Franciscans *Library. Nothing concluded against us from the number and learning of his Doctors, or their pretended conversation in all the Fathers and Councils. As little from their sincerity. Some examples of that kind, one in the sixth* African *Council, about a Canon of* Nice; *another about the place of* Theodoret *for Purgatory; A third transcribed from Mr.* White, *about the* Molinists. *Corruption of our nature no argument against us.* S. W's *change of medium from that of Possession to Tradition.*

1. THE Eighth ground is yet more *severe* and *confounding*, under this form, that *The proofs alledged by Protestants against them, bear not even the weight of a probability to any prudent man, who penetrates and considers the contrary motives.*] This as amazing as it is, will at large be *demonstrated* also; and then, what retreat possible for *S. W*'s adversary? Our case being thus desperate, we will again trie whether our φύσει ἴσχει may not stand us in stead, and an auspicious *Spring* or *plunge*, the *ultimus conatus*, repell, and quit the danger; If it do, it may be a seed of long life, for I have look'd over the leaf, and see, to my *Reader's* joy, that this is the concluding ground of this *Section*.

2. It begins thus, *For the proofs they alledge are Testimonies.*] I answer, they are indeed; and we have been taught to call *Testimonies*, witnesses of a debated truth, and such *witnesses* (if they be ἴσαι μαρτυρίαι, *competent witnesses*) *proofs*. But *S. W.* it seems, hath another description of them, [*testimonies*, saith he, *i. e. words capable of divers senses*] If that be all, we hope well of the κείσει. For this is but the very trick played over before, and already discovered, and hath not so much as put on a *new face*, as even now *Testimonies* were allowed to do.

3. 'Tis

3. 'Tis therefore added *in terrorem*, that *words are capable of different ſenſes, as they ſhall be play'd upon by Wits, Scholars and Criticks*, and if *S. W.* be all theſe, how harmoniouſly and variouſly indeed will his *Adverſary*, and his *Teſtimonies* be ſure to be *play'd* upon? 'Tis no good time to ſtand at the gaze here, and examine whether as all *Wits* be not *Scholars*, ſo all his *Scholars* be not *Criticks*, for if the terms be coincident, why might not *Criticks* have ſtood for all *three?* If they be not, I ſhould not be willing the life of my *Client* (*Teſtimony*) ſhould depend upon a *Jury* of *Wits*, ſuch as *S. W.* which I cannot diſcover to be any deep either *Scholar* or *Critick*. But in great earneſt, doth the trade of a *Controvertiſt* conſiſt in this, to call for *Teſtimonies*, to magnifie *Tradition*, to make ſolemn *appeals* to *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, and when they are from undenyable authorities produced, then to ſend to the next *Tavern* for a *Wit* to *play upon them.*

4. We have now the diſcovery (drop'd from him, 'tis poſſible, before he thought of it) how it comes to paſs, what he next preſſeth, that [*It is found by experience, that generally ſpeaking, their party and ours give ſeveral meanings to all the Teſtimonies controverted between us.*] for if when we bring *plain* words, and take no pains to affix any other interpretations on them, than what either ordinary ſtyle, the *law* of ſpeaking, or the three parts of *Grammer*, πχικὴ, ἐξηγητικὴ and κριτικὴ, without any violence direct us to; the *Wit*, when we *ſleep*, enter with his falſe finger, and take out a ſmall *ſyllable* [*not*] or turn a *comma*, or *colon* into an *interrogative*, or tell us, the words ſignifie quite contrary to what all ordinary Readers underſtand of them, as, * *ſearch the Scriptures, for in them ye think to have eternal life*, i. e. *ye deceive your ſelves if you think you have eternal life in them* (and then we ſhall be *deceived* indeed, if we think, or hope to be gainers by any *Teſtimony*) or inſtead of theſe nicer ſubtilties, cry out upon all *wordiſh Teſtimonies*, at a venture tell us they are *capable of divers*, though they have but one *ſenſe*, they may be *plaid upon by Wits*, though the *Wits* have not yet been at leiſure to *play* actually upon them; If, I ſay, this be but part of the *character* of ſuch a *Controvertiſt*, as *S. W.* profeſſes to be, I ſhall not account my ſelf fitted with weapons to enter combate with him, yet think it may with any other man have the weight at leaſt of a *probability* (and 'tis that is denyed in this *eighth* ground) that what is regularly concluded from the obvious both *literal* and *rational* importance of the plain words of a *written teſtimony*, of undeniable authority, may be ſufficient to compoſe a debate betwixt two ſober Diſputers. For how oft ſoever I have been warned by *S. W.* and am in his *Poſtſcript* (upon peril of his treating with me no longer) ſolemnly required to deal in no other, but a *rigorouſly demonſtrative way*, I am ſtill obſtinately bent upon my courſe, to lie down in my Bed, at the ſeaſon of reſt, though I know 'tis poſſible the roof may fall upon me there, to eat the *meat*, that is ſet before me, and expect to be nouriſhed by it, though I cannot *demonſtrate*, that 'tis not my poyſon, to write on, till I am a little more tired, though I have no aſſurance, that one man ſhall reade what I write, and ſo to produce *teſtimonies* to *S. W.* (and ſometimes in *Greek* too) though it be poſſible he may find occaſion, and as he ſaith, to *raiſe ſeveral conjectures*, to amuſe the Reader, and inſtead of being wrought on, to *exerciſe* himſelf and Reader, and *play* upon them.

* *Mr. Whites Apol. for Tradit.* p. 153.

5. But if this be allowed him, that *by experience 'tis found that their party and ours give ſeveral meanings to all the teſtimonies controverted between* them, he hath then a *medium*, which will prove all irrefragably on his ſide; for *'tis manifeſt*, ſaith he, *that computing the vaſtneſs of times and places in which our profeſſion hath born ſway; we have had near a thouſand Doctors for one of the Proteſtants, who though they highly venerated and were well verſed in all the ancient Fathers and Councils, yet expreſs'd no difficulty in thoſe proofs, but made certain account, that all antiquity was for them.*

6. But again how far is this which begins with [*It is manifeſt*] from *demonſtrating* or truely *manifeſting* his concluſion? Let us firſt try it by parts, every improvement of it ſingle; 1. It is not *demonſtrated*, that the multitude of their *Doctors* hath been ſo great, as he pretends. *Gerſon* complains of it, as of an *abomination*, (*declar. defect. vir. Eccl.*) that one held *two hundred*, another *three hundred Eccleſiaſtical Benefices*, and as that might be *one*, ſo we may gueſs at many other, not improbable means to leſſen the *number* of *learned Doctors*. 2. If the *number* were granted, yet it will not be concluded with any *evidence*, that if they that have had much *longer* time, and much *larger* circuit, and withall a *fairer* Sunſhine, by much, of *Halcyon* days, to beget *Doctors*, than the *Proteſtants*, have *proportionably* had many (be it a *thouſand*) more ſuch *Commencers* in their *Schools*,] then *all the proofs alledged by Proteſtants bear not the weight of a probability.* Are theſe materials able to furniſh out a *Syllogiſm* of *immediate connexion* of *terms?* 3. Will it follow, that becauſe [*S. W. ſaith* of his *Doctors*, though perhaps he hath not converſed ſo much as with the writings of half a *thouſand* of them, that *they ever highly venerated, and were well verſed in all the ancient Fathers and Councils*] therefore they did indeed ſo *venerate*, and were well *verſed in all* of them? In this place, *firſt* I muſt mind the *Reader*, who 'tis that ſaith it, even *S. W.* that * not long ſince having commended his adverſary for *unwearied induſtry*, and *looking into ſuch variety of authours*, not onely tells him, what *rare productions half that induſtry might be mother of, if employed by ſome ſtrong brain in a rational way*, but withall gives him no obſcure intimation, that *this way of teſtimonies* is not in *it ſelf much eſtimable.* And then, if thoſe *Doctors* brains were indeed *weak*; what advantage would it have been to them, to have laid out the moſt *unwearied induſtry* in *Fathers* and *Councils?* the height they ſhould have arrived to, would have been, but ſome *declamatory proofs*, ſome *ſlight quotation arguments*, as he there ſaith; But if their *brains* were *ſtrong*, they muſt have been, in all obligation of conſcience, *employed* in the *rational way*, as that is viſibly oppoſed to *reading* or producing of *teſtimonies*, (i. e. *all the Fathers and Councils*, which are the fountains of thoſe *Teſtimonies*) And if it were ſo ſcandalous an errour in courſe of ſtudy, thus to have miſpent their time in this *converſation*, methinks *S. W.* ſhould have ſo ill an opinion of his *friends*, as to conceit, they *highly venerated*, or were *well verſed in all* them.

* *P.* 19.

8. If this have no more force with him, I muſt then apply my ſelf more immediately to his propoſition, that *they ever highly venerated and were well verſed, &c.*] The *former* part of which, that reſpects the *high veneration*, at firſt ſight is diſcovered to ſignifie nothing, by the good token of

Memnon's

Memnon's Statues, which had all their *veneration* by not * being *convers'd* with, or the *mysteries* of the *Heathens*, which were moſt *venerated* by thoſe which *knew* leaſt of them, and ſo there might be the *fewer Epoptæ*, † *veri arcani conſcii*, the more *veneratours* there were. But even for thoſe of them that have *known* moſt, 'tis not uneaſie to diſcern what *ſolid veneration* they have afforded the *Fathers*; For *firſt* if Mr. *White* be to be heeded, there lies ſuch an *equivocation* in the word *Fathers*, as being diſcovered, will bring this matter to a ſpeedy iſſue, (as far as belongs to *all* the *Fathers*, in our preſent notion of them) for *when* he *learn'd Latine*, *Pater*, * ſaith he, *ſignified the immediate Progenitor of the Son*, and St. *Paul* is cited for it, *telling his Converts they had no Father but himſelf, becauſe he had in perſon begotten them in the Goſpel, and though by ampliation, this word hath included alſo the parents of our Fathers, and upwards even to Adam, yet how it comes ſo to ſignifie the moſt remote, as to exclude the neareſt*, is, ſaith he, *beyond his skill in Grammar*] and more to this purpoſe to bring down the notion of *Fathers* from that of the *Primitive Fathers* of the *Church* or *ancient Doctors* onely (as when the *Romaniſts* themſelves call St. *Bernard ultimum Patrum*, *the laſt of the Fathers*) to his immediate *Romiſh Anceſtours*, his *Mothers*, rather than *Fathers*, as elſewhere his *Grammar* of exact ſpeaking directs him to ſtyle them; and if theſe do not joyn with thoſe remoter *Fathers*, we know how little ſhall be attributed to *thoſe*. And then it matters not much to our preſent diſcourſe, what *veneration* their *Doctors* be deemed to afford to *all the* (in this notion of) *Fathers*, (and indeed *S. W*'s way of *Oral Tradition* well hardly admit of any *other*.) He knows well enough, that there are *Fathers* of the *Countrey* as well as the *Family*, and again, *Grand* and *firſt*, as well as the *laſt* and *immediate Fathers*; ſo there are by *analogie*, the *Fathers* of the *whole Church*, *Chriſt*, his *Apoſtles*, and their *Succeſſours*, thoſe, which by advantage of living *neareſt* their times, and receiving th ir *Doctrine* from them, without mixture, are more competently qualified to *teſtifie* of it, than thoſe that live at the utmoſt poſſible *diſtance* from them; And when to this *propriety*, the *uſe* alſo of the ſtyle is added, and the title of *the Fathers*] in common ſpeaking of *Papiſts* as well as *Proteſtants*, appropriated to thoſe *ancient*, and not to theſe *modern Fathers*, I ſhall ſtill hope we may be allow'd to uſe the word in this notion, yet not confining it to the ages *ſimply firſt*, but to all thoſe that maintain the line of *Doctrine* from them without *additions* of their own, which whether the *Rom niſt parents* be guilty of in theſe latter ages, is now the queſtion, and till it be decided, *excludes* them; if the *Grammatical* notion of the word do not, from the number of *the Fathers*. If there be yet any doubt of this, I ſhall to his quotation from *St. Paul* return that other from our *Saviour Mat.* XXIII. 9. *Call no man Father upon earth*, and ask whether by the force of that Text all that cannot *approve* (not onely pretend) their Doctrine to come from *heaven*, be not *excluded* from that title, and conſequently their preſent *Romiſh Fathers*, if they have no better evidence for themſelves than that they had it from their *immediate Anceſtours*, which we know is *Mr. White*'s *Tradition Oral*.

10. But then for thoſe *Romaniſts* that have taken the *Fathers* in the ſtricter notion, onely for the *ancient writers* of the *Church* of *Chriſt*, and declamed at others for *Innovatours*, what ſubſtantial *Reverence* have they afforded them, when they ſeem not to favour their *intereſts*? Witneſs their *Great Cardinal Perron*, who certainly was as converſant in them, as moſt of the *Romaniſts*, and profeſſed ſeveral times that he had done the *Church* of *Rome* eminent ſervice in this kind, invented anſwers to the *teſtimonies* of the *Fathers* (brought by the *Proteſtants*) which were perfectly *new*, and had * *never any authour before him*; How agreeable to *veneration* this *inventing* of *new* anſwers to their *teſtimonies* was, I take not on me to judge; The paſſages in him that I meant to refer to, are ſuch as theſe, that the *Fathers in their writings againſt the Gentiles ſaid oft thoſe things, not which they did believe, but diſſembling or diſguiſing them, ſaid thoſe things which ſerved their cauſe to refute the Gentiles objections*, and much more to the ſame purpoſe, † upon the head of *invocation* of *Saints*, that he might give ſome kind of account, why the firſt *Chriſtian writers* never ſpake as the *Romaniſt* would have men believe, on that ſubject, intimating hereby not obſcurely, the two great (ſaith he, but *ſeeming*) accordance between the modern *Roman* practice, and that of their *Gentile Anceſtours*, which when another *Romaniſt*, *Ludov. Vives* ingenuouſly confeſs'd to be real, or the † *difference to him inviſible*, the *Inquiſition* was to paſs on ſuch *plain* dealing, and the words were appointed to be left out by the *Lovane Divines*, wherein the *Paris Edition* of *St. Auguſtine* 1613. hath readily obeyed them. But this by the way.

quod ſit diſcrimen inter illorum opinionem de ſanctis, & id quod Gentiles putabant de Diis ſuis. Not. in Auguſt. de Civ. Dei, l.8.c.27.Edit. Baſil.Col.494. B

11. I ſhall no longer inſiſt on this Theme, 'tis ſure ſuch *veneration* as this, is no argument of what even now was preſumed, that *they made certain account that all antiquity was for them*; If they did, there would have been leſs need of ſuch extraordinary *new* anſwers of that *Cardinal*.

12. For the latter then, *their* being *well verſed*, &c. before the truth of it will be acknowledged *demonſtrative*, the *quantity* of the *indefinite* propoſition muſt be reſolved, for elſe he knows it will not be *argumentative*; and if upon inquiry it be found to be but *particular*, 'twill then fail ſtill of being *demonſtrative*; Is it then *univerſally* true, that *all the Romiſh Doctors* ſuppoſing them to have had *near* a *thouſand* to *one* of *ours*, *were very well verſed in all the ancient Fathers and Councils*, *in the ages before Printing* came into the World, or in the *Century* next preceding the *Extinguiſhing Act*?

13. Perhaps in the mention of *all the Fathers and Councils*, the *Scriptures* were purpoſely left out, leſt we ſhould have heard of ſome one, or more ſuch, as *Andreas Caroloſtadius*, that had been a *Doctor* of theirs, of good (above *ſeven* years) ſtanding, before he *read the Bible*; and conſidering how little the people are allowed to *know* of it, we need not wonder, if there were more *Doctors* of no higher form in *that* kind of knowledge.

14. But even for *learning* leſs profound than that, or of *all the Fathers* and *Councils*, we may be allowed to make ſome *queſtion*, if we conſider their own *complaints*, how little that was taken notice of for ſome time, in the beſtowing of *ſpiritual promotions*; *Alfonſus de Caſtro* laments the ſtate of the *Church* under * *Popes* plainly *illiterate*, and not a *few*, but *many* ſuch; And when ſome have aſcended that *higheſt throne*, at the age of *ten*, and *eighteen* years old, and having ſo little themſelves, cannot be preſumed to have been any paſſionate advancers of *learning*; when we cannot but have heard

* *Ideo Splendebant quia non viſebantur. Tac.*

† *Contenti ſint ad veneracionem figuris defendentibus à vilitate ſecretum, Macrob. in Som. Scip. l. 1. c. 2. Macrob. Ibid.*

* *Dailles Arts Diſcov. p. 182.*

* *Author ante me nullus, &c. ad Bellarm. ſee Bellarmine's life, l. 2. c. 7. R. 3.*

† *P. 1044, 1045.*

† *Divos Divaſque non aliter venerantur quam Deum. Nec vel deo in multis*

* *Multos Papas adeo illiteratos, ut Grammaticam penitus ignorent. l. 1. de Hær.*

heard of *beardleſs youths* and School-boys, ſitting in great gravity in *Councils*; when 'tis preſs'd (as none of the leaſt *grievances* of our *Church* under the *Papacy*) by *Peter Caſſiodor* about the year 1250. that the † *good Paſtors were removed, and the Pope's Nephews and Kindred and others advanced, ſome not knowing letters, mute and d'af*, as he phraſeth it, *not underſtanding the bleating of the Sheep:* and this no peculiar infelicity of *that* time, but 180 years after, one of the complaints ſent from *this* Nation to the *Council* of *Baſil*, was, * that *puberes vix facti, they which were but boys are admitted to the higheſt dignities of the Church*, and yet nearer our times, 120 years after that, (in the year 1550.) *Franc. Duarenus*, a *Romaniſt*, and learned *Lawyer* of *France*, † makes the obſervation *principally* of the *age* wherein he lived, that *Biſhopricks and Prieſtly Offices uſed to be conferr'd on the moſt unlearned, and thoſe that were far from Religion*; and (which is of a more comprehenſive importance) the *Court* or *Parliament of Paris* among their reaſons given to *King Lewis* the *eleventh*, againſt the *abrogation of the Pragmatick Sanction*, * mentions this for one, that by the continual applications to *Rome* for the preferments of the *Church*, † *Scholaſtici conventus, & Univerſitates ſtudioſorum deſolatæ ac deſertæ jacebant, The Scholaſtick meetings, and Univerſities of Students lay deſolate and deſerted*; When *ignorance* was proclaimed the *Mother* of *devotion*, and *Mr. White* himſelf, at this day, a prime *Luminary*, in an age of *noon-day* light, can deſcend from his great *learning* to give many good words to the *Colliers Faith*, believing as the *Church* believes, and hath not yet demonſtrated, that either the *learned'ſt Doctor* is *bound* to believe any otherwiſe, or conſequently to impoſe this ſo ill method of ſtudy, as a penance on himſelf, to *be well verſed in all the Fathers and Councils*, or any other ſort of *wordiſh writings* of *dead* men; In a word, when common fame is ſo ready to give in its *ſuffrages* telling us of whole ages ſo ſcandalouſly *ignorant*, that *Paſquil* the marble *Pillar* in *Rome*, can tell *Pope Eugenius*, from the *voice* of the *people*,

Complures quoque Epiſcopos——
Ipſo me mage ſaxeos videmus,

that a *multitude of Biſhops* were ordinarily to be *ſeen more ſtony than himſelf*, we may then take leave to *adviſe* farther before we yield, what *S. W. cheaply* aſſumes, that *near a thouſand* of *theirs* to *one* of *our Doctors* were all *well verſed in all the Fathers and Councils*; eſpecially when it is known to have fallen out ſo unluckily, that the *Biſhops*, and others in *Henry* the *Eighth*'s days, which concurred in the *Exterminating Act*, were learned beyond any example of former times, and did teſtifie their *converſation* in *Fathers* and *Councils* by what they wrote againſt the *Papacy* in that point, more than all their *Anceſtors* had done before in *defence* of it.

15. In brief, for other parts of the World, I appeal to *Eraſmus* (that lived in the wane of thoſe *dark* times, and was a competent judge of abilities) whether the way of the *Schools*, even that which *S. W.* profeſſes, *St. Thomas*'s way, was really experimented to ingage men in the ſtudy of *any* (that is much leſs than *all*) the *Fathers* and *Councils*.

16. And for our Nation, a little ſearch into our *Antiquities*, if it be but in the *Univerſity* of *Oxford*, as famous as any other, * *Æmula Pariſienſis*, and, † the *fountain* and *mother of our Chriſtian Faith*, will give us ſome light; for there we have the memories of the bitter feuds betwixt the *Grecians* and the *Trojans*, implacably purſued for ſome time, till it was compoſed at length by Sir *Thomas More*'s Letter, and the interpoſition of his *authority*; This aſſures us, that even thus late (what think we then of the *Century* foregoing?) a competent part of the *Doctors* had not much *Greek*; and were not all of them rarely qualified for *converſation* with all the *Ancient Fathers and Councils*, when *S. W.*'s Reader may have heard, that very many, if not the moſt eſtimable, and *venerable* of them, were written in that language, which was a *Barbarian* to ſo many of thoſe *Doctors*? This I take to be ſomewhat near *demonſtrating*, that they that were avowedly but *Trojans*, that underſtood no *Greek*, as they had not the *gift* of *Tongues*, ſo they could not work ſuch *miracles*, as to be very well verſed in *Greek* Writers.

17. And even for the *Latine Fathers* and *Councils*, a man might make ſome gueſs from the account that * *Jo. Leland* gives of the *Franciſcans Library* at *Oxford*, inriched by the bountifull Legacy of *Biſhop Groſthead*, but ſadly deſpoiled by the *Friers*, who, ſaith he, had *filched* and *diſſipated* all the *books*, but, if we may judge by *ſymptomes*, very little of the *learning*. The Records of thoſe *dark* times have not yet left us unfurniſhed of many other the like paſſages, which will render it probable, that *all* the *Doctors* of that *age* were not *well verſed* in *all* the *Fathers* and *Councils*. And for their venerable *Council* of *Trent* it ſelf, we cannot but obſerve, what the *Hiſtorian* tells us, in the debate about the *Latine tranſlation* of the *Bible*; *There was*, ſaith he, *much difference between ſome few who had good knowledge of the Latine, and ſome taſte of the Greek*, (but *few*, it ſeems, of ſuch in *that* Aſſembly) *and others who were ignorant in the Tongues:* and ſpeaking of *Cardinal Cajetane* as of the *prime Divine of that and many more ages, unto whom there was no Prelate or perſon in the Council who would not yield in learning, or thought himſelf too good to learn of him*, and of his *ſtudy of the Scripture, expounding not the Latine tranſlation, but the Hebrew roots of the Old, and Greek of the New Teſtament*, he adds; *In which Tongues being ignorant himſelf, he employed men of good underſtanding, who made conſtruction of the Text unto him word by word*——It were not difficult to inforce this obſervation, and ſhew the *accordance* exact in other their *learnedſt Doctors* of thoſe times. But I ſhall not endeavour to help this to its *probabilities*, but onely remind, what I have oft told him, that when this point, which we have now before us, was once *ſtudied*, and the *Fathers* and *Councils* conſulted in it, the whole Army of *Doctors* and *learned* men uniformly conſented to what we contend for.

18. But then 3. how is it approved to be *evident*, that *all* the *Doctors expreſs'd no difficulty in thoſe proofs*, or how doth this advance *S. W.*'s intereſts? 1. They that *conſidered* not thoſe *proofs*, could *find* no *difficulty* in them. 2. They that *conſidered* them, and found *difficulties*, might yet have motives to diſſwade *expreſſing* themſelves. 3. They that did expreſs themſelves, might if they were not ſentenced by them, be many of them concealed from *poſterity*, if they were *caſt* out by *cenſures*, and the

† *Alioſque nonnullos literas ignorantes, & velut mutos & ſurdos, ovium earundem non intelligentes balatum. Pet. Caſſ. de Tyran. Pont. Rom. in jura Reg. & Eccl. Angl.*
* *Vid. vit. Archiep. Chichl.* p. 86.
† *Maximè hoc ſæculo----quo Epiſcopatus & Sacerdotia indoctiſſimis hominibus & à religione alienis deferri ſolent. de Benef.* l. 1. c. 11.

* *Libert. Eccl. Gall. Defenſ. in App. ad Duaren. de Benef.*
† *Cap.* LXIV.

* *Mat. Paris. Ann.* 1252.
† *Rot. Parl.* 1. *Hen.* VI. n. 43.

* *De Scriptor. Angl. To.* IV. p. 217.

Hiſt. of Coun. Trent. p. 155.

Ibid.

the noiſe of them ſo loud, that we hear of it (as ſure *Biſhop Groſthead* was, when he appealed from the * *Pope's Court* to the *Tribunal of Chriſt*) they might paſs for *Schiſmaticks*, upon the ſame account that we are put in that form. * *Hen. Knighton. de eventub. Angl.* l. 2. c. 15.

19. *Laſtly*, how is it demonſtrated, that *all their Doctours made certain account that all antiquity was for the Doctrine that S. W.* now *defends*? May not the affirming this (if it be not abſolutely *falſe*) be the *fallacy plurium interrogationum*? They 1. *knew*, or might know that the *Pope* was *Biſhop* of *Rome* by ſucceſſion from St. *Peter*, and St. *Paul*, and ſo by *divine right*, and by the ſame power inſtated in a *Primacy* over his own *Province*; 2. that by *Canon* and *Cuſtome* of the *Church*, as *Biſhop* of the *Imperial City*, he was the *firſt* and chief of the *Weſt*, ſtyled *Patriarch*; 3. That by his own ambition, and the advantage of *Phocas*'s collation on *Boniface* III. he came to be call'd *Univerſal Biſhop*, and to aſſume, and exerciſe many acts of *juriſdiction* accordingly, and ſo in other parts by the conceſſion or connivence of *Princes*; and 4. that at length he began to *believe* himſelf, at leaſt *perſwade* others, that this was it (and not the bare forementioned *Primacy*) which was conferred on St. *Peter* firſt, and ſo on him by *Chriſt*. And they that ſaw, and were well adviſed of all this, might make account, that the firſt *antiquity* was for the *firſt* of theſe, a *ſecond* ſort of *antiquity*, after *Conſtantine*'s time, for the *ſecond* of theſe; and though they knew nothing in antiquity for the *two* latter, might yet live *quietly* under thoſe *aſſumers*. And this is all he hath advanced by his inſiſting again on the *number* and *learning* of his *Doctours*.

20. For their *ſincerity*, he ſaith, *it ought not to run in a leſs proportion, than their number*, and I ſay ſo too in his very ſtyle, that it *ought* not; Yet becauſe he adds, he *hears not it is pretended, that the contrary can be evidently manifeſted*, and ſo he need not take pains to prove it, It is not amiſs ſhortly to intimate, how far this is from *demonſtrative*, if it be but by minding him of two paſſages which he cannot but have *heard* of, the one in *former*, the other in *later* times, of ſome publick cogniſance both.

21. *Firſt* I may be allowed to ſuppoſe, that he may have *heard* of the managery of the cauſe concerning the *Pope*'s receiving *appeals* from *Africk*, in the *ſixth great Council* of *Carthage*, in debating of which, the *Pope*'s *Legates*, in the name of their Maſter, alledged a *Canon*, of the *firſt Council* of *Nice*, and the *Africans* denyed there was any ſuch *Canon*, and upon ſending to the *Patriarchs* of the *Eaſt* for a perfect Volume of *Canons*, there was no ſuch *Canon* to be found, as the *Pope*'s *Legates* alledged; I need not ask what *ſincerity* there was in this. I know what is anſwered to this, by the great Abetters of the *Roman cauſe*, *Card. Bellarmine* and *Baronius*, confeſſing that this was a *miſtake*, and to be rectifyed by ſubſtituting, in ſtead of the *Nicene*, the *Sardican Canon*; but firſt, this was no great eſſay of their *converſation*, and *skill* in the *Councils*, which juſt now was pleaded, to miſtake a *Grand General Council of Nice*, for the *petty Sardican*. Secondly, 'tis evident enough, that the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, 105 years after that of *Sardice*, in the reckoning of the *Canons* of the *Univerſal Church*, mentions not the *Sardican* at all. And Pope *Nicholas* the *firſt* writing to *Photius Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, teſtifies that the *Greeks receive not* that *Council* (ſee his *ſixth Epiſtle* in the ſixth *tome* of the *Councils*, p. 494.) reciting their words, which alſo are put into *Gratian*'s *Codex*, *Can. quod dicitis*, 16. *diſt.* which ſufficiently evacuates the force of that *anſwer*, without farther reflecting on the quality of that *Council*, all the *Eaſtern Biſhops* being departed, and but *twenty Weſtern* ſubſcribing it, as *Sulpitius* tells us Vol. 1. *Concil.* and all in a manner tranſacted by *Oſius Cordubenſis* (as by the *Canons* appears) of whom we are told, that he had been *twice excommunicated*, firſt for favouring the *Donatiſts*, and then the *Arians*. But this by the way.

22. The *ſecond* is more *freſh*, in another difference of the *Papal* concernment, that of *Purgatory*, between them and the *Greeks*, when there was but one *teſtimony*, that could have any force in it to the *Romaniſts* conclusion, that out of *Theodoret*, upon examination of *all his writings* * he was *not found* to have ſaid any ſuch thing, as was by the *Latines* cited from him, And this was no ſecret, being by the *Greeks* declared to the *Council* of *Baſil*.

* Ἃ φάπε τὸν μακάριον Θεοδώρητον λέγειν, ἄνδρα σφόδρα κὰ θεῖον, κὰ μέγα ἐπὶ λόγοις ὄντα τὸ κλέος, εἰ μὴ κὰ παρ' ἡμῖν ὅπως ἠυρέθη ἔχοντα, εἶχον ἂν πνα λόγον, κὰ πῦ ἴσως ἀπολογίας ἐδέησεν. ἐπεὶ δὲ πολλῶν ὄντων τῶ ὁκείνε παρ' ἡμῖν συγγεγραμμάτων, ἐν ἑνὶ φαίνεται πώποτε εἰρηκὼς, ὑδὲ λόγε ἡμῖν δεῖν ποιῆς τὰκεῖθεν. *Græc. Apol.* l. 1. p. 145. 147.

23. Being thus far entred on an ungratefull ſubject, I ſhall not allow my ſelf any farther line, than by reflecting on one paſſage of Mr. *White*'s, which may not be either *offenſive* or *unheard* of to *S. W.* being in his irrefragable *Apology* for *Tradition*, cited from the very *Manuſcript Acts of ſome Congregations at Rome*, not long before the death of the *laſt Pope*. The buſineſs of no ſmall concernment, and acted, † he ſaith, on one part by the *choiceſt wits, and ancienteſt Scholars could be pickt out of that ſo famed ſociety* (the great maintainers of the *Papal Supremacy*, againſt the pretenſions of *Biſhops*) and the *manner and* upſhot of the managery he gives you in theſe words [*But let us hear the Pope ſpeak, Upon the* 8. *of* July *was held the ſecond Congregation, His Holyneſs began with theſe words, Nos perſonaliter vidimus congeriem locorum quam vos qui Molinam defenditis, induxiſti ex Auguſtino, & nullus inventus eſt qui faveat, imo contrarium tenuit Auguſtinus, Unde* * *mirum quod tot artibus utamini*; *And hence it ſeems they were forced to corrupt St. Auſtin to the Pope's face, the* 30. *of* September *following*; *which being diſcovered, the Authour dyed of melancholy and diſgrace. Again in the tenth Congregation, the ſame Pope taxed them, quod Scholaſticis maximè ſuis, non Scripturâ, Conciliis, Patribus uterentur, a ſign how ſound their way of Doctrine is, how ſincere their proceedings to defend it.*] Thus far Mr. *White*, and methinks ſomewhat home to the preſent purpoſe, both for the *way of learning* (not that of the *Father*'s and *Councils*) and alſo for the *ſincerity*, and *both* exemplified in thoſe men which are not deemed the leaſt eminent of the *Romaniſts*, and are now ſure advanced to a much higher pitch of the *one* (whatſoever proportion will be allowed them of the *other*) than was obſervable in the times *before* the *Extinguiſhing Act*; And 'tis farther obſervable, that thoſe which were thus *paradigmatized* for *ſincerity*, and that, as he ſaith, by the *Pope* himſelf, did ſoon obtain a *definition* on their ſide from the ſame *Pope*, the *Conſtitution* of *Pope Innocent* the 10th, *An.* 1653. † *Apol.* p. 62. * *It is wonderfull you ſhould uſe ſo many artifices.*

24. I ſhall make no farther additions to this out of mine own *Supellex*, nor examine the *ſolidity*

of what *Hildebrand* the advancer of the *Papacy* to its preſent geatneſs, hath defined concerning the * *ſanctified*, as well as *infallible ſtate* of thoſe that *Canonically aſcend that throne*, that *by the merits of St. Peter they are undoubtedly made holy*, (and then I know not what privilege he may have, of conveying this to all that ſhall eſpouſe ſo *ſanctified* a cauſe.) Yet not for this, but other reaſons, eſpecially becauſe I abhor the paſſing ſentence on any man elſe, but my ſelf, I ſhall no farther reply to that head of *ſincerity*, than to mind him of the no perfect *invincibleneſs* of his demonſtration, which in this particular depends wholly on *his not hearing that it is pretended that the contrary is made manifeſt*, and therefore that if his *adverſary* ſhould now tell him, and ſo he now *hear* it, or becauſe many things are ſaid, which he *hears* not, or becauſe many things are *manifeſt*, which are not *ſaid* to be ſo, and *laſtly* many things *might* be *made manifeſt*, which are not, his concluſion that holds its being ſo precariouſly, and by the courteſie of ſo many *caſualties* is ſtill a *demonſtrative* concluſion of the *new mode*, as homogeneous to the former, as if the *ſeventh* and *eighth Ground* had been both *framed*, and *proved* by the ſame numerical *S. W.*

* *Romanus Pontifex ſi Canonicè fuerit ordinatus, meritis Beati Petri indubitanter efficitur ſanctus. Sent.* 22.

25. Meanwhile I cannot omit to take notice of one auxiliary conſideration, taken in to approve the *ſincerity* of his *Doctours*, *conſidering*, ſaith he, *the corruptneſs of our nature, the prejudice ought rather to ſtand on the part of the diſobeyers than obeyers of any Government.* And truly I ſhould think ſo too, though I did not *conſider the corruptneſs of our nature*, ſuppoſing 'twere, as *S. W.* pretends, a *Government* of *God*'s erecting, a reality, and not onely a *phaſm* of *Government*; But in our queſtion I diſcern not, why the *corruption* of our *nature* may not incline ſome to *aſſume*, what is not their due, as well as others to *deny* it them. I ſuppoſe *S. W.* had a reach I cannot aim at, and I will not unneceſſarily diſturb him in his *conſiderations*.

26. At ſuch a rate of demonſtrating as this, he hath certainly gained his deſigned purchaſe, and ſo goes off the Stage with no leſs than *a thouſand to one in a moral eſtimation in the means of underſtanding aright theſe Teſtimonial proofs*] 'Twas but a mere charity that he did not drop a *Cyphre* or two more, and ſay *ten*, or an *hundred thouſand* to one, by which reckoning I cannot but yield to him, and think he hath *reaſon* not to take that to *have any real probability*, which hath ſuch vaſt odds, be it but a *thouſand* to *one* againſt it. Onely the unluckineſs of it is, that ſome things come to paſs which *S. W.* by giving heed to his own *arguings*, thinks moſt improbable, and ſo it will often be, till he hath got cure for that (ſome call it *diabetick*) *paſſion*, by which *demonſtrations* ſuch as they are, run from him ſo inſenſibly.

27. But I muſt look forward, and then I find by his next words that I have inſiſted too long on the ſurvey of this proof, when, though he have made uſe of it *twice*, for the confirming his *ſeventh* and *eighth* ground, yet he better bethinks himſelf, and (as he now ſaith) *ſtands not much upon it.* And if the *Printer* had ſpared his pains, and not *ſtood upon* it alſo, I might have been ſome minutes ſooner at my journeys end. 'Tis now too late to complain of it. But why is this *medium*, of ſo *ſevere*, and *immediate connexion of terms*, deſpiſed and caſt off, as ſoon as it hath done its beſt for him? He tells it plainly, *He hath a far better game to play*] It ſeems if he had not, this deſpicable creature, as mean an account as he now makes of it, ſhould have been kept up in a reputation, and traffick'd for him ſtill. And I cannot but ſay, I am half ſorry for the change, having gotten ſome little acquaintance with this *medium*, which took off the ruggedneſs and amazingneſs of it. But in what *ſuit* lies his *better game*? Why he ſoon tells us, he *means the force of Tradition.*

28. And then unexpectedly in the cloſe of a very long and tough *Section*, which hath coſt me at leaſt eight times as much paper, to give it the due conſideration, I muſt begin again, and as if the vaſt efficacy of *Poſſeſſion* were blaſted, or *thunderſtruck* and *vaniſhed*, and ſo, he could not think fit to *ſtand much upon* that, at leaſt on that alone, without this ſupply from another Coaſt, in comes his new *trick* upon the *Cards*, the very *Idea* of *Ruſhworth*'s *Dialogues*, that we might not doubt from what *architect* his *Grounds* were derived to him, the *force of Tradition.*

29. But for this I muſt take a little breath, before I ſet to it, and though he is ſo familiar with it, as to introduce it here at the fag end of a *Section*, yet I muſt uſe it with more reſpect, and ſolemnly dedicate, and ſet apart a whole *Chapter* for it; and that I ſhall not refuſe to doe, that I may not diſappoint all his former *challenges*, and *attempts* to engage me in this point.

CHAP. III.

Of Tradition.

SECT. I.

The Doctrine of Tradition, in the way of Ruſhworth's *Dialogues. The method of conſidering it. Four previous conſiderations. The Encomiums of this way, how unreconcileably large. Some faith to Teſtimonies ſo great, that more Teſtimonies cannot ſtrengthen it. Five queſtions by which to judge of the truth of the Encomiums.* Canus's *way of inveſtigating Tradition, a prejudice to* S. W's.

1. TO advance then to the due beholding of the beauties of this *Helena*, the *Common Miſtreſs* of the *Authour* of *Ruſhworth's Dialogues*, Mr. *White* the *Apologiſt* for thoſe *Dialogues*, and *S. W.* the *Diſpatcher* (whether all theſe make up but *one*, or more perſons, is not much material) the firſt thing I conceive neceſſary, is, that we put our thoughts in ſome order, not gazing on all at once, and ſo *dazling*, and *confounding* our ſights, but diſtributing the object into its parts, and accordingly martialing our views of them. And conſidering that the full portraicture, which

in

in a large map makes up no leſs than *all Ruſhworth's Dialogues*, is yet ſeveral times *abbreviated*, and given us in *little*, from thoſe who are acknowledged to have fully *penetrated* and comprehended it, particularly in this place to the end of this Section, and in *Mr. VVhite's Apology*, in the *firſt incounter*, p. 7. and 8. I ſhall labour to direct my courſe by the ſtearage of theſe *two* together, and for methods ſake bound my ſelf to theſe limits.

2. *Firſt*, and by way of *Apparatus*, I ſhall take notice of the *character*, as that is expreſs'd by the large *Encomiums*, which are given of this way; and *ſecondly*, (that I may fit it for *defining*) clear it from all *ambiguity*, and ſeparate it from the other notion of which the word *Tradition* is capable, and to which 'tis ordinarily applied; then *thirdly*, gather the briefeſt *definition* or deſcription of it, and *fourthly* and *laſtly* conſider the *proofs*, on which it is eſtabliſhed. And each of theſe being firſt ſet down from their own *writings*, and then allowed their due *eſtimate*, will afford the Reader as diſtinct a view of the whole, as any thing but *Oral Tradition* (which I confeſs I have not in this matter) can furniſh him, and I ſhall then leave him, or the *Roman Conclave* to paſs judgment on it.

3. And firſt the *Encomiums* of it you have here in theſe words,—— *A far better game to play, I mean the force of Tradition, which is fortified with ſuch, and ſo many invincible reaſons, that to lay them out at large, and as they deſerve, were to tranſcribe the Dialogues of* Ruſhworth, *the rich ſtore-houſe of them, To them I refer the Reader for as ample a ſatisfaction as even Scepticiſm can deſire.* Another *Encomium* I ſhall tranſcribe from *Sch. Diſar.* p. 19. in theſe words, *I doubt not but the Doctor will grant it impoſſible, that all the Proteſtants in* England *ſhould be fallible or miſtake in witneſſing whether* 20. *years agoe there were Proteſtant Biſhops in* England *or no, and that ſuch was the tenet and Government of the Church at that time. Yet* 1000 *times greater evidence have we of the indefectibility of the Churches faith, and her infallibility, As you may to your amazement ſee (if you will but open your eyes) in that incomparable Treatiſe of* Ruſhworth's *Dialogues.*

4. With theſe two I will ſatisfie my ſelf (though there be as many more, as but caſual mentions of this matter) the truth of which it is not my purpoſe (nor would it be reconciled with any *civility*) to examine, but onely to conclude from thence the very leaſt that is *concluſible* (according to *S. W*'s own rule) by *immediate connexion* of *terms*, that if *S. VV.* write as he thinks, then in his *opinion*, this Schem of proving the *infallibility* of the *Church* of *Rome* by *Mr. VVhite's* way, is *more* than *clearly demonſtrative*, for that which is no *more* than ſo, doth not *ſatisfie* a *Sceptick*, for he, we know, doth maintain his ἐποχὴ and ἀναλαμψία, i. e. his *ſuſpenſe*, and *diſſatisfaction*, againſt *demonſtration* it ſelf, if they that write of the *Scepticks* pretenſions deceive us not, or if *S. VV.* cannot give us better intelligence of them, than *Sextus Empiricus* in *Pyrrho's* life hath done. 2. That in *his opinion* this way is a *thouſand times more evident* than what was *really done* 20 years agoe, and what I *ſaw* my ſelf, and had the *concurrent ſenſations*, of all both *Papiſts* and *Proteſtants* too, that then lived, and are ready to teſtifie that I was not miſtaken in thus judging of my own *ſenſations*, i. e. than what many *millions* of men not ſo much as agreeing in any intereſts hereon depending, did unqueſtionably *ſee* and *hear*.

5. And having, I ſuppoſe, regularly inferred thus much, what hinders, but that I proceed to conclude, that this diſcovery of *Mr. VVhite's*, as it is the greateſt *bleſſing*, the richeſt *Jewell*, ſo 'tis the greateſt *riddle* and *myſtery* in the *world*, *Thuanus's*, or *Dr. Harvey's Miſado* is nothing to it. But in ſtead of owning this as my own *Corollary*, I ſhall onely propoſe it to conſideration, *Firſt* whether there be at this day on earth to *humane finite* underſtandings, any way of more convincing proof, than that of *clear demonſtration*. 2. Whether there be really any *evidence* of which a *Romaniſt* is capable, in judging of his *Faith*, a *thouſand times* greater, than that of a plain matter of *fact*, which many *millions* of men have undoubtedly *ſeen* and *heard*; He muſt remember, that *evidence* is the ſubject of this *quere*, and that to make good his affirmation, he muſt at the leaſt prove thoſe three things, 1. That the *number* and *authority* (one or both) of *Romaniſts* is 1000 times greater than of *Proteſtants*. 2. That the *Romaniſts Faith* is *Orally* teſtified to them by all theſe, as the matter of *fact* done in *England twenty years* agoe, is teſtified by *all Proteſtants* there. 3. That when a thing is ſo teſtified already by a number, and authority, much *more* than *ſufficient* to make it *unqueſtionable*, yet the addition of a greater number of *teſtifiers* will ſtill proportionably increaſe this *evidence*, ſo as one *myriad* being much more than enough to evidence a plain *matter* of *fact*, a *thouſand myriads* ſhall produce a *thouſand* times *greater evidence*, i. e. a *thouſand times* more than *ſufficient*.

6. That the proving of theſe three things are neceſſarily required of him, to conclude his *affirmative* of the *queſtion*, though I have no cauſe to doubt of his aſſent, yet I ſhall here add my *reaſon*, why I conceive it incumbent on him: My *reaſon* is, becauſe all the *evidence* of the *concluſion* inferred by *Mr. VVhite's* way, is derived from the *teſtification*, and not from the matter of the *Teſtimony*, or any other ſuch conſideration, the matter of the *Teſtimony* being the thing concluded, and therefore no part of the *medium* to conclude it; For example, *Oral Tradition* evidences to a *Romaniſt* by many links of *ſucceſſive teſtifications*, that the *Apoſtles* ſent by *Chriſt*, univerſally preach'd, and confirmed with miracles, the Doctrine of the *Crede*, as *neceſſary* to all men to *believe* to their ſouls health; The *concluſion* here *teſtified* and *believed* upon this medium of *Oral* teſtification, is this matter of *fact* [that the *Apoſtles* preached and confirmed with miracles this *Doctrine* ——] which *concluſion* being believed upon this *teſtification* onely, as all matters of *fact* are, and not from any *intrinſick* arguments from the thing it ſelf, (which are *branches* of the *concluſion*, and not *mediums* to infer, or *evidence* it) it neceſſarily follows, that the *evidence* of this *concluſion* is greater or leſs, as the *teſtification* is more or leſs weighty and *vigorous*, and receives not its *increaſe* of weight at all from any thing elſe. And if ſo, then 'tis *evident*, that to make the *evidence*, as he ſaith, a *thouſand times greater*, he muſt make good that there are thoſe *circumſtances* of *number* and *authority*, one or both, in the *teſtification*, thus multiplyed above thoſe in the other Scale, ſo far as to make it a *thouſand* times more *evident*. Now that the *evidence* of any one thing depending upon *Oral Teſtimony*, is not thus increaſable, as to be a *thouſand times greater*, than the *evidence* of another thing, which is *ſufficiently* and *unqueſtionably evidenced*, and wherein, as he ſuppoſeth, *it is impoſſible* that the teſtifiers *ſhould miſtake*, I offer him this argument, which to me ſeems

to have force in it: Some things which are teſtified to us by all the *Chriſtian* world in all ages, are not onely not *teſtified*, but actually *denyed* and rejected as *Fables* by a far greater part of the *men* of the world in all the ſame ages. In this caſe I demand what other reaſon can be given, why, when I believe an article upon *tradition* of the *Chriſtian* world, ſo far a greater number of men to the *contrary*, ſhould not beget ſome leaſt *dubitancy* in my *belief*, thus founded, unleſs it be this, that the *number* and *authority* I have to depend on, is *ſufficient* to induce a *faith* ſo *firm*, that nothing of this kind to the contrary can *weaken* it in the leaſt degree; and if nothing of this kind can *weaken* it, then by the ſame reaſon nothing of this kind can *ſtrengthen* it; the reaſon holding equally on both ſides. And that the *Romaniſt* will conſent to this reaſoning of mine, I have this ground to perſwade my ſelf, Becauſe many of his *Articles* of *faith* are, he knows, disbelieved, upon the ſame ground of *tradition*, by a far greater part of the *Chriſtian* world (for I ſuppoſe I may ſtyle them part of the *Chriſtian* world, whom yet he ſtyles *Schiſmaticks*, the *Greek Church*, *Abiſſines*, *Georgians*, and *Proteſtants*;) and yet this no way ſtaggers or but gradually weakens his deemed *infallibility*; Why ſo? Becauſe he ſuppoſes he hath from the *teſtification* of the *Church* of *Rome* ſo compleat an *evidence*, that no *oppoſitions* of others can *weaken*, and then by the ſame reaſon alſo, no ſuppoſeable humane *addition* will have any force to *ſtrengthen* it.

7. A *third queſtion* propoſeable will be, whether the leaſt that can be affirmed of *Mr. White*'s way will not be this, that the *demonſtrativeneſs* it pretends to, doth at the loweſt amount to that of a *Mathematical demonſtration* exactly ſuch in every link of it, ſo that the denying of any ſuch link, ſhall imply no leſs than a flat *contradiction*. This I wiſh may be remembred, becauſe hereafter perhaps there will be uſe of it.

8. A *fourth*, whether it be *credible*, that ſo great a *jewel* as this pretends to be, ſhould be withheld from the *Chriſtian* world for above 1600. years, and at laſt brought forth, not onely by one man that pretends not to *inſpiration*, but alſo in a *ſlight familiar conference between two Kinſmen*, *Apol.* p. 1. It hath been a work of great *ſubtilty* and labour among the *Romaniſts*, to inveſtigate the *Traditions* of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, * *Melchior Canus* in a *ſingular* manner hath travailed in it, and among other ways hath ſet down for the *third*, *Si quicquam eſt nunc in Eccleſia communi fidelium conſenſione probatum, quod tamen humana poteſtas efficere non potuit, id ab Apoſtolorum traditione neceſſariò derivatum eſt*, *If any thing be now in the Church approved by the common conſent of the faithfull, which yet no humane power could do, that muſt neceſſarily have been from the Apoſtles*, *As*, ſaith he, *to diſſolve vows, remit Oaths, was not of humane power, becauſe by the Law of Nature we are bound to perform to God our Vows, and keep Oaths, and humane power cannot pardon and take away thoſe things which are due by the Law of Nature, Nec enim credi poteſt, for it cannot be believed that the Church of God hath generally aſſumed any power in thoſe things which belong to the Law of Nature, but what they had received from Chriſt and his Apoſtles, for then this were a great errour in manners*, which the *Church* muſt not be thought guilty of. Here indeed was an *extraordinary* reach, to conclude a *power* from *Chriſt*, becauſe it was againſt the *Law* of *Nature* (which yet *Chriſt came not to deſtroy, but* πληρώσαι, *to fill up* and improve) which I cannot imagine any ſober man would ever have adventured on (*Ocham*, I am ſure, reſolves the quite contrary, that the *power* of *Chriſt*'s *Vicar* is but *limited* to thoſe things, † *quæ nec legi divinæ nec legi naturæ reperiuntur adverſa, which are not found contrary either to the Law of God or Nature*) if this other of the *Oral* of the *preſent Church*, without any Auxiliary, would have ſalved the *difficulty*; and that is matter of ſome *conjecture* at leaſt, that it is, as was ſaid, a *novell invention*; and being of ſuch efficacy, 'tis ſtrange it ſhould be envyed the world ſo long.

* *Loc. Comm.* l. III. c. 4.

† *De Juriſdict. Imp. de cauſ. Matrim.*

9. The *fifth*, whether, if this do not make good what it undertakes, eſpecially if in the iſſue it prove ſo far from a ſolid *demonſtration*, that it arrives not ſo much as to a fair *probability*, the conſequence be not clear, that it is a *temerity* ſeldome exemplified in other perſons, or times, all *circumſtances* being conſidered, as that he that pretends it, is a *rational* man, and though he ſaith it not in *Greek*, ὃ πιθανῶς εἰπὼν ψεύδος νικήσαι δύναται, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἀλήθειαν μετ' ἀκριβοῦς ἐξετάσεως, (*Philocal.* c. XXIV.) yet avows it in plain *Engliſh*, as oft as any, that he *deſpiſeth*, and diſcerns the inconcludency of a *thouſand barely probable arguments*, and admits of nothing in a *Controvertiſt* under *rigorous*, i. e. the moſt *ſevere demonſtration*.

10. Other pertinent *queſtions*, *conſectaries* of the *premiſſes*, I might propoſe, and likewiſe offer grounds of debating and deciding theſe, But that will better be done, when we have had particular inſpection of the way, and then perhaps there will be no uſe of it; At the preſent this may ſuffice for the firſt *previous* conſideration.

SECT.

SECT. II.

The ſecond previous conſideration. Oral Tradition in oppoſition to Scripture or Fathers. Mr. White's *paſſages concerning Scripture, in his Apology conſonant to* Ruſhworth's *Dialogues. The Scales ſet betwixt* S. W's *way of Oral Tradition (Mr.* White's *invention) and ours of Apoſtolical Tradition, Scripture and Fathers. Our way eſtabliſh'd. Writing no prejudice to Tradition. This prove dby the Suffrages of the Ancients of the five firſt ages, St.* Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Baſil, Auguſtine, Vincentius, Salvian, *The* Greek *Church of the laſt Century, the Romaniſt publiſher. The practice at* Nice, *and* Epheſus. Capreolus. Juſtinian. *Mr.* White. Gregory XIII. Julius Rogerius, Suarez, Abulenſis, *Mr.* White *again*, Bellarmine, Suarez *again. The true notion of Tradition from* Pereſius. *Records overrule cuſtome.* Driedo's *account.* S. W's *three objections anſwered. Perſpicuity of Scripture. Helps for interpreting it. No advantage of Oral. The Romiſh mothers teaching written words not accuſable of muteneſs. The Scriptures want of artificial rules of demonſtration objected by* S. W. *So their not being written of latter Controverſies. Charity to diſſenters taught by Scripture and Councils. Their Univerſal Paſtourſhip and Infallibility deduced from Scripture by themſelves.*

I. SEcondly then to clear the ſubject of our debate from all *ambiguity*, and *diſtinguiſh* it from any other pretenders, I have my directions here from the * cloſe of this Section in theſe words, [*To ſtop the way againſt the voluntary miſtakes of mine adverſary, I declare my ſelf to ſpeak here not of written tradition to be ſought for in the Scriptures and Fathers, which lies open to ſo many cavils and exceptions, but of Oral Tradition*] ſo frequently elſewhere. To which alſo I refer that of the *Apologiſt* p. 8. that this Maxime † [*The Churches Doctrine is received from Chriſt, and ſtill handed along to the preſent generation*] is the *onely undoubted and ſelf-evident principle*; and again that of the ſame hand *p.* 11. that *A conſiderer, were it his deſign to ſet up a Religion, which he would have conſtantly and univerſally propagated, he muſt of neceſſity pitch upon this way*, pronouncing, that *if God hath not already taken this courſe, certainly he ſhould have done it.* Which ſpeeches how *untunable* ſoever to ſofter ears, muſt yet be taken in good part from ſo great an *Authority*, and are to be underſtood, with *analogy* to the former, of *Oral Tradition*, and not of *written* either in *Scriptures* or *Fathers*. * *Schiſ. Diſpati* p. 47.

2. To this head again I refer the paſſages in this authour, which to my weaker ſenſes, ſavour much of diminution and unkindneſs (at leaſt comparative) to the *Scriptures*. As when he ſaith, *Juſtin Martyr* proved his *Millinary* Doctrine *merely out of the Prophets, and never mentions Tradition for it* (where yet by the way, he that avouched it as the Doctrine of *all that were in all things of right opinions* at that time, will hardly be denyable to have propoſed *Oral Tradition* for it, which is *S. W*'s way though neither *Apoſtolical* nor *Univerſal*, which is our way of urging *Tradition*) the [*merely out of the Prophets*] lays blemiſh on ſuch *Teſtimonies* out of the *Prophets*, i. e. the *Scriptures* in *compariſon* of the other of *Tradition*. So when he ſaith 'tis a *ſhamefull propoſition to ſay the Scriptures were written of Controverſies, long after their date, ſprung up in the Chriſtian world*] As if it were a great impudence in a Chriſtian to think that the *Apoſtles* could foreſee by *God*'s ſpirit, and *obviat* the *hereſies* which ſhould after riſe in the Church. And yet as * St. *Irenæus* obſerves of St. *John*'s *Goſpel*, in relation to the *Valentinians* and *Marcionites*, ſo I doubt not but the *Arians* hereſie which after ſprung (to omit others of yet later date) might, without ſhame, be defenſible from ſome *Text of Scripture, there be three that bear witneſs in heaven—and theſe three are one, I and my Father are one*, and the like, which made me the more take notice of his ſuggeſtion, that he hath *ground to believe that ſome learned men in Court were prevented by Arius and ſolicited into a ſecret favour of his errour, from whom 'tis likely proceeded that motion of Conſtantine to the Council for determining the point out of Scripture, and when the Biſhops contradicted not the propoſition of the Emperour in words, and* (he ſaith) *had reaſon for it*, yet he adds, *that was not to that end to which the Emperour propoſed it*, viz. *the ſolution of the queſtion, but to the Conviction of the Arians, and ſatisfaction of the world*, where I might ask why the *Arians* ſhould firſt contrive underhand the *determining* the point by that means, and then be ſo far from *wits*, as to be *convinced* by it? and again how the *world* ſhould be *ſatisfied* with it, if that were not *deemed* by the world at that time the proper way of *determining Controverſies*? which if it might be yielded of any *one* age of the world, there were then alſo a determination and end of *this Controverſie*. *Apol.* p. 79. * *Contr. Her.* l. 3. c. 11. *Ap.* p. 39.

3. So when he makes the compariſon betwixt the * *authority* of the *Church*, as the *living word written in their breaſts* (that is the periphraſis peculiar to his *Oral Tradition*) and the *dead letter of the Scriptures*, and yet plainer, a † *mute ambiguous dead writing, not quickned with reaſon and diſcourſe*, and this, becauſe, as he again explains himſelf more fully, the *ſtyle of the Bible is accommodated to vulgar capacities* (and yet alas it muſt not be permitted to the uſe of the *vulgar*) *and the delivery by way of plain and direct affirmation* (who would then ever have thought, it had been ſo exceſſively *ambiguous*) *without attending to the artificial rules of demonſtration* (which the *authour* ſo much affecting and attending to, muſt be excuſed, if he ſay ſome things, that *vulgar capacities* cannot comprehend to have the leaſt even *probable* truth in them.) And as this is the *ground*, ſo it is the *interpretation* of his grand diſtribution of *Profeſſours* of *Chriſtianity* into *believers of the word taught or delivered Orally, and believers of the word taught or delivered in Paper*, in the beginning of his *Preface to the Dialogues*. As for the *Dialogues* themſelves, it were a long, and joyfull labour to recount, what, beyond the induſtry and ſagacity of all former writers in the world, I ſay not, *Romaniſt Chriſtians*, or * *Tridentine Fathers* (who profeſs to make uſe of *Scripture teſtimonies in confirmandis dogmatibus*, acknowledging *God* for the *authour* of them) but even the moſt profeſs'd *enemies* of *Chriſtianity*, *Jews*, and ſcoffing *Heathens*, (*Mahumetanes* have not attempted any thing of the kind) he hath compiled and heaped together, to diminiſh the conſideration of the books both of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, on this one account of their being *written*, both in the *Originals* and *Tranſlations*: One *ſingle* * *operation* of his (for he hath † *P.* 149. * *Seſſ.* 4. *decr.* 1. * *Dial.* 2. *Sect.* 4.

hath many more that bear proportion with it) is so successfull to him, that having made one easie supposition, *that there have been as many Copies* taken *in some age of an* 100 *years as there are columns in the Bible*, he demands, *May not we well reckon as many faults escaped in every Copy (one with another) as there are words in a Column* (which he supposes to be 336) *which admitted* ('tis then beyond a may be, it commences *certain*) *you will find*, saith he, *the number of errours in all the Copies made since the Apostles times, amount to fifteen or sixteen times as many as there are words in the Bible, and so by this account, it would be fifteen or sixteen to one, of any particular place, that it were not the true Text.* And although this be but the *Nephew's account* in the *Dialogue*; who is feigned to think it *too dangerous to be possible*, yet the demure *Uncle* tells him plainly, *I do not conceive you have taken your proportions too high*, and hath but one exception to this reckoning, *viz.* that *the errours of many Copies may have been the same in divers of them.* Which being his onely obstacle to concluding *that we might look for Scripture in Scripture, and doubt whether we meet with one true syllable of it*, and this most unluckily chosen, and the least for the *Christians* interest of any, (for the more Copies *agree* in an *errour*, the more likelihood there is, that this errour should *prevail*, and supplant the *truth*, such accordances being not easily supposeable to be *casual*, or imputable to the *Scribes*) the *Result* is obvious, and of near concernment to more than † the *City-wives* (whom he jeers for *turning their Bibles*) or the * *people at St. Antholins* (who he thinks *would stone him with their Brazencorner'd Bibles* (by the figure, you must suppose, of a *Leaden Ink-horn*) but could not *answer his argument*) even to all *Christians*, that shall ever think it their serious *interest*, to keep *Paganism* from returning to overrun the world, or *Judaism* to *defie Christianity*; which how would they miss to do, should they use but ordinary *industry*, the *Christian* being thus deprived of the *writings* of *Moses*, his cheif weapons of *defence* and security from the *one*, and of the *writings* of the *Prophets* also, from whence *Christ* and the *Apostles* fetch'd their principal evidences and *offensive* arms against the *other*; both which, with the rest of the *written word*, are by the *judgment of common sense*, if we will heed the *Dialogist*'s reasonings, voted to be so *uncertain*, that they can never be relyed on with any *confidence* (any more than * *a beetle to cut with*) against any adversary, and accordingly the † rule is given expressly, that *Catholicks* never undertake to *convince their Adversaries out of Scripture*, and so not *Jews* or *Mahumetans*, when they are *such*. This minds me of Mr. *White*'s arguings against *Purgatory pains* being *inflicted by God*'s *vindicative justice*, the very same, that will equally hold against *adjudging* men to the *torments* of *hell*, viz. 1. * Because there accrues *no profit either to the Souls themselves, or to any other, single person, or Universe*, 2. Because † *neither the cause of restitution nor caution perswade it*, which alone can have place, saith he, with a *wise God*, 3. Because the *sins* to which the *pains* are apportioned, *seem not to him to be any* * *injury to God*, for *how can they*, saith he, *volens vel nolens? si nolenti fit, non erat omnipotens, cum vellet impedire neque potuit, volenti si factum est, injuria non est*] The very *Logick* and *Dilemma* that the *Ranters* have lately used, to conclude all the *foulest* acts of *men* or *devils*, the will of *God*, and thence to resolve, that there is nothing *culpable* in them. All that I shall think fit to reply, at this time, to all this, is, in these few *lines* to take notice of the full *image* and *character* of *immoderate opposition* (ἀμετρία ἀνθρακῆς) which, so it may impugn *enough* the present *Christian* adversary, foresees not what aids it brings in to the *Jew*, or *Pagan*, or even to the *Devil* himself; But this by the by, I would it might have been spared.

* *Dial.* 2. *Sect.* 14. p. 130.
† *Ibid.* p. 129.
† P. 79.
* P. 101.
* *De Med. an. Stat.* p. 39.
† P. 41.
* P. 43.

4. He that will have a complete *Collection* of such passages for extolling the *Oral*, and depressing all *written Tradition*, must transcribe those *Dialogues* and the whole *Apology* for them, and therefore may more cheaply content himself with *S. W*'s *Epitome* of it in these two expressions, 1. *Positive* † [*the incomparable force of Universal Tradition, our onely tenour*] 2. *compared* to the [*what small merit of assent can be pretended to by words of men dead long agoe, left to be toss'd by our various expositions and criticisms, and liable to a thousand evasions*——

† *Sch. Disp.* p. 17.

5. All that I note them for in this place, is to give the undoubted notion of the *Tradition* he speaks of, not so as that word properly signifies any kind of conveiance to us from the *Apostles*, whether by the *Scriptures* or the *writings* of the *Fathers*, &c. but precisely *Oral Tradition*, that, which, saith Mr. *White*, *the Mothers flatter into their children*, and is * the *most sweet and connatural way that can be imagined to beget a firm and undoubted assent*——and this still if not *exclusively*, yet *comparatively*, so as to carry it clearly from *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, which are all *but dead letters and mute writings*, in *comparison* of this which alone he looks on as *God's living word.*

Apol. p 10.
* P. 11.

6 The subject then being thus explain'd, and removed from all ambiguity, and the competition cleared to lye betwixt *Oral Tradition*, or the *Mothers* teaching their *Children* the *Faith*, on one side, and *Apostolical Tradition* conveyed to us by *Scripture and Fathers*, on the other, the former *S. W*'s *sole* pretension, the latter conjoyned (and taking in also *Oral*) *ours*, It is not amiss in this place, before we come to the definition and fuller discussion of it, to poise the Scales a while, and consider what rational *demonstrative* grounds he can be discerned to have, to depress our way, of *Scripture* and *ancient Records* of the *Apostles depositum*, both which remain to us in writing, and are our *test*, to *discern* what *belief* is due to what is *orally* delivered us; for by this we shall be prepared to discern afterward, what *incomparable force* there is in his *motives*, to advance, and give the deference so much to this *Invention*, which with him hath supplanted that other.

7. *Invention* I call it, from Mr. *White*'s own *Profession*, that it is a † *path not much beaten by their own modern Controvertists*, and by his telling us the beginning of it in a * *slight familiar conference*, and by *S. W*'s † *great comfort*, that he professes to take, that *the best sort of Wits begin to own their Reason in this particular*, though yet he cannot but discern there be *few* of them. And that, me thinks, to one that acknowledges any kind of *Tradition* for his onely ground, should be a competent prejudice against it. But of this we shall hereafter consider more seasonably.

† *Ep. Ded. to the Apol.*
* *Apol.* p. 1.
† *Schis. Disp.* p. 18.

8. Let us then a while 1. *establish*, and 2. *secure* our own way, And therein first, consider the *rational* grounds upon which it proceeds, acknowledged to be such by the *Romanists* themselves, and such as in other matters bear sway with the *Romanists*.

9. And *first* for the *establishing*, It is by all confess'd that the whole *Christian Faith* hath its intire begin-

beginning from the *preaching* of *Christ*, and the teaching of the *Holy Ghost* who should *lead the Apostles into all* necessary *truths*; 2. That the Apostles *orally* communicated all such to all *Churches* of their Plantations; 3. That their *writings*, as far as they are *perspicuous*, and as they set down these *Christian* Doctrines, so far they ought to have force with all *Christians*, the same that their words would have, if they were *orally* conveyed to us, there being no such difference imaginable betwixt words *written*, and *spoken*, and the *reading* of one, and *hearing* the other, as that one should found certainty of *belief*, and the other be uncapable of founding it. 4. That if (on supposition) there be any thing in their *preachings* which they delivered as *necessary*, but committed not to writing, yet in case we have this their *delivering* it competently testified by those that heard their *preachings*, and in case this *testification* of those hearers, be plainly and intelligibly conveyed to us by their own *writings*, or by the consentient writings of those which received it, thus delivered down to them successively from their *preachings* in the several *Churches*, we have then no more reason to doubt of the truth of these *written* testifications, than if they who first wrote, had *orally* delivered to us the same things, which they wrote.

10. This then, thus briefly deduced, is the ground why *Tradition* being yielded to be the onely *Rule* of *Faith*, and that nothing is to be imposed as *de Fide*, and necessary, but what is thus delivered by the *Apostles* of *Christ*, we think not this *Tradition* prejudiced or any way weakened (I need add no more to *S. W.*) by being committed to *writing*.

11. For this, it is not amiss to add the testimonies of antiquity, and I refer him in the first place to *St. Irenæus* in the second *Century*, who having in his Preface to his third book promised the Christian Reader, *a* * *most full resistance against all hereticks*, and establishment in the † *sole true and vivifick faith, which the Church received from the Apostles, and distributed to her Children*, tells him in the beginning of the *first* Chapter, that we know not that the *disposition of our salvation is by any others, but those* * *by whom the Gospel came to us, which they then preached, but after by the will of God delivered to us in the Scriptures, to be the foundation and pillar of our faith. Thus*, saith he, *Matthew among the Hebrews* † *set out the Scripture or writing of the Gospel in their tongue*; *Thus* Mark, *the Disciple and Interpreter of St.* Peter, * *delivered to us in writing what was preached by* Peter; *thus* Luke *a follower of* Paul, † *set down in a book the Gospel which was preached by him*; and afterward *John*——Then in his second Chapter, branding the *hereticks*, he sets this for the first part of their charge, that when they are found fault with from *Scriptures*, they fall to accusing the *Scriptures*, that they are not right, that they are not *authoritative*, because they are *variè dictæ*, and *because truth cannot out of them be found by those that know not Tradition, for that was not delivered by writing, but by live voice.* And as this was one of the *hereticks* foul guilts, to reject, and appeal from *Scripture* to *Oral Tradition*, so in the next words we are taught the true notion of *Tradition*, which next to *Scripture* was set up by the *Church*, as the rule of judging the truth, *viz.* That * *which is from the Apostles, which by the succession of the Elders is kept in the Churches*, (the *descending* and not *revers'd Tradition*) and to this the *Orthodox Christians* made their *appeal.* And then the brief of the hereticks charge is, that they neither *consent* to the *Scriptures* * nor to *tradition*, in which respect the *slipperiness* of the *Serpent* is there said to be their Copy. For the confounding of whom † he first opposes the *tradition* of the *Apostles*, * *manifested through all the world in every Church*, and for † brevity sake, not to *enumerate all*, in *the greatest, and most ancient and known to all, the Church of Rome, founded by two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul*, shewing there the *tradition* which that had from the *Apostles*, and the *faith* declared to men, coming down by *successions* of *Bishops* to his time; and so on, in those expressions of * *honour* to that *Church*, for conserving *Apostolical Tradition* in it, which we willingly acknowledge, was by him most justly bestowed on it; wherein he nameth the immediate *successours* of those *Apostles*, *Linus*, *Anacletus*, and *Clemens*, who saw and confer'd with them, and had their preaching *sounding in their ears*, and *Tradition* † *before their eyes* (which they could not well be supposed to have had, unless it were *written*) under the last of which, *Clemens*, the *Church* of *Rome*, saith he, wrote to them at *Corinth* * a *writing* (the first *Epistle* of *Clemens*) *most sufficient* and powerfull, *reducing them to peace*, and † *repairing their faith, and declaring the Tradition which it had newly received from the Apostles.* Then setting down the heads of *Faith*, * *They*, saith he, *that will, may learn out of the writing it self, and understand the Apostolical Tradition, seeing that Epistle is ancienter than the false teachers*; And from *Clemens deducing* the succession of *Bishops* to *Eleutherius* in the twelfth place, *by this succession*, saith he, *the tradition which is in the Church from the Apostles, and the preaching of the truth is come down even to us.* And this, he concludes, is a most *full demonstration*, that it is *one and the same inlivening faith*, which in the *Church* from the *Apostles* untill his time is *conserved and delivered in truth.* The like he instances again in *Polycarpe Bishop* of *Smyrna* in *Asia*, who received his Doctrine from the *Apostles*, and delivered it to the *Church*, and concludes of him that he hath * written a most *sufficient* or *powerfull Epistle* to the *Philippians* (the phrase, which when 'twas used before, of the *Church* of *Rome* gave occasion of *Fevardentius*'s note, that *from the beginning that Church had authority in moderating the* Greek *Churches*, and then so had *Polycarpe* too) *from which they that are willing, and have a care of their own salvations, may learn the character of his faith, and the preaching of truth.* And though *ch.* 4. he ask, in

* *Plenissimam adversus omnes hæreticos contradictionem.*

† *Sola vera ac vivifica fide quam ab Apostolis Ecclesia percepit, & distribuit filiis suis.*

* *Per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos, quod quidem tunc præconiaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum & columnam fidei nostræ futurum.*

† *Scripturam edidit evangelii*, in Greek, Γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου, *Euseb. l.* 5. *c.* 8.

* Τὰ ὑπὸ Πέτρου κηρυσσόμενα ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παρέδωκε.

† Τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κηρύξαντα.

* *Ad Traditionem quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per successionem Presbyterorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus eos.*

* *Evenit itaque neque Scripturis, neque Traditioni consentire eos.*

† *Ch.* 3.

* *In toto mundo manifestatam in omni Ecclesia.*

† *Quoniam valde longum est in hoc tali volumine omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones, maximæ & antiquissimæ & omnibus cognitæ, à gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro & Paulo Romæ fundatæ & constitutæ Ecclesiæ.*

* *Potentiorem principalitatem*——

† Τῷ παραδοθέντι ὑφ' ἡμῶν λόγῳ

* ἐκκαταστάσιν γεγραφώς.

† Ἀνανεοῦσαν τὴν πίστιν, καὶ τὸν ληφθέντα ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων παράδοσιν κλήρου.

* *Ex ipsa Scriptura qui volunt discere possunt & Apostolicam Ecclesiæ traditionem intelligere, cùm sit vetustior Epistola his qui nunc falsa docent.*

* Ἐγὼ δὲ ἐπιστολὴν Πολυκάρπου πρὸς Φιλιππησίους γεγραμμένην ἐκανωτάτην, ἐξ ἧς ἂν τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς πίστεως αὐτοῦ, καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα τῆς ἀληθείας οἱ ἐνδιάθετοι καὶ φροντίζοντες τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας μανθάνειν.

† *Quid si neque Apostoli Scripturas reliquissent, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi Traditionis?*

* *Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, quorum qui in Christum credunt sine charta & atramento scriptam habentes per spiritum in cordibus suis salutem——*

† *Revertamur ad eam quæ est ex Scripturis ostensionem.*

* *Omnia talia circumscribere volens, & regulam veritatis constituere in Ecclesia——*

† *Abstulit à nobis dissensiones omnes Joannes dicens In mundo erat——*

case † *the Apostles had not left writings, must we not have followed the order of Tradition*, and affirm the *faith* to have been * *preserved in some barbarous Nations without Paper and Ink, in their hearts by the Spirit* (an authority better perhaps, than *S. W.* knew of, for the affirming of *Oral Tradition*, that 'tis *written in mens hearts*) yet *ch.* 5. he † *reverts to the demonstrating of the faith* against the *hereticks out of Scriptures*; and *ch.* 11. resolves that St. *John* having *preached* the *faith wrote* his *Gospel* * on *purpose to constitute a rule of truth in the Church*, that *hereticks* not onely such as were in his own, but such as in that Father's time, (the *Marcionites* by name, &c.) were *refuted* by what he *wrote*, and by his *Gospel* † *dissensions taken out of the Church.*

12. The observations which this large transcript out of that one so *Primitive* a Father (a *Controvertist*, as well as *S. W.*) will yield, I shall leave the Reader to make to himself (for to *S. W.* I know 'tis but a *wordish testimony*) The least that he can, is the most that I shall *conclude* from it, that at that time, *Scripture* and *Tradition Apostolical* (that is not *Oral*) where they were both to be had, were the means of establishing truth, and that it was no prejudice to *Tradition*, that it was *written*, in order to this of *demonstrating against Hereticks.*

13. *Tertullian* in the beginning of the *next* age, the third *Century*, the greatest asserter of *unwritten Traditions*, where no more is to be had, doth evidently set the *written* first, and then, by way of supply, the *unwritten*. He *that will better exercise his curiosity* in the business of his *salvation*, *Let him*, saith he, *survey the Apostolical Churches with whom the very chairs of the Apostles preside in their places*, * *with whom the very authentick Letters of them are recited, sounding the voice and representing the face of every one of them, and instancing in* the *Church* of *Rome*, an *happy Church*, *in which the Apostles poured out their whole Doctrine with their bloud*, he saith of it, that it † *mixes Law and Prophets with Evangelical and Apostolical writings, and from thence drinks the faith*, and *signs* it with *baptism*, &c.

* *Apud quas ipsas authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur sonantes vocem---uniuscujusque,* De Præscr. Adv. Hær. c. 26.

† *Legem & Prophetas cum Evangelicis & Apostolicis literis miscet, & inde potat fidem eam, aquâ signat —Ibid.*

14. The same it is manifest was the rule in St. *Cyprian's* time, in the middle of that third *Century*, *Ep.* 74. to *Pompeius*, where, upon *Pope Stephen's* pressing *Tradition* to him, he replies, * *Whence is the Tradition? doth it descend from the authority of the Lord and the Gospel, doth it come from the commands and Epistles of the Apostles?* for *God*, saith he, *testifies and proposes to* Joshuah *son of* Nun, † *that those things are to be done which are written, saying, the Book of this Law shall not depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate in it day and night, and observe to doe those things that are written in it* (*God* it seems then thought that *written* words might be *intelligible*, and the *rule* of their *lives*) * *If then it be commanded in the Gospel or contained in the Epistles, or Acts of the Apostles, Let this divine and holy Tradition be observed*; But * *if in all* former times *it be no where commanded nor written, what obstinacy*, what presumption *is it to prefer an humane Tradition before God's disposing?* Adding that † *Custome without truth, is but antiquity of errour*; and concluding, that it is the duty of *Priests* that *kept God's Laws*, that * *if in any particular the truth totter, or be ready to fall*, they *revert to the beginning in Christ and the Gospel, and Apostolical Tradition* (not what the *present* age teaches) *and from thence let the reason*, saith he, *of our action arise, whence our ordination and beginning* (of our *Christianity*) *arose.*

* *Unde est ista Traditio? utrumne de dominica & evangelica authoritate descendens, an de Apostolorum mandatis atque Epistolis veniens?*
† *Ea facienda esse quæ scripta sunt.*

* *Si aut in evangelio præcipitur, aut in Apostolorum Epistolis aut Actibus continetur——observetur divina hæc & sancta traditio.*

* *Si retrò nusquam omnino præceptum est, neque conscriptum, quæ est ista obstinatio, humanam traditionem divinæ dispositioni anteponere?*

† *Consuetudo sine veritate vetustas erroris est.*

* *Si in aliquo nutaverit aut vacillaverit veritas, ad originem dominicam & Evangelicam & Apostolicam traditionem revertamur. Inde surgat actus nostri ratio, unde & ordo & origo surrexit.*

15. Here certainly *Tradition*, if truly so called, was conceived to refer to the *Authours* in the *first* place, and to the *remains* of them that were in *writing* (and so to the *wordish testimonies* so fastidiously rejected by *S. W.*) and but *secondarily*, and as it accordeth with those, to *after-custome.*

16. So St. *Basil* in the *fourth Century*, as one while his appeal is from the *disputers subtilties*, to *Christ*, *Apostles*, *Fathers*, *Martyrs*, (sufficiently opposed to the *Revers'd Tradition*) † Συσχετέον σε ἡ παράδοσις, ὁ Κύριος ὕπως ἐδίδαξεν, ἀπόστολοι ἐκήρυξαν, πατέρες διετήρησαν, μάρτυρες ἐξεβεβαίωσαν, ἀρκείσθηι λέγειν ὡς ἐδιδάχθης, καὶ μὴ μοι τὰ σοφὰ ταῦτα, *Let Tradition put thee to the blush, the Lord hath thus taught, the Apostles preach'd, the Fathers observed, the Martyrs confirmed, be thou content to speak as thou hast been taught, and bring not me these captious Sophisms*; So * another while more expressly, by way of *definition*, in his morals, Δεῖ πᾶν ῥῆμα ἢ πρᾶγμα πιστοῦσθαι τῇ μαρτυρίᾳ τῆς Θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, *Every word or thing ought to be confirmed or ratified by the testimony of inspired Scripture.*

† *To.* 1. *Hom.* 27. *cont. Sabel.* p. 608. A.

* Ὅρος ες το. 2. p. 307.

17. And St. *Augustine*, in the beginning of the fifth Century, though he differed in opinion from *Cyprian* about the *baptizing* of those that had *baptism* from *hereticks*, yet he avowedly adheres to his grounds (onely adding that of † *conciliar determinations*, by which he came to *see what Cyprian had not seen*) * *When*, saith he, *he adviseth us to recur to the fountain, Apostolical Tradition, and from thence to bring down the Conduit to our own times, it is best, and without doubt to be practised*; and accordingly fetches his *testimonies* out of *Scripture.* So again *de Unit. Eccles.* c. XIX. *Utrum ipsi teneant Ecclesiam, non nisi de divinarum Scripturarum Canonicis libris ostendant*, requiring the *Donatists* to *shew from the Canonical Books of holy Scriptures*, whether they be in the right or no in their pretensions; as, saith he, when *Christ rose from the dead, and shewed himself to his Disciples, lest they might think there were any deceit in it, magis nos testimoniis Legis & Prophetarum & Psalmorum confirmandos esse judicavit*, he thought fit to confirm them by testimonies of the *Law and Prophets and Psalms, shewing that those things were fulfilled in him, which had been so long before foretold.* An eminent testimonie from *Christ's* own judgment, what was the fittest way of concluding controversies of *Faith.* So † *against the Letters of* Petilian; *Whether* I,

† *Universalis Ecclesia admonitus firmitate vidit aliquid quod ille non vidit, quia plenarium de hac re concilium nondum habebat Ecclesia.* de bapt. Contr. Donat. l. 4. c. 6.

* *Quod autem nos admonet ut ad fontem recurramus*, i. e. *ad Apostolicam traditionem, & inde canalem in nostra tempora dirigamus, optimum est, & sine dubitatione faciendum*, l. V. c. 26.

† L. 4. c. 85.

or

or you be Schismaticks, non ego nec tu, sed Christus interrogetur ut indicet Ecclesiam suam, Let Christ be asked, and neither I nor you, that he may shew or point out *his Church.* And so more expresly in his 166th. *Epistle, In Scripturis discimus Ecclesiam,* the *Scriptures* which *teach* us *Christ*, are the means to *teach* us the *Church* also; and * again, *Lest any should tell thee, that is Christ, which is not Christ, aut Ecclesia est, quæ non est Ecclesia, or that is the Church which is not the Church, audi vocem Pastoris, hear the voice of the Shepherd*, i. e. of *Christ*, in *Scripture*: Elsewhere we have him as punctual for our way of *descendent*, against this new of *ascendent*, Revers'd *Tradition*; *Puritas doctrinæ expendenda est non secundum Traditionem presentis aut hujus, vel illius particularis Ecclesiæ, hujus vel illius interpretis, sed secundum Traditionem ab initio à temporibus Apostolorum concordi Patrum sententia ad nos usque deductam, The purity of Doctrine is to be weighed, not according to the Tradition of the present Church or of this or that particular Church, of this or that Interpreter, but according to Tradition deduced from the beginning from the times of the Apostles even to us by a concordant opinion of the Fathers.* Many the like are to be had in that *Father*.

* *In Psal. 69.*

18. About 20. years after him, *Vincentius Lirinensis* in his *Commonitory* against *heresies*, resolves the way of refuting them to be by * *producing and comparing the concordant opinions of the old Masters*, and in case the *heresies* be of some standing, so as to have *falsified and corrupted those rules of ancient Faith*, (this it seems by him is no impossibility) then the onely way is † *either by the sole authority of Scriptures, or by the ancient Universal Councils.*

* *Prolatis atque collatis veterum magistrorum concordantibus sibimet sententiis.* c. 39.

† *Aut sola Scripturarum authoritate aut jam antiquitus Universalibus Catholicorum Conciliis. Ibid.*

19. And about 20. years after him, *Salvian* speaking of the *Goths* and other *barbarous* Nations, that received the *Faith*, but as it was corrupted by the *Arians*, gives this account of them, that *Though they have the Scriptures, yet for want of literature* * *they know nothing, but what they hear from their Teachers, and what they hear they follow.* And again, *they that* † *being ignorant of all literature do know the sacred mystery of God's Law by teaching rather than reading* (a direct image of *S. W.'s sole principle, Oral Tradition*) *do rather retain what they are taught, than the Law* of God, *and therefore the Tradition of their Masters and inveterate teaching is as it were law to them, who know that which they are taught; they are therefore hereticks, but know it not, hereticks in our, but not in their own account, for they are so confident that they are Catholicks, that they defame us for hereticks.* (Whose practice this is, both in the *root* and *fruit*, *S. W.* will soon recollect if he be so minded.)

* *Nihil omnino sciunt nisi quod à doctoribus suis audiunt, quod audiunt, hoc sequuntur, de Gub. l. V. p. 153. Ed. Oxon.*

† *Necesse est eos qui totius literaturæ ac scientiæ ignari, sacramentum divinæ legis doctrina magis quam lectione cognoscunt, doctrinam potius retinere quam legem. Itaque eis traditio Magistrorum suorum & doctrinæ inveterata quasi lex est, qui hoc sciunt quod docentur, hæretici ergo sunt, sed non scientes; Denique apud nos sunt hæretici apud se non sunt. Nam in tantum se Catholicos esse judicant, ut nos ipsos titulo hæreticæ appellationis infament. Ibid.*

20. I might multiply authorities in each Century, and thereby demonstrate that *S. W.*'s one principle hath not been received in all ages of the *Church*, and so according to his own *demonstration*, is infallibly to be degraded from that dignity which he hath bestowed on it, and *Scripture* and *Tradition* together set up in its stead, the one to *interpret* and supply whatsoever imaginable omissions in the other, and that the latter of these is not to be *prejudged* (any more than the former) on this onely account that it hath been *written*, and so me-thinks the *testimonies* which his *preaching* adversary fetcheth from thence for deciding controversies, should not for ever fall under the reproach of *wordish testimonies*.

21. I shall onely add the *Profession* of the *Greek Church*, which the * *Romanist* that publish'd it, recommends to all, as the means to recall them to the *Catholick Church*, by shewing they can have no sort of *company* out of it, the *Eastern*, as well as the *Western Church* refusing to countenance them; And yet in this so considerable a point, the resolving on the *ground* of all our *faith*, it is evident we are agreed; For thus in their name *Jeremias* the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, † sets it, *the very truth and wisedom of our Lord Jesus Christ, which his divine Disciples and Apostles in their Canonical and whol some writings profess, which all the universal and particular Synods of the holy Fathers have followed, which the Preachers and Doctors of the one holy Church full of Divine knowledge deliver to us, and all with one common concord and will clearly consent in it.* And again they profess in their dealings with the *Germans*, to *take care of this especially, not to say ought from their own private sense, but to fetch all they say from the seven Holy and Universal Synods* (and so do * we as far as they were *universally received*) *from the sense of the Holy Fathers and Interpreters of the Scripture delivered to us from God, whom the Holy and Universal Church of Jesus Christ commends and approves with unanimous consent, for these by the spirit of God speaking in their mouths, and breathing by them, as most lightsome stars illustrated the world with their teaching, signs, and wonders; their teaching and institution can never be put out or moved by any age or length of time, as being founded on the omnipotent word of God, according to that of St.* Paul, *that the Church of Christ is the pillar and ground of truth, against which the very gates of hell, according to Christ's promise, shall not be able to prevail.* To all which it is not amiss to annex the *Romanist publishers* resolution (by way of † annotation on the mention of their acknowledging the *seven Councils*) that if the *Greeks* and *Germans* to whom they write, * *followed even those seven Councils alone, the one would have no need of Schism, the other of heresie, it being abundantly explicated in those seven, what is to be thought and held in every thing and place.* And then sure if the *Oral Tradition* of the *present Roman Church* have more Doctrines of *Faith*, than those *seven Councils abundantly explicated*, or if that of the *Scripture* and *ancientest Fathers* and *Councils* may not be permitted to be our *sufficient Rule*, but be required to be parted with, in exchange for the *Oral*, of the *present Mothers*, and *Catechists*, we shall have some company, even of *Romanists*, to countenance us, how deeply soever we fall under *S. W.*'s displeasure.

* *Socolov. Præfat. A. 4. 5.*

† *Proœm. Censur. P. 3.*

P. 6.

* *See Tract of Heresie, Sect. 9, 10.*

† *Socolov. Annot. p. 8.*

* *Si vel has solas septem Synodos requirerentur, neque illis Schismate, neque illis hæresi quicquam opus esset, cum in illis septem abunde explicatum sit, quid de quaque resentiendum, quid quoquo loco habendum sit.*

22. And as this was the *Doctrinal* judgment, so † *Theodoret* from *Athanasius* tells us the *practice* was in

† *Hist. l. 1. c. 8.*

in the great *Council* of *Nice*, they *defined* * *from Scripture-words piously understood*, and so as they † *had testimony from the Fathers.* Agreeably *Capreolus Bishop* of *Carthage*, which was, saith he, a *Legate* sent to the *Great Council* of *Ephesus*, gives an account of the proceedings of that *Council* against the *Nestorian heresie*, that it was * *radio Apostolicæ lucis extincta, extinguished by a beam of Apostolical light*, and he being solemnly resorted to by the *Bishops* of *Spain* (under the title of the † *Bishop* of the *Catholick Church* of *Carthage*, * *holy, venerable and most blessed Pope*, and his † *holy Apostleship*) * for *instruction* in the *true faith* (in such a manner, as when 'tis used to the *Pope* of *Rome*, passes for a proof of his *supreme Pastourship*) though, saith he, p. 42. the *authority* of the *Catholick Church* (that in the *Council* forementionn'd) be sufficient, yet he will add his own professions that this is the † *onely and true Doctrine which the Evangelical antiquity holds and delivers*; which may serve for farther evidences of the course we assert, of *refuting* and *convincing heresie* by the *tradition* and *doctrine* of the *Evangelical* and *Apostolical antiquity.*

* ἐξ ἁγίων μετ' εὐσεβείας ἐννοουμένων λέξεων.
† ἐκ τῶν πατέρων ἔχοντι μαρτυρίαν.

* *Ep. ad Vital.* p. 42

† *Capreolum Episcopum Ecclesiæ Catholicæ Carthaginis*, p. 35.
* *Domine sancte, venerabilis & beatissime Papa*, p. 40.
† *Sancto Apostolatu vestro*, p. 36.

* *Proveluti genibus exoramus humiles servi tui sanctum Apostolatum vestrum ut informetis parvitatem nostram in his quod rectum habet fides Catholica.* † *Unam verámque doctrinam hanc esse confitemur quam Evangelica tenet ac tradit antiquitas.* p. 43.

23. Add to all these, the *Novell* constitution of *Justinian*, where confirming the four first *General Councils*, he resolves, * their *Doctrines we receive as the Divine Scriptures, and their Canons we observe as Laws*, where the joynt authority of the *Divine Scriptures*, and *Canons* of those *Councils* entred into a *Codex*, are exactly our pretension, and so I suppose St. *Gregorie's* too, when he profes'd to receive those *four Councils as the four Gospels.*

* τὰ δόγματα καθάπερ τὰς θείας γραφὰς δεχόμεθα, καὶ τοὺς κανόνας ὡς νόμους φυλάττομεν. *Justin. Novell.* διατ. 131.

24. To all this, if mens words are intelligible, I must conclude the *learned Romanists* to give their suffrage also. In the first place *S. W's* good friend Mr. *White*, when 'twas usefull to confute † Mr. *Daille*, saith, the *seventh Council confirmed all that was either in Scripture or Tradition, by binding us to those two pillars of truth* (*Scripture and Tradition, the two pillars*; and the *Tradition*, that which was so *ancient*, as to be *confirmed* in the *seventh Council*: who would ever desire more of him?) and in his *Tab. Suffrag.* being to prove the truth of his pretensions against *new Revelations*, he makes use of the very method that we *Preachers* are wont to do, by the *Suffrages* of the *Law and Prophets, and Gospels, and Epistles of the Apostles, Tab.* 1. and then by the *Testimonies of the Fathers, Tab.* 2. Next after him I shall mention *Pope Gregory* XIII. in his *Epistle* to the *King of Spain* before his *Bible*, *His libris* (*Scripturarum*) *omnia nostra Religionis & Divinitatis mysteria explicantur, in the Books of Scripture all the mysteries of Religion and Divinity are explicated*; which how they can be, if they are so wonderfully *ambiguous* and *unintelligible*, I confess not to understand. Next I add *Julius Rogerius Protonotarius Apostol.* (*Possevin*, saith he, was *Legate* in *Poland* from the *Pope*, and *Secretary* to the *Pope*) who resolves, *Traditionem nullam nullius esse ponderis, nisi nullis temporum intercapedinibus interruptam, ab Apostolorum usque temporibus, inde enim necesse esse traditionem manare, That Tradition is of no weight, unless it be uninterrupted from the very Apostles times, for that it is necessary all Tradition should flow from thence.* According to which (saith *Possevin*) writing of the *Canonical Books*, *Horum Traditio ad Apostolica usque tempora revocata*——his method was to *recall their tradition*, and carry it back *even to the Apostles times.* This then is the true nature of *Tradition*, to refer *primarily* to the *Authour* or *Authours*, from whence it flows, and but *secondarily*, to any after practice, or *custome*, or Doctrine, for the confirming it, and so the onely method this of *ours*, to look up to the *authours*, and so bring it down to the present *Church*; To which purpose * *Suarez* distinguisheth betwixt *Tradition* and *Custome.* To this also I refer the resolution of † *Abulensis*, who placeth the *firmness* of *truth* in this, that the *Church cannot err*, meaning, as he saith, *none but the Universal Church, and that without any limitation, or connotation of time or place, and so taking in all time* since there was a *Christian Church*, as well as *place* also. And this, a man would think again, should be Mr. *White's* meaning in his *Tab. Suffrag.* * when calling the *Church* to account *by what title it holds the name of Catholick*, he answers for it, that it is onely *from the Catholickness of the Faith*, and that the *Faith is said to be Catholick, because it hath had the possession of all Christianity per ætates & loca, through ages*, (that must be through *all* ages) as well as *places*, concluding that the *Faith*, if it will be *Catholick, must be of all times and places*; which I should think were very impertinently insisted on by him, if what were now taught in the *Church* of *Rome*, as of *Faith*, by his *Oral Tradition* of the present age, were by that one *medium* secured to have been the Doctrine of *all times*, for then what farther need were there of evidence for the *contignation* and conjuncture to the *Apostles*, which after he with great reason requires of the *new* and *latter Revelations*, which the favourers of *Papal Infallibility* pretend to. After these I appeal even to *Bellarmine* himself in his defence of *unwritten Traditions*, † *We call that*, saith he, *unwritten Doctrine, not which hath never been written, but that which hath not been written by the first Authour.* From whence all that I conclude is, that as by him *Tradition* is set in expres opposition to *Scripture*, and belongs not to those things which are *written* there (which will anon be usefull to us on another occasion) so the *writings* of the *Fathers*, those *words of dead men*, in *S. W's* scornfull dialect, are as properly *tradition*, as any thing else, in his opinion.

† *Dailles arts Discov.* p. 225.

* *De leg.* l. 7. c. 4. Sect. 10.

† *Defensorii* par. 2. c. 32. *Ecclesia quæ non potest errare non est aliqua nisi universalis, & ista vocatur proprie Ecclesia sine aliqua limitatione, quia est multitudo non connotato aliquo loco aut tempore.*
* *Tab.* 3.

† *De verbo Dei non scripto.* l. 4. c. 2. § *Vocatur autem*——*Vocatur doctrina non scripta non ea quæ nusquam scripta est, sed quæ non est scripta à primo authore.*

25. To which sense I add the expres words of * *Suarez*, *writing is not Law, but may serve for a record and probation, as we prove Traditions unwritten out of the Fathers.* The same is evidently of force to holy *Scripture* also, which was not *written* by *Christ* the *first* authour of the *Christian Law*, but being *delivered* by him, by word of mouth, was afterward set down

* *De Leg.* l. 7. c. 2. *Illa Scriptura non est lex, sed potest deservire in memoriam & probationem, sicut nos probamus Traditiones non scriptas ex Patribus.*

down in *writing* by his *hearers* and their *Disciples*, and so is at once most signally the *Oral* Doctrine of *Christ*, and *Law* of his *Church*, and *Tradition Apostolical*, not *written* by the *first authour*, and so *tradition*, though by others it were *written*.

26. For that this is the proper use of the word, to signifie, not that which is *not written*, but *not written* by the *first authour*, may be judged by *Martinus Peresius*, † defining it in the most exact propriety of the *Romanists* understanding of it, *Tradition*, saith he, *more properly and more pertinently to our purpose, is taken for the Doctrine of the first and most ancient in the Common-wealth of the faithfull, received by word of mouth, and derived by continual succession from the Fathers to Sons, and confirmed by ancient custome, and not contained in the authentick Books of that common-wealth; and* * *though it be written in other Instruments or Books worthy of belief, it doth not for that lose the name of Tradition.*

† *De Tradit. par. 1. Tit. Quid sit propriè Traditio.*

* *Licèt in aliis instrumentis vel libris fide dignis scripta fuerit, non ob id traditionis nomen amittit.*

27. And then certainly these *written* memoires intervening, must be allowed, according to their *esteem*, and *undoubtedness* of their sense (of which words *written* are as fully capable, as spoken) to have force to prove, or repudiate any *Traditions* or *Customs* which are vouched by the present age, and not on the other side, those *writings* be controll'd by the present *Doctrines*; As in the *Municipal Laws* of our Land (to which *S. W.* resorts in the matter of *possession*) If a *custome* be sworn by all the *homage* of a *Manor*, (can the *Oral Tradition* of his present *Church*, ascend above this proportion?) that for all their *memory* such hath been an *usage*, and esteemed a *right*, and that their *Fathers* told them, that such it had been in all their *memory* also, yet if any *Court-roll* or other *Record* be extant, which declares that the *custome* was otherwise in *ancient* times, (like the finding of an *ancient Coin*, by which *Baronius* reforms all Historians *ancient* as well as *modern*, in the point of *Maxentius*'s birth, *An.* 306. n. 23.) that *Record* is a sufficient confutation of the *testimony* of the *Homagers*, and makes the *custome* not to be *immemorial*.

P. 38.

28. And this is a received truth among the *Civilians*, who give this account of it, *Scriptura est conservativa memoriæ, writing is conservative of memory*, and *Scriptura semper loquitur, writing always speaks* (and then, by *S. W*'s good leave, 'tis not so *mute* and *dead* a *letter*) as in other things * *Scriptura monumentum contractus, the writing is a monument of the contract*, and † *Baldus* resolves that the *affirmative*, viz. that there *is* a *memory* of it, may well be proved by an *instrument* or *writing*; So * *Cravetta* propounds the very *questions*, how a *prescription* may be proved, or *immemorial custome*, and how the *affirmative* (against a *prescription*) that there is *memory* to the *contrary*, and answers to the latter; † *The affirmative, that there is memory to the contrary, is proved by instruments from which evidence is brought of the contrary observance.* And then what becomes of *S. W*'s and the *Apologists* whole Scheme, if *Testimony* of present witnesses may be controlled by *written* memorials of *credit*, (and that *Scripture* or *Fathers* are not such, they have not yet affirmed to be their opinion, the *deadness*, and *muteness*, and *ambiguity*, and want of *demonstrativeness*, are the principal of their *charges*, and not that of the want of *credit*.)

* *Grot. de jur. Bell. l. 2. c. 16. § 30.*

† *2. Par. princ. tr. Præscript.*

* *4. par. de Antiqu. temporib.*

† *Affirmativa memoriam in contrarium extare, probatur per instrumenta, ex quibus apparet de contraria observantia.*

29. The plainer resolution therefore of * *Driedo* I desire the Reader will compare with *S. W*'s more refined *Scheme*, who recounting the speech of *St. Austine*, of the great *authority* the *Church* had with him for the *believing the Gospel*, saith it was the † *Universal Church* (not of his *present age*, but) *which was from the beginning of the Christian Faith, growing down according to the series of succession of Bishops*, * *which Church* saith he, *comprehends the College of the Apostles, But understanding is prescinded and abstracted, or naked, and without coherence in the faith and manners with the Churches which were in the former ages, Augustine would say*, saith he, *I should not acknowledge the men of this Church to be the Church of Christ*, † *unless the authority of the four Gospels taught me, I should not believe the Church, if it should preach to us in any other Gospel, and not teach us the Doctrines of the Apostles.* I conclude this with the words of *Tertullian adver. Marc.* l. 1. *Omnino res Christiana sancta antiquitate stat, nec ruinosa rectius reparabitur, quam si ad originem censeatur, Christianity depends on sacred antiquity, and the best redress for any corruption, is by resorting to the beginning.*

* *De dogm. variis & lib. Apocr.* l. 4. c. 4.

† *Ecclesia Catholica quæ fuit ab initio Christianæ fidei.*

* *Quæ sanè Ecclesia collegium plectitur Apostolorum.*

† *Nisi doceret me quatuor Evangeliorum authoritas.*

30. It was therefore but necessary, that he that would place all *authority* in the *Oral Tradition* of the *present* age, should demonstrate the *impossibility* of its *non-coherence* to the *Apostles* times, which how happily he hath attempted to doe, we shall see hereafter.

31. Thus much, mean while, for the establishing of our *tenure*, that by *Scripture* and *Apostolical Tradition*, as it comes down to us in the *writings* of the *Fathers*; which there could be no need to have defended so *solicitously* in relation to any other sort of *Controvertists* (unless perhaps the *Schismatical* opposers of our *Church*) but was fit to be thus confronted to *S. W*'s pretension, his *oral* and *unwritten tradition* not of any, but the *present* age of the *Church*, nor as that stands in conjunction with all the former ages, but as by it, the conjunction with those former is, as he conceives, *demonstratively* inferred, for else we have nothing to object to it.

32. I must now proceed to secure it from his exceptions; They are in effect but three. 1. That general fate of *writings*, their being *ambiguous*, *uncertain*, *mute*, *dead*, and that as being the *words of men dead long agoe*, saith *S. W.* 2. The *Scriptures* being *delivered* by way of *direct affirmation, without attending to artificial rules of demonstrating.* 3. Their not being imaginable to be written of the *Controversies, which since have sprung up.*

P. 17.

33. To the *first* I answer by these steps and degrees; 1. That the style of the *sacred* writers hath been generally observed to have great *plainness* and *simplicity*, especially in setting down matters of fact in the *Old Testament*, the history and preachings of *Christ* and his *Apostles* in the *New*, and in that grand part of solid substantial piety, the ingageing us in *good* life; and though in some parts there be no small obscurity, as in the *Prophecies*, and in the *metrical Books*, and also in the *contexture* of some of *St. Paul*'s *Epistles*, yet all force of objection which can be drawn from hence, will be superseded, 1. By that one rule of *St. Chrysostom*'s τὰ ἀναγκαῖα δῆλα, *those things are perspicuous that are necessary*, from whence we may conclude, that as next the *articles* of the *Crede* nothing is so *perspicuous* in the *Scripture*, as the directions to all sorts of *Christian practice*, so when those *necessary* articles are received into believing hearts, the rest of our talent of time and industry should be laid out on a carefull conscientious *practice* of all duty, and then the *Fathers* will assure us, that the ξυναγὶς πίστως ϗ ἔργων, this *chariot* with *two horses* in it, *belief* of the *Crede*, and *practice* of the *Sermon*

on the *Mount*, will bring the humble constant persevering *Christian* most safe to his journeys end, though he never think of calling in at *Purgatory* by the way, and the like, never furnish himself with the *Roman new Articles*, which *S. W.* may be believed, he will hardly meet clear in *Scripture*. 2. By the supply, which is to be had from *ancient Tradition*, which hath in all points of *faith* been experimented to be ready and able to remove all such *ambiguities*, and those in the first *Councils*, the *Conservatories* of all *Catholick* faith, are consigned to us in words, so distinct, and so solicitously removed from all *ambiguity*, that the *heresies* which had crept in for *want* of this light, were generally extinguish'd. 3. By the expres's commands of those *Councils*, that nothing else should be taught as of *faith* (or the *belief* exacted of any *Proselyte*) but what was thus clearly establish'd in those *Councils*. For then is the ἐυπειθεια of the *Gospel* requiring no more of any man, than what *God* by his grace doth, or is ready to assist him and inable *him* to perform, foundeth a *demonstrative* proof, that his *commandments are* not *far from us*, ὑπερογκοι and βαρειαι, *over-heavy*, or *unsupportable*, but a *gracious*, at once, and *light burthen*; so the same temper of the *Covenant* of grace pertaining also to *doctrines*, and thus confirmed by the charity and tenderness of those *Councils*, and, in them, of the *Universal Church of God*, hath given us full assurance, that whatever *obscurities* or *ambiguities* be supposeable in *Scripture*, there is still *light* sufficient in them (to all that will not set up their own judgment in opposition to *ancient Catholick Tradition*, visible in *Fathers* and *Councils*) securely to conduct any pious charitable humble *Christian* to everlasting happiness. And of this a man would think *Mr. White* himself should not make any doubt, when he hath made it his observation of Scripture *style*, that 'tis * *accommodated to vulgar capacities*.

* *Apol.* p. 139.

34. *Secondly*, That in case there should be any considerable *ambiguity* in our *written Traditions*, whether of *Sacred Scriptures*, or *ancient Fathers*, yet unless the *writings* where they are set down, were on purpose framed in the most material parts, to be thus *ambiguous*, as the old *Oracles*, or to be thus *obscure*, as what was said to be *so written as that it was not written*, or unless they were written by half witted-men, that either comprehended not their own notions, or were unable to express them (none of which I hope *S. W.* will think fit to charge on them) there are still known rules by which *ambiguous* passages are interpretable; The Heathen *Rhetoricians* have furnished us with some, in their handling the place ἐξ ἀμφιβολίας of *ambiguity* and περὶ ῥητῆς καὶ διανοίας *of the letter and the sense*, and the *Lawyers* have directed us to others on their head of *Antinomies*, from the *matter*, from the *effect*, *from the adjuncts*, &c. and the *sacred Criticks* have given us many more, by the help of which, those that understand the *languages*, wherein the *Scriptures* are written, and bring not prejudices with them, to impose their own, instead of receiving the Writers judgment of their *propositions*, will not in the *hypothesis* find it so impossible to understand *Scripture*, as *S. W.* phansies it in his *demonstration*. Many things are dreaded at a distance, and deemed impossible, which by *God's* blessing on honest endeavours, with moderate skill, and industry, and humility, are soon discerned to be most easie and familiar; What therefore is concluded from such *general* suggestions of the ambiguities of all writings, of the several possible sorts of such, *Critical*, *Philological*, *Historical*, *Sophistical*, of their being left to be *toss'd with our various Expositions and Criticisms*, *and liable to a thousand evasions*, and the like, have perhaps somewhat of art in them, to amuse, and affright those *vulgar capacities* (to which yet at another time they are confess'd to be *accommodated*) but are of no solid force, when they are brought down to any particulars, there being obvious helps, either by surveighing of the *context*, or comparing of *Scripture style* and *dialect*, or conferring plainer places with the more *difficult*, which if thankfully made use of, will decide such difficulties, as are of any real importance to be decided; And I cannot but observe, that when *Mr. White* was willing to *discover Mr. Daille's arts*, this was then noted for a principal one, that *he would*, *if we could believe him*, *perswade us*, *Nothing is to be learned or understood out of Books*, *but every three words will never fail to have some reason or other to make them so obscure*, *that no light or satisfaction can be derived out of them*, Page 216.

35. But then 3. if *words* committed to *writing* are so *ambiguous*, *so subject to be toss'd and misinterpreted*, yet having on the other side, the advantage of being *written* by none, but either *inspired*, or *renowned* persons, and that with great care and forecast, and deliberation, what shall then be said of *S. W's* favourite, *Oral Tradition*, the illiterate, and perhaps (and not rarely) *simple* mother, teaching her oft times *dull* and aukward children, who generally mark not what is taught them, or but con them by roat, (which he calls being *written in their hearts*) but pretend not to understand ought of them?

36. For I demand 1. Are the *Mothers* and *Catechists* so much better managers of their *depositum*, or more skilfull conveyers of it, than *Scriptures*, and *Fathers?* Are they conceivable to convey the Doctrines of the *Church* to their children in such a manner, as, according to *Mr. White's* rules, shall exact *belief* of them? I shall instance in one particular, formerly touched on. * *A Tradition*, saith he, *begun by some Apostles*, *not all*, *'tis no sacrilege to leave off*, and by † *Christ's Doctrine* he means no other but *what was generally preached by the Apostles*; I demand then, how can all his *Mothers* or *Catechists* be imagined to assure their children, that what they teach them, *beyond* the *Apostles Crede*, (be it any of their *additionals*) was *preach'd* by more than *some*, even by *all* the *Apostles?* Is it certain that every *Mother* now delivers it in this *Universal* style? or that her *Mother* gave her commission thus to deliver it? What if in reference to St. *Peter's* Chair in *Rome*, she shall be found to have delivered the *Pope's supremacy* onely as a preaching of St. *Peter's?* In this the *Catechumenus*, that hath all his Faith from this *connatural way*, the *Mothers Oral Tradition*, can be no farther obliged than the *Mother delivered* it, and so may either disbelieve this *article*, and *leave off* this obedience *without sacrilege*, or else (which *S. W.* must in no-wise imagine) two passages in that *Apologist* are not *beyond all possible confute*. Many such like imperfect manageries the *Mothers* may be subject to, according to these new *Controvertist's rules*, to which in our method the *Scriptures* and *Fathers* will not be lyable, for they will assure us of *all* our *Articles*, that they were *preach'd by all the Apostles*, and resolved on joyntly by *all*, before they set out to *preaching*. 2. Is the *child's* memory, though then most

* *Apol.* p. 16.
† *Ibid.* p. 7.

moſt *receptive*, yet being taken alone without ſtaydneſs of temper, and maturity of other *faculties* (a volatile *brain*, and a *giddy* heart) a ſurer Conſervatory, than the ſame *memory* in him, when he is come to more *maturity*, and ſtayedneſs, and adviſedneſs, and maſtery of paſſions, and hath the addition of *judgment* to *memory*, and the ſupply of a *form of words* in a *written Creed*, and *written Goſpels*, &c. and ſo alſo the Expoſitions of *Fathers* and *Councils*, all ready to aid and inſtruct him farther? Or 3. are *words ſpoken*, ſuch *charms*, that they ſhall certainly caſt out the *oracular* dark *Spirit*, and cannot be miſinterpreted?

37. To this laſt *querie* * Mr. *White* hath offered ſome ſatisfaction, by telling us, that *a Tradition, as he hath explained it, is a ſenſe delivered not in ſet words, but ſetled in the auditors hearts by hundreds of different expreſſions explicating the ſame meaning*] But I am very far from being ſatisfied with this, 1. Becauſe the propoſitions of *Faith* in *Scripture* and *Fathers* have certainly had this advantage of *hundreds of different expreſſions explicating the ſame meaning*, and ſo are not exceeded herein by *Oral Tradition*, whatever can in this kind be imagined of it. 2. That it no way appears *de facto*, as in *Scriptures* and *Fathers* it doth, that *Mothers* do thus *ſettle ſenſes by hundreds of different expreſſions*, or indeed any more than teach the words of *Bellarmine's Catechiſm* (and then where are the *hundred different expreſſions?*) or if they do, the *Mothers* are now become *Expounders*, and their expoſitions will be lyable to all the infirmities, that our *Lay-mens* (which are one degree above *Lay-womens*) *Expoſitions* and *Sermons*; Nay 3. if all this were granted him, yet upon *his* grounds, this will but *encreaſe* the difficulty on his ſide, for why may not every of thoſe *hundred different expreſſions* be capable of as great variety of *interpretations*, as the very ſame *expreſſions*, or any other, written in a book? and then ſtill the *more* the *expreſſions* are, the *more* and not the leſs the *uncertainty* will be. 'Tis certain the *Mothers* muſt communicate their *ſenſes* by *words*, (for they are *Mothers*, not *Angels*) and then thoſe words muſt have the *common fate* of all *words*, and ſo be ſubject to all the *ambiguities* that *S. W.* objects to *written Teſtimonies*. * *Apol.* p. 81.

38. He tells us in another place, that his way is, for *Mothers to flatter into their children the firſt elements of the acquiſition of beatitude, and continually goe on, nurſing them up in the maxims of piety.* But firſt, this can belong to none but *pious* and carefully conſcientious *Mothers*, and all the world of *Romaniſt* Mothers, I fear, are not ſuch. 2. Of thoſe that be, why is it not poſſible (and then the contrary is not *demonſtrable*, or to be as a *principle* ſuppoſed, without attempt of proof) that they may ſpend that time of leiſure, which they have for ſuch offices of charity to each of their children, in impreſſing the knowledge of *God* and *Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*, the *holy Catholick Church*, *the judgment to come*, &c. in infuſing forms of *prayer*, *knowledge* of the *Sacraments*, and the general branches of duty toward *God* and *man*, and *themſelves*, and the more obvious particular duties of daily occurrence, without ever telling them of the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, as that is much more than a *Patriarchate*, and as it is extended to all other Nations, to *England*, and *India*, when the child perhaps is brought up in *Italy*, and is as certainly part of his *Dioceſe*, if he be but a *Primate*, or *Patriarch*, as he would be, if he were *Governour* of the *Univerſe*, and therefore need not be told any more, than that he is to pay obedience to him, as his lawfull *Eccleſiaſtical Governour*, without bringing him out the two *Goſpels*, as *Xaverius* to the *Indies*, the one of *Chriſt*, the other of St. *Peter*, and again without telling them of *Purgatory*, *Tranſubſtantiation*, &c. or being able to give them a diſtinct diſcriminative notion of theſe *articles*, as the one ſignifies *temporary* pains commencing at the time of death, and laſting many *thouſand* years, and is capable of being abbreviated by *indulgences*, and *prayers*, and *almes* of the *living*, and as the other is miraculouſly more, than the *real communication of the body and blood of Chriſt*. *Laſtly*, thoſe that ſhall be ſuppoſed to doe more nearly what *S. W.* would have them, infuſe into their children a whole *Romiſh Catechiſm*, and that they may be ſure to leave out no *article*, pitch upon *Bellarmine's ample declaration of the Chriſtian Doctrine*, is it not certain that they ſhall teach them to believe the *immaculate conception of our Lady* (an article which Mr. *White* will not receive into his *Faith*) as firmly as the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*? And if thus it be in theſe, or other inſtances, then what becomes of the *ſweet connatural way*, ſo much preferable to all others, as not onely to be the *principle*, but the *ſole principle* of our *Faith*? Or becauſe thus it *may* be, though it were not, or *may* have been in any conſiderable part of any *one* age (if but through inrodes of *barbarous* invaders, inteſtine wars, urgency of *worldly* diverſions, &c.) what *demonſtration* is that like to be, which is ſubject to ſo many *uncertainties*, every day experimented to have more than poſſible truth in them?

39. The *muteneſs*, and *deadneſs* of *written* words, what it means, ſo as to found any appearance of objection, will not eaſily be reſolved on; *Words written*, when they are read with the *voice*, are as *lively* and *vocal*, as if they were never *written* (and therefore * *Dr. Holden*, that reſolves that *believing generally comes by hearing*, and is ſo by *all acknowledged*, doth yet put together *what is told us*, and *what is written* to us, adding his reaſon, *for reading is a kind of hearing*) and ſo when without *voice* they *ſpeak*, or are *delivered* to the *eyes*, they have as ready an *avenue*, and *admiſſion* to the *mind*, as when they enter by the *ear*, and to a blind man that cannot make uſe of his *eyes*, 'tis all one, whether his *Mother* or *Catechiſt* have read him his Lecture out of a *book* (the tranſcript of the *writers* mind) or pronounced it out of their *memory*, or immediately powred it out of their *habit* of underſtanding. The onely poſſible difference is, that what is *written* in a book, the Authour being *dead*, it cannot be farther, than it is already, explained by *that* Authour. This then I ſuppoſe is the ground of the *objection*, becauſe *S. W.* ſpecifies in *men dead long agoe*. But I conceive not the *demonſtrative* force of the argument, as it is thus improved; For 1. the *authour*, *dead* 1600. years ſince, hath ſo ordered it, that though he be *dead*, he *yet ſpeaketh*; 2. That Authour having then approved his authority, and that being now abundantly teſtified to us, he is as *authentick* a *witneſs*, as far as he hath declared himſelf, as if he were now *living*, and known to be inſpired by *God*, much more ſo, than the *Mother*, or the *Catechiſt*. 3. If he have written intelligibly then, in each particular place, or if what is in one place obſcure, he have elſewhere interpreted, or if our *Fathers* of the *Church* diſcerning this want, have ſupplyed it from him, ſtill he ſpeaks *audibly* to the *intellect*, though he be *dead*, and ſo *muſt*. 4. If all this envy falls upon * *Anal. ch.* 1. *Leſſ.* 3.

him

him, becauſe he is not able to hear our preſent *debates*, and, upon our reſort and appeal to him, interpoſe his judgment, and ſo *ſpeak* to them, then that will be coincident with the third objection, of the *Scriptures* not ſpeaking to *later Controverſies*, and thither I refer it, and ſo there remains no leaſt ſhew of difficulty in this *firſt* objection.

40. Paſs we then to the ſecond, the Scriptures being *delivered by way of direct affirmation, without attending to artificial rules of demonſtrating*] This I confeſs hath in it ſome of that *amazingneſs*, which *S. W.* promiſed me, whenſoever I ſhould approach this *Apology* for the *Dialogues*, whether I reſpect the coherence it hath with the other argument, or the particular matter of it; If the former, 'twould even *amaze* one to think, how that which is confeſs'd to be *delivered by way of direct affirmation*, and as he there adds *accommodated to vulgar capacities*, ſhould yet be 1. ſo prodigiouſly *ambiguous*, *left to be toſs'd by our various Expoſitions and Criticiſms* (All that I need reply, is, that ſure it would have been much more ſo, if it had not been *delivered* in this *Categorical* way of *direct affirmation*) and 2. ſo *dead* and ſo *mute*, nothing being more contrary to our ordinary notions of thoſe words, than *direct affirmations*. But the more truly *amazing* part of our preſent proſpect is, that when all *Chriſtian Religion* is at once *demonſtrated*, by being convincingly proved to be taught us by *Chriſt*, and when all that is *delivered* in the *Scripture*, is, by *immediate connection* of *terms* from that one *proſyllogiſm*, demonſtrated to have *divine* and ſo *infallible* truth in it, the very ſame that there is, in nature, of this propoſition, that *God cannot lye*, he ſhould yet complain of the want of *artificial rules* of *demonſtration*. If this *demonſtration* be not cogent or *artificial* enough with him, that the *Scripture* being the *word* of *God*, every period thereof muſt have exact *truth* in it, I am then *amazed* to think what a *Patron* of the *Catholick Religion* this is; but if what is thus once for all *demonſtrated* in the *groſs*, or bulk, muſt again in the *retail* be farther *demonſtrated* of each truth in *Divinity*, if every thing that *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles* ſay, be by him required to be confirmed from other arguments of *natural* reaſon, and the like, then he is a *Didymus* indeed. *He* would not believe *Chriſt*'s *reſurrection*, without it being demonſtrated to, and inforced upon his ſenſes; and this other, requires *demonſtration* for that which is onely to be received by his *faith*, and this is not far removed from the former, and is an equally *amazing* conſideration.

41. But then 2. how it doth appear that the *Mothers* in their *Oral* deliveries, have either been more skilfull, or more diligent in obſerving theſe *artificial rules* of demonſtrating? their *ſofter* method of *flattering into their children*, as he ſtyles it, I ſhould think were diſtant enough from this other which he is wont to call *ſevere* and *rigorous*; I hope I ſhall not be required to inſiſt longer on this objection.

42. Laſtly then for the 3d. the *Scriptures not being imaginable to be written on the Controverſies which ſince have ſprung up*, 1. It hath evidently no truth in it; For the *hereſie* of the *Gnoſticks* being riſen in the *Apoſtles* times, and a great part of moſt of the *Epiſtles* written on purpoſe for the refuting of that hereſie, and many other hereſies, *Valentinians*, and *Marcionites*, &c. after that, ſpringing from that *root of bitterneſs*, as 'tis certain they did, thoſe books muſt be very proper to thoſe *Controverſies*; And ſo for others after them; That one place of St. *Paul*, Rom. IX. 5. doth, * ſaith *Proclus*, *Archbiſhop* of *Conſtantinople*, *ſhut and wall up all paſſage for calumny from them that love contumely or ſpeaking ill of Chriſt*; ſo ſaith *Theophylact*, † *From hence is Arius confuted, St* Paul *proclaiming Chriſt to be God over all.* And not to inſiſt on the *ancient* hereſies, nor on *modern*, as well as *ancient*, which have their poſitive irrefragable deciſions in *Scripture*, I ſhall confine my ſelf wholly to the *Controverſies* betwixt the *Romaniſt* and us; And if it were not, as I ſuppoſe it is, evident from *Scripture*, that ſome of our *Articles*, oppoſed to theirs, are the *Doctrines* of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, as the *uſe* of the *cup* for *all* in the *Sacrament*, the not *confining publick prayers* to an *unknown* tongue, the *honourableneſs of marriage for all* that are not within the *prohibited* degrees, &c. yet the difference on our part from them, being onely this, that we admit not many of their *new articles*, not that they reject any of our *old*, though ſome of theſe particulars ſhould not be decideable from *Scripture*, yet the duty of *Communion*, and charity toward all thoſe, which are lively members of *Chriſt*, being irrefragably concluded from plain Texts of *Scripture*, and the *Univerſal Councils* decreeing that there ſhall be no more exacted of any to believe but the *few neceſſaries*, which as they are all contained in *Scripture*, ſo they are not doubted to be maintained by us, the reſult is, that *Scripture* and the *firſt Councils* together, do bind the *Romaniſt* not to ſet up their *wall* of *ſeparation* againſt us, but to imbrace charitably all, who believe what they doubt not us to *believe*, and ſo will decide all our *Controverſies* at once, and having done ſo, need not deſcend more minutely to the deciſion of each ſeveral.

* Παρεισδυσιν συκοφαντιας ἀπολειχειν τοις φιλοδοξοις, *Procl. de Fide.*

† Καὶ ἐντεῦθεν δὲ καταισχυνεται Ἄρειος ἀπὸ τῆς Παύλου τὴν Χριστὸν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸν ἀνακηρύττοντος.

43. *Secondly*, a prime controverſie between us and the *Romaniſts* being that about the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* of the *Pope*, and that being by them deduced from *Chriſt*'s *donation* to S. *Peter*, and *S. W.* himſelf deducing it from thence, I ſhall demand, Doth the proof of that depend upon any words of *Chriſt*, which are not *delivered* in the *Goſpel*? If it doth, what are they, and by what *Tradition* are they avouched? But 'tis certain no ſuch *unwritten* words in this point are pretended, but expreſly the *written*, *Thou art Peter, and I will give thee the Keys*, and *Feed my Sheep*, and all theſe are *verbatim* in the *Goſpels*. And then I demand, 2. Do theſe truly own the *Romaniſts* pretenſions, and decide the *controverſie* on their ſide, or do they not? If they do, then are the *Goſpels* written of our *preſent Controverſies*; if they do not, why are they then ſo eagerly preſs'd on men, and all we denyed the peace of their *Church*, for denying this importance of them. If, as he ſaith of the *Scripture* in general, ſo he believe of *theſe Texts* of *Scripture*, that they are *ambiguous*, *uncertain*, *mute* and dead, and they have no other poſſible head, to which to devolve this *Doctrine*, and cannot maintain the *jus divinum* of it, but by thus devolving it, and if for the clearing of this *ambiguity*, the *writings* of the *ancient Church* be by them deemed *ſufficient*, then why may not we uſe the very ſame method, and at once avow in all things to ſtand to the *award* of it, and be no more blameable than they, who how unjuſtly ſoever they manage it, and how imperfectly ſoever they conclude from it, are yet obliged not to *blame* in others, what themſelves *practiſe*.

44. The

44. The like may again be inferred from their founding in, and proving from the words of *Scripture* [*the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it*, and *the pillar and ground of truth*] their other great Article, the *Infallibality* of their *Church*, on which reverts again all which hath been said on the former head, and then how can he in earnest think, that the *Scripture* was not written of our *Controversies*?

45. But then our pretension taking in the *ancient Fathers* to *Scriptures*, unless it be also appliable to them, that they speak not to our *Controversies*, this, if it had what it aimed at, in respect of *Scripture*, must presently loose all its *efficacy*, or concludency against us. For 'tis certain the *learned Romanist* lays or pretends to lay great weight on the *authority* of the *Fathers*, for *deciding* all the *Controversies* depending between us, so that * *Campian* could vaunt concerning this head, *Admiseris? captus es; Excluseris? nullus es*, that we should be *insnared* and *caught*, if we were content to be *judged* by that rule of their *authority*, but if we would *not stand* to it, we were utterly *lost*. And then we that do not exclude them, but set them up avowedly against *Oral Tradition*, and from the *variable*, imperfect judicatures of the one, appeal to the more authentick, stable *Tribunal* of the other, what can we, on their grounds, be deemed to want, for the deciding of our Controversies? Thus perfectly void of all *probability* are his *demonstrative* arguments. And this may be sufficient to be added on the *second* head, the clearing the subject of the question from *ambiguity*, and fitting it for defining. * *Ration.* 51

SECT. III.

Oral Tradition defined, and the force of it proposed by Mr. White *and* S. W. *Some things granted in this Scheme. One weak part pointed at, which betrays the whole demonstration. Other parts of no concernment to it. The great Conclusion denyed, and unproved. Traditions of the present age frequently false. The* Jews, *the* Arians, *the Heathens, the* Mahometans, *the Christian Mothers among them.*

1. IT is now time to advance to the third part of our designed method, to gather the briefest *definition* or *description* of this way, arising from the force of *Oral Tradition*. This in the *Apology* is set down, by *establishing these definitions*, that by *Tradition he means the delivery of Christ's Doctrine from hand to hand, in that part of the world which with propriety is called Christian.* By *Christ's Doctrine* he means *that which was generally preached by the Apostles, and contains all such points as are necessary to the salvation of the world, and not onely in particular to single persons, but for Government of the Church, and bringing multitudes with convenience to perfection in this life, and felicity in the next.* Then, by proceeding to this *General position*, that *All Christ taught, or the holy Ghost suggested to the Apostles of this nature, is, by a direct uninterrupted line, intirely and fully descended to the present Church, which communicates with, and acknowledges subjection to the Roman.* Adding also the *converse* of that *proposition*, viz. *Nothing is so descended but such truths, nor any thing held by this tenure, but what is so descended, which being cast up, amounts to this great conclusion, No errour was ever, or can be embraced by the Church in quality of a matter of Faith.* This again *S. W.* farther abbreviates into this one definition, *Oral Tradition (supposing the motives with which it was founded, and the charge with which it was recommended by the Apostles) carries in its own force, as applyed to the nature of mankind, an infallible certainty of its lineal and never to be interrupted perpetuity.* P. 7.

2. In this Scheme, several things there are to which I shall in the obvious sense so far yield, as not to make any impertinent debate about them; As 1. that *Tradition* is the *delivery of Christ's Doctrine from hand to hand in that part of the world, which with propriety is called Christian*, meaning by that phrase, all that have been *baptized* into the *Christian Faith*, and have not by some destructive, wasting *superaddition*, forfeited their title to that *dignity*; for that the *Greek Church*, that do not own to have ever received the *Faith* of the *Pope's Universal Pastourship* from the *Apostles*, St *Paul* and St. *John*, which planted some of them, (and have this real *prejudice* against it, that St. *John*, which long out-lived St. *Peter*, and by his *Apostolical* power was exempted from being *inferiour* to any other, whether *Cletus* or *Clemens*, his *Successours* at *Rome*, cannot reasonably be thought to have subjected *his Successours* to them, but should rather himself, being the *surviving Apostle*, be his *Successour* in that *supereminent* power, if any such had been given to *Peter* by *Christ*) should for the not believing or yielding that, be acknowledged no *Christians*, or not *Christians with propriety*, but *equivocally* and improperly called *Christians*, can never appear probable, but by a convincing confirmation of the *real* delivery of that Doctrine to *all*, from all the *Apostles*, which if it were here meant to be pretended, is certainly as yet but *pretended*, to be *delivered* from thence. The like must be said of *Christians* of other denominations, which are neither *Greek* nor *Roman*, yet have by *uninterrupted Tradition* received the *necessary Faith* in every branch of it, and retain it without the *Roman* additions, and though not the *Papal*, yet the *Apostolical Government* also.

3. So secondly, for the notion of *Christ's Doctrine*, we scruple not to understand it of that, which was *generally preached by the Apostles, and contains all such points as are necessary to the salvation of the world*, and *Government of the Church, and bringing multitudes with convenience to perfection in this life, and felicity in the next*] meaning by [*necessary to salvation*] *generally necessary*, as an effective means to bring home sinners to *repentance*, to perswade them to a sincere reception of the Precepts of *Christ*, as of the one certain way to *eternal* salvation, without examining whether any particular man without the *explicite* knowledge of every single branch of that *Faith*, be capable of performing the condition of the *Gospel*, and so of salvation on the *Gospel* terms, *God's accepting according to what a man hath, and not exacting what he hath not*, and again by [*perfection in this life*] understanding *sincerity* of *Evangelical obedience*, styled often *perfection* in the *Scripture*, though in many respects it must be acknowledged *imperfect*.

4. So thirdly, that *all that Christ taught, or the holy Ghost suggested, of this nature, is by a direct uninterrupted line intirely and fully descended to the present Church, which communicates with, and acknowledges subjection to the Roman*] Adding, that it doth so also and equally to the *Church* of *England* in every particular, and so it is acknowledged by the *Romanists* to be intirely maintained by

us, ſave onely that we acknowledge not one link of their *pretended Government*, that of the *Roman ſupreme Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, which yet in theſe definitions hath not in the leaſt-wiſe been proved to be any (much leſs *neceſſary*) truth of *Chriſt's teaching*.

5. Thus far then there is no more asked, than granted by us, ſave onely that of the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtorſhip*, and that no way inferrible from theſe premiſſes, and conſequently nothing gained from us by theſe ſo many ſteps of his *fair method*.

6. But then when he adds the *converſe* of the laſt *propoſition*, that *nothing is ſo deſcended but ſuch truths, nor any thing held by this tenure but what is ſo deſcended*, there may be ambiguity in theſe propoſitions; For the firſt may be deſigned to ſignifie that no *article* is to this age of the *Roman Church* delivered down from the ages immediately precedent, upon the account of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, but what is both true and *neceſſary* to be believed; If this be the meaning of it, then he knows 'tis denyed by us, and muſt either be convincingly proved by him, or elſe there is a very *weak*, *ſoft*, unfortified part, which will be ſure to *betray* all his *demonſtration*, and being not here attempted to be proved in the propoſal of the caſe, if it be not provided for in the laſt part of the method, the *proving* of his *definition* (which when we advance to that, we ſhall then examine, whether it be, or no) then that abundantly invalidates his whole *Scheme*.

7. But the propoſition is capable of another ſenſe, that *nothing is deſcended to the Church by ſuch uninterrupted Tradition from the Apoſtles*, but ſuch *truths* as they, from the *holy Ghoſt*, thought *neceſſary*; which though it have no truth in it, becauſe many things may have been conſtantly received, and never doubted of by any *Church*, which yet have no ſuch *neceſſity*, as that *Chriſt* lived to the age of thirty three years, and the like, yet becauſe this ſeems not to me to have any influence on our *preſent controverſie*, I ſhall not need to put in any exception to the *propoſition*, upon this ground of ſecurity, becauſe the *articles*, which the *Romaniſt* holds neceſſary, and we do not, we hold not to have this continual *ſucceſſion*.

8. So the latter part of the *converſe*, that *nothing is held by this tenure but what is ſo deſcended*] if the meaning be, that nothing is by the *Romaniſt maintained* to have *deſcended* from the *Apoſtles*, as *neceſſary* to be preached, and believed, but what hath thus *really deſcended* (as the obvious meaning is) then 'tis the main thing, which, he knows, is, in this queſtion, denyed by us, and that with great inſtance, ſpecifying many particulars, which no way appear to us to have deſcended from them, nor to have been by the *Church* look'd upon as *neceſſary* to be believed, but viſibly excluded out of the number of thoſe articles, which alone are affirmed by the *univerſal Church* in the *firſt* great *Councils* to be thus neceſſary.

9. *Laſtly* to his great *Concluſion*, if that ſhould mean no more than that *No errour or falſe Doctrine was ever or can be received by the* Univerſal *Church* truely ſo called, *in quality of a matter of Faith*, then though I have no aſſurance that it cannot, becauſe the receiving an *errour* by way of *ſuperaddition*, and defining it *de fide*, is not ſure to *deſtroy*, or infer the *defectibility* of a *Church*, as long as they retain all the true *fundamental Doctrine*; yet again I am no way concerned to debate that, in relation to our *preſent* queſtion, becauſe the receiving ſuch *errours* into the *faith* of the *Roman*, is not receiving them into the *faith* of the *Univerſal Church*. But if the meaning be, that no errour was ever, nor can be embraced by the *Roman Church*, in quality of a matter of *faith*; then he knows, 'tis far from being acknowledged by us. And this being probably the importance of his *great concluſion*, the falſeneſs of it depends, and is conſequent to the *falſeneſs* of that foregoing *propoſition*, interpreted, as I thought, and think it neceſſary that the ſenſe carry it, *viz.* that no article is to this age of the *Roman Church* delivered upon the ſcore of *Apoſtolical Tradition*, but what is both *true* and *neceſſary* to be *believed*; and ſo alſo to the *falſeneſs* of that other, that nothing is by the *Romaniſt* maintained to have deſcended from the *Apoſtles*, as *neceſſary*, but what hath thus really *deſcended*. And ſo the utmoſt that this rarely *fair method* of the *Apologiſt* hath yet produced, is no more than a few true propoſitions equally granted by us, and of no leaſt concernment to him againſt us, and one *grand falſity*, twice crept in to his *definition* (diſcernible enough to be ſuch, as ſoon as *ambiguous* expreſſions are interpreted), and the *concluſion* naturally following the *weakeſt* part, moſt falſe in our opinion, and moſt evident to be by *S. W.* aſſerted without any *ground* as yet diſcovered by him; From all which the concluſion is irrefragably inferred, that unleſs hereafter he demonſtratively prove that *propoſition*, which he calls the *great concluſion*, he is the greateſt *begger* of the *principle*, and ſo *trifler* in the world. The trial of that muſt be reſerved to the *fourth*, and *laſt* part of our method.

10. So in *S. W.*'s abbreviature, the matter of the definition [*that Oral Tradition, ſuppoſing the motives and the charge with which it was founded and recommended by the Apoſtles, carries in its own force, as applyed to the nature of mankind, an infallible certainty of its lineal and never to be interrupted perpetuity.*] is either moſt extremely *fallacious*, and *captious*, or elſe what is worſe than ſo, moſt manifeſtly *falſe*.

11. If he will have all men ſuppoſe with him, that all the *Romaniſts* preſent Doctrine, i. e. *Oral Tradition*, was *taught* and ſo *founded* and *recommended by the Apoſtles*, and that with weighty *motives* to be *believed*, and *ſtrict precept* to be kept as a *depoſitum*, and *commended* as a treaſure to all poſterity, this is then the courſeſt draught, or image of (his conſtant familiar) that moſt vulgar fallacy, the *begging* the *Queſtion*, his ſuppoſing us to *grant*, what he knows we muſt deny, and ſo is moſt intolerably *ſophiſtical*.

12. But if abſtracted from any ſuch *ſuppoſition* or *poſtulatum*, he intend to aſſert, that whatſoever is *orally affirmed* in that manner, or to that degree, as the *Pope's Supreme Paſtorſhip* is now affirmed, and delivered from *Father* to Son in the *Roman Church*, is not onely *true*, but alſo by this means undeniably *aſcertain'd* to be derived from the *Apoſtles*, then as this propoſition is moſt *infirm*, without any appearance of *ſolidity* in it, ſo muſt the *concluſion* neceſſarily be, that is inferred from it, unleſs again he can produce ſome *evidence*, by which what is in it ſelf, and in *theſi*, thus *improbable*, and in other inſtances frequently experimented to be falſe, ſhall in this *one* inſtance be aſcertain'd to have truth in it; It being no more ridiculous, what the *Frier* in *Canus* profeſs'd, to believe all that is in any *printed Book*, than to *believe* all which is by a multitude (how great ſoever) of one *age orally delivered* as from their *Fathers* and *Progenitours*.

13. This

13. This may be judged 1. by the example of the *Jews* in *Christ*'s time, while their *Oral Traditions* had the greateſt force among them. Theſe, we know, were by them ſtyled תורה שבעל מה * their *Law by the mouth*, in oppoſition to the תורה שבכתב *Law in writing*. Of the commendation of this, their ſobereſt Writers are as profuſe, as Mr. *White* can be of his, ſtyling it תיסורות אשר המרה יסורותיכם, &c. *The foundations on which ye are founded, the roots, the cuſtomes, decrees, and conſtitutions which your great ones have conſtituted, from the day which the Lord commanded, and ſo on through all Generations, like the Towre of David erected on your hill, in which are hanged a thouſand Helmets with all warlike inſtruments of the choice ones, all the ſhields of the mighty.* Then for the pretended *divine* original and unqueſtionable conveyance of them from *God* and *Moſes*, the account is given by the ſame *Maimonides*. 1. That *all the Precepts of the Law that were ſent down by God to Moſes, were ſent down to him together with their interpretation, God delivering by word of mouth firſt the Text, then the explication and interpretation of it, and what the authentick Text comprehended.* 2. That *Moſes having received both, coming to his Tent ſent for Aaron and declared to him the Text, and taught him the Interpretation; then Aaron ſtanding at his right hand, he called unto him Eleazar and Ithamar Aaron's ſons, and did the like* to them; then the *ſeventy* in like manner, *Aaron's ſons ſtanding by*; and then the *promiſcuous aſſembly of Iſrael*, in the preſence and audience of *all* the former. 3. That *Moſes departing, Aaron who had now heard this four times, repeated it out of his memory to all*, and after him his *ſons* in like manner, and ſo the *ſeventy* alſo; and by this means every one heard both *Text* and *Interpretation* recited *four* times, and ſo were *inabled to inſtruct one another*, the *Text being written in rolls* or *volumes*, and the *Interpretation* or *Tradition fixed in their memories*. 4. That *Moſes before he died*, made Proclamation, that *if any had forgotten any Tradition which he had received from him, he ſhould come and ask, and he would declare it to him*; and then *writing thirteen Copies of the Law, one for every Tribe, and one for the Levites, he died*. 5. That *Joſhuah* being furniſh'd with theſe *Oral traditionary explications, judged the people according to them*. 6. That *Joſhua* before his *death, left all theſe Traditions to the Elders of the people*, and the *Elders* to the *Prophets*, and ſo they continued *without any diſſention to the time of the men of the great Synagogue, Hagge, Zachary, Malachy, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Zorobabel*, &c. and ſo from hand to hand from *Ezra* to *Simeon*, from *Simeon* to *Antigonus*, from *Antigonus* to *Joſes*, from *Joſes* to *Joſhua* ſon of *Pherak*, from *Joſua* to *Judas*, from *Judas* to *Shemajah*, from *Shemajah* to *Hillel*, from *Hillel* to *Simeon*, from *Simeon* to *Gamaleel*, from *Gamaleel* to *Simeon*, from *Simeon* to *Gamaleel*, from *Gamaleel* to *Simeon* the *Juſt*, called *Rabbenu Hakkedoſh*, the *Phœnix of his age*, and he *collected all the Oral Traditions of Moſes thus delivered down to him*. In this account, if the *Jews* own teſtimony may be taken, what can be more exact and punctual for the ſure conveying of theſe *Oral Traditions* from *Moſes* and *God* himſelf? Could *S. W.* pretend this for all the *articles* of his preſent *Roman Mothers*, what Trophies would he ſet up? And yet after all this, we cannot *disbelieve* our *Saviour*, who aſſures us in his time, (which was certainly within the ſpace of this pretended undiſturbed *ſucceſſion* of *Oral* deliverers) that the *Doctrine* of *God* was ſoully *depraved, evacuated*, and *deſtroyed* by *their Traditions*, pretended to be thus lineally deduced from *Moſes* and *God* himſelf. This I have thus largely ſet down, becauſe I ſee the *Apologiſt* (reflecting on this argument when it was propoſed by my L. of *F*) hath made a ſhift to miſapprehend it, underſtanding by the *Jewiſh Cabala*, (in the vulgar modern notion of *Cabaliſtical*) the *myſtical traſh of the later Jews, whatſoever*, ſaith he, *any of them have collected from Scripture by a threefold abuſe of the Letter. 1. By taking every letter of a word, for a word beginning with that letter. 2. By changing letters according to rules framed by themſelves. 3. Finding numbers of years*, &c. *by the numbers which the Letters of the word compound*; And this, ſaith he, a *Doctrine pretended as delivered to few, with ſtrict charge to keep it from publicity, and ſo communicate it again to a ſelect Committee of a few, wherein there is a fair opportunity of juggling and couzenage*] But it is very ſtrange he ſhould not take notice of that which is ſo evident, *viz.* 1. That the *traditions*, wherein this *argument* is founded, are not the reſult of their *literal collections*, but pretended to be delivered from *Father* to *Son orally* from *Moſes*, as the *unwritten interpretation* of the *written Text* of the *Law*, and 2. that they were no *jugglings* of a ſecret *Cabal*, but *univerſally* received by the *learneſt Jews* in our *Saviour*'s time; Inſtance in that of their νιπτῶνται, *waſhing up to the wriſt before meat*, *Mar.* VII. 2. of which ſaith the *Evangeliſt*, the *Phariſees, and all the Jews, if they do not ſo waſh, do not eat, holding the Tradition of the Elders*, and, as he adds, ἄλλα πολλά ἐστιν ἃ παρέλαβον κρατεῖν, *there be many other things which they have* (Traditionally) *received to hold*. The like again follows v. 9. *&c.* of ſaying *Corban* to *Father* and *Mother*, where our *Saviour* ſets down expreſly the *Text* firſt, the *commandment* of the *Law*, *Honour thy Father*——and then the *Jewiſh Doctrine*, derived (as they pretended) by *Tradition* from their *Elders*, that if any ſhould *ſay Corban to his Father or Mother*, it was no more *lawfull* for him to doe any thing of relief to them, than to convert to private uſe that which was *conſecrated to God*, according to that of *Maimonides*, delivered as a rule derived from *Tradition*, that *vows have force*, על דברי מצות *upon matters of precept*, as much as upon דברי רשות *matters of will* or *choice*. In theſe examples, 'tis clear, that thoſe Doctrines were *generally* taken up, *publickly* avowed, and *conſtantly* adhered to by the *Jews*, as derived to them from *God* by *Moſes*, by an uninterrupted *Tradition*, which yet were ſo far from deſcending thence, that one of them was perfectly *deſtructive* to the *Law*, which undoubtedly was derived from *heaven*, and the other was a mere impertinent *addition*, and ſo come home exactly to the utmoſt that we can be deem'd to charge upon the *Romaniſt*. And there is no argument that *S. W.* doth or can urge for the authentickneſs of the *tradition* for the *Roman additionals*, which will not be equally of force to a *Jew* in *Chriſt*'s time for either of theſe *Traditions*, eſpecially if the *Oral Tradition* of the preſent age be of force to conclude for all the former, back to the *Apoſtles*, for that theſe were the *traditions* of that *preſent* age, our *Saviour* hath ſet beyond poſſibility of doubting.

14. A ſecond Inſtance may be that of the *Arian hereticks*, who in *Conſtantius*'s days had a very great, and almoſt an *univerſal* prevalency over the *Church*, and whilſt they had ſo, not onely delivered (the Mothers and *Catechiſts*, to their children) falſe *heretical* Doctrine, but withall delivered it, as that which had been delivered to them, and which came down from the *Apoſtles*; In which

* *Maimon. Pref. in Sed. Zeraim.* p. 7.
Ib. p. 2.
Ib. p. 5.
Ib. p. 10.
Ib. p. 34.
P. 123, *&c.*
P. 126.
Yad. Nedar. c. 3. § 1.

Proceſs there were little to be objected now by us to the truth of their Doctrine, if all were neceſſarily to be believed for *Catholick* and *Orthodox*, which the *multitude* and *ſtream* of any *one* age univerſally profeſſed, and delivered to their children, as received from their *anceſtours* and ſo from the *Apoſtles*.

15. A *third inſtance* may be taken from the *Univerſality* of *Heathens* in any age, ſuppoſe that wherein St. *Paul* preached firſt the faith of *Chriſt* to them; Of theſe it is ſure, that their *firſt*, though not *immediate* Anceſtours had been the *worſhippers* of the true *God*, *Japhet* and *Noah*, and his Anceſtours before the Flood, and conſequently that their *Idol worſhips* were certainly of a *later* date (though ſome difference there may be among curious inquirers, when they *began* to *prevail* among them, and whether debauched by ſome one great Leader, or whether in a long Proceſs of time, by a *gradual* degeneration from piety, and an *inſenſible* unobſervable growth of impiety) And though this be as manifeſt and undeniably true, as the ſtory of the *Bible*, which aſſures us of it, yet is it as evident, that the whole *Heathen world* of any ſuch age (which was of far larger extent than the *preſent Roman Communion*, deduced their falſe *ſacrilegious* Worſhips from their immediate *Anceſtours*, and that ὡς παραπαραδόσει, as *delivered from Father* to *Son* from the *beginning* of all time, as *ancient* as the *Moon*, and *Mountains*, making uſe of this very *argument*, as their great *Palladium*, by which all their ſeveral branches of *Idol-worſhip*, their whole *religion* was at once defended, and rendred uncapable of *Reformation*, τὸ μὴ κινεῖν ἀκίνητα, that *unmoveable things* (the Religion of their Countrey from all antiquity) were *not to be innovated*.

16. A *laſt inſtance* ſhall be from the *Mahometanes* themſelves, I mean not in deducing their *Doctrines* from *Mahomet* (for that I ſuppoſe they truely doe, though we know they are divided among themſelves, and the different way of *Hali* pretends as conſtant *Tradition* from their *Prophet*, as the other) but in believing and teaching that their *Mahomet* was promiſed by *Chriſt*, and conſequently that the Doctrines which *Mahomet* firſt taught out of his own corrupt heart, are the Doctrines of the *Paraclet*, i. e. the *holy Ghoſt*, for as ſuch, they are delivered now from *Father* to *Son*, and have in many parts of *Chriſtendom* wholly extirpated the *Apoſtolical* Doctrine or *Faith* of *Chriſt*, where it is evident, that through the powerfull inrodes and *conqueſts* of the *Turks*, the *chriſtian mothers* have not onely been kept from delivering to their children the *Faith* which they received, but have themſelves been induced to *renounce* that *Faith*, and then by the help of *Oral Tradition*, become inſtruments to transfuſe the contrary into their children, and this, be it never ſo deſtructive to their *childrens* and their own *eternal well-fare*, onely to ſecure their lives, and a ſmall part of their portion in this world. Which being done by that means in this ſo much greater inſtance (renouncing and forgetting all *Chriſtianity* at once) may as poſſibly be done by the like *tyranny*, and conjuncture of earthly motives in a leſſer inſtance (receiving in this, or that *falſe* Doctrine) unleſs the proviſions be more competent againſt the one, than the other.

17. What ſecurity there will be offered us by *S. W.* to the *contrary*, we muſt yet expect, when we come to the *view* of his proofs, and to that we ſhall now haſten, having as yet onely attended him ſo far, as the eſtabliſhing of his *definition*, and aſſigning him the *concluſion*, which we ſhall expect from him to *prove*, and ſettle *demonſtratively*, that (whatever be ſaid of *Jews*, *Arians*, *Heathens*, *Mahometanes*) it is impoſſible to be imagined of the *Romaniſts Oral Traditions*, ſo *circumſtantiated* as they are, to have any *fallibility* in them.

SECT. IV.

A view of the great Demonſtration for the Infalliblneſs of Oral Tradition, firſt in Mr. White's, *then in* S. W's *words. What the chief medium. Reduction of the diffuſed demonſtration to a Syllogiſm. The weaker propoſition of it unproved, taken for a principle by Mr.* White, *and ſo by* S. W. *The falſeneſs of it diſcovered in a firſt view, as the Church ſignifies the Church of* Rome *of the preſent age. The fallacy of* notum per ignotius. *His principle denyed by the Romaniſt. Certainty not of ſuch truth as may enter a demonſtration. No ſuch maxim declared. Not always held. Mr.* White's *confeſſion at another time. Other Romaniſts. Pope* Clement's *method of deciding Controverſies. Mr.* White's *anſwer conſidered. The method of the laſt Pope, and ſo of this preſent age. An argument borrowed from Mr.* White, *Appeal to the Mothers and Catechiſts, and to Mr.* White's *words elſewhere. A ſecond view of the propoſition. What 'tis to go on this Maxim. Bare profeſſions. A third view. Difference between delivering as an Opinion, and as a Doctrine of Faith. Mr.* White's *defence of Biſhop* Fiſher's *Doctrine of Purgatory and indulgences. The* Greeks *opinion of Purgatory in and after the Council of* Florence. *Mr.* White's *Maxim refuted by that Biſhop's words. The opinion of the ſecret Receptacles, among the Ancients, and Pope* John 22. *unreconcileable with Purgatories being of Univerſal Tradition. (Mr.* White's *repugnant anſwers) So Tranſubſtantiations not being of faith before the Council of* Conſtance. Theodoret, Scotus, Tunſtall, Vaſquez. *The Cup denyed the Laity. Circumgeſtation. The unhappineſs of* S. W's *Demonſtration.*

1. LEt us therefore now ſolemnly view thoſe circumſtances, which promiſe, and inſure truth to every *propoſition*, which the *Romaniſt Mothers* teach their children, and of which is made up that *Grand Demonſtration*, the very *Quinteſſence* of *Ruſhworth's Dialogues*, in which the whole weight of the *one ſelf-evident principle, Oral Tradition*, the *one infallible rule of faith* (the *Pope* himſelf being by Mr. *White* ſolemnly diſcarded from his *Infallibility*, to make room for it) is ſummed up. And that we loſe no leaſt joynt of this controlling, *irreſiſtible* machine, I ſhall firſt ſet it down in the words of the great artificer himſelf, * the *Apologiſt*.

* *Firſt Encounter*, p. 8.

2. *The*

2. *The proof*, ſaith he, *conſiſts in this, ſince 'tis confeſſed the Catholick Church goes upon this Maxim, that her Doctrine is received from Chriſt, and ſtill handed along to the preſent generation, they who cavil at this aſſertion* (viz. that *no errour was ever, or can be embraced by the Church in quality of a matter of Faith*) *ſhould aſſign ſome age, when they conceive an errour crept in, and the maintainers ſhould prove it entred not in that age, becauſe that age held nothing was to be admitted as of faith, except what was delivered to it by the former, but the objectours themſelves ſay, this ſuppoſed errour was not delivered by the former, ſince they put it to be now firſt believed, therefore the age in which they imagine this errour crept in, could not be the firſt that believed it. And leſt ſome might reply, though the preſent Roman Church ſtands now upon the propoſed Maxim, yet anciently it did not, the ſame argument may be thus reiterated. If this principle which now governs the Church, had not always done ſo, it muſt have been introduced in ſome age ſince the Apoſtles. Name therefore the age, and immediately 'tis urged, either the Church had aſſurance in that age, all ſhe held was deſcended lineally from the Apoſtles, or not. If ſo, then queſtionleſs ſhe held her Doctrine upon that Maxim, for it is the onely undoubted and ſelf evident principle; If not, then ſhe willfully belyed her ſelf, and conſpired to damn all her poſterity, voluntarily taking up this new rule of Faith, and commanding it to be accepted by all the world, as the neceſſary Doctrine of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, deſcended upon the preſent age by Univerſal Tradition from their Anceſtours, and for ſuch to be delivered to their children, and all this againſt the expreſs evidence of her own conſcience. Thus far reaches the argument.*

3. Now if upon reading, and reading again, this confounding argument, and upon an undoubted underſtanding of every word, and portion of period in it, the *Reader* do not yet readily diſcern the *immediateneſs* of *connexion*, and ſo *convincingneſs* of it, but be ready to ask ſome innocent queſtion, whether the *concluſion* be inferred by *one*, or *more Syllogiſms*, or if by *one*, in what *mode* and *figure* it concludes, or if in *more*, which is the *principal*, and commanding *medium*, and the like, all the relief I can help him to, is to repeat it again in another (i. e. *S. W*'s) *mode*, and then to hope that (as elſewhere he ſaith of the *Oral repetitions* of the ſame ſenſe in variety of words) this will be ſo ſure a means to plant the *inward force* of it in his *mind*, that he cannot chuſe but diſcern the *demonſtrativeneſs* of it. Hear then the *Oracle* more *vocal* and *articulate*, as he is *echoed* by his ὑποφήτης. Thus he delivers himſelf.

4. *If it be impoſſible that all the now fathers of Families in the Catholick Church, diſpers'd in ſo many Nations, ſhould conſpire to tell this palpable lie to their children, that twenty years agoe ſuch a thing* (*viſible and practical, as all points of faith are*) *was held in that Church, if no ſuch thing had been, and that conſequently the ſame impoſſibility holds in each twenty years upwards till the Apoſtles, by the ſame reaſon, by which it holds in the laſt twenty, then it follows evidently that what was told us to have been held twenty years agoe, was held ever, in caſe the Church held nothing but upon this ground, that ſo ſhe received or had been taught by the immediately foregoing faithfull. For as long as ſhe pretends onely to this ground, the difficulty is equal in each twenty years, i. e. there is an equal impoſſibility they ſhould conſpire to this palpable lie. Now that they ever held to this ground* (i. e. to the *having received it from their Anceſtours*) *is manifeſted by as great an evidence; For ſince they now hold this ground, if at any time they had taken it up, they muſt either have counterfeited that they had received it from their Anceſtours, or no; The former relapſes into the aboveſaid impoſſibility, or rather greater, that they ſhould conſpire to tell a lie in the onely ground of their faith, and yet hold* (*as they did*) *their faith built on that ground to be truth: the latter poſition muſt diſcredit it ſelf in the very terms, which imply a perfect contradiction, for it is as much as to ſay, nothing is to be held as certainty of faith, but what hath deſcended to us from our Fore-fathers, and yet the onely rule which tells us certainly there is any thing of faith, is newly invented.* And thus far the argument alſo in *S. W*'s elucidation of it.

5. And here I ſeriouſly deſire the Reader, as he doth value his own intereſts (which he is by *S. W.* ſo oft aſſured, do depend upon the opening his heart to the force of this *demonſtration*) and upon pain, that if he comprehend it not in one of theſe draughts, he muſt, to compaſs it, be fain to ſurvey all *Ruſhworth*'s *Dialogues*, to ſit down, and ponderingly revolve either, or both of theſe *Schemes* ſo long, till he be able to aſſign and determine, which is the *Maſter-medium* in this diſcourſe, which hath the chief efficacy in it, to infer the *concluſion*, which is agreed between us to be this [*that no errour was ever or can be embraced by the Church* (I muſt interpoſe, *of Rome*) *in quality of a matter of Faith*] And if then he find difficulty in the reſolution, he muſt either profeſs that he is more dull, than a *Sceptick* is *irreſolute*, or never heed this *Epitomiſt* of thoſe *Dialogues* more, which refers him thither for *as ample ſatisfaction as Scepticiſm can deſire*, and yet tranſcribes not ſo much from ſo rich a *treaſury*, as may give him the *leaſt ſatisfaction*.

6. When the Reader hath a little tired himſelf in a *labyrinth* of ſome perplexedneſs, perhaps he will be content to be directed to a *clue*, and it will be this one adviſe, not to penetrate too deep, when all that is to be had, flotes on the ſurface, obvious, and diſcernible at firſt ſight, in theſe *two* propoſitions. 1. That *the Church of Rome hath one Maxim on which it goes, not to teach any thing* de fide, *which hath not been delivered or taught by the age immediately preceding.* 2. That *they which go by that Maxim, cannot poſſibly err in matter of Faith.* From conjunction of which, this *Syllogiſm* is regularly conſtituted.

That *Church* which *goes on this Maxim of not teaching any thing*, de fide, *which hath not been delivered or taught by the age immediately preceding, cannot poſſibly err in matters of Faith*;

But the *Church* of *Rome goes on this Maxim, not to teach any thing*, de fide, *which hath not been delivered or taught by the age immediately preceding.*

Therefore that Church cannot poſſibly err in matters of faith.

Into this one *Syllogiſm* all the force of this commanding engine is contracted, and there being *two* parts of it, a *ſtronger* and a *weaker*, I ſhall not yet ſay, a *true*, and a *falſe*, but one which certainly wants more *confirming* than the other, it is obſervable that all the aids which are tendred, or brought in, are ſtrangely *partial*, come onely in favour of the *ſtronger* part, the weaker *Phalanx* having no creature to back it, no reſerve to inforce the firſt impreſſion, but lying at the mercy of the enemy, who if he ſhall have but courage enough to ſtand the firſt *onſet*, and deny the *Minor propoſition*, the

unwary *Syllogiſm* is utterly routed, on the fortune of which depends this ſo (admired, were a poor word, unable to expreſs the leaſt part of *S. W*'s *kindneſs* to it) *adored*, *ſtupendious demonſtration*.

7. This is ſo ſtrange an *infirmity*, and ſo little to have been expected from a *ſevere* diſcourſer, that I ſhall not expect to have it believed on my word; till the *Readers* own eyes accompany me through the Camp, either as *Mr. White* or as *S. W.* hath pitched it, and by their own diſcoveries aſcertain them of the truth of it. The *weaker* part I take to be the *Minor*, in theſe words, The *Church* of *Rome goes on this Maxim*, *not to teach any thing* de fide, *which hath not been delivered or taught by the age immediately preceding*. And in the firſt words of *Mr. White*'s deſcription of this argument, this is taken for a thing *granted*. *Since*, ſaith he, *'tis confeſſed the Catholick Church* (or, as after, his ſtyle is, the *Roman Church*) *goes on this Maxim*, *that her Doctrine is received from Chriſt*, *and ſtill handed along to the preſent generation*] Here ſure 'tis evident, that the truth of the *minor* is taken as *confeſs'd* and then I am not to have ſo mean an opinion of the *demonſtratour*'s skill, that he will impertinently attempt to prove, what he takes for *confeſs'd*. And indeed herein he hath obſerved the rules of his *art*, he hath not added a word toward the *proof* of it, but on the contrary, makes uſe of that, as of a *principle* for the *proving* of every thing elſe, that can be doubted of. So it follows in the next words, *They who cavil at this aſſertion* [viz. *that no errour was ever or can be embraced by the Church in quality of a matter of faith*] *ſhould aſſign ſome age when they conceive an errour crept in, and the maintainer*, i. e. the *Apologiſt* himſelf, *ſhould prove*, *it entred not in that age*, *becauſe that age held*, *nothing was to be admitted as of faith*, *except what was delivered to it by the former*.] Here 'tis evident their *holding* this *Maxim*, is the onely *proof* of his *grand* concluſion, or aſſertion, and no farther proof is tendred of that; So again in theſe words, [*Leſt ſome might reply*, *though the preſent Roman Church ſtands now upon the propoſed Maxim*, *yet anciently it did not*,] — Here the objecter, replyer, adverſary, that is foreſeen to queſtion the *ancient Churches holding this Maxim*, is yet ſtill *preſumed* to *acknowledge* it without all queſtion, that *the preſent Roman Church ſtands now upon this Maxim*. Once more, in theſe words [*The argument may be thus reiterated*, *If this principle which now governs the Church*, *had not always done ſo* —] Here it is again preſumed, that *this principle now governs the Church*, and from thence to the end of the argument not a ſyllable toward the *proving* of it, but all along a taking it for *granted*, that the *Church goes on this Maxim*, as on the *onely undoubted*, *and ſelf evident principle*.

8. So in *S. W*'s *Scheme*, though it be not ſo crudely affirmed to be *confeſs'd*, that they *go on this Maxim*, yet it is viſibly ſuppoſed, or taken for *granted* that they doe, in theſe words, [*For as long as ſhe pretends onely to this ground*, viz. *that ſo ſhe received or had been taught by the immediately foregoing faithfull* —] and *For ſince they now hold this ground* —] and again, *It is as much as to ſay*, *nothing is to be held for certainty of Faith*, *but what hath deſcended to us from our fore-fathers* —] ſtill *ſuppoſing* them to hold to that *Maxim*, to ſay (as that which they *adhere* to) that *nothing is to be held but what thus deſcendeth*.

9. Here then will be the ſpeedy end of this *controverſie*, if without any ſolicitous ſearch, or nicer examination of the *major* propoſition, we betake our ſelves wholly to the beholding of his *Minor*, and examine what could induce him to aſſume that as a *confeſs'd* or yielded *principle*, which when it is *explained*, will be found to have very little appearance of *truth*, certainly nothing of *ſelf-evidence* in it.

10. All then that is now farther incumbent on us, is by a *view*, or two, thus to *explain*, and to ſecure the Reader of the right underſtanding of the *propoſition*, there being ſome phraſes a little *ambiguous* in it, which muſt be cleared, before it will have any determinate ſenſe in it, whether *true* or *falſe*. As 1. what is meant by the *Church* of *Rome*, or, as he ſtyles it, the *Catholick Church*, Is it the *Church* of *this* age, or no? To this he yields me expreſs anſwer, that he means the *Church* of *this* age.

11. Here then, ere we advance any farther, it is obſervable, that he thinks it incumbent on him to prove that *other* ages of the *Church* have held this *Maxim*, and accordingly attempts to infer it by this *medium*, the *preſent Churches holding* it, and yet never thinks fit to tender us any the ſlighteſt *ſecurity*, that the preſent *Church* it ſelf doth hold it, when yet he cannot but gueſs, that we are more inclineable to believe it of many former, than of theſe latter, or this one *preſent* age of the *Roman Church*; and it being not a principle either of *natural* or *Chriſtian Theology*, that *this* age holds it, more than *all* or any *other* ages (when yet that all *others* held it, was not deemed ſuch a *principle*, and therefore he attempted to prove it) this ſure is no method of *ſevere demonſtration*, but a downright *begging* the *principle*, and a proving *ignotum per ignotius*, that which *leſs needs*, by that which *moſt needs* his arguments to ſecure the truth of it, and ſo as mean a piece of *Sophiſtry*, as could well have appeared in ſo *venerable* a dreſs.

12. For 1. that which he pretends to be *confeſs'd*, is of all things moſt conſtantly, and confeſs'dly *denyed* by us; yea and by the ſobereſt of their *own* Writers; for when * *Caſſander* makes no ſcruple to affirm that the *preſent Church non parum in doctrinæ ſinceritate ab antiqua*, *unde orta illa eſt & derivata*, *diſſidet*, *doth not a little differ from the ancient*, *whence it is derived*, *in ſincerity of Doctrine*; and again that *à veteri Eccleſia deflexit*, *it hath deflected from the ancient Church*, and particularly of the *Popes* that they have advanced their authority *ultra fines*, *beyond the bounds* preſcribed by *Chriſt* and the *Church*, no doubt can be made of his denying that the *Church* of that his age went by this *Maxim*; And then if *this* age goes by it, it muſt, (contrary to *S. W*'s reaſoning) take it up *anew*. 2. If it were indeed confeſs'd by his adverſary, nay more than ſo, if it were *de facto* really true, yet if it be but *contingently* true, *i. e.* ſuch as might have been otherwiſe, (as it needs muſt, if it depend on others *wills*, as their *confeſſing* doth) 'tis not then *neceſſary*, and conſequently can be no ingredient in a *demonſtration*, which muſt conſiſt of none but *neceſſaries*; what is but contingently true, is but *probable*, and *Mr. White* hath taught him what to think of a *thouſand* (and that is ſomewhat above *one*) but *probable mediums*.

* *Conſult. Art.* 7.

13. But

13. But then thirdly, if I ſhall not take the advantage of either of theſe frailties (which yet are queſtionleſs the *ruine* of his whole *fabrick*) but leave him to repair the preſent defect by *future diligence*, and prove *hereafter*, what *yet* he hath not attempted to prove, I diſcern not that he is capable of receiving any the leaſt benefit by this compliance; for although I need not undertake to maintain the *negative*, in matter of *fact* (ſo undiſcernible, as it muſt needs be, what *maxims* their *preſent Church* holds at this time, when 'tis not agreed among themſelves, to whom the *infallible* pronouncing belongs, ſome being as earneſt for the perſon of the *Pope*, as Mr. *White* in his *Tab. Suffrag.* is againſt him) yet neither can he with any reaſon pretend to maintain the *affirmative*, unleſs either he ſet up for *auguries*, undertake to interpret mens *minds* without their *words*, or be able to produce ſome *declaration* made by his *Church* in this matter, which whether it be *poſſible* or no to be made, I need not define, when 'tis certain they have not lately ſo much as met in a *Council* to make it.

14. Nay fourthly, to give him over meaſure, if I may heed the reaſonings of *S. W.* I ſhall not want motives to reſolve the plain *negative*, that this is not the *maxim* of their *Church* at this day. One of his reaſonings is from their ſuppoſed *holding* it *now*, to infer their *holding* it *ever*; which if it be *demonſtrative*, it muſt then follow in the *converſe*, that if they held it not *ever*, they do not hold it *now*; But that they held it not *ever*, ſeems apparent to me, by that age, when not onely *Liberius* the *Pope*, but in a manner their whole *Church*, and the *totus orbis whole world* were become of the *Emperour's Religion*, i. e. *heretical* or *Arian*, and yet as the age foregoing that, ſo again the age following under an *Orthodox Emperour* and *Pope*, was *Orthodox*, which it could not be, if it proceeded by this *maxim*, of holding nothing as of *faith*, but what was delivered to them by the immediate foregoing.

15. The ſame I ſhall again prove by my *wordiſh* way of *Teſtimonies*, from the *Apologiſt*'s own *pen* (when 'tis *his*, I hope 'twill be as important as his *words*) in *Dailles arts Diſcov.* p. 224. *Every one knows*, ſaith he, *that ſubſequent Councils have always been ſo far from thinking it unlawfull to add unto the former, that ſuch additions are the very buſineſs and end of their aſſembling.* Theſe are his expreſs words, and by him applyed to the *modern points* of *Controverſie*, and rendring an account of how little importance Mr. *Dailles* objection was, that *they* are not *reſolved in former Creeds and Councils, for every one knows*, ſaith he, *&c.* which if it hath truth in it, then *ſubſequent* have *added* to *former* ages, and that they cannot be imagined to doe, while they ſtand to this *Maxim* of believing nothing, but what they *received* from the *former*.

16 The ſame is as evident again by the frequent profeſſions, of *Romaniſt Writers*, not onely thoſe, that tell us diſtinctly, when ſuch or ſuch a point became a *doctrine of faith*, as *Scotus*, *Ante Lateranenſe Cencilium Tranſubſtantiatio non fuit dogma fidei*, *Before the Lateran Council, that manner* of the *real* preſence in the *Sacrament* which is called *Tranſubſtantiation, was not a doctrine of Faith*, but alſo thoſe many others, who when the ſayings of any of their *ancients* are brought againſt them, reply, that this was before the contrary truth was *defined*, the reſult of which is, that thoſe things which were not formerly held, were after, ſomewhat more than barely *held*, viz. *defined*.

17. And it may be remembred what anſwer Mr. *White* once gave to *one* argument in this point. The argument was this, *A great controverſie being riſen between the Dominicans and the Jeſuits*, it was heard before *Pope Clement*; that *Pope* in a time, wherein he was more oppoſed than uſually, had reaſon conſequently to be more *cautious*, than to chuſe a *new way*, by which truth was not wont to be *found* out by the *Romaniſts*, on like occaſions, and therefore the courſe he took may paſs in reaſon (for more than an *inſtance*, or ſingle *example*) for a *proof* of his *opinion* and judgment at leaſt what that *Churches* courſe was in ſuch deciſions. And yet his *courſe* was not that of this preſent *maxim*, to inquire what the age immediately foregoing ſaid of the point in *Controverſie*, and determining according to that, but he appointed both ſides to prove which of them followed St. *Auſtine*, intending according to that to give ſentence, if he had not been prevailed with to the contrary. Now when Mr. *White* comes to conſider this argument, his dealing is a little remarkable, his word are theſe, * *In Clement the eighths action the main point is to conſider on what grounds he ſought to eſtabliſh the definition he went about to make. And, upon the immediate ſtep, we both joyntly ſtand, to wit, that it was to find out, whether parties opinion was conformable to St.* Auſtin. *But if I miſtake not, my adverſaries make not the ſame apprehenſion of it that I do, They ſeem to take St.* Auſtin *for one Doctour, peradventure a great one, peradventure the chief, but yet onely one; I apprehend him as the leading Champion of the Church in the Queſtion of grace, whence it follows, that the Doctrine of St.* Auſtin *was the Doctrine of all thoſe Catholick Writers, by whoſe demonſtrations and authority the* Pelagians *were condemned*, i. e. *it was the faith of the Church in that age, and conſequently which the Church continued ever after.*] * Apol. p. 59.

18. Here 1. it is evident, that the onely thing, whereon the weight of the argument lay, [*viz.* that the *Pope* determined to define according not to his *immediate* anceſtours, but St. *Auſtin*'s Doctrine] is wholly laid aſide by the *Apologiſt*, and not a word of anſwer given to it, but a diverſion made to another thing which was no part of the argument; 2. That for the ages between St. *Auſtin* and that *Pope*, there is no word ſaid, much leſs of the age immediately foregoing the age of that *Pope*, ſave in the laſt words [*it was the faith of the Church in St.* Auſtin's *age, and conſequently which the Church continued ever after.*] Where by a ſtrange *Logick*, the *Churches holding it ever after*, is proved by that *ages holding* it, in which St *Auſtine* lived, as if I ſhould ſay, the *Arians* Doctrine was the faith of the *Church* in *Conſtantius*'s age, therefore it hath been ſo ever ſince, or to keep cloſe to the inſtance of St *Auguſtine*, that holy *Father* defined the *cruciating* of *Infants* in *hell fire*, who died without *Baptiſm*, and his Doctrine, if we believe Mr. *White*, was the *Doctrine of that age*, therefore it hath been the *Doctrine* of all *ſucceeding* ages; which, beſide the evident *falſneſs* of the *Concluſion*, is moreover a *Regreſſus*, and *Circle* both, in that *learned Gentleman*'s Logick, one while proving it the *faith* of *former* ages, becauſe it is the *faith* of the *preſent* age, and now that it is the *faith* of the *Church* ever after, and ſo at *preſent*, becauſe it was the faith in St. *Auſtine*'s, 1200. years agoe. 3. It may be obſerved alſo that he ſaith the *Pelagians in St.* Auſtin's *time were condemned by the demonſtrations and authority of the Catholick Writers*, whom he there mentions, and explains

plains by [*that is the Church in that age*] which if it were true, then the definition in St. *Auſtin*'s time was made by the *authorities* of *that* age, and that is not of the *precedent* age, of which the now pretended *Maxim* proceeds; Nay 4. he reſolves expreſly that *Pope Clement had great reaſon to endeavour the deciſion of that queſtion by the authority of St. Auſtin*; which was all that the argument deſired, and ſo the concluſion ſtands good, that unleſs St. *Auſtine*'s age were the *immediate foregoing* age to *Clement* the eighth, the *Maxim* was not in force with that *Clement*, to judge by the *immediate foregoing*.

19. *Laſtly*, this argument, it ſeems, had more force in it, than the ſingle inſtance of *Clement*, one *Pope*, could give it; for, * Mr. *White* himſelf tells us (as on another occaſion I formerly ſhewed) that in the laſt *Pope*'s time when that queſtion was again debated, *almoſt in every Congregation the ſentence of St.* Auſtin *was judged to be againſt the Moliniſts*,] by which one may gueſs Mr. *White*'s own ſenſe to be, that the definition *ought* to have been by that ſtandard (how that will be interpreted by them that think the *Pope* ſoon after judged on the other ſide, I ſhall not foreſee) and yet farther, that the *Pope* in the tenth *Congregation* taxed them, *Quod Scholaſticis maximè ſuis, non Scripturâ, Conciliis, Patribus uterentur, That they uſed the Schoolmen, eſpecially their own, and not the Scripture, Councils, and Fathers.*) And if the *School-men* be they that lived in the age immediately foregoing, and if *Fathers* and *Councils* and *Scriptures* are ſomewhat ancienter, and if theſe did not agree in the ſame Doctrine (for if they did, they might eaſily have reformed their Proceſs at the *Pope*'s check, and loſt nothing by it) then ſure it is not yet the *Maxim* of this age, or but laſt ſeven years (wherein this was done) to decide Controverſies, or judge of *Doctrines* by what was delivered by the *ages* immediately foregoing (which is *S. W*'s principle) but by *Scriptures*, *Fathers*, and *Councils*, which is the poor preaching *Proteſtants* method of probation.

* *Apol.* p. 62.

20. One thing more I ſhall offer to conſideration, from Mr. *White*'s *Tabulæ ſuffragiales*, where as an aſſerter of the * *Churches Infallibility*, founded in their proceeding according to this *Maxim*, he vehemently oppoſeth the † *expecting of any new Articles of Faith*, and as a *branch* of that, the * *Infallibility of the Pope*, the *belief* of which he *reſolves* to be † *improbable*, * *heretical*, † *Archihereticall*, and the * *propogating* the opinion, a *moſt grievous ſin*. From hence I ſuppoſe I may conclude, that this ſo *improbable*, *heretical*, *Archihereticall*, and *moſt grievouſly ſinfull* opinion, was by him conſidered as *oppoſite* to, and unreconcileable with his own *Doctrine* of the *Churches Infallibility*, founded in their proceeding by his *Maxim*; And ſo moſt evidently it is *oppoſite*, for if the *Pope* can infallibly *define*, and ſo make any *new article*, then ſomewhat may be *defined*, and ſo *taught* in any one age of the *Church*, which had not been taught in the age *immediately foregoing*, which is the direct *contradictory* to this *Maxim*; Which being yielded to Mr. *White*'s arguments, 'tis yet moſt certain, that a very great and conſiderable part of the *preſent Church* of *Rome*, do as earneſtly maintain this *power* and *Infallibility* of the *Pope*, as Mr. *White* oppoſes it; How then can they be with truth *affirmed*, (or conſequently their *preſent Church*, of whom theſe are ſo *great and conſiderable* and *flouriſhing* a part) to proceed on this *maxim* (ſo *contrary* to their own reſolute opinion) of teaching nothing *de fide* but what the former age had taught them?

* *Tab.* 4. & 22.
† *Tab.* 1.
* *Tab.* 10, 11, 12, 13, 15.
† *Tab.* 17. 8.
* *Tab.* 19.
† *Tab.* 20.
* *Tab.* 21.

21. To *conclude* this point, I cannot, I ſuppoſe, put it to an iſſue more to the hearts deſire of the *demonſtratours*, than by appealing to his *Oral Traditours* themſelves, whether the *flattering Catholick Mothers*, or the *Catechiſts*, and of them I demand what aſſurance *S. W.* hath, that this is one ſolemn part of their *inſtruction*, and familiar Colloquy with their tender *Catechumeni*, that they teach them *nothing but what before their Fathers*, or rather *Mothers had taught them*; that among the *firſt elements of the acquiſition of beatitude* and *maxims of piety*, this really is *one* at leaſt, if not the *firſt* and *principal*, that they teach them not a *propoſition*, but what *their Mothers* taught them. If my adverſaries will not ſtand to this *appeal*, the *practice* of the preſent *Mothers* and *Catechiſts* in this matter, what can they ſay in their defenſe, that by *Oral Tradition* profeſs to mean that of the Mothers *flattering into their children* the *elements* of *happineſs*, and would have it *believed*, and preſume it confeſs'd, that their *Church* doth now in their *Oral Tradition goe upon this maxim*; If they will ſtand to it, let them direct us to any competent means to diſcern, 1. that any, 2. that not onely *ſome*, but *all Mothers* did ever entertain this *maxim*, (not contenting themſelves with that other ground of *faith*, the Doctrine of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* in *Scripture*) 3. that they have all thought it their *duty* thus (and not any other way) to teach and inſtill the *faith* into their *children*; 4. that they that neglect many other parts of their *duty*, are certain never to neglect that; I ſhall leave this profound pair of *Tutor* and *Scholar* to chew upon this a while, and diſcern how eaſie it will be for them to *prove*, and till that be ſome way attempted, how reaſonable it is to ſuppoſe, and expect it will be granted, that all *Catholick mothers* thus teach their children; and, whatever elſe they omit, are ſure not to *omit* this, *viz.* not onely to infuſe into them every branch of the *Roman Catholick faith*, and infuſe it intelligibly, and ſo as they cannot probably miſtake it in any branch, but withall to every branch particularly to add, and inculcate, that this they *learn'd* from their *Mothers*, and they from *theirs* (which ſure is more than they can know) up to the *Apoſtles*. It may here deſerve to be remembred, what Mr. *White* once thought true in his *anſwer to my Lord Falkland*, that not onely the *Clowns*, but *good women* (thoſe ſure are the *Mothers*) *in Spain and Italy trouble not themſelves to ſeek the ground of their faith*] and if ſo, 'tis ſhrewdly to be ſuſpected that they do not *trouble* their *children* with any account of it; And if indeed it be conſidered how very *little* is taught the people at all, and of that *little*, how much leſs than a *little* is any more than barely *taught* them, there will be little room for *debate* or *doubt* in this matter. And this may ſerve for a *firſt view* of the *Propoſition*.

P. 33.

22. If we look on it a *ſecond* time, it will not be amiſs to demand, what is meant by *going on this Maxim*] Is the meaning of it, that the *Church profeſſes to goe by that maxim*, or more than ſo, that it *really goes* on it, and never ſwerves from it? Theſe two are very diſtant in themſelves, and that difference muſt needs have a main influence on the *concluſion*, which is to be induced by this *principle*.

23. If he ſhould mean that the *Church* of *Rome* doth and always hath acted according to this principle, then he cannot imagine that this will be allowed to paſs as a *principle* without any attempt

of

of *proof*. 'Tis certain they that charge the *Church* of *Rome* with *additionals*, do not *believe* or acknowledge that they have made no *additions* to the *faith*, but contend and ſpecifie many particulars wherein they have *innovated*; And to anſwer them, that they do, and have always acted according to that *maxim*, is to prove they have not *innovated*, becauſe they have not *innovated*, and that is, I hope, the *begging* of the *queſtion* in the deepeſt tincture. And in this ſenſe to ſay (as Mr. *White* doth) 'tis *confeſs'd* that their *Church goes upon this maxim*] would be the ſuggeſtion the fartheſt removed from all appearance of truth; It being viſible we do not *confeſs* it. It remains then, that the meaning be no more than this, that their *Church profeſſes* to proceed on that *maxim*, which though it be not ſuggeſted with truth, as appeared in our firſt *view*, yet if it were the moſt *demonſtrative* truth, it could have no more force in it, than a deceiver's *profeſſion* that he ſpeaks nothing but *truth*, which being onely his *teſtimony* of himſelf, and bringing no *miracles* to confirm it, is no advantage, but rather *prejudice* to him, and admoniſhes us, that they that profeſs ſo demurely to *innovate* nothing, do fear detecting, and endeavour to ſupply with *profeſſions* what is wanting in *performances*. And this, it ſeems, is the utmoſt importance of the propoſition, for ſo Mr. *White* delivers it, *the maintainers ſhall prove, the errour entred not in that age, becauſe that age held nothing was to be admitted as of faith, except what was delivered to it by the former*. It *held*] denotes it their *Tenet*; Their *Tenet*, if it be not that, by which they really act, is no more than an *unſincere* profeſſion, and every *ſeducer* in the world hath ſtore of them, which paſs for *arguments* with thoſe which have no better. As in our *Engliſh* ſtory he that could not confirm his new *Revelations* by *miracles*, endeavoured to do it by ſtrong aſſeverations, and from thence proceeded to *Oaths* and *execrations* againſt himſelf, if it were not true which he delivered; And if either he or *S. W.* can hope this ſhall goe for *demonſtrating*, [The *Church* of *Rome profeſſes* to teach nothing but *received truth*, therefore it is *infallible*] he muſt have a very mean opinion of his Reader, who if he would believe all that is *profeſs'd* on that one evidence, becauſe it is *profeſs'd*, had never needed his *Ruſhworths Dialogues*, to convince him to receive the *Roman faith*, for before the writing of thoſe, he knew there were ſuch *Romaniſts*, that did *profeſs* it.

24. Here then a *ſecond ambiguity* being explicated, he hath leave to take which part of the *explication* he pleaſe; If he take the former, he muſt be at a new charge to *prove* that their *Church* never miſſes to act according to that *maxim*, for elſe I can aſſure him it ſhall never be granted upon his *importunity*; If he take the *latter*, he hath gained nothing by it, but that their *profeſſions* and *practice* are at ſome diſtance, which is little for the *reputation* of them, for whom he thus pleadeth. A man would not think it poſſible, that ſo *hopefull* and promiſing a *demonſtration* ſhould ſo ſoon fall to this *deſtitute* ſtate, by a little cloſer inſpection; As it is, it yields us a lively inſtance, if we needed ſuch, that every thing *performs* not, what it *profeſſes*.

25. Let us proceed to a third and laſt view, and demand, what is meant by *not teaching* de fide *what hath not been delivered or taught*——] Is it to be underſtood of *teaching nothing as an article of faith*, which was not *delivered or taught as an article of faith* by the *foregoing* age? There is a very conſiderable difference between theſe two, *delivering* or *teaching* a thing as an *opinion*, and *delivering* or *teaching* the ſame as a *doctrine* of *faith*. And if by *taught* by the *age immediately foregoing*, he mean onely, *taught* as an *opinion*, then his *maxim* in plain terms is this, that no age of their *Church* defines any thing *de fide*, which was not before held as an *opinion*; And if that be it, then firſt he muſt own it as his *confeſſion*, that his *Church* teaches what it hath not been *taught* by the foregoing age, for it teaches a thing *de fide*, or neceſſary to be believed, which the *foregoing* age taught not as ſuch; 2. It concludes nothing to his advantage, but rather againſt him, *viz.* that probable opinions of their former *Doctours*, are converted into matters of *Faith* by their *latter*. Thus 'tis evident, that all the *Mothers*, that inſtruct their children out of *Bellarmine's Catechiſm*, aſſure them * that *the Bleſſed Virgin never had any ſpot of ſin neither original nor actual*, which *S. W.* if he continue to be Mr. *White*'s Scholar, will not yield to have been any part of the *Faith* of the *foregoing* age. And then 'tis not a much larger ſtep for a mere *falſity* to be help'd to a fair *varniſh*, and converted into a *probable* opinion; And he knows this is the *progreſs* by which we affirm the *Romiſh additionals* to have advanced from groundleſs into *probable* opinions, and from thence into *definitions*.

* *Chriſt. Doctr.* p. 142.

26. But if by *taught*] he mean *taught* as an *article* of *faith*, then to take this for confeſs'd, and needing no proof, which is of all things moſt *denyed* by us, what an intolerable *begging* of the *queſtion* is it?

27. This again were ſufficient to evacuate his propoſition, which pretends to no truth but from his adverſaries *largneſs*, and that will not always be afforded him. But I ſhall add a little more on this head, to juſtifie the reaſonableneſs of our *non-conceſſion* or down-right *denyal*, and it ſhall be by a few inſtances; The *firſt* in the *Doctrine* of *Purgatory*, which is competently known to be not barely an *opinion*, but a *Doctrine* of *Faith* in the *preſent Roman Church*, meaning thereby, as it is viſible they mean, not that of the *conflagration* at the day of Judgment, but the *purgative pains* of *Souls*, attending their departure out of the body, wherein thoſe ſouls which ſhall one day come to *heaven*, are now *detained*. Yet of this we have evidence enough, that it hath not been thus delivered to the *preſent Church* by the foregoing in this quality of a Doctrine or point of *Faith*; Inſtead of many, take the *Teſtimony* of † *Otho Friſingenſis*, who wrote above *five hundred years* ſince, *Eſſe apud Inferos locum Purgatorium in quo ſalvandi vel tenebris tantum afficiantur vel expiationis igne decoquantur quidam aſſerunt, That there is in the other world a Purgatory, in which they which ſhall be ſaved, are either puniſhed with darkneſs onely, or ſcorch'd with the fire of expiation, is aſſerted by ſome.* Which concludes it at that time but an *opinion* of *ſome*, and not any *publick Doctrine*, or *article* of *Faith*. What Mr. *White* himſelf hath thought in this queſtion, can be no *ſecret*, after the publiſhing his thoughts *de medio animarum ſtatu*, where utterly denying any * ſuch *Purgatory*, as from the *Schools* is now vulgarly taught, and contenting himſelf with that of the † *conflagration* at the day of judgment, he yet vindi-

† *Chron.* l. 8. c. 26.

* *Non itaque locum uſpiam tartareis oppletum ferculis cogitamus, quibus ab extrinſeco tortore lanienam patiantur. Dim.* 1. p. 3.

† *Quiſquis admittit animas purgari in die judicii per flammas conflagrationis, defendit Purgatorium in ſenſu ſanctorum. Dim.* VII. p. 26.

cates himſelf to be far from departing from the faith of the *ancient Church*, adding alſo (how truly let others inquire) that the contrary is at this day but an *opinion* and not *Doctrine* of their *Church*. Which if it were true, it were a great *partiality* firſt, and yet withall a great *ſeverity*, that when they have liberty to think as they pleaſe, we *Proteſtants* ſhould be condemned for *hereticks* (if not for *Schiſmaticks* too) for not ſubſcribing to this or the like *articles*, which in the ſame manner as this, are taught in the *Roman Church*. One advantage of weight this point hath above ſome other, that it hath an eminent *practice* dependent on it, that of *Indulgences*, as they have been of later times uſed in their *Church*; and if one be not a *Doctrine* of *Faith*, 'twere ſtrange that the other, being wholly founded in it, ſhould be allowed ſo *general* and *ſolemn* a *practice* in their *Church*, (as for ſome time it had) that this authour, being by his hypotheſis kept from being * willing to yield it the *practice of the Church and Univerſal*, yet freely confeſſes, † *paſſim exerceri*, that 'tis *every where exerciſed*. Accordingly the *Doctrine* it ſelf, which he rejects, he yet owns as the *vulgar opinion* though not of the *Church*, yet of the *Homines Eccleſiæ*, *perſons* of which the *Church* hath conſiſted ſince the time of the *Schools*. The importance of this *diſtinction* of his may be worth obſerving; It is this, as far as I can deduce from what himſelf declares; that what they believe or acknowledge as * *ſo many perſons*, not as ſo many *believers*, or parts of the *Church*, belongs not to the *Faith*, any more than an *opinion* in *Philoſophy* or *Hiſtory*; but what they believe as a † *Church* or *company of Believers*, that belongs to them as to thoſe that have *accepted the Doctrine of Chriſt, and conſerved it to this very day*, which, ſaith he, can have no place in this opinion, which * *'tis clear that it began from the times of Gregory the Great, was not thought of in Auſtin's time*, and *not very famous before the age of the School, and either not propoſed or rejected by the Eaſtern Church*, and therefore whatſoever ſort of *perſwaſion* may be pretended for it, in reſpect of the men of the *Church* yet it *hath no pretenſion to them*, † *as they are a Church*, i. e. *as believers*, i. e. *as founded upon perpetual Tradition*. Thus he, and from thence I ſhould hope it concluſible to others, as well as to this particular, that whatſoever is in the *preſent Roman Church* moſt *generally* believed, if it be not *founded* in *perpetual tradition*, but appear to have a *later beginning*, or no *Univerſal reception* in other parts of the *Church*, ſhall not paſs for a *point* of *faith*. And this will be a competent prejudice to the *Oral* way, which ſaith *S. W.* from its being *held now, concludes it was ever held.*

* *Si dicas eſſe praxim—& tamen non permittis eſſe ſingulorum praxim, ſed Eccleſiæ & Univerſalem, tardus accedo, Dim.* 27. p. 120.

† *Si dicas paſſim exerceri, ſi à multis, à pleriſque, omnia fateor—Ibid.*

Dim. 28.

* *Tot homines & perſonæ.*

† *Cum Eccleſia ſit congregatio fidelium, hoc eſt credentium, hoc eſt eorum qui Chriſti doctrinam acceptaverunt, & uſque in hodiernum diem conſervaverunt.* p. 126.

* *Hanc autem ſententiam clarum ſit incepiſſe—Ibid.*

† *In eos ut Eccleſia ſunt, hoc eſt ut credentes, hoc eſt ut ſuper perpetua traditione fundati, nullum prætextum habet. Ibid.*

28. But I ſhall lead the Reader to another view of this *authour*'s ſenſe of this matter, when a year after the publiſhing the Tract *de med. An. Statu*, he comes, on another ingagement, to conſider this point of *Purgatory*. In my *Lord* of *Faulkland's* * *Reply* to an *Anſwer* of his to his *Lordſhips* diſcourſe of *Infallibility*, the words of *Biſhop Fiſher* were produced, that *there are many things of which there was no inquiry in the Primitive Church, which yet upon doubts ariſing are now become perſpicuous by the diligence of after-times.* And his inſtance being of *Purgatory* and *Indulgences*, is expreſs'd in ſuch words, as evidently ſhew (what the *Lord* obſerved) that *he ſpeaks not of matters of bare opinion*, but of *points of faith*, *No Orthodox man*, † ſaith that *Biſhop*, *doubts whether there be a Purgatory, of which yet among the ancients* there is * *no mention, or exceeding rarely; it is not believed by the Greeks to this day, neither did the Latines conceive this truth but by little and little*; and again, *Purgatory was a good while unknown, after, partly by Revelations, partly by Scripture it came by little and little to be believed by ſome, and ſo at laſt the belief of it was generally received by the Catholick Churches. And for Indulgences, who*, ſaith he, *can wonder, that in the Primitive Church* there was *no uſe of them, which began after men had trembled a while at the torments of Purgatory.* To this Mr. *White*'s anſwer is, that he † *conceives there is a great equivocation through want of care and warineſs in diſtinguiſhing* (here then we are like to have an eſſay, how *ambiguous* the plaineſt *teſtimony* may be rendred, when *Wits*, as S. *W.* told us, have to deal with it) *For*, ſaith he, *let us take the Council of Florence or Trent, in which we have the Churches ſenſe concerning both Purgatory and Indulgences, and ſee whether the holy Biſhop ſays any of the points thoſe Councils defined, are either denyed by the Greeks, or brought in by private Revelations, or new Interpretations of Scripture. For how could he be ignorant that the Greek had agreed to the Latine Church about the definition of Purgatory in the Council of Florence, or forget himſelf ſo far as not to remember a publick practice, indulgences in all the ancient Church for remiſſion of penal injunctions laid upon ſinners? Beſides he ſaith that the Latines did not receive Purgatory at once, but by little and little. Whence 'tis evident by the name Purgatory he means not onely ſo much as is eſtabliſhed in the Council, but that the manner alſo and circumſtances were introduced by revelations of private perſons, and argumentations of Divines. The like he expreſſes of Indulgences, ſaying they began after men had trembled a while at the pains of Purgatory. Whence it is plain he contented not himſelf with the preciſe ſubject of the Councils definition, or the ſenſe of the Church, but included alſo interpretations as Divines give of them. So that by ſpeaking in general terms, and not diſtinguiſhing the ſubſtance of Purgatory from the accidents and dreſſing of it, as likewiſe in Indulgences not ſeparating what the Church hath alway practiſed, from the interpretative extenſion which Divines attribute to them, he is miſtaken to ſuppoſe new articles of Faith may be brought into the Church; Neither imports it that he uſeth theſe words, No Orthodox man now doubts, for that is true of ſuch concluſions as are termed Theological, and generally received in the Schools, yet are not arrived to the pitch of making a point of Catholick belief: beſides he expreſſes himſelf that this generally extends no farther than that there is a Purgatory.* Thus far are the words of his anſwer, which I have ſet down at large, that I might not *maim* by abbreviating them, and that the *Reader* may with eaſe accompany me in a diſtinct view of them.

* *P.* 109.

† *P.* 496.

* *Apud priſcos nulla, vel quam rariſſima fiebat mentio, ſed Græci ad hunc uſquediem non creditur Purgatorium eſſe. Roff. cont. artic.* 19. *Luth.*

† *Apol.* p. 59.

29. With his firſt propoſal then I ſhall comply ſo far, as to take the *Council* of *Florence* or *Trent* and diſcern what advantage theſe will help him to, toward the avoiding the force of the *Biſhop's Teſtimony*. For though that *Biſhop* dyed almoſt thirty years before the drawing up the *Decree de Purgatorio-*

torio in the *Council* of *Trent*, and ſo can have no relation to that, yet this ſhall not cauſe any difference between us. The *decree* of *Florence* and of *Trent* are very conſonant in the matter of *Purgatory*; That of *Trent*, * *Eſſe Purgatorium—— that there is a Purgatory, and that the ſouls there detained are helped by the ſuffrages of the faithfull, but eſpecially by the acceptable ſacrifice of the Altar.* That of *Florence*, † that *if thoſe that are truely penitent, die in the love of God, before they have by meet fruits of Repentance ſatisfied for their commiſſions and omiſſions, their ſouls after death are purged by Purgatory pains, but ſo, as that for their relief from thoſe pains the helps of faithfull men living are profitable to them*, viz. *the holy Sacrifices and Prayers and Alms and other works of piety, which are wont to be performed by the other faithfull, according to the precepts of the Church.*

* *Concil. Trid. Seſſ.* XXV.

† ὅσοις τῆς Συνόδ. t. 8. p. 853.

30. Now that the *Biſhop* ſpake not of this thus defined by the *Councils*, he ſuppoſes himſelf to have proved *demonſtratively* by this onely argument, becauſe the *Greeks* had agreed to the *Latine Church* about this *definition* in the *Council* of *Florence*. But herein the *Seſſions* of that *Council* will ſufficiently inform us. In the *fifteenth Seſſion* we reade that *four Metropolitanes* conſented to this determination, μήτε ὑπάρχειν μὲν ἐν βασανιστηρίῳ καὶ εἴτε πῦρ ἐστὶν, εἴτε ζόφος καὶ θύελλα, εἴτε τι ἕτερον, ἃ διατείνεται *Ibid.* p. 838. μεθα, *that the middle ſouls are in a place of torment, and whether it be fire, or miſt and tempeſt, or any thing elſe, they contend not.* When therefore the *article* in the ſame *Seſſion* was drawn up into this form, that they which had *ſinn'd and confeſs'd and were in the number of penitents, and had not performed works of ſatisfaction, ſhould goe into Purgatory fire, and being there purged ſhould be placed in the number of thoſe who behold God's eſſence immediately*, the *Greeks* anſwer then is, that they *had no power from their Emperour to anſwer any thing*, but as *friends privately they anſwered that they receive that which they ſaid of Purgatory, and they* truely *admitted that the Souls ſee the eſſence of God*, and being preſs'd to *receive* their *writing*, having no *mandate* of the *Emperour's*, they *received it not.* So again when the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* was *dead*, an *Epiſtle* of his is produced wherein of *Purgatory* he ſaith, ὅτε δὲ αὐτὸ ἐχώρισαν, ὅτε ἀναγκαῖον δὴ, that *the diviſion* or *ſeparation was not on that account, neither was it neceſſary.* Then the *Emperour* called all the *Prelates* of the *whole Church*, and in ſome the whole *Oriental Synod*, and the *determination* was concerning *Purgatory* and one other particular, μήδ' ὅλως εἰπεῖν περὶ αὐτῶν, *that they ſhould not at all ſpeak of them*, ἀγνοοῦντες ὡς ὅμως τῷ ἀληθῆ τὰ πράγματα περαίνειν, *not knowing as I think, the true determination of the matter.* Then the *Latines* reſiſted the *Emperour*, and told him, that 'tis impoſſible for the *Church* to be *united*, unleſs theſe two *controverſies* be added; But the *Emperour* οὐ κατεπείσθη, *would not be perſwaded*; Then the *Latines* preſs'd τὸ περὶ τῶν καθαρσίων μόνον τιθῶσιν ἐν ὅρῳ, *that there ſhould be no more put in the decree but onely the mention of Purgatory.* Then after a while, the *occaſions* of *departing* preſſing the *Emperour*, he tells them, * *he hath no more to ſay, but that he can ſtay no longer.* Then *Cardinal Julian* doeth what he can παραθύειν to *mollifie* the *Emperour*, and again, all *going to his houſe* ἀναγκάζουσι τὸν βασιλέα πολλὰ, *We earneſtly conſtrained him, telling him the onely queſtion was that the ſouls of penitent ſinners are purged by prayers*, and therefore they † *pioufly entertaining the Emperour, conſtrained him to finiſh the work, but he would not.* After that the *Emperour* called to him the *proxies* of the three *Patriarchs*, *Gregory* the *proxy* of the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, and *Marcus Metropolitan* of *Epheſus*, *proxy* both of the *Patriarch* of *Antioch* and *Jeruſalem*. But this produced nothing in favour of the *decree*, but on the contrary *Marcus* and *Scholarius* diſputed largely againſt it, as in the *Synod* is ſet down; and to conclude, the *Greek Biſhops returned home, and told their fellows what had paſs'd, and they diſliked and would not ſtand to the agreement*, ſo ſaith, *Laonicus Chalcocondylas, Græci domum reverſi non amplius his quæ convenerant in Italia, ſtare voluerunt, verùm apprehendentes ſententiam diverſam, noluerunt amplius in Religionis negotio adhærere Romanis. The Greeks returning home would not ſtand to the Italian concord, but taking up a contrary opinion, would not adhere to the Romans in the buſineſs of Religion.* On this the *Pope* ſent learned men to *Conſtantinople* to diſpute it; but, ſaith he, the *Greeks received not the Concord*, and *ubi ad colloquium & diſputationem ventum eſt, Romani nihil efficere potuerunt, verùm re infectâ domum reverſi ſunt, When they came to diſcourſe and debate, the Romans could prevail nothing, but returned home without doing ought.*

* Πλέον οὐδὲν λέγουσιν, ὁ καιρὸς δ' ἤγγικε, καὶ πλέον ἃ δοκεῖ μὴ μέλλειν. p. 844.

† Εὐσεβῶς ἀναγκάζουσι τὸν βασιλέα πολλὰ, τὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὁσίοις ἀνδράσι τὸ ἔργον ἐκτελεσθῆναι. *Ibid.*

l. VI. p. 407.

31. For the farther clearing of the *Greeks* ſenſe, I refer the Reader to their *Apologetick* Tract written (as now we have it annex'd to *Nilus* and *Barlaam*) but a year before the *Council* of *Florence*, and deſigned particularly, and accordingly preſented to the *Latines* in the *Council* of *Baſil*, to give them aſſurance of their Doctrine in this point. For *Purgatory*, ſay they, *and temporary puniſhment by fire*, ἡμεῖς ὑπὸ τῶν ἡμετέρων οὐ παρειλήφαμεν διδασκάλων, *We have not received it from our Doctours, nor do we know that the Eaſtern Church is of that mind*; and † again, μήτε παρά τινος——*We have not received it from any of the Doctours; and we are afraid, leſt if we ſhould define this temporary punitive Purgatory*, τῷ παντὶ λυμαινώμεθα τῆς ἐκκλησίας πληρώματι, *We ſhould doe miſchief to the whole body of the Church*; rendring their reaſon, becauſe *God* having *pronounced that the wicked ſhall goe into everlaſting fire, and all believers ears being acquainted with this from their youth, and dreading it above all things, and guiding their words and actions accordingly*, εἰ νῦν ἐν νέῳ, *if they ſhall now of new come with this ſtyle of temporary fire*, 'tis to be *feared*, that *Chriſtians will believe all fire to be ſuch as this, and ſo that all ſhall have an end*, as *Origen* thought, and by this means *bring in great ſtore of fewel for the eternal fire*; From which and other ill conſequences, their reſolution is expreſs, οὐδέποτε μέχρι τῆς νῦν εἰρήκαμεν τοιοῦτο οὐδὲν, οὐδ' ὅλως ἐροῦμεν, that they *never till that day had ſaid any ſuch thing, nor ever would.* * Again they affirm, that *never any of the Doctours of their Church made any mention of this*, inſiſting on St. *Chryſoſtom's* teſtimony to the contrary on that Text of 1 *Cor.* 3. and aſſerting his skill, and the aſſurance of *God's Spirit* in interpreting thoſe *Epiſtles*, againſt whatever could be pretended by the *Latines* from any of their *Doctours*. And ſo on, vindicating their aſſertion, that never any of their *Doctours* had mentioned any ſuch matter, and † charging on the *Latines* a citation of theirs out of *Theodoret*, which was * no where to be found in his *writings*.

* *Edit. Hanov.* p. 119.

† *P.* 123.

* *P.* 124.

† *P.* 147. 1.

* ἐν οὐδενὶ φαίνεται πώποτε εἰρημένος——

32. I ſhall conclude this, with the expreſs and full *ſuffrage* of the *Greeks* inhabiting at *Venice*, in their anſwer to the *queſtions* of the *Cardinal* of *Guiſe*, tranſlated and publiſh'd at *Baſil* by *Leunclavius*, where to the queſtion of their ſenſe of *Purgatory*, their † return is, *we by no means believe that there remains any Purgatory-fire after death*; and to the ſame ſenſe more at large, in the *anſwer* to the *tenth queſtion.*

† *Ad Qu.* 9. *Nequaquam poſtmortem reſtare Purgatorium quemnam ignem credimus.*

33. Here, then 1. appears the unſeaſonableneſs of Mr. *White*'s queſtion, how the *Holy Biſhop could be ignorant, that the Greeks agreed to the Latines about the definition of Purgatory in the Council of Florence?* The *Biſhop*, I doubt not, knew the very truth which hath here been ſhewed, and judged not the *Greeks* to have ever admitted that *Doctrine*, which onely ſome *few Biſhops* of theirs in the *Council* yielded to, for the gaining advantage by an *union*, but others from the beginning reſiſted, and all their *whole Church* uniformly upon their return to their *Country*, *diſclaimed* and finally rejected. And then what ſhew or colour of truth is there in this whole anſwer, whoſe one *fundamental* proof hath thus failed him, and inſtead whereof, the argument is of full force againſt him, the *Purgatory* defined in the *Council* of *Florence*, is that which the *Greek Church believed* not, but uniformly rejected after the *Council*; and that *Purgatory* which the *Greeks* thus rejected, is it which *Biſhop Fiſher* ſpeaks of; therefore in his aſſertion, the *Purgatory* defined by the *Council* of *Florence* was never mentioned by the *Ancients*, or *very rarely*, and ſo was no matter of *faith among them*, neither did the *Latines receive it at once* (and ſo 'twas no part of the πίστις ἅπαξ παραδοθεῖσα, *the faith at once delivered*, *Jud.* 3.) but *by little and little*, it was *a good while unknown*——which was the thing induced from that *Teſtimony*.

34. Many other infirmities there are in the remaining parts of that anſwer; as 1. that he interprets thoſe words [*No Orthodox man now doubts*] of *concluſions Theological* and *generally received in the Schools*, *but not arrived to the pitch of making a point of Catholick belief*] whereas 'tis evident, and from his following words neceſſarily inferr'd, that the *Biſhop* by that phraſe means *matter* of *faith*. For 1. theſe are his words, *No Orthodox man now doubts whether there be a Purgatory*; not ſpeaking of the *circumſtances*, but the very *being* of a *Purgatory*, and that ſure is a matter of *Faith* with the *Romaniſt*. 2. He farther expreſſeth his ſenſe in theſe plain words, *at laſt the belief of it was generally received by the Catholick Churches*] What can more punctually expreſs a *point* of *Catholick belief*? 2. That he interprets the *Indulgences* here mentioned, of thoſe in the *ancient Church* for *remiſſion of penal injunctions laid on ſinners*; when by the dependence of *Indulgences* on *Purgatory*, 'tis neceſſary the *Biſhop* muſt mean the *Indulgences* by which men are freed from *Purgatory-flames*, and not from the *cenſures* here in this *life*, of which onely the *Ancients* ſpake. 3. That from the *Biſhop's* mention of the *Latines receiving Purgatory by little and little*, he concludes it *evident that he means not onely ſo much as is eſtabliſhed by the Council* whether of *Trent* or *Florence*] when no ſuch thing can be evidenced from that mention; but on the contrary, that the very ſubſtance of *Purgatory* being never or *very rarely mentioned* by the *Ancients*, ſome Texts of *Scripture* were yet thought applicable firſt to the *conflagration* at the end of the *world*, then, in poceſs of time, to *temporary puniſhments*, commencing at the end of this *life*, to thoſe who dyed without performance of works of *ſatisfaction*; and this certainly was the thing which came into belief from *Revelations* of *private perſons*, and *interpretations* of *Scriptures*, and conſequently the *Purgatory* defined in the *Council* in the words *quibus detentæ*, *&c.* and not onely the *circumſtances* which are not *defined* there. So 4. when from the *Biſhop's* ſaying, that *Indulgences began when men had trembled a while at the pains of Purgatory*] he concludes again, that *it is plain he contented not himſelf with the preciſe ſubject of the Councils definition*] whereas 'tis moſt evident he might and muſt mean the *Doctrine* of his *Church* in *his* time to be, that by *Indulgences* men were freed from the *pains* of *Purgatory*, and that was the *Councils definition* of it. And ſo ſtill it is moſt evident, that that *Biſhop* is not miſtaken by us, but rightly believed to ſuppoſe that *new articles* of the *Faith* may be brought into the *Church*.

35. And I diſcern not how this could be ſo incredible to Mr. *White*, who, as 'twas cited from him, affirms, in general, that ſuch * *additions are the very buſineſs and end of ſuch aſſembling of Councils*; and, in application to this particular, will never be able to make good (I may from his Tract *de med. animæ ſta.* conclude, he will never attempt to *ſhew*) that that very *Purgatory*, in which, ſaith the *Council*, *animæ fidelium detentæ*, *the ſouls of believers are detained* (and cannot be interpreted of the *conflagration*, which begins not till the day of *Judgment*) that βασανιζόμενον, ſtate of *temporary tormenting puniſhments*, relievable by the *prayers*, and *ſacrifice*, and *almes*, i. e. the *merits* of the *living*, againſt which he expreſly, and ſtrongly argues, *p.* 68. (omitting all other *circumſtances* and *dreſſings*, and taking it barely, as it was taught by the *Council*) was ever to be found as an *article* of *Faith* in the *Primitive Church*. Thus much for that one teſtimony of *Biſhop Fiſher's*, which is not peculiar to him; *Alfonſus de Caſtro adv. har.* l. 8. under the title of *Indulgences*, makes the ſame obſervation, and *Polydor Virgil* repeats *Biſhop Fiſher's* words *verbatim*, *de invent. rer.* l. 8. c. 1. and this, if we wanted other ſtore, alone evinces, that their *Church* in one age hath taught ſome things as of *faith*, which have not been taught as ſuch in former ages; and ſo, that it cannot be yielded to have gone on his pretended *maxim*, of never doing ſo.

* *Apol. p.* 224.

36. In accordance with this, I ſhall proceed to another inſtance; It is competently known, that many of the *ancienteſt Fathers* both of the *Greek* and *Latine Church* did maintain, that the *Souls* of *juſt men* departed, injoying not the *viſion* of *God*, were kept in certain *hidden receptacles* (whether in, or) *without* the *body* of the *Heavens*, enjoying *eaſe* and *reſt from their labours*, the ſight of *Chriſt's humane nature*, the frequent *viſits* of *Angels*, and with joy expecting the *reſurrection* of their *bodies*, and with that, the *conſummation* of their bliſs. Of this opinion *Pope John* XXII. is acknowledged to have been, and the *prayer* of the * *Roman Church* for the *dead*, under the ſtyle of [*Qui nos præceſſerunt cum ſigno fidei, & dormiunt in ſomno pacis, Who have gone before us with the ſign of the Faith, and ſleep in the ſleep of peace*] and again, *Omnibus in Chriſto quieſcentibus, all that reſt in Chriſt*] is an argument for it ſo convincing, that † *Occam*, that produceth it as an *objection* of the *Joannites* (as he calls them) and preſſeth it ſo, that it cannot be underſtood of the *Souls* in *Purgatory* under *pain* and *affliction*, whereas theſe are ſaid to *ſleep in the ſleep of peace*, and to be *at reſt*, gives it one anſwer, which wants but little of granting all that is *demanded*, *viz.* that *that prayer of the Church is for the holy ſouls in heaven*, *that they which ſleep the ſleep of peace may reſume their bodies and come to the place and ſtate of their ultimate felicity*.

* *In Can. Miſſa.*

† *Dial par.* 2. *Tract.* 2. c. 3.

37. Now of this opinion thus profeſs'd in the *Church*, ſeveral uſes might be made to our purpoſe, concerning the *uninterrupted* handing down of all *Traditions* pretended by *S. W.* The onely

uſe

uſe of it, which I deſign at this time, is in relation to the former Doctrine of *Purgatory flames*, with which that *ſleep of peace* is ſufficiently unreconcileable, and that belonging to the very ſame *ſubject* (not the *Souls* of *Martyrs*, and ſome ſuch ſpecial *eminent* perſons, but) *juſt* or *holy* men indefinitely, quite contrary to the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, which placeth thoſe very ſouls in the condition of *horrible torments*.

38. Of the *truth* of this Doctrine, my *argument* requires me not to ſpeak; The whole force of it, as far as I now deſign in it, ſhall be given *S. W.* from the pen of one of his own friends, * *Pamelius*, in his *antidote* to the *ninth Paradox* of *Tertullian*, where ſpeaking of this, as of an *errour*, he ſaith, it was yet no *prejudice to the learning and piety of thoſe ſo illuſtrious writers, whilſt the Church had not determined any thing to be certainly believed in that article, but*, ſaith he, *ſince the Univerſal Council of Florence which hath made a definition in this matter, aliter ſentire non licet, it is not lawfull to think otherwiſe*, than the *Council* hath defined. From whence ſure it will be no inſolence to *conclude*, that that which *ſince* the *Council* of *Florence* hath *commenced* ſuch, was no *article* of *Faith* before that *Council*.

* *Pamel. Edit. Tertull.* p. 31. G.

39. This opinion of the *hidden* and *quiet receptacles*, was by my *Lord* of *Faulkland* † ſeveral times mentioned to Mr. *White*, in his *Reply* about *Infallibility*, twice as a proof that ſome things were now *received* as Doctrines, without any ſuch *continued line* of *Tradition*, by name that of the *Saints injoying the beatifical viſion before the day of judgment*, and once as a viſible prejudice to *Invocation* of *Saints departed*, which the *Romaniſt* founds upon the ſuppoſition of their being already *admitted* to the *Beatifical viſion*; And 'tis not unworthy a ſlight reflexion, to obſerve what returns that *Apologiſt* hath made to theſe inferences.

† P. 59. 83. 114.

40. To the former he * anſwers expreſly, the *Beatifical viſion of the Saints before the day of judgment is not yet held a matter of Faith, but onely a Theological concluſion. Not yet held* (he muſt mean by the *Romaniſts*) a *matter of faith*; To which I might reply, that then it ſeems, *definitions* of *General Councils* amount not among them to the conſtituting *matters of Faith*, for 'tis certain the *Council* of *Florence defined* this againſt the *Armenians*; But I ſhall rather expect his *own verdict*, in another place, where he ſpeaks † again of this matter, and then, that he may, as he ſaith, *utterly deſtroy the objection* fetch'd from hence againſt *Invocation*, his words are as expreſs, that *thoſe who ſay we learn by Tradition that Saints are to be prayed to, ſay likewiſe we have learned by Tradition that Saints go to heaven*, i. e. *are admitted to the ſight of God before the day of Judgment*. Here the Reader muſt remember, even now, *it was not held a matter of Faith*, and yet now *they have learn'd it by Tradition*.

* *Mr. White's Apol. for Tradit.* P. 56.

See here p. 415.

† P. 103.

41. Here then I demand *firſt*, who they are that *ſay they learn'd by Tradition* theſe *two* Articles? The *Romaniſts*, I muſt ſuppoſe. And then my *ſecond* queſtion muſt be, whether Mr. *White* be ſuch, and whether he be not the very ſame *Apologiſt* that ſaid before, that one of theſe is *not yet held a matter of Faith*? The *leaſt* that the Reader can infer from hence, is the *moſt* that our cauſe demands, that all the *Articles* which the *Romaniſts* have *learn'd by Tradition* (yea and defined in their reputed *General Councils*) are *not yet held matters of Faith*; for I muſt not imagine that this *miracle of wit* ſhould thus fail in point of *memory*, when he thus wrote.

† P. 56.

42. The wonder is leſs, that in that *other* † Book publiſhed a year afore, he ſhould let fall ſome paſſages which agree not with either of theſe. For whereas in the former of theſe, he ſaith, *the beatifical viſion of Saints before the day of Judgment is not yet held a matter of Faith*, he there ſaith, * *it is not lawfull in reſpect of the matter to free it either from utility to piety, or from neceſſity of faith*; And whereas in the latter of theſe he explains the *Saints going to heaven*, by their *admiſſion to the ſight of God, before the day of judgment*, and makes both of them *Tradition*, he there acknowledges that * *very many of the Ancients* † (*Irenæus, Juſtin, Tertullian, Clemens Romanus, Lactantius, Origen, Victorinus, Prudentius, Chryſoſtome, Theodoret, Aretas, Oecumenius*, by name) *did ſeriouſly deny that the Saints were in heaven*, yet that none (but St. *Bernard* and *John* XXII.) ever ſpake * *ſo much as doubtingly* of the *article* of their *ſeeing God*——But this by the way.

† *De med. Anim. ſtatu.*

* *Neque articulus eſt quem materiei ratione vel ab utilitate ad pietatem vel à neceſſitate fidei liberare liceat, Dim.* 4. P. 13.

* *Verum eſt complures hoc ſeriò negaviſſe, ſanctos in cœlis eſſe*, Ib. † P. 15.

43. Other miſcarriages, I think, there are very diſcernible in this Apologiſt's *anſwer* to this *argument* againſt *Invocation*; as when *ſuppoſing* the Souls of *Saints* are *not received* into *heaven*, he asks, *may they not nevertheleſs pray for us*? when he knows that is not the *queſtion*, but whether we are to *pray to them*, which certainly depends on their coming to ſome *knowledge* of our *prayers*, and that again, on their injoying the *beatifical viſion*, as the *Romaniſt* himſelf confeſſes, and as was expreſs'd in the *objection*, but not at all taken notice of by that *irrefutable Apologiſt*; But this and the other parts of the anſwer, juſt of the ſame batch, I omit, becauſe the former is onely pertinent to our preſent matter.

* *Vel dubitanter.*

44. Add to theſe the Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, as now it is taught, in the *Roman Church*, to be the *converſion of the ſubſtance of the bread into the ſubſtance of the body of Chriſt*, and yet is confeſs'd by the *Romaniſts* themſelves not to have been any *Doctrine* of *Faith* before the *definition* of *Innocent* III. in the *Council* of *Lateran*.

45. Whether the *ancient Church* had that apprehenſion of the meaning of the words of *Chriſt*, is not the *queſtion* (though if it were, we ſhould have no difficulty to evidence it againſt the *Romaniſts* by arguments of that nature, which moſt of thoſe, if not *S. W.* acknowledge to have force with them in other things) but onely whether it were till this *late* date, any *article* of *Faith*.

† *In* 4. *diſt.* 11. q. 3.

46. That it was not, is known to be the affirmation of † *Scotus*, as even now was touched, who is rebuked for it by * *Bellarmine*, though acknowledged to ſay true by *Perron*, as renowned and learned a Cardinal. But he is not *alone* in that *confeſſion*. All they that excuſe *Theodoret*, for ſaying that the *Sacramental Symbols do not depart from their own nature after the conſecration, but remain in their former eſſence and ſhape and form*] becauſe at that time the *Church* had not *defined* in that matter, are evidently of *Scotus*'s mind. Thus doth the *Authour* of the *Preface* before that *Father's Dialogues* in the *Roman* Impreſſion 1547. *Theodoret*, ſaith he, *may perhaps be worthy ſome pardon, that at that time de ea re ab Eccleſia nondum fuiſſet aliquid promulgatum, nothing was promulgate of that matter by the Church*. Many the like teſtimonies of the *Romaniſts*, in relation to him, and

* *De Euchar.* l. 3. c. 23.

Οὐ μόνα τὰ ἀγνὰ τῶν μυστικῶν σύμβολα τῆς ἰδιότητος ἐξίστασθαι φύσεως μένει γὰρ ὅπερ ἦν πρὸ τῆς θέσεως καὶ ἐν εἴδει καὶ τῷ σχήματι καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ. *Theod.*

* *Gelaſius*, *Dial.* 2.

* *Esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis & vini. Contr. Eutych. & Nestor. de duab. Nat. in Christ.*

* *Gelasius*, the Reader shall find together in the most learned *Bishop* of *Edinburgh* his *consideration de Eucharistia*, p. 401. from *Ruardus Tapperus*, *Harding*, *Fisher*, all to this sense, that *before* the *definition* made by the *Church* (i. e. at *Laterane*) 'twas not *repugnant* to the *sincerity* of the *Faith*, either to be *ignorant* or to *doubt* of the truth of that *Doctrine*.

† *Censor. Belg. in Indic. Expurg. de Bertr. in fine.*

47. The like passages there are among those who give the more moderate *censures* of *Bertram* (and are not so precipitously bent, with *Bellarmine*, to give him up for an *heretick*) confessing that he was *ignorant how the accidents could subsist without any subject*, &c. † *quæ subtilissimè & verissimè posterior ætas per sacras Scripturas addiderit, which the latter age hath by holy Scriptures most subtilely and most truely added.* The like say many others, in their defence of *Scotus*'s words. Let our *Bishop Tunstall*, and *Vasquez* serve for the many more that might be (and by the *Bishop* of *Edinburgh* are)

* *P. 405. &c.*

* enumerated on this Theme.

† *Tunstal. de ver. Corp. Chr. in Euchar. p. 46.*

48. The † former in these words, *Ante Innocentium tertium* —— *Before Innocent the third, Bishop of Rome, who presided in the Council of* Laterane, *they that examined the business more exactly, thought it might be done after three manners, but Innocent rejected the two former, and pitch'd upon the third*; though he cannot but express his opinion, that the *miracles are multiplyed* in *Innocent*'s way, and ask, if it had *not been better to have imposed silence on those who would be searching the manner*, or to have *left it* (undetermined) *to each mans conjecture, sicut liberum fuit ante illud Concilium, as it was free before that Council*, yet concluding it his opinion that now 'tis *defined*, the *judgment of the Church was to remain firm*; by which as he expresses his submission to the *Decree*, and so approves himself a *Romanist*, and so a competent witness in this matter, so he professes 'twas *free* to all to believe as they pleased for the *manner* (wherein alone *Transubstantiation* is concern'd) *before that Council.*

* *In 3. par. D. Th. Distr. 18. c. 1.*

49. As for *Vasquez*, his expressions are very well fitted for *S. W*'s turn, who will not believe any *change* to have been introduced into the *faith*, whose effects have not been *visible* in *practice*. For so saith this learned *Schoolman* it was on this point, * *Audito nomine Transubstantiationis, tanta inter recentiores aliquos Scholasticos exorta fuit controversia, ut quo magis ab ea extricare conati fuerint, eo majoribus difficultatibus seipsos implicaverint, As soon as the name of Transubstantiation was heard of, there rose so great a controversie among some later Schoolmen, that the more they endeavoured to extricate, the more they involved themselves in difficulties*, concluding that there is *nothing to be invented, which in that way can explain the difficulty.*

50. Here then, without examining the *truth* of this *decree*, or inquiring what *trust* is to be given to the *Romanist*'s relations of the *Acts* and *Canons* of that *Council*, the matter is again clear, as before in the point of *Purgatory*, that what is now a matter of *Faith* with the *Romanist*, was not as such delivered down from the *Apostles* times, or from the age immediately precedent to the *Council* of *Lateran.*

† *Nullus Presbyter sub pœna excommunicationis communicet populum sub utraque specie. Concil. Tom. VII. p. 1042. E.*

51. And what shall we say of those *two* other points of *Romish Doctrine*, and *practice* in this *Sacrament*, the denying the *Cup* to the *Laity*, and the *carrying* the *Host* about the *streets* in *pomp*, to be shew'd to the *people*? For the former of these, was it ever thought *necessary*, and enacted under pain of † *excommunication*, till the *thirteenth Session* of the *Council* of *Constance*, *An. Dom.* 1415. and hath not that very *Council* that *decreed* it, done it with an express *non obstante* to *Christ*'s *institution*, and the * *practice* of the *Primitive Church?* And doth not *Cassander*, as learned a man, and as much valued, as any of his age, confess that † *all the ancient Church*, both the *East to that very day, and the West for above a thousand years after Christ*, *especially in the solemn and ordinary administration of the Sacrament, gave it in both kinds to all the faithfull?* offering, if need were, *innumerable witnesses* of this truth. And shall we still believe it a certain *Maxim*, that the *Romanists* of this or that age proceeded by, never to deliver any thing to others, which was not delivered to them continually by *succession* from the *Apostles?*

* *Licèt Christus post cœnam instituerit, & suis Discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie, tamen hoc non obstante*---Ib. B.

Licèt in Primitiva Ecclesia reciperetur à fidelibus sub utraque specie, Ibid, c. † *Satis compertum est, universalem Christi Ecclesiam in huncusque diem, Occidentalem verò seu Romanam mille amplius à Christo annis, in solemni præsertim & ordinaria hujus Sacramenti dispensatione, utramque panis & vini speciem omnibus Ecclesiæ Christi membris exhibuisse*------Consult. Art. 22.

* *Ibid. Sect. de Circumgest.*

52. So likewise for the *circumgestation*, that learned * *Romanist*'s judgment is express, that it *seems præter veterum morem & mentem, haud ita longo tempore inducta, of no long standing in the Church, introduced beside the manner and mind of the Ancients*; and although he saith but [*videtur, seems*] and [*præter, beside*] it is evident by the proof he adds, that he means it really *is contrary* to it] For, saith he, *they*, i. e. the *Ancients have had this Sacrament in so much religion and veneration, that they admitted not any but the faithfull, such as they thought worthy to partake of it, either to receive or look upon it, and therefore before the consecration, the Catechumeni, Energumeni, penitents* (unabsolved) *and non-communicants were commanded by voice of the Deacon to depart*, and the *Door-keepers* looked to the performance: adding from *Albertus Crantzius*, that *Christ instituted the Sacrament for use and not for ostentation* or *shewing*; which if he did, then surely the modern *Roman practice*, and *Doctrine*, wherein that is founded, was not, according to direction of this *Maxim*, received from them, that by any *series* of *succession* conveyed it from *Christ*; And if in a matter of *practice*, that may have gotten *reception*, which is so contrary to the mind of *Christ*, why may not the same be imagined in point of *Faith*? when, as *Tertullian* asks on one side, (*de Cor.*) *Annon putas omni fideli* —— *Do you not think 'tis lawfull to any faithfull person to conceive and appoint what agrees to God, conduces to discipline*, and the eighth *Oecumenical Council* professeth to *observe and keep the laws delivered not onely from the Apostles and Orthodox Synods Oecumenical and Topical, but* even * *παρὰ τινὸς θεηγόρου πατρὸς καὶ διδασκάλου τῆς ἐκκλησίας, by any divine-speaking Father, a Doctour of the Church*, so 'tis as evident on the *other* side, that the *Doctrine* of the *Chiliasts*, from the infusions but of *one Doctour*, and he none of the profoundest, *Papias*, took root, and spread very far, and prevailed to the leading away *Justin* and *Irenæus*, and other great, and ancient lights of the *Church.*

* *Act X. Can 1. Concil. To. VII. par. 1. p. 977. B.*

53. To

53. To these *Instances* I shall add the *Canon* of *Scripture*, as it is defined in the † *Trent Decree*, following as it is pretended, *the writings of the Orthodox Fathers*, but far removed from being delivered down from the *Apostles* by a continued uninterrupted *Tradition* through all ages. For the truth of which, I need not enter the contestation, being able with so much more ease, to refer him to the late exact *Scholastick history* of Dr. *Cousins*, through every age of the *Church*, deducing the *doctrine* of the *Church of England* in this point, in opposition to the *Tridentine* definition.

† *Sess.* IV. *decr.* 1.

54 Thus much for the *third view* of his *Proposition*; and in every shape of it, it hath had the commendation of some constancy (though not altogether such as was taken notice of in *Alcibiades*, to have the utmost *beauty* of each age, yet) such as is well nigh as *admirable*, that in whatsoever sense of it, it might be usefull to our *demonstratour*, in that sense it is either certainly *false*, or utterly *unproved*, and *improbable*, and in whatsoever sense it hath any kind of but *probable truth* in it, it is wholly unserviceable to the undertaker. And with these *views* of a rarity having abundantly satiated my curiosity, I am very well content to give over the farther pursuit, though to him that were delighted with *chases*, there is behind in each *Scheme* variety of *quarry* to spend many waste hours upon; Let it suffice that I have thus far attended him, and driven his admired *Demonstration* to its *non ultra*, and sufficiently shewed, how far that *medium* is from *demonstrating*, which having no attempt of proof to secure the *truth* of it, is as much *denyed* (which sure doth not signifie *confess'd*) as the *conclusion*.

CHAP. IV.

A view of his six last Grounds.

SECT. I.

His ninth Ground. His plea of Possession unavailable. We plead not our possession at present. No prescribing against Truth. S. W's *confession. His censure of Intruders. His great displeasure on dating the Universal Pastorship from* Phocas's *time.* Gregorie's *testimony.* Baronius's *Authours.* S. W's *hard imposition. His weightless cavils. His contumely by ill hap falling on Christ.*

1. HAving thus largely examined his *first* set of *grounds*, and therein expresly his utmost pretensions for that which he professes his *best tenure*, *Possession attested by Tradition of his present Church*, I might spare the pains of surveying his *sixth Section*, which is intitled *The continuation of the same Grounds*; For if they are but the *same* with those, which have been so largely *refuted*, there will be no need of pursuing them so soon with any fresh *refutation*. Yet shall I not refuse to attend him through this *Stage* also, though I doe it more briefly, by way of reference sometimes to what hath already been more largely insisted on.

2. His *ninth Ground* then [*that the Catholick Church and her Champions ought in reason to stand upon Possession*] hath already been weighed in the balance, and found nothing contributive to the maintenance of the *Universal Pastorship* in *England*, there being no time assignable, wherein *this* in their notion of it (wherein alone we are concerned) can be *proved* to have been in *possession* in this *Island*; as hath appeared in the *answers* to his *four first grounds*. And then sure, they that never had *possession*, cannot well be allowed to *stand upon* it; or if they are peremptorily resolved to do so, will thereby proclaim to the world, their want of all *solid tenures*, who are forced to make so much of this *imaginary*. Which seeing they are inexorably bent on, I might, one would think, be allowed as reasonably to insist on the title of *right*, and having at this time certain *possession* on our side, and little doubt (if we may judge by the *first* times and records) of a *right* also, set them united in *balance* with his single and that imaginary assumed *possession*, which being brought to prove the *right*, cannot well be confirmed by it, and is it self so far from *approving* it self, that it cannot with any reason be thought competent to infer any thing else.

3. But because I must not *presume*, and am not now, out of its place, to attempt the *proving* the *right* on *our* sides, and profess to have no kind of opinion of such a sort of bare *possessions* as these, *possessions* of mens *minds* (which are not subject to *occupancy* and *prescription*, as *material* secular *possessions* are) considered without, and abstracted from the *reasonableness* and *justice* of them, I shall not think fit to found any plea of mine in such tenures; I have learn'd of the *eternal law* of *reason*, what * *Tertullian* hath put into a *definition*, that *truth* is a majesty *cui nemo præscribere potest, non spatium temporum, non patrocinia personarum, non privilegium regionum, against which none can prescribe, no space of times, no Patronage of persons, no privilege of regions*; adding, that *custome receiving its beginning from some ignorance or simplicity, in usum per successionem corroboratur, is by succession corroborated into use*, and so comes to be *defended against the truth*, whereas, saith he, *Christ calls himself the truth, not custome, and old custome is sometimes heresie*, and much more to the same purpose.

* *De Velandis Virg.* c. 1. *Pamel. Edit.* p. 229.

4. And therefore though *S. W.* in his *tenth* ground be willing to tempt me to *retort* this argument from *possession*, by putting me in mind, * that now we *are in actual possession of independency from the Pope*, and so that by his *strengthning the title of possession*, he presumes I will apprehend that *he hath pleaded for me, and ploughed my ground by his own heifer* (and having put this weapon into my hand, is sorely put to it, to wrest it out again, and in doing it, hath made as full a *confession*,

* P. 49.

as

† P. 50. as I could wiſh, that † *though in humane affairs where preſcription hath force, we uſe to call it poſſeſſion, when one hath enjoyed any thing for ſome certain time, yet in things of divine Inſtitution, againſt which no preſcription pleads, he onely can pretend poſſeſſion of any thing, who can ſtand upon it that he hath had it nearer Chriſt's time*, which is the abſolute renouncing of the title of *poſſeſſion*, and devolving all to that other of *right*) yet I ſhall not be wrought on by his *temptation*, nor plead that for our ſelves, which I diſlike in him, how great ſoever the *advantage* be on our ſide; but ſetting aſide ſo feeble a *tenure*, as that of our *bare poſſeſſion* is, which every *proſperous thief* hath liberty to inſiſt on, and in uſurpations of *Supreme rights*, which are by *divine natural* law, cannot be made *valid* by any tract of *time*; reduce all our plea for our ſelves (though, as I ſaid, I muſt not here go out of my way to demonſtrate it) to the one claim of *right*, as that by the beſt and moſt *authentick records* ſhall be found truly pleadable, and then leave *S. W.* to reconcile his own *antinomies*, that

* P. 47. * *poſſeſſion* (in things of this nature) *is of it ſelf a title*, and yet that

† P. 50. † *he who ſhall be found to have begun it later, unleſs he can evidence that he was driven out from an ancienter poſſeſſion, is not, for the preſent having ſuch a thing or power to be ſtyled a Poſſeſſour, but an Uſurper, an intruder, an invader, diſobedient, rebellious and Schiſmatical.* Cenſures ſo ſevere, that his enemy would not have been forward to heap them on his *Church*; Let him quit it of them, who hath impertinently drawn them down upon it; For though without *ſubmiſſion* of the *Church* to the *Pope*'s intruſions, it cannot truly be ſaid, that he hath ſo much as a *preſent poſſeſſion*, and therefore I have hitherto denyed him that (pooreſt) *Title*, yet it cannot be queſtioned but he hath aſſumed the *Monarchick Authority* of *Supreme Univerſal Biſhop*, and ſo is fallen under the *ſevereſt* of *S. W*'s *cenſures*, in caſe he ſhall be found not to have had it from *Chriſt's time*, for then he hath *begun it later*, and is not imaginable to have been *driven out from an ancienter poſſeſſion*, unleſs he pretend it by inheritance from *Caiaphas* the *Jewiſh High Prieſt* at that time.

5. In this matter then, if it ſhall appear that the *Pope* had it not from *Chriſt's time*, there is no more needfull to be attempted, to bring, by this his *Champion's* own Suffrage, this Catalogue of *heavieſt* guilts upon him, beginning in *Uſurper*, and ending in *Schiſmatical*; And for the evidencing of this, what can be deemed ſufficient, if the comparing of *Gregorie*'s, and *Boniface*'s words and *practices* be not? Paſſages in ſtory ſo *manifeſt*, that I ſhould not think fit to reflect on them any more, were I not ſeverely rebuked for *affirming* this *rawly*. [*I am not ignorant*, ſaith he, *that*

P 50. *D. H. rawly affirms, that the Pope's authority began in* Phocas's *time*; *but I hope no reader that cares much for his ſalvation, will take his word for honeſt, till he ſhew undenyable and evident matters of fact, concerning the beginning, progreſs, authours, abetters, oppoſers of that newly introduced Government of Head of the Church, the writers that time for it or againſt it, the changes it made in the face of the Eccleſiaſtical State, and the temporal alſo, with whoſe intereſt the other muſt needs be enlink'd, and what conſequence followed upon thoſe changes, together with all the circumſtances which affect viſible and extern actions; Otherwiſe, againſt the ſenſe of ſo many Nations in the Church they left, the force of Tradition, and ſo many unlikelyhoods prejudicing it, to tell us onely a crude ſtory that it was ſo, or putting us off with three or four quotations in Greek to no purpoſe, or imagining ſome chimerical poſſibilities, how it might have been done, hardly conſiſting with the nature of mankind, is an anſwer unworthy a man, much more a Doctour; and to ſay it crept in inviſibly and unobſerved, as Dreams do into mens heads, when they are aſleep, is the part of ſome dreaming dull head, who never look'd into the actions and nature of man, or compared them with the motives which ſhould work upon them.*

6. Hitherto *S. W.* hath gone on *triumphantly*, in a very *rare* and extraordinary piece of *Pageantry*, which 'twill be hard to parallel in all the moſt *Romance* acts of *Chivalry*, and no title is vile enough for his *adverſary*, that hath brought all this *wrath* upon himſelf by ſaying ſomewhere (he ſays not, and I remember not, where) that *the Pope's authority began in* Phocas's *time*, i. e. in effect by referring to two plain matters of *fact*, which are not for *S. W*'s intereſt to hear of. 1. That *Pope Gregory* in his own, and all his *anceſtours* name, up to St. *Peter*, renounced and diſclaimed the title of *Univerſal Paſtour*, as *impious*, *ſacrilegious*, *blaſphemous*, *Antichriſtian* and *Diabolical*; and yet *Boniface* his next Succeſſour but one, *affected* it, and obtained it to be beſtowed on him by *Phocas* the *Emperour*.

7. Herein it is not imaginable any more ſhould be incumbent on me, than to vouch my *proofs* for each part of that relation; and that is done irrefragably as to the firſt part of it, by the plain words of *Gregory* in many places of his own *Epiſtles*, which remain on the *Roman Regiſter*, and proclaim it his opinion that it is moſt *impious* and *Antichriſtian*, &c. for any *Biſhop* to be ſtyled *Oecumenical* or *Univerſal* (the teſtimonies have of late been ſeverally ſet down) and for the *ſecond Boniface*'s *affecting* and *obtaining* it from the *murtherer Phocas*, it is the expreſs narration of their

* *Ann. Ch.* 606. 1. *&* 2. own Hiſtorian * *Cardinal Baronius* out of *Anaſtaſius* and *Paulus Diaconus* (he might have added † *Platina* alſo) 1. that *Boniface dwelling at Conſtantinople till his Predeceſſour Gregorie's death, Phocam*

† *In vit. Bonif.* III. *ſibi demeruit in ejus amicitiam inſinuans, inſinuated himſelf into* Phocas's *friendſhip and got his favour.* 2. That *hujus rei cauſa factum eſt*——*for this cauſe it came to paſs, that* Phocas *writing to him though hated of Cyriacus Patriarch of Conſtantinople, profeſs'd that onely the Biſhop of* Rome *was to be called Oecumenical or Univerſal Biſhop*, adding that the *Biſhop of Conſtantinople could not, but Boniface himſelf obtained it of him.* Here is undenyable *teſtimony* for the truth of the *affirmation* in both parts; and indeed, if there be truth in the *former* part of *Gregorie's renouncing* and *diſclaiming* that title (of which his own words are ſo far from *ambiguous*, that the *Wits* muſt turn *Monopoliſts*, and deprive all other men of their *wits*, e'er they can wreſt that *evidence* from them) it matters not whether *Phocas*'s giving it to *Boniface* were true or no, becauſe the *Title* of *Univerſal Paſtour* being now *aſſumed*, which was diſclaimed by *Gregory*, 'tis neceſſary there ſhould be ſome beginning of that *Title* between *Gregory* and us, and then it matters not, whether it were in *Boniface* it began, or any other.

8. This then being ſufficiently *atteſted*, and ſo *demonſtrated* by that onely *medium*, which matters of *fact* can be *demonſtrated* by, I know not what will be deemed a *mature*, *concocted*, if this be ſtill a *crude* or *raw* affirmation; Is there any thing can ſecure us of a *matter* of *fact* but competency of *teſtimonies*? and what can be *competent*, if theſe are not? Here then is an *eſſay* of the *real ſe-*

verity

verity of this *demonſtratour*, that, when a matter of *fact* is thus *teſtified*, and nothing offered to be produced from any *diſſentient*, or contrary *teſtimony*, doth yet *conjure* all, that *care much for their ſalvation*, *not to take this word for honeſt*, i. e. to *diſbelieve* and reject all *teſtimony*, untill many things more be done, [*undeniable and evident matters of fact ſhewn concerning the beginning, progreſs, authours, abetters, oppoſers, writers of that time for it or againſt it, changes in the face of the State Eccleſiaſtical and temporal, together with no leſs than all the circumſtances*, &c.] which what it is, but to propoſe a moſt *impertinent*, *uſeleſs*, *long*, if not *endleſs* task (when the matter is ſo *clear* already, that more diligence would but help to *obſcure* it, or elſe it were more than *poſſible* to give expreſs *anſwers* to moſt, if not *all* the particulars of his *demand*) and this, in ſtead of *anſwering* our argument, as the *penance* of that great *crime* of producing any thing contrary to *S. W*'s *intereſts*, or but proving a plain matter of *fact* by undenyable *teſtimonies?*

9. On the back of this, 'tis ſtrange to ſee, how many *amuſing Chimæra*'s or ſeeming objections are thought neceſſary to be heaped up, 1. The *oppoſite ſenſe of ſo many Nations in the* (*hurch we left*] whereas 1. we have not been proved to have *left* any *Church*, but onely to have been *caſt* out by them, 2. No one Nation of their *Communion* hath, or ever pretended any *ſenſation* contrary to this of *Gregory*'s *diſclaiming*, and *Boniface*'s *affecting* and *aſſuming* the title of *Univerſal Biſhop*; and therefore 3. not *many*, which yet is ſomewhat leſs than *ſo many*.

10. *Secondly* the *oppoſite force of Tradition*] when 1. no kind of *Tradition* either of the *former*, or even *preſent* age, *written*, or *Oral*, hath ever ſuggeſted any thing contrary to *this* paſſage of ſtory, but even their own *records* and *authentick Hiſtoriographers* atteſted it; 2. when *Tradition Oral* of this *preſent* age, which is *S. W*'s *Oracle*, cannot with any reaſon be oppoſed to *ancient hiſtory*, or deſerve to be heeded without it, in a matter of *their*, not *our* cognizance; Their own * *Baronius* having very reaſonably reſolved, *Quod à recentiore de rebus antiquis ſine alicujus vetuſtioris authoritate profertur, contemnitur, What is ſaid by a modern concerning ancient affairs, without the authority of any more ancient, is contemned.*

* *Tom.* 1. *Ann Chr.* 1. n. 12.

11. *Thirdly, ſo many unlikelihoods prejudicing it*] when 1. as a *thouſand probable arguments* (in Mr. *White*'s balance) have not the leaſt *weight* in them, ſo *improbabilities* be they never ſo many, muſt weigh as little; 2. when there is not ſo much as one *improbability* mentioned or ſuggeſted to be in this *relation*; nor 3. is the nature of the *relation* ſuch, as that it ſhould be capable of more *unlikelihoods*, than there are in this one *propoſition*, that *ſome* mens *practices* are directly *contrary* to *others*, that ſome men are *juſt*, *pious*, and content with that portion of *power* that *God* hath given them, and others *invaſive*, *ambitious*, and inclinable to *inlarge* their *Borders*.

12. *Fourthly*, the contemptuous mention of *three or four quotations in Greek to no purpoſe*] when 1. the *quotations* that are vulgarly produced in this matter, are moſt exact *to the purpoſe*, to which they are directed, the concluding this matter of *fact* irrefragably; 2. none of thoſe *quotations* are in *Greek*, but in *Latine* from *Gregory*'s own *Epiſtles*, and *Baronius* and his *Latine* Authours, *Anaſtaſius*, *Paulus Diaconus* and *Platina*; 3. The *Teſtimonies* in this matter, are many more than *three* or *four*; and 4. *three* or *four authentick Teſtimonies*, without any one competent authority offered or pretended to the contrary, are, according to all Laws of *God* and *man*, ſufficient to eſtabliſh the truth of a narration.

13. *Fifthly*, our imagining ſome *Chimerical poſſibilities how it might have been done*] when 1. the ſubject of our preſent debate, is inferred by *poſſitive teſtimonies*; and 2. thoſe *teſtimonies*, narrations of things *actually done*, and 3. all thoſe very *conſonant*, and *agreeable* one to the other, and ſo no way *chimerical*, and withall very *intelligible* to him, that is moſt unwilling to underſtand them, *i. e.* to *S. W.* who certainly would take all this pains to guard his Reader from believing a *chimæra*, which he knew he could not *underſtand*.

14. *Sixthly*, the *being hardly conſiſtent with the nature of mankind*] when 1. for one man to *aſſume* what his *Predeceſſours* had not aſſumed, nay what *himſelf* had formerly *renounced*, (which is much more than is here pretended to have been done) is a matter of *frequent* practice, every day experimented among men; and 2 the *contrary* principles of *good* and *evil*, *juſtice* and *injuſtice* (to which theſe *practices* are conſequent) are not *prodigies* in *humane depraved reaſon*, or *corrupt nature*; and 3. the ſuppoſing *Boniface* onely to have affected, and the *Greek Emperour* to have afforded him this *title*, without the *Churches univerſal acknowledgement* of it, is alone able to ſalve all the contrary appearances, which *S. W.* is willing to ſuggeſt, ſuch as the no diſcernible *changes in the Eccleſiaſtical and temporal ſtate, and the conſequents of them.*

15. *Laſtly*, he objects our ſaying it *crept in inviſibly and unobſerved, as dreams do into mens heads when they are aſleep*, and pronounces with great aſperity, that to ſay this, is *the part of ſome dreaming dull head*] as before the pretended *crude* affirmation was *unworthy* of a *man much more of a Doctour*; when 1. there is no ſuch thing affirmed by us, in this matter of the *title* of *Univerſal Paſtour*, we are ſo far from *thinking* it *crept in inviſibly*, that we ſpecifie the very *age* wherein, and the *perſon* by whom it entred, and who was the *firſt* that *aſſumed* it; and 2. 'tis very regular and rational for *errours* to *creep* into the *Church*, as *dreams* into *mens heads*, even waking dreams, not when they themſelves, but when their *Paſtours ſleep*, or are *negligent*; and therefore 3. 'tis no part of either *dullneſs* or *dreaming*, to think or affirm, that thus they many times do, *Chriſt* himſelf having ſuggeſted to us this very obſervation, that in the *field*, the *Church*, where the *wheat* was *ſown*, the *enemy* came in by night *while the Husband-man ſlept*, and *ſowed* his *tares* (and from the authority of that very Parable it is, that at any time we affirm that *errours* may have *crept into the Church unobſerved*) on which to affix ſo ſour a *cenſure*, will hardly be excuſed from the groſſeſt *blaſphemy*, but by ſaying that he meant the *ſtone* againſt his *adverſary*, which without his foreſeeing or *deſigning*, fell on *Chriſt*. And I pray God this miſadventure may teach him more *warineſs* or more *meekneſs*, either to take his ſolemn leave of all *contumilies*, or to be ſure they be not let fly at *truths*, for thoſe will either *directly* or *interpretatively* reflect on him who is *truth* it ſelf.

16. And ſo much for his ninth ground, the conſidering of which, hath taken in the moſt part of what he hath ſaid on the *tenth* ground alſo, which therefore will now be diſpatch'd more ſpeedily.

SECT. II.

His tenth Ground, how infirmly proved. In the queſtion whether we are guilty of Schiſm, we evidently Defendants. In the like of them, they. They Defendant muſt evidence his own innocency. The method of that by anſwering objections. Expounding by wit. Oral Tradition an authentick Interpreter of Scripture.

1. HIS *tenth* ground then, that [*in our Controverſies about Religion, reaſon requires that the Romaniſt ſhould ſuſtain the part of the Defendent, the Proteſtants of the Opponent*] is, it ſeems, no otherwiſe proved, than as we have already competently refuted it, from their *Obligation to ſtand upon the title of poſſeſſion, as a ground beyond all arguments, untill it be convinced to be malæ fidei*] But for this proof, as far as the *Supreme Paſtourſhip* is concerned in it. 1. We have largely ſhewn, that in the notion, wherein *S. W.* maintains it from *Chriſt*'s *donation* to St. *Peter*, it hath not ſo much as the *feebleſt* plea of *poſſeſſion* in this Nation, nor ever appears to have had. 2. If it had, we doubt not to prove it a *poſſeſſion malæ fidei*, by the *equality* of *power* given by *Chriſt* to the *Apoſtles*, and the no *ſupremacy* of any member in that *College*, and by the unreaſonableneſs that thoſe other *Apoſtles*, which ſurvived St. *Peter*, ſhould be ſubjected to his *ſucceſſours*, *Biſhops* of *Rome*, which they yet muſt have been, if the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* were derived to them by tenure of that *ſucceſſion*; and by the many ages, before the *power* or *title* of *Univerſal Paſtour* was aſſumed, and wherein it was diſclaimed as *Antichriſtian*, which muſt neceſſarily ſuperſede the *uninterrupted ſucceſſion* of it from the *Apoſtles*. 3. For his *proof* of their *poſſeſſion* (which again he profeſſes to own as *his onely ground of all their belief*) *delivery from Father to Son, explicating the places of the written word*] it hath been largely manifeſted from the *vanity* of that *one medium*, their *holding to their pretended Maxim*, that it hath no force to prove any thing.

2. And then, the ground of *poſſeſſion* being ſhaken, on which alone the *concluſion* is built, that *we muſt ſuſtain the part of Opponents*, and *they of Defendents*,] We are freed from that pretended obligation, and the *reſult* is, that the ſtate and nature of the queſtions diſputable between us, is it that muſt aſſign us our ſeveral *offices*; and the *queſtions* being of divers ſorts, our parts cannot be conſtantly the ſame. If the *queſtion* be about *our Schiſm* [Whether to live obediently under the *Primate* and *Biſhops* of *England*, our lawfull *Superiours*, conſerving alſo *fraternal charity* with the *whole Church* of *God*, that particularly which lives in *communion* with the *Biſhop* of *Rome* (from which we are inexorably *caſt* out by them, or elſe ſhould have retained *external communion* with them) be the *great* and *damning* ſin of *Schiſm*] herein 'tis impoſſible we ſhould be any other than *Defendents*, or they than *Opponents*, if for thus doing they *accuſe* us of *Schiſm* (for then ſure they are bound to *prove*, or make it good) and we undertake to anſwer all that they can bring againſt us. But if the queſtion be [Whether Mr. *S.* born and *baptized*, and brought up under the ſame obedience with his brethren of the *Church* of *England* twenty years ſince, be guilty of *Schiſm* in *caſting off* that *obedience*, and betaking himſelf wholly to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, as to the *Univerſal Paſtour* appointed by *God*] I then humbly conceive the office of a *Defendant* belongs to him, and of an *Opponent* to us.

3. Mean while, though we ſhall not refuſe to debate this *ſecond* queſtion, and therein to afford them, if there be any, the advantages of *Defendents*, yet 'tis manifeſt the Tract of *Schiſm*, which I wrote, and hath proved the μῆλον ἔριδος, *apple of debate*, was deſigned on the former account, as the *Title* proclaims, in *Defence* of the *Church* of *England* from that *accuſation*; and then, 'tis neceſſary, till the *State* and *quality* of the *debate* be changed, that the ſecuring of that *Tract* againſt all *exceptions* or *ſuggeſtions* of the *Romaniſt*, be acknowledged the part of the *Defendent* ſtill, and he that will prove us *Schiſmaticks*, muſt be the *plaintiff*, *accuſer* and *opponent*; and ſo ſtill *my skill in the art of diſputing*, which on this ſcore is ſolemnly *arraigned*, would not be *blemiſhed*, ſhould I inſiſt (which I remember not that at any time I yet have done) on my *right* to be the *defendent*, in this matter of the *Schiſm* charged on us; And if he have no other pretenſe but this, for his no manner of *Teſtimonies from Antiquity* for his pretenſions, the *Reader* will ſoon diſcern, that he hath it under *S. W*'s own *hand*, that he doth not (as he adds) *prove things in his Schiſm diſarm'd* (and as little in his *Schiſm Diſpatch'd*) and conſequently that there is no heed to be given to that, which is without any tender of *proof* ſo *magiſterially affirmed* by him.

4. But for all this I ſee 'tis decreed, that no leſs than *three abſurdities* I muſt ſtand guilty of in this matter; The *firſt*, that I *put my ſelf upon the ſide of the Defendent, whereas I pretend to evidence*, i. e. *to prove*] But to that I anſwer, that to *evidence* ones *innocence* by anſwering all the charges produced againſt him, is to *defend*, and that was my part at that time. The *ſecond*, that I *imagine that the ſolving an argument is an evidence to the contrary.*] To that I anſwer, that I do not *imagine* it, but believe, that when *one argument* is *ſolved*, I am bound to proceed to the *next* that is *produced*, and not to think my ſelf ſafe, as long as any *argument* produced ſtands in *force* againſt me; But when I have *ſolved all* ſuch, I may be allowed to think, I have *defended* my *Client*, which is not to be *condemned* without *cauſe*; and that was all I pretended to attempt in the *Tract* of *Schiſm*, to *defend* the *Church* of *England* in point of *Schiſm* from the *Romaniſts exceptions*, and ſo far onely to *evidence* our *innocence*, as to ſhew that none of the charges brought againſt us, could endure the *teſt*, or appear to have any *ſolidity* in them. The *third*, that I *ſuppoſe they build their faith upon places of written words as explicable by wit not by Tradition and the practice of their Church, whereas they onely own the delivery from Father to Son as the ground of all their belief, and make this the onely rule by which to explicate Scripture.*] To which I *anſwer*, that indeed I thought it reaſonable for all *Chriſtians* to interpret *Scripture* by *practice* and *Tradition Apoſtolical*, convey'd and made known to us by thoſe who lived in, or next their times, and ſo might moſt probably diſcern the *truth* themſelves, and had no temptation to be willing to *deceive* us; As for *Explications of Scripture by wit*, if that ſignifie

ſignifie any other, than by *ſober*, *Rational rules* of expounding *obſcurer* by *plainer* places, or underſtanding plain words according to the *obvious* meaning of them, and *conſent* with other places of *Scripture*, and *ancient* practice, I diſclaim having any thing to doe with it as much as he, having been told by *S. W.* what *miracles wit* can doe, not in making *hard* places *plain*, but in *diſguiſing plain* unto unintelligible. But for the preſent *practice*, or *Tradition Oral*, or *delivery from Father* (or rather *Mother*) *to Son*, that this ſhould be the *onely* Interpreter of *Scripture*, or that the *Parents* do at all take upon them to interpret *Scripture* to their *children*, or if they did, that their *interpretation* ſhould in any reaſon be deemed *authentical*, any farther than they can approve themſelves by the *Tradition* and *practice* of the *Primitive Church*, and the other forementioned rules of *ſober interpretation*, I profeſs to admire the confidence of *S. W.* that he ſhould *crudely* own aſſerting it, and give no manner of *proof* of it here, having *demonſtrated* it ſo *infirmly*, when *ex profeſſo* he handled that matter of *Tradition Oral*.

5. What elſe is added on occaſion of this ground, was taken in whilſt we examined the *ninth*, and muſt here be omitted, and then this is all that needs to be returned to his *tenth ground*.

SECT. III.

His eleventh Ground. Fact all one with poſſeſſion, yet granted not to conclude a right. Regal power concludes againſt S. W*'s poſſeſſion. Papal excommunication of us, onely non-communion. That lawfull in another Dioceſe. The Romaniſt's partiality. No poſſeſſion anciently pretended to. His three proofs of his eleventh Ground defeated, and retorted. Kings cannot exempt from their own authority.* Suarez *his reſolution of a Jeſuite made Pope. Popes capable of ambition as well as Kings.*

1. HIS *eleventh Ground* [that *Hiſtorical proofs which manifeſt onely fact, do not neceſſarily conclude a right*] muſt be ſome news to be delivered, as here it is, in *continuation of his former Grounds*, by *S. W.* who hath appeared ſuch an advocate of the *tenure* and *title* of *poſſeſſion* abſtracted from that of *right*, and who ſet it for his *fifth Ground*, that *no poſſeſſion ought to be diſturbed without ſufficient motives and reaſons, and conſequently is it ſelf a title, till thoſe reaſons invalidate it and ſhew it null*] and aſſumed to prove this * then by *nature*, by *morals*, by *politicks*. And yet now, when he apprehends it poſſible that we may reap fruit by this *title*, the caſe is quite altered; and *fact*, which in this matter is directly *equivalent* with that *poſſeſſion*, be it never ſo manifeſtly *proved*, cannot conclude a *right*. * P. 38.

2. That *fact onely*] and *poſſeſſion onely*] are equivalent in our preſent diſputes, will eaſily be diſcerned, if we but conſider the *matter* wherein he pretends their *title* of *poſſeſſion*, and wherein I have urged *Hiſtorical proofs declarative of ancient Fact*, or *Practice*. The main thing wherein he pretends the *title* of *poſſeſſion*, is that of the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*; and the *Fact* which he ſpecifies to be *manifeſted* by my *Hiſtorical proofs*, is that of the *Princes erecting* and *tranſlating* of *Patriarchates*, a thing ſo directly unreconcileable with the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, that as the *right* of one muſt needs *evacuate* and *deſtroy* the *right* of the other, ſo the *practice* of the *one*, as far as it extends, muſt needs prejudge the *poſſeſſion* of the *other*. P. 52.

3. For example, If it be queſtioned, whether in the *Roman Empire* at any fix'd time, be it the reign of *Valentinian* or *Juſtinian*, the *Pope* were *poſſeſſed* of the *Supreme Paſtourſhip*, as conferred by *Chriſt* on St. *Peter*: The meaning of that queſtion, if it be any thing beyond the *Pope*'s own *dream* or *fancy*, muſt be [whether the *Empire* were at that time ſubjected to that *authority*, as by *right* veſted in the *Pope* by *Chriſt*, i. e. whether the *Emperours* and their *Subjects* at thoſe times acknowledged the *divine right* of his *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, and ſo own'd or ſubmitted to it] And that being the *queſtion*, it follows neceſſarily, that if thoſe things which are *eſſential* branches of that ſuppoſed *power*, were not *own'd* or *acknowledged* in that *Empire*, but the contrary *powers* profeſs'dly *practiſed* by the *Emperour*, (ſuch is the *erecting* or *tranſlating* of *Patriarchates*, and the like) then the *Pope* was not at that time *poſſeſs'd* of that *power*; which is the *Negative* of the *Queſtion*.

4. The ſame may be exemplified in this Kingdom, where the principal title that *S. W.* pretends for our obedience to the *Roman* See, is the *poſſeſſion*, which the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* had, in his opinion, among us, before *King Henry*'s *days*, and the *Extinguiſhing Act*, and from this ſuppoſed *poſſeſſion* he concludes a *Right*. If then by *Hiſtorical proofs* which *manifeſt onely* Fact, or *practice* in this Kingdom, it appear from time to time, in thoſe ages wherein that *poſſeſſion* is pretended, that there was no ſuch *poſſeſſion*, but that our *Kings* made *Laws* in *Eccleſiaſtical* matters, forbad *Appeals* to the *Roman* Tribunal, and *entrance* to *Legates*, *erected* or *tranſlated Epiſcopal* Sees, gave *immunities* and *exemptions* to whom they pleaſed, called *aſſemblies*, gave * frequent *inhibitions* and *reſtraints* of *Papal Excommunications*, ſo that an † *excommunication made* and *certified* by the *Pope*, was of no *force* to *diſable* any man in *England*; and this, before any *Statute* made againſt *foreign Juriſdiction* (which concludes the *Pope's Excommunication* of the meaneſt Subject of *England* to be no *excluſion* of him from the *communion* of the *Catholick Church*, but onely a declaration that he will not joyn in *communion* with him, and ſo no act of *Supremacy*, or any more than a *non-communion*, ſuch as *Paul* V. his *interdict* of *Venice*, was by the *Prelates* and *Eccleſiaſticks* eſteemed to be, and ſuch as * *ancient Canons* allow of, a *communion* within ones own *Dioceſe*, and not elſewhere) If, I ſay, theſe and many the like pregnant Facts and frequent uſages be produced from *authentick Hiſtories*, this certainly is a competent prejudice to *poſſeſſion*; And whatſoever can be pretended againſt ſuch *facts* inferring a *Right*, will be of equal force againſt *poſſeſſions* concluding a *right* alſo; And for *S. W.* to make it one of his *grounds*, that *poſſeſſion* alone infers a title, and another, that *Facts* manifeſted by *Hiſtorical proofs* will not infer it, what is it but to make uſe of the *Ladder* to advance himſelf, and then *draw* it up, or break it in peices, that no other may *aſcend* after him? or to tranſcribe that more honourable, but yet parallel example of *Conſtantine*, doing the like in his flight or defection from his perſecuted *Mother* in *Britany* to *Rome*, which the other did when he fled from

* *Cooks Rep. Cawdryes caſe, fol.* 23. a. b.

† *See Cook Ibid. fol.* 26. a. *and* 27. a. b. *and Hoveden. fol.* 284. b. 23. *and Mat. Paris* p. 103. 43. *and others cited by Sir Roger Twiſden*, p. 65, 66. 67.

* Ὀφείλειν τὰς πόλεις τῇ κοινωνίᾳ τῆς ἰδίας ἐκκλησίας ἀρχειδς. *Cod. Can. Eccl. Afric. c.* 76. *& Ibid. c.* 80. ἀπὸ τῆς τοιαύτης κοινωνίας χωρίζουσθω τῆς ἰδίας κοινωνίας ἀρχειδῆ μόνη. *Vid. Syneſii Epiſt.* 58. *Edit. Turneb.* p. 35.

† *Baron. Ann.* 306. n. 9. from *Rome* to his *Father* in *Britany*, † firſt uſing, and then killing all the *Poſt-horſes* by the way, that ſo he might not be *overtaken?*

5. This is a *partiality*, that nothing but immoderate purſuit of *intereſts* could tempt him to; and yet this is not all; for ſuppoſing (though not granting) the utmoſt he would have ſuppoſed, the *poſſeſſion* to have been in force immediately before the *Reformation*, we are yet ready to ſhew, that more anciently there was neither *poſſeſſion*, nor opinion of *Right* pleadable for this *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, when yet for the *ſovereign* power of *Princes* in their own Dominions, in all, and ſo in *Eccleſiaſtical* affairs, we are as ready to evidence (and hope that we have in the *former* Treatiſes, and ſome Chapters of *this*, already performed it) not onely by *Hiſtorical proofs*, which are but *evidences* of the *Fact*, but by the *Laws* both of *God* and man, which are *aſſurances* of *right* alſo, that thus they ought to be, and thus they are ſettled in this Kingdom.

6. And then for his *three proofs* of this his *eleventh ground*, 1. that *the teſtimonies expreſſing onely the fact, conclude onely the fact*, 2. *becauſe matters of fact which concern executions of any buſineſs, may be performed by him that hath no proper right, but borrows it from the delegation of others, as in Viceroys*, 3. *becauſe in the proceſs of* 1500. *or* 1600. *years it cannot be imagined, but there ſhould be ſome matters of fact either out of ambition, intereſt, ignorance or tyranny, againſt the moſt inviolable right in the world, nay ſometime out of too much zeal.*] Firſt they are all, and each of very ſmall importance and force againſt us; for 1. our *teſtimonies* from *Canons* of *Univerſal Councils*, and from our *Laws*, conclude *right*, as well as our *Hiſtorical proofs* evidence *fact*; 2. our *Kings* acted by *inherent right*, and not as *delegates* from the *Pope*, as by our *Laws* alſo appears; and then 3. there is no place for unſeaſonable *ſuſpicions* of *ambition, tyranny*, &c. on the Princes, nor pretence of any kind of *inviolable right*, on the *Pope*'s ſide; And *ſecondly* it were moſt eaſie to *retort* every of theſe arguments againſt *S. W*'s *grand Tenure, Poſſeſſion.*

1. For 1. Beſide that their *poſſeſſion* is far from being *proved*, the offers of proof, if there were any, and th e *valid*, would yet, in the words of his *firſt* argument *conclude no more than they expreſs*, and *expreſſing onely poſſeſſion*, would *conclude onely poſſeſſion*, and no way infer the *right* of the *Papacy.*

8. *Secondly*, the *acts* of *power* at any time *exerciſed* in this Kingdom by the *Pope*, and not *oppoſed* by our *Princes*, might be, and *actually* were by their *conceſſion* onely, and that is thus far equivalent to *delegation* from them, that it ſuppoſes the *Original right* to be in the *Princes*, not in the *Popes*; and then the powers which the *Princes* gave, they might moſt certainly recall, and if they did not, yet ſtill their *Succeſſours* might, which were not obliged by their *conceſſions*; It being a rule in *Government*, that *Sovereigns* who may grant *exemptions* to ſome from the power of *inferiour Magiſtrates*, cannot *exempt* any from their *own* authority, which is *ſupreme*, they cannot *abdicate that* right; for no privileges granted or permitted to *Subjects*, can make them ceaſe to be *Subjects* within the dominions of that *Prince*; The *Pontificians* tell us, that the *Pope* (who ſay they, can diſpenſe with *Laws* of *God*, and ſo hath a good proportion of *omnipotence*) though he may *exempt* any one in *ſpirituals* from the *juriſdiction* of *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops*, cannot *exempt* any from his own *authority*, but he muſt thereby ceaſe to be *Pope*, as to that perſon; In conſequence to which 'tis * *Zuarez* reſolution, that a *Jeſuite profeſſed*, who *vows* to *obey* the *General* of his *Order*, and to continue that *obedience*, though he be made a *Biſhop*; is not by that *vow* obliged, when he is advanced to the *Papacy*, though if he be but a *Cardinal*, he is.

* *De Relig. tr.* 10 *de Rel. Societ. Jeſu in particulari*, l. 6. c. 9.

9. Thirdly, *in the ſpace of ſo many years it cannot be ſtrange*, if ſome *Popes* were *ambitious* to inlarge their *power*, and pretended *divine right* for *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, and by *ſecular policies* founded in *manifeſt intereſt* (and ſo, either through *force*, or *circumvention* and *artifice*) advanced themſelves to ſome degree of *poſſeſſion* of that greatneſs, which they ſo paſſionately affected, and ſo diligently purſued.

10. And to this alſo the *ignorance* of ſome, and as *S. W.* ſaith, the *too much* (*i. e.* the *blind* or *miſtaken*) *zeal* and *piety* of others, may have brought in their liberal contributions.

11. And then, that all the *Pope's actions have been byaſſed by none of theſe, but governed by pure reaſon*, as it is certainly *denyed* by us, ſo will it be very hard to prove by *S. W*'s *rules*, who acknowledges it *cannot* be done, unleſs it be *manifeſted that he had right*, which as it is the *principal* thing in *queſtion*, and therefore is far from being *granted*, without *proof*, ſo if *it could be otherwiſe proved*, *S. W.* is much in the right, that *it were very needleſs to ſtand alledging thoſe teſtimonies, which expreſs onely fact*, and more needleſs ſure to inſiſt on an *unproved poßeſſion.*

12. When therefore he concludes that *it is frivolous to bring hiſtorical proofs of fact upon the ſtage, in a diſpute about right, ſince taken alone they make a dum ſhew, and can act no part in that controverſie, for the very alledging that ſome of theſe faults might intervene, diſables ſuch premiſſes from inferring a right* [I wiſh inſtead of the word [*fact*] he would inſert [*poſſeſſion*] and then judge from his own reaſonings here, what feeble foundations thoſe were which he formerly laid in a bare ſuppoſed (but *unproved*) *poſſeſſion.* And that is all that is needfull to return to his *eleventh Ground.*

SECT.

SECT. IV.

His twelfth Ground. Two immoderate ſuppoſals, or beggings of the queſtion. A third built on them. Acceptation ſometimes an Act of Supreme power. The Church-Laws] *an ambiguous phraſe. Laws of General Councils not obligatory, till accepted. Acceptation no act of obedience. Imperial Edicts. Supremacy differs from infallibility. Ancient Canons reſtored.* Card. Cuſanus, *and Pope* Innocentius III. *for preferring thoſe Canons. Our practice according. A confeſſion of Catholick Governours now, much to* S. W*'s prejudice. What makes an Univerſal Paſtour? Dr.* Holden*'s anſwer.* Gerſon*'s,* Cuſanus*'s. True Supremacy not transferr'd to any. The Negative performed by us. The Affirmative not yet performed by the* Romaniſt. *No Schiſm in aſſerting the King's Supremacy.* Hart*'s confeſſion.* Henry *the* II. *and* Lewis XII. *of* France, *to the Pope.*

1. HIS *twelfth Ground* [*that the Acceptation of the ſecular powers, and their command to the people, are neceſſary to the due and fitting execution of the Churches Laws, whence follows, not that the Princes made thoſe Laws by their own authority, but that they obeyed and executed what the Church had ordered*] is made up of *four propoſitions*, the *two* firſt taken for *granted*, and ſo not endeavoured to be proved, the *third* founded in the *ſuppoſal* of the two former, the *fourth* an expedient deſigned for the ſuperſeding the force of one ſort of our proofs, thoſe from the *examples* of our *Princes* making *Laws* in *Religion*, but this of no appearance of force, ſave what is founded in the two *unproved ſuppoſals*.

2. The ſuppoſals are ſomewhat immoderate, 1. that all the *commands* of the *ſecular power* in *Eccleſiaſtical* matters, are but effects of their *acceptation* of the *Churches Laws*, and 2. that they are onely in order to the *execution* of them; The *third* which is founded in *ſuppoſal* of theſe *two*, and hath not ſo much as a *poſſible ideal* being abſtracted from that *ſuppoſal*, is, that *ſuppoſing* the *Church* to be the onely *Law-giver*, and that 'tis the *Prince*'s part onely to *accept* their *Laws*, and by *civil ſanction* to command the execution of them, this *acceptation* and command of the *ſecular powers* are very convenient and *neceſſary* to the *bene eſſe*, the *due and fitting execution of the Churches Laws*. All which if yielded by us, the *Corollary* would indeed be natural enough. that the *Princes Laws* in *Eccleſiaſtical* matters cannot be concluded by us to be of their *own authority*, but on the contrary, of *obedience* and *ſubordination* to the *Church*.

3. But 'tis very ſtrange 1. that that ſhould be taken for a *ground*, which is by neceſſary interpretation the matter of the whole *queſtion*, 2. that this which is ſo much *queſtioned*, and ſo conſtantly *denyed* by us, and the contrary proved by all thoſe *arguments*, by which either we diſprove the *Pope's right* to *Supremacy* in our *Kingdom*, or eſtabliſh the *King's Supreme authority*, and the inſeparableneſs of that from the *Crown*, and that *chiefly* in the *chiefeſt* and moſt important things (ſuch certainly are matters of *Religion*) and more eſpecially by the *Laws* which our *Kings* always made in *Church* matters, by their own *ſupreme power*, not receiving them from the *Pope*, but oft making them in *oppoſition* to him; ſhould be thought fit to be impoſed on the Reader, without the leaſt offer of *proof* for it, which what is it, but the old *ſovereign* never-failing *Sophiſm*, τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ, *preſuming* the truth of that which is moſt *denyed*, and tendering arguments for that onely, which is of no importance *for* him, or *againſt* us?

4. For the *firſt* 'tis evident, that the *queſtion* or matter of preſent *debate* between us is, whether or no in our Kingdom the *Supreme Eccleſiaſtick* power belong to the *Pope*] the *Romaniſt* affirming, and we denying, and placing it in the *King*; now inſtead of proving their affirmative, all that is here done, is, to ſuppoſe that the *ſecular power accepts* (and that, in the concluſion, is interpreted *obeying* the *Church*) and *executes* their *orders*, which when 'tis no more than ſo, is certainly to *obey* them. This therefore is *begging* the *queſtion*.

5. And for the *ſecond*, 'tis as manifeſt, that all that his explication or confirmation of his twelfth ground is applyed to, is the *uſefulneſs*, or moral *neceſſity* of thoſe *ſecular executive* commands to the backing the *Churches Laws*, which is the *third* propoſition, and would be denyed by none, were it firſt proved that the *ſecular Laws* are thus *executive* and no more; but that being *denyed* by us, and not offered to be *proved* by them, it matters little what *uſe* there *would* be of that which is not, in caſe ſomething elſe were, which hath no being, but in *S. W*'s teeming *fancy*.

6. Another *fallacy* there is in the *ambiguity* of the word [*acceptation*] which is expreſly uſed by *S. W.* for an act of *obedience* in the *accepter*, for ſo, from the *acceptation* of the *ſecular powers*, he makes his concluſion, that they *obeyed what the Church had ordered*, And ſo for *execution* alſo: Whereas *Acceptation* is ſometimes an act of *ſupreme* power, as in *Parliament*, when *Statutes* are by his *Subjects* offered to the *King* to be inacted by him, and the liberty by our *Laws* veſted in him, of either *rejecting*, or *accepting* them, *Acceptation* is in this caſe *inacting*, or making *Laws*, and an exerciſe of the *Supreme* power. So in *Convocations* of the *Clergy* or *National Councils*, the *Biſhops* and *Clergy* prepare *Canons*, and preſent them to the *King*, and he either *diſlikes* and *rejects* them, or *approves* and *accepts*, and ſo ſets his Signature upon them, and inacting, commands the *execution* of them; and in both theſe caſes, the *acceptation*, and *execution* are not tokens of *obedience*, but *acts* and *exerciſes* of *ſupreme authority*. And thus unqueſtionably it is, as oft as the *accepter* hath power not to *accept*, for in that caſe it is evident, he is no *Subject*, or under obligation of *obedience*, as all *Subjects* are.

7. Here then is the utmoſt of the *demonſtrativeneſs* and *ſelf-evident* virtue of his *twelfth ground*. It is founded in the *ſuppoſal* of *two* things, which (being ſet down in *ambiguous* dialect) as they appear to be underſtood by him, are the *principal queſtions* between us, and never attempted to be *proved* by him; and as they fairly and properly ſignifie, ſo they are the *confirming* the very thing for which we contend, the veſting the *ſupreme* power in our *Kings*, without whoſe *acceptation* no *Laws* of the *Church* (be it *Pope* or *Council*, as appears by * comparing the ſecond *Council*

* *See Tr. of Hereſie, Sect.* 10. *n.* 9. &c.

of *Nice* with the *Council* of *Frankfort*) have any force to oblige the *Subjects* of *Chriſtian Kings*, and whoſe *accepting* is an act of *Legiſlative* power, i. e. of *Supremacy* in the *accepters*.

8. It is here farther obſervable, that that which this *twelfth ground* proceeds upon, is the *Churches Laws*, and *what the Church hath ordered*] And that again is an *ambiguous* phraſe; for it may ſignifie 1. the *Laws* of the *univerſal Church* in *Oecumenical Councils* truly ſo called, or 2. the *Laws* of the *Biſhop* and *Church* or *Conſiſtory* of *Rome*, or 3. the *Laws* of ſome *larger Council*, aſſuming to be, when it is not, *Oecumenical*, or 4. the *Laws* of our *own National Councils*. To all theſe notions the words lye common and undiſtinguiſhed, and it will be uncertain, what the importance of his *Ground* is, till they be better *diſtinguiſhed*.

9. If the *Laws* ſpoken of, be the *Laws* of the *Univerſal Church*, inacted in any *Council* truly *Oecumenical* (which receives the *validity* and force of ſuch, by being *univerſally accepted*) then the *Acceptation* of thoſe *Laws* in any Nation by the *ſupreme power* there, is *neceſſary* to the *validity* of thoſe *Laws* in that Nation, and not onely to the *due execution* of them. But this hinders not the *Princes* of thoſe Nations to be *Supreme in all cauſes* in their own Dominions, any more than it doth the *Pope* to have the *Supreme* power in his own *Territories*, that his *accepting* the *Laws* of the *General Council*, is neceſſary to the *validity* of thoſe *Laws* in his *Dominions*; It rather proves the contrary, that they are *Supreme*, becauſe their *acceptation* is *neceſſary*, and till they have *accepted*, they are not *obliged*.

10. So likewiſe in *Councils* not truly *Oecumenical*, none can be obliged, but thoſe that *accept* them, and they which doe that, doe it *freely*, and as having *power* over their own *wills*, and ſo might doe the *contrary*, and that is no act of obedience in them.

11. And then much more, when the yet leſſer *authority*, the *Council* of the *Pope* and his *Cardinals* have given any *Laws* to our *Kingdom*, and our *Kings* have *accepted* them, and *commanded execution* of them, this they have done *freely*, and without any opinion of *obligation* thus to doe; and ſometimes when they liked not, *rejected* them; and from their *acceptation* it was, that all their force as of *Laws* was derived, which conſequently they wanted, when they were not *accepted*. (And, by the way, it is obſervable, that the *ancient Emperours* did ſometime uſe to put into *Edicts* ſome *Canons* of *Councils*, but not the *decrees* of *Popes*, (*S. W.* may exerciſe himſelf, if he pleaſe, in finding any) and in the ſpurious *Epiſtles* of the ancient *Popes* (I ſuppoſe it now granted there are ſuch) many things are impoſed, as their *decrees*, which were indeed the *Edicts* of the firſt *Chriſtian Emperours*.)

12. And in the very ſame manner it holds of our *National Councils*, who pretend not to make *Canons*, but to *prepare* them, and offer them to the *King*, and by his acceptance and confirmation, or by his *rejection*, they either *receive*, or *loſe* all their force and validity, and are not ſo much as in *Conſcience* obligatory, till he hath thus *eſtabliſh'd* them.

13. Herein 'tis poſſible the *King* may make an ill choice, confirm and inact thoſe *Canons* which were fitter to be *rejected*; But 1. that is no prejudice to his *Supremacy*, to which we pretend, but onely to his *Infallibility*, to which we pretend not, and to which for the *Pope* himſelf to pretend * Mr. *White* aſſures us is *Archiheretical*. 2. To ſecure our ſelves from ſuch errours, our *Anceſtours* in *Henry* VIII. his days proceeded by thoſe rules, that the ſobereſt *Romaniſts* themſelves judged fit to preſcribe, *viz.* by reſtoring the *Canons* of the *Ancient Church*, to the preſcribing of which the *Popes* are bound by *Oath*, and by not permitting the *Pontifician* and *later* decrees and dictates of the *Weſtern Councils* to extrude them. Of which decrees ſaith *Cardinal* † *Cuſanus*, *Quando obviant Canonibus, potius Canonibus obediendum eſt*, *When they go againſt the Canons* (of the *ancient Church*) *the Canons muſt rather be obeyed*, proceeding largely to make proof of it. And * *Innocentius* III. that *whenſoever* in the *Acts* of *Councils* a *diſcordant opinion is found*, *Illius Concilii magis teneatur ſententia, cujus aut antiquior aut potior extat authoritas*, *That Councils opinion is to be held*, *whoſe authority is more ancient or more preferrable*. According to which that they then proceeded, appears in the *Neceſſary Doctrine* and *Erudition*, in the *Chapter* of *Orders*.

* *Tab. Suff.*

† *De Concord. Cathol.* l. 2. c. 20.

* *Diſtinct.* 50. c. 28.

14. In the cloſe of his explication of this his *twelfth Ground*, he tells us, that *Teſtimonies* of *ſuch Execution and Laws, cannot prejudice the Pope's right, ſince Catholick Governours doe the ſelf ſame at preſent* (*as far as concerns this point*) *which was done then*,] Theſe words I think worthy reflecting on a while, as being ſo far from helping to *demonſtrate* what he deſires, that they are a ſore *prejudice*, and argument of the contrary. For if it ſhall appear that thoſe things which *S. W.* imputes to the *Princes accepting* and *executing* the *Churches Laws*, are at this preſent done by *Catholick Governours*, and no *delegation* appear, or be producible, whereby they *derive* this *power* from the *Pope* or the *Church*, this, I ſay, is ſuch a *prejudice* to the *Pope's univerſal Paſtourſhip* being acknowledged at this day, as *S. W.* will not readily rid himſelf of, or reconcile with his *Phænomena*.

15. For the evidencing of which, I ſhall take leave to ask the *Romaniſt* this queſtion, wherein the *priority*, *preeminence* and *dignity* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* doth conſiſt, and that which makes him an *Univerſal Paſtour*? and I deſire ſuch an anſwer, as the *Romaniſt*, that gives it, hath confidence ſhall have the *univerſal approbation* of other *Romaniſts*, particularly thoſe that think him inferiour to *General Councils*, and that are not noted to be enemies to *Monarchy*.

16. This I think hath not yet been done, though a clear explication of it, would be moſt neceſſary to the manifeſting truth in this point of *Schiſm*, which is founded in the *queſtion* of *Supremacy*.

17. * *Dr Holden* with much moderation and judgment acknowledgeth, that *it is not ſo eaſie to determine what are the ſpecial and peculiar acts of this ſuperiority conſtituted by divine Law*, having † before ſaid, that thoſe *acts*, which *Divines do ordinarily reckon as the ſpecial and proper acts of the Biſhop of* Rome, *are not immediately and expreſly annex'd* jure divino *to that See*, which he acknowledges to be *performed by others, yea to be omitted, and to be oppugned*, and inſtances in the *calling* of *General Councils, appeal in greater cauſes*, &c. All theſe, ſaith he, *we have ſeen examined, limitted, and rejected ſometimes, by particular Churches, and civil Commonwealths*; and yet this *derogates nothing from the right of the Apoſtolical See*] From this free *conceſſion* we are ſurely allowed to conclude, that

* *De Reſol. Fid.* l. 2. c. 3. p. 297. *Quinam ſint eadem* (i. e. *divina*) *lege conſtituti ſpeciales & peculiares hujus ſuperioritatis actus non adeo facile eſt decernere.*

† *Ibid* p. 293, 294.

that *theſe* particulars, which have been thus *rejected*, are indeed no *rights* of the *Papacy*; *imprimis*, the *calling of General Councils*; let *S. W.* remember that. Meanwhile what the *Right* of that *Apoſtolick See* is, or how many *Sacra Individua* there be, the *denying* or *rejecting*, or *limitting* of which would *derogate* from the *Right* thereof, he tells us not.

18. *Gerſon* puts the queſtion, whether there be any power in the *Pope*, * *that is of force to any thing, to which no other Eccleſiaſtick power hath force*; and reſolves, that *the Church may transfer all ſuch power to one whom they ſhall deſign.*

19. † *Cuſanus* yet more particularly, doubts not to ſay, that *if* (by *poſſible* ſuppoſition) The *Archbiſhop of Triers ſhould by the Church convened, be choſen for their Preſident and Head*, * *he ſhould be properly the ſucceſſour of Peter in that preeminence, more than the Biſhop of Rome*; whereas we know that the ſpecial acts of *true Supremacy* are not uneaſie to be *numbred*, and of the *ſupreme power* it ſelf, 'tis univerſally reſolved, that it cannot be transferred by *Subjects* to any other.

20. The Sons of the *Church* of *England* have oft ſhewed, and ſpecified what the *power* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome* did *not* extend to, in the judgment and practice of the *Engliſh* Nation through all memory (ſee the worthy Sir *Rog. Twiſden*, Ch. V. p. 104. &c. particularly *Sect.* 17. p. 108, 109, 110. and the *Right Reverend* the *Lord Biſhop* of *Derry*, c. IV. and VII. where he makes it appear, that *Germany* and *France* have done all the ſame acts that *Henry* VIII. did, in *limitting* and *inhibiting Papal attempts*) And there being but two ways poſſible, the *Negative* and the *Affirmative*; the former, what the *power* of the *Pope* is *not*, we have ſhewed already. It is therefore incumbent on the *Romaniſt* to undertake the *Affirmative*, and ſhew wherein it conſiſts, or elſe 'tis vain to pretend, as here *S. W.* doth, in general, that *Catholick Governours* may doe what we ſee, and he ſaith they do without *prejudicing* the *Pope*'s rights.

21. Where there is true *Supreme power*, it is much more hard to ſay *negatively*, theſe are *not* acts and prerogatives of it, than to ſet down *poſitively* the moſt *eſſential* and *neceſſary*. We have ſhewed that which is *hardeſt*; but inſtead of doing that, which if there were any truth in it, were the moſt eaſie, the *Romaniſt* contents himſelf with confident *General* claims, that it is well known that the *Supremacy* of the *Pope* was acknowledged in *England* before *Henry* VIII. And under theſe *generalities* all deceit lyes in *ambuſh*, which would ſoon diſcover it ſelf, if they would but ſet down, what the *rights* are, which are peculiar to the *Supreme Paſtourſhip*, for then it would be diſcernible, whether *Catholick Governours* aſſume them or no, and ſo whether *Henry* VIII. were a *Catholick*, or ceaſed to be ſuch by aſſuming them.

20. Meanwhile 'tis certain, that the aſſerting the *Supremacy* of the *Prince*, was in all times in all Nations allowed of, as a defence of their juſt *right*, and no *Schiſm* deemed chargeable on *Princes* on that account; When the *Convocation Ann.* 1530. expreſly declared and recognized the *Supreme authority* of the *King*, ſtill *communion* was held with the *Church* of *Rome*, and *Archbiſhop Cranmer Ann.* 1533. received *Bulls* and his *Pall* from *Rome*. But when in *Feb.* 1533. a *Law* was made that the *Archbiſhop* of *Canterbury* (not as *Legate*, but as *Primate*) might grant *diſpenſations* and exerciſe the *higheſt Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction* within his *Province* (which yet certainly he might doe, by *Commiſſion* from him that had ſupreme authority) without reſort to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, then ſoon after iſſued out *Excommunication* againſt the *King*, and interdict againſt the *Kingdom*; ſo *Sanders* tells us, The *forbidding of ſuits and appeals to* Rome, *and placing that power in the Archbiſhop, which had been attributed to the Pope*, this was the beginning of *Schiſm*. And yet this is no more, than what is neceſſarily conſequent to the *King*'s *Supremacy*, which therefore being rightly underſtood makes an end of this Controverſie. And ſo it really did with Mr. *Hart*, who † having read *Alexander Nowell*'s anſwer to *Dorman* about this matter, he returned anſwer, that he had *miſtaken our Doctrine in this point, and that if we gave the Prince no greater authority than Mr.* Nowell *doth, he did agree with us* it being no more than what * St. *Auguſtine* did, that *Kings ſerve God in this as Kings, if in their own Realms they command good things and forbid evil, not onely concerning the civil ſtate of men, but the Religion of God alſo*; This they cannot doe, if the *Supremacy* be not veſted in them, if what they doe of this kind, they doe by *accepting*, and *executing* and *obeying* the *Orders* of another, for that is not to act as *Kings*, but as *Subjects* rather. What therefore the *Catholick Governours* doe as *Kings* in their *own* Dominions, that ſure they *derive* not from the *Pope*, but *God*, and their own *Kingly Office*. And till it be reſolved on the *Romaniſts* ſide, what the things are, which they may not doe, by *this right*, as our *Laws* and *Hiſtories* ſhew what they *may*, there will be no *end* of diſpute, and as little *benefit* expectable from it in this matter. With this at preſent we content our ſelves, that *Henry* VIII. did in effect but the ſame things, that other *Catholick Princes* are confeſs'd to have done; Let *S. W.* ſhew their *Commiſſion* from the *univerſal Paſtour* to doe them, as his *Miniſters*; But that ſure will not be pretended in thoſe *acts*, which have been *againſt*, and in *defiance*, and for the retrenching the *power* of the *Popes*, as thoſe are, wherein we have formerly inſtanced, and more particularly that of *Henry* II. threatning *Pope Alexander* III. and his *Succeſſours*, that if he will not doe him juſtice in the buſineſs of *Thomas* [of] *Becket*, † *neither he nor his Barons nor Clergy will any longer perform obedience to him.* And ſo that of *Lewis* XII. of *France*, who had the advice of the * *Council* of *Tours*, that *in the caſe propoſed it was lawfull to withdraw obedience from the Pope.* And ſo much for his fancy of the ſecular powers *acceptation*, and his *twelfth Ground.*

* *De poteſt. Eccl. Conſid.* 11. *qua poſſit in aliquid quod nulla altera poteſtas Eccleſiaſtica poteſt.*

† *De Concord. Cath.* l. 2. c. *ult.*

* *Ille proprie plus ſucceſſor ſancti Petri in Principatu foret, quam Romanus Præſul.*

† *Confer. bet. Reynold and Hart.* p. 859.

* *Contr. Creſcon.* l. 3. c. 15.

† *Matt. Paris An.* 1168. *neque ego neque Barones mei neque Clerus meus aliquam eis ulterius ſervabimus obedientiam.* And again *An.* 1169.

* *Concil. Turon. in Maſſæi Chronic. An.* 1510.

SECT. V.

His thirteenth Ground. Conceſſions of the Church] *ambiguous. The Pope's acknowledged ſubjection. No teſtimony of the Pope's conferring on Princes the powers which they execute.*

1. THE *thirteenth Ground* [that *it is granted by Catholicks that Kings may exerciſe ſome Eccleſiaſtical juriſdiction by the conceſſion of the Church, and yet not prejudice thereby the Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*] is of the ſame piece with the former; from a bare *poſſibility* that the *power*, and

and *acts* of *Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction* in *Princes* ſhould have been *granted* to them by the *Church*, to whiſper the unconcludency of thoſe manifeſt *teſtimonies*, which relate the *Princes* exerciſe of *Eccleſiaſtical power*.

2. But here is a double ambiguity in the phraſe [*Conceſſion of the Church*] for as by the *Church* may be meant either the *Univerſal Church*, or the *Pope* their *ſuppoſed head* of the *Church*, ſo by [*Conceſſion*] may be meant either *granting* and *conferring* a power originally veſted in him that grants it, and onely from him *derived* to the other; or elſe the *acknowledging* it to be his *proper due*, that claims it, and willingly *allowing* it, and pretending nothing againſt it.

3. If now in the firſt place we ſhould underſtand it of the *Univerſal Church acknowledging Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction* to be due to *Princes*, this is certainly a competent *evidence*, that thus 'tis *due*, and ſo muſt be a *prejudice* to the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*.

4. *Secondly*, if the *Pope* himſelf ſhall thus acknowledge, as I ſuppoſe *Pope Gregory* doth, when he tells *Mauritius*, *Ego juſſioni tuæ ſubjectus, eandem legem per diverſas terrarum partes tranſmitti feci*, that he is *ſubject to his command*, and as ſuch, *cauſes* his *Law* to be *promulgated*, and in the other forecited paſſages referred to by *Wenceſlaus's Edict*, (ſee *ch.* 2. *Sect.* 4. n. 17.) then certainly that is an *acknowledgment* as prejudicial to the *Papal Supremacy*, as *ſubjection* is unreconcileable with *ſovereignty*.

5. *Thirdly*, if in the notion of *conceſſion* for *conferring* or *deriving* by *grant* a power to another; it ſhould appear (as it doth not) that the *Univerſal Church* hath *granted exerciſe* of *Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction* to *Princes*; yet even that would be *prejudicial* to the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, for in that caſe if the *Church* or *Council* did no more than they had *power* to doe, the *Church* (and that is not the *Pope*) muſt have that *power*, or elſe it could not confer it on the *Princes*, and if it have it, it is above the *Pope*, and that is unreconcileable with the *Pope's Supremacy* or *Paſtourſhip* over all. When therefore in the confirmation of this *ground*, he adds that the *Teſtimonies by me alledged from the Church in her Councils granting juriſdiction to the ſecular power, is a ſtrong prejudice againſt their ſelf and proper right*] he is very far from *demonſtrating* or even *probable*-ſpeaking; for if by *granting*, he meant *acknowledging* the *Juriſdiction* in the *ſecular power*, then (as hath been ſaid) 'tis as convincing a proof of it, as the *teſtimony* of the *Church* is of any *right*, or *truth*; and ſure that cannot be converted to a *prejudice againſt* it; but if it ſhould be (which it no where appears to be) a *conferring* of it, then ſtill it appears that 'tis not *conferred* on them by the *Pope*, and conſequently that 'tis not *originally* veſted in him, and then he is not the *Univerſal Paſtour*.

6. *Laſtly*, if (which is the onely thing for *S. W*'s turn) it ſhall de ſuggeſted, that what *power Kings* have, they have by *conceſſion* from the *Pope*, and ſo it ſhould be thought incumbent on me to ſhew that the *powers* they have, are not thus *conferred* on, or *derived* to them, then, as I ſhall not want a competent ſtore of *arguments* to teſtifie it to be no *borrowed* but *original* right, ſo it muſt much more be incumbent on the *demonſtratour* or layer of *grounds*, to ſhew any record of the *Pope's conferring* this *power*; otherwiſe as no *derivative power* is a *power*, unleſs it be held by ſome *commiſſion* or way of *conveyance* from him, whoſe it was *originally*, ſo bare *ſuggeſtion* of a naked *poſſibility* is very much *inferiour* to a *Probability*, when yet a *thouſand probabilities* will not amount to the *thouſandth* part of one *demonſtration*.

7. But I cannot believe that *S. W.* who profeſſes to be Mr. *White's* Diſciple, will own this of the *Pope's conferring* this *Juriſdiction* on *Princes*] to be his meaning, when he ſaith the *conceſſion* of the *Church*] and then as I have no reaſon farther to diſprove that, ſo he hath ſecured himſelf from gaining much by his *thirteenth* Ground.

SECT. VI.

His fourteenth Ground. The no probability of it. The Schiſm at Corinth, *deſcribed by* Clemens, *very unlike that which* S. W. *cenſures in us to be the onely way of Schiſm poſſible.* Clement's *interpoſition not as Univerſal Paſtour. The Romaniſts way of Schiſm.* Petitio Principii. *Schiſm and Charity may enter at the ſame door. Our confeſſion no guilt. The fear of a Premunire, no cauſe of the Biſhops ſubſcription. Cardinal* Wolſey's *Legatine power contrary to Statute. The Clergies Petition, and the Title of it. The Univerſities debate, and definition. The firſt mover in* Henry VIII *his action, the Pope's unlawfull diſpenſation. The Pope foremoſt in the Sacrilege. King* Henry's *repentance falſely pretended. The truth of the Hiſtory.*

1. WE are now come to *S. W*'s *exit*, or *laſt Ground*, that *in caſe a Schiſm ſhould invade a whole Country, it could not be expected to have happened otherwiſe than D.* H. (*of Schiſm* c.) *hath deſcribed*] ſtill at the ſame rate of *demonſtrating*, as he hath afforded us all this while; Firſt, the thing that he ſaith, hath no degree of but *probability* in it, 2. if it were not onely *probable*, but true, it would no way prejudice *our*, or aid *his pretenſions*.

2. That it is void of all probability of truth, appears by this eaſie intelligible *relation*, which hath more than once had *Hiſtorical* truth in it.

3. In the *Church* of *Corinth* (as under that title are comprehended the *Saints of all Achaia*, and ſo) that whole *National Church*, it is ſomewhat more than *poſſible*, that a *Schiſm* ſhould ariſe, and that this ſhould be the method (beginning and progreſs) of it; 1. That ſome of the *Church* ſhould differ in ſome *Doctrines* and more *rites*, and pretend ſeverally to be taught by their ſeverally admired *teachers*, or by the word of *God* diverſly interpreted by them; Hereupon each, confident in his own way, ſhould *ſeparate*, and *abſtain* from *communion* the one of the other; At length the *wind* or vapour in the *bowels* of the earth, being violently *compreſs'd*, ſhould violently reſiſt and ſhake the whole *body*, the *Schiſm* improve into a *ſedition*, μιαρὸν σχίσμα, an *accurſed deteſtable ſedition*, * ὧν ὀλίγα μέτωπα θρασυτὴς καὶ αὐθαδείᾳ ἐξήναψαν, *which a few giddy and bold perſons accended*, † οἱ ἄνηβοι, οἱ νεοὶ, *ignoble*, mean *young* men, whoſe very perſons were ſo infamous, that they might reaſonably have *deterred* and averted

* *Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Cor.* 1. p. 2.
† P. 4.

averted all followers (* καταπαῦσαι τινὰς ὑμᾶς διέστειλαν) In this *ſedition* of *ambitious*, *malicious*, *reaſonleſs*, *reſtleſs* men, all that were † in *honour* and *dignity* in the *Church*, eſpecially the *Biſhops*, caſt out of their *ſeats*, * *although they had been conſecrated to their Office either by the Apoſtles*, or (*mediately* from them) *by eminent perſons*, *and had without any blame officiated and attended on the flock of Chriſt*; Then that this *tempeſt* that began in the *Church*, ſhould extend it ſelf to the *State*, and ſo the ζῆλος, καὶ ἔρις, καὶ στάσις, *zeal*, *ſtrife*, *ſedition*, be improved and inlarged into † ἀναστασία καὶ πόλεμος, πόλεμος καὶ αἰχμαλωσία, tumultuous *confuſion* and *perſecution*, *war* and *captivity*, and this in oppoſition to all *obedience* due from them ὑγουμένοις, to their *rulers* of *civil Magiſtrates*, ſuch as were not onely *Chriſtians*, but *zealous* upholders of the faith, and all good *order* in the *Church*.

* P. 16.

† P. 4. & 16: Ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐντίμους καὶ τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους.

* Καταστασιάζεσθαι ὑπ' ἐκείνων (*i. e.* Ἀποστόλων) ἢ μετ' ἐξὸν ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τούτους ἀπβάλλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας. *Ib.* p. 59. And τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενεγκόντας δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλλεσθαι. *Ib.* And κἀλῶς πολιτευομένους ὁρῶν τῆς ἀμέμπτου αὐτοῖς τετιμημένης λειτουργίας μετεσχήκοτας. *Ib.* † P. 4.

3. That all this was more than a bare *unexpectable poſſibility*, even a *real* and *notable Hiſtory*, I refer him to the moſt *pious* and *charitable Epiſtle* of the *Roman Church* and *Biſhop Clemens*, St. *Peter*'s Deacon and Succeſſour, who as he ſent not out his Emiſſaries to blow up theſe *coals*, which he ſaw kindled among them, but uſed the moſt powerfull *ſuaſories* to *extinguiſh* them, ſo neither he, nor that *Church* interpoſed their *authority*, as any *Univerſal Paſtour*, or ruling *Mother*, (though a *Roman Advocate*, *Fevardentius*, would fain collect ſomewhat toward it, from *Ireneus*, ſaying, that he wrote ἱκανωτάτην γραφὴν, a *moſt ſufficient* or *powerfull writing*, no more, than (as hath formerly been ſhewed) the ſame * *Irenæus* ſaith of the *Epiſtle* of *Policarpe*, the *Biſhop* of *Smyrna*, to the *Philippians*, who were no way under his authority) but as a *Siſter-Church*, *Chriſtianly* and *charitatively* † debated it with them.

* *Hinc obſerva Romanam Eccleſiam etiam ab initio authoritatem ſuam interpoſuiſſe in moderandis quoque Græcorum Eccleſiis, in* Ireñ. p. 240.

† P. 234. B.

4. Here then is an image of a *Schiſm*, wherein a *whole Church*, or *Chriſtian* Countrey was ingaged, and yet quite contrary to *S. W*'s *expectation*, neither the *ſecular Magiſtrate* (the *Chriſtian* ὑγούμενοι) were for it, nor the *Biſhops*, nor *Clergy*, nor *Univerſities*, but all in vain oppoſe, and are overborn by the *Paroxyſm*, unable to *give any ſtop to its proceeding*, *or to hinder its univerſal invaſion*.

5. And Copies (too much to the life) 'twere poſſible to produce in *other* Countries, where this very Tragedy hath been acted over again in the very ſame manner, and yet neither the *Roman Church* nor *Biſhop* have ſhewed altogether ſo much *zeal* to the *quenching* them, as that *Virgin* charity of theirs yielded thoſe which were very far removed from them.

6. This may ſerve an indifferent Reader to judge of the truth of this laſt profound *ground* of his. For if a *Schiſm* may and have entered and over-run a Kingdom, by *inferiours* riſing up againſt their *Superiours* both in *Church* and State, and caſting their moſt pious *Biſhops* out of their *Church*, and have been by the *Biſhop* and *Church* of *Rome* it ſelf judged to be a moſt *deteſtable Schiſm*, though they never ſent out any *declarations* againſt *Rome*; then with what truth could *S. W.* ſet it for a *ground*, that *in caſe Schiſm ſhould invade a whole Countrey*, *it could not be expected to happen otherwiſe*, *than by the King and Biſhops and Univerſities being formoſt in it*.

7. I could mention other ways, particularly that, by which the *Church* of *Rome* hath divided from the *Greek Church*, and from the *Church of England*, *damnando & à communione arcendo*, by denying them *communion* and *ſalvation*, which they know, we are not, *cannot* be guilty of toward them.

8. Meanwhile that any *Schiſm* in a *Countrey* (of that ſort, of which we are accuſed by the *Romaniſts*, a diviſion of *inferiours* from *ſuperiours*) can ever poſſibly happen after this manner, by the *King* and *Biſhops* being foremoſt in it, if it be believed, it is and muſt be *founded* in a *ſuppoſition* that there is ſome other *ſuperiour* both to *King* and *Biſhops*; and that he knows, is again the *begging* the *queſtion*, a *fallacy* that he is perpetually aſhamed of, and deſirous to avert, but will never, it ſeems, ceaſe to be guilty of, even whilſt he is about that work which is moſt extremely unreconcileable with it, the *laying* of *Grounds*.

9. But then, 2. on *ſuppoſition* there were ſome appearance, *poſſibility*, nay *probability* of truth in his ſage obſervation, that this were *the onely expectable way for Schiſm to enter into a whole Church*, what could he gain by it? May not *truth* and *peace* enter at the very ſame door? and by the very ſame manner of progreſs, as *hereſie* and *Schiſm* doth? Certainly it may. If true *Apoſtles*, ſober and pious *Governours* in *Church* and State, bring in *verity* and *unity*, may not *falſe Apoſtles*, *deceitfull Workers*, *heretical Princes* and *Biſhops* (witneſs *Conſtantius* and *Valens*, and their *Arian Biſhops* of old, to omit modern examples) introduce *falſhood* and *diviſion*? Was not the *Jewiſh Church*, that was led into *Idolatry* by their *Apoſtate Princes*, reformed by *good Joſiah*, and the like? And then what *prejudice* can it be to *us*, or *gain* to *S. W.* that he is forced to confeſs, that what was done in this Nation, was done by the *united ſuffrage* of *lawfull power* and *learning*, the joynt conſent of *King* and *Biſhops* and *Univerſities*? What Bulruſh may not become a *Spear*, what *wooden* Knife may not be whet at the *Philiſtins* Grindſtone into *Goliah*'s Sword, if by *S. W*'s omnipotent faculty, this ſo much leſs then *nothing* can be hightened into a *Demonſtration*?

10. From this *Ground* then thus fortunately produced and managed, *S. W.* muſt be allowed to raiſe his advantages, and ſo to annex his *conſequences*, which are no other but theſe, 1. That *my narrative diſcourſe hath nothing in it to bewonder them* (and if I can ſeriouſly profeſs, that I made it not, on any deſign to be thought a *dancer* on the *ropes*, or *wonder-worker*, I hope that *Corollary* hath wrought no *miraculous* advantages for him) 2. That *my narration is as plain and particular a confeſſion of the fact*, *as any penitent malefactor can make*, *when he is to ſuffer*] And truly I, that meant not to *lye*, though 'twere in intuition of the greateſt advantages, and wanted not ſuch *aids* to ſupport my cauſe, reſolved to ſpeak as true in ſetting the caſe, as if it had been on the *Scaffold*, or on my *death-bed*, but in doing ſo, made no *confeſſion*, as I thought, of any *evil* deed; And to call us *malefactours*, and *penitents*, and ſuggeſt that avowing what we have done with a good conſcience, is the *confeſſion* of a *guilt*; and not ſo much as attempt to ſhew, where the *guilt* lies, is again *S. W*'s *ſevere* method, which would be a *rarity* in another ill Diſputant, but is as *familiar* to *S W.* as laying of *Grounds* or *demonſtrating*.

11. But ſaith he, *the Doctour diſgraces his narration by confeſſion*, p. 136. *that the Clergy were inclined to ſubſcribe by the fear of a præmunire.*] I anſwer, *S. W.* ſeems to want ſome advantages, elſe he would not probably have ſought them by *miſinterpreting* my words. I mentioned the *Clergie's* having *incurred* a *præmunire*, but I ſaid not in the page cited, nor any where elſe, that they *were inclined to ſubſcribe for fear of it.* A change of *ſenſe* ordinarily follows a *change* of an adverſarie's *words*, ſo it doth here. The words in that page of *Schiſm* are, [*though the firſt act of the Clergy in this were ſo induced, that 'tis eaſie to believe that nothing but the apprehenſion of dangers that hung over them (by a præmunire incurred by them) could probably have inclined them to it, and therefore I ſhall not pretend that it was an act of their firſt will and choice, but that which the neceſſity of affairs recommended to them, yet the matter of right being on that occaſion taken into their more ſerious debate in a Synodical way, and at laſt, a fit and commodious expreſſion uniformly pitched on by joynt conſent of both Houſes of Convocation, there is no reaſon to doubt but that they did believe what they did profeſs, the fear being the occaſion of their debates, but the reaſons and arguments offered in debate, the cauſes (as in charity we are to judge) of their deciſion.*

12. Here 'tis viſible, that all that I ſay toward *S. W*'s purpoſe is, that the *fear* of the *premunire inclined* them to the *firſt act*, i. e. to taking this matter into *ſerious debate*, which is again expreſs'd by the *fear being occaſion of their debates*, which is very diſtant from *inclining them to conſent*, (as *S. W.* ſuggeſts that I ſay;) for to that I there ſuppoſe them *induced* by the *reaſons* and *arguments* offered in *debate*. If therefore he ſhall ſtill think that he hath duely cited my *words* or *ſenſe*, and that I *my ſelf diſgraced my narration*, I muſt in both theſe equally *diſſent* from him: The grounds of my diſſent in the former, have already appeared in *recitation* and *comparing* of the *words* by me uſed, and by him *impoſed* on me. And for the later, it ſtands thus;

13. The *Statute* of the *ſixteenth* of *Richard* II. (ſet down at large by my * *Lord* of *Cherbury* in the *Atturny*'s *charge* againſt *Cardinal Wolſey*) appoints, that if any *purchaſe or purſue in the Court of* Rome *any Tranſlations, Proceſſes*, &c. *and they which bring or receive them, or make notification or execution of them, ſhall be put out of the King's protection, and their lands*, &c. *forfeit to the King, and they attached in their bodies, or proceſs made againſt them by Writ of Præmunire facies.* Of which *Statute* the ground is ſet down, that *the Crown of England hath been free at all times, and in no earthly ſubjection, but immediately ſubject to God in all things touching the Legality of the ſame Crown and to none other, particularly not to the Pope.*

* P. 262.

14. Now it appearing that the † *Cardinal* acting as *Legatus a latere*, had *obtained and exerciſed Bulls quite contrary to this Statute, and exerciſed Juriſdiction Legatine to the deprivation of the King's power*—— and ſo that he was fallen into the *præmunire*, and the *Law proceeded* upon him accordingly, It was alſo * found by debate of the *King's Council*, and *reſolved againſt the Clergy*, that they were concluded under the ſame *crime*, and *penalty*, by ſupporting the *power Legatine* of the *Cardinal:* And this danger of theirs ſuggeſted the preſenting of a *petition* for the *King's pardon*, and the *title* of the *King* in the *Petition* coming under conſideration, they at laſt reſolved, all conſenting (*Biſhop Fiſher* being one of them) to give him the *title* of *Eccleſiæ & Cleri Anglicani Protector & Summum Caput*, (*quantum per Chriſti legem licet*;) and thus they preſented their *Petition.* All which amounts to no more than this, that they which had done quite contrary to the *Laws*, and incurred a viſible, conſiderable imminent *danger* by it, were awaked, by the near approach of their danger, to conſider their *crime*, and on ſight and acknowledgement thereof, to return to their *obedience*; for which they found a concurrence of all the moſt juſt *reaſons*, when they *conſidered* them, but were firſt *inclined* to *conſider* them, by the danger their crime had brought upon them.

† *Ibid.* p. 263.

* *Ibid.* p. 320.

15. And this I take to be the very frequent method not of averting ſinners from *God*, but of bringing them back to *repentance*, when, the *ax* being *layd to the root of the tree*, dangers approaching, a *Baptiſt* adviſes them to *fly from the wrath to come*, or an *Apoſtle*, to *awake* and *ariſe from the dead*; and they being thus rouſed by outward judgments, bethink themſelves, and return to a *right mind*, and have all the reaſons in the world to doe ſo; though, till the *danger* had thus *awaked* and qualified them, they were not ſo happy as to *admit* thoſe *conſiderations.* This I think may ſerve to reſcue my *narration* of the fear of a *Præmunire* from bringing any *diſgrace* upon it ſelf.

16. What he next adds, is of the ſame ſtamp, that *the queſtion about the Pope's right in England being debated in the Univerſities, I ſay onely*, p. 135. *that it was generally defined in the Negative*, i. e. ſaith he, *when the King's party prevailed.*] And I wonder what I could need to *ſay more*, but that it was *generally defined in the Negative, and ſo returned teſtified under their hands and ſeals*, An evidence of their *univerſal*, deliberate, *voluntary* conſent to it. And for him to adde, that it was *when the King's party prevailed*, is as if he told us, *the King's party prevailed, when the King's party prevailed*, or that it not appearing ſo plainly before that *debate*, which way the *Univerſities* inclined, upon debate it was found that the *prevailing* ſuffrage, ſuch as concluded the *General conſent* of the *Univerſities*, was for the *King*, againſt the *Pope*, which indeed was all that I intended to infer thence.

17. But ſaith he, *I omit that the King's luſt firſt moved him to think of Schiſmatizing, and his final repentance of that Act, which ſhew that the firſt Spring which moved the whole Engine was not purity of conſcience, but the impureſt and baſeſt of paſſions.*] I anſwer, I *omitted* them, becauſe I could not with *juſtice* or *charity* ſet them down, and I had much rather comply with both theſe exactly, than offend againſt both, or either of theſe, on what other *intereſts* ſoever.

18. It cannot, with either of them, be ſaid, that *his luſt firſt moved him to think of Schiſmatizing*, when *firſt*, he never *Sciſmatized*, but acted as his *Predeceſſours* had done, by ſtrength of thoſe *Laws*, which declare *the Crown of England to be free from all ſubjection to the Pope, immediately ſubject to God*; on which the *Pope* excommunicated him, and brake that *peace* and *union* which a *Spiritual Paſtour* ought moſt zealouſly and ſolicitouſly to have *conſerved.*

19. Secondly, the *firſt viſible* mover of the *Engine* was, the *Pope's diſpenſing with the Law of God*, in allowing him to marry his *Brother's wife*, which one thing, moſt unjuſtifiable in the *Spiritual Paſtour*,

Paſtour, was the *Origine* of all the ſubſequent train of inconveniences, that involved his affairs in *England*; which yet might in ſome degree have been redeemed, if he would have diſcerned his errour, and have reſcinded his *unlawfull diſpenſation*, which the chief *Univerſities* of that part of *Chriſtendom* which was then in communion with the *Pope*, declared it his duty to have done. Or if any thing on the *King*'s part intervened, and contributed, why ſhould not *charity* judge (at that time, when the *King* was in as great and *univerſal* honour among all, as any *Prince* in *Chriſtendom*) that what *S. W.* will call *luſt*, was truly a deſire of an Heir *male* to inherit his *Kingdoms*? And if this deſire will co-operate with the *conſcience* of the *unlawfulneſs* of the *marriage*, to ſolicit the *divorce*, why ſhould not the *Spiritual* man have conſidered the *neceſſity* of the *one*, *reflecting* alſo on the *reaſonableneſs* of the *other* motive?

20. A man would have thought, that in a charge of no great *partiality* to *Henry* VIII. the *Sacrilege*, which was viſible, and the *covetouſneſs*, which might tempt inviſibly, as well as the *luſt*, might have been as fit to have been added to *S. W*'s *indictment* brought in againſt that *King*. But, as he ſaith without cauſe, that I *omit* the *one*; I may juſtly obſerve, that he *omits* the *other*, and give ſome gueſs at the reaſon of it; Becauſe in this Scene alſo the *Pope* was the *firſt Actour*, and he that gave the *example* and *incouragement*, and ſo more than the *temptation* to all that followed, by conſenting to the *Cardinal*'s requeſt for *ſuppreſſing* and *ruining* * of divers *Religious Houſes*, which the piety of former *Princes* had erected. In which matter it is not to be forgotten what the *Romaniſts* themſelves, the thirty ſecular Prieſts in their † addreſs to Pope *Clement* the VIII. *Ann. Dom.* 1600. from *Widbich*, expreſly tell him. *Horrenda Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ calamitas jam indè à diebus Clem. VIII. incepta eſt, à quo Cardinalis Wolſæus (vir prudèns ſecundum, ſed tanto loco, & celſitudinis gradu indigniſſimus) acceptâ poteſtate ad quæque pro ſuo arbitrio agenda in regno noſtro, quid non eſt auſus? Ipſe primus omnium diruit non pauca monaſteria, & ſub Apoſtolicæ authoritatis ſpecie impunè deſæviens in noſtram Eccleſiam, anſam & exemplum præbuit Henrico Regi paulò poſt totam Dominicam vineam exterminandi.* &c.

* Ld *Cherb. Hiſt. Hen.* VIII. p. 157, 158.

† *Declarat. motuum.* p. 87.

21. As for the *King's final repentance of that Act*, (if he mean any thing, he muſt mean the *Extinguiſhing Act*, for to mean *Schiſm*, is again to beg the *Principle*;) I wonder on what ground of *Hiſtory* he can think to affirm it, or what he can hope to gain by it, if there were any truth in it.

22. His ground of *Story* I may gueſs at, becauſe the *Catholick Gentleman* having the like paſſage, that *to his dying day he deſired to be reconciled, and that it was but the coming two daies ſhort of a Poſt to Rome, which hindered that the reconcilement was not actually made*:] he cites it from my *Lord* of *Cherbury*, *fol.* 361. To this I † formerly gave anſwer, ſuch as ſufficed, but had not then my *Lord* of *Cherbury*'s Book by me to conſult, which having now reviewed, I find in that page, that in the *year* 1533. (which is 14. years before his *death*) the *Pope's ſentence againſt the King being openly ſet up at* Dunkirk, the *King*, *to prevent inconveniencies*, *reſolved*, 1. to *inform his Subjects of his Appeal to the Council General*, 2. of the *unlawfulneſs of the Dowager's Appeal to* Rome, 3. to *command it to be taught that the General Council is above the Pope*——and then deſired the *Biſhop of* Paris *to certifie* Francis, *that if the Pope would ſuperſede from the executing his ſentence, until he had indifferent Judges who might hear the buſineſs, he would alſo ſuperſede of what he was deliberated to doe, in withdrawing his obedience from the* Roman *See*, giving alſo the *Biſhop power to negotiate at Rome*, aſſuring him that *he had intire confidence in his diſcretion and ſufficiency*, and would *confirm as much as ſhould by him be accorded on his part*; Hereupon the *Biſhop* poſted to *Rome*, came to terms of accord, and a day was fix'd, and a *Currier ſent for receiving from our King a Confirmation hereof within a ſet time*; but the *Currier* not returning till two daies after that time was expired, the *ſentence* was *præcipitated*, and the *cenſures fulminated*, and then the *Currier* arrived with *ample Commiſſion* and *authority from the King to conclude and confirm all that the Biſhop had agreed in his name*. But what was that agreement? Why, that *the King was content to accept the judgment of that Court, upon condition that the ſuſpected and Imperial Cardinals ſhould not intervene, and that indifferent perſons ſhould be ſent to* Cambray *to be informed of the merits of the cauſe, giving authority for his Proctours to appear in that Court.* And if this be *repentance* of that *Act*, and being 14. years before his *death*, *final repentance*, *S. W.* ſhall be credited ſtill in relating matters of *fact*; but withall, the *Pope* that would firſt *præcipitate*, and then upon an approved or *approvable repentance*, not reſcind it, muſt lye under the *cenſure* not onely of Mr. *White* for a very *fallible Judge*, even when he hath proceeded by the *votes* of his *Conſiſtory*, but of all other men, for a very *unkind Father*, that came not to *call* or *receive ſinners to repentance*, or *penitents* to *peace*. And that is all I ſhall need to add to what hath before been largely replyed to the *Catholick Gentleman* (on this head of *King Henry*'s *final repentance*) where hath appeared, what moderate gains he was to be content to reap from that ſuggeſtion, if ſuppoſed to have perfect *truth* in it, which now it hath *failed* of alſo.

* *Reply to Cath. Gent.* p. 116.

CHAP. V.

A Rejoynder to S. W*'s Exceptions to my former Replies, and inforcements of his own, in his First Part.*

SECT. I.

S. W*'s Reflexion on his fourteen Grounds. The whole matter devolved to this test, the truth or falsehood of these grounds; A Recapitulation of the returns made to them, and a brief view of the state of our Controversie. The method of the remaining Strictures, and the motives to it.*

1. HAving laid down these his (no less than) *fourteen Grounds*, and thereby, as he thinks, given his Reader a competent number of *prejudices* to our cause, and instilled seeds of pregnant *kindness* to his, he yet contents not himself, without assuring him again at parting, that *these Grounds will themselves lay open the whole case clearly to the ordinary Readers, and inform the more prudent ones, that nothing is or can be said by* D. H. *of a force and clearness comparable to that of their possession, and that of Oral Tradition, which they ever claimed for their tenour, from which also we disclaimed, when we reformed in this point of the Pope's Supremacy, so that little more remains to be performed by S. W.* but to manifest the *Doctour's shallow weaknesses and trivial impertinencies*—]

2. With this resolution of his I shall not refuse so far to comply, as to acknowledge, that if his *Grounds* had approved themselves as they promised, *demonstrative*, the consequence would have been, as he pretends, and all farther *Replies* or *Discoveries* have proved *superfluous*; For if *Possession* and *Oral Tradition* be such irrefragable tenures, and both of them be proved or granted to be on the *Romanist*'s side, our denying the *Pope*'s *Supremacy*, and so the *Extinguishing Act*, must needs be acknowledged, in *Clement*'s style, not onely φάσμα, but πάσις and πόλεμος, more than *Schism*, even *sedition* and *rebellion* it self, the casting our *Sovereign*, the *Pope*, out of his *Dominions*.

3. To this therefore, as to the grand issue, I acknowledge the matter to be duely brought by *S. W.* and consequently am obliged to stand to the triall on these terms of the *question* thus stated; And if they can so manage their argument fetch'd from *Oral Tradition*, as thereby to *demonstrate the Pope's continual possession in the supreme universal Pastourship by succession from* St. *Peter*, and so *derivation* from *Christ*, I am *humble* enough to confess, and *impartial* enough to pronounce, that our cause is finally lost; But if in this pretended *Demonstration S. W.* hath miscarried, and failed to perform in the *least* degree, what in the *highest* he promised, and if in this my *Reply* to his *fourteen Grounds* (wherein the very *quintessence* of his cause is by his own confession comprised, and by his own *Limbek extracted*) it hath competently appeared that he hath thus *miscarried*, the united force of *both* his admired *mediums*, *Possession* and *Tradition Reversed*, amounting to little more, than their *present Churches* assuming, without proof it *is* so, and *S. W*'s assuming (on no *other* proof, but their so teaching) that it *must* be so, and cannot possibly be otherwise; If over and above, it have in passing, been cleared in the *first* times, that the pretended *universal Pastourship* was not so much as *pretended* to by any *Pope*, nor by any the *first General Councils* allowed, nay *denyed*, and so, under characters of the greatest *detestation*, disowned personally, by *Popes*, both for themselves and all others; If yet farther it hath been competently testified that their *possession* in *England* was never admitted under that *title*, which alone *S. W*'s Doctrine and *interest* exacts, but at the utmost, on such claims, as the *Kings* of *England* might as well *exclude* as *admit*; And if, after all this, it were still the *Pope* that first cast off the *King* by his *severe* censures, and *precipitated*, *inexorable Bull*, and so made it impossible, that the *King* should be guilty of this sin of *breaking communion*, or *separation*; (to all which I shall be allowed to *hope*, that the *Testimonies* are *pregnant*, and though from necessity of the matter, *wordish* in *S. W*'s style, yet withall neither *dead* nor *mute*) There will then be little colour of pretence for the charge of *Schism* against us, and not much more for the appendant, but slighter suggestion, that either *King Henrie*'s lust (as *S. W.* hath it) or his *sacrilege* and *covetousness* (as others more colourably) began our *Reformation*; since the *Pope*, that dispensed with him to marry his *Brother's wife* (against the expres command of *God*, * repeated to the *Jews*, but first given to all the *sons* of *Adam* and *Noah*) and with *Cardinal Wolsey*, to pull down the lesser *Monasteries*, was *first*, if not principally (and so more) *chargeable* with it. And if our *God* of *pureſt eyes*, who hateth and *punisheth* all these sins, hath also by his over-ruling hand, made use of them to chastise the provocations of the *Church*, and to introduce that more pure unmix'd profession of *truth*, which had long been incumbred, and defaced under some rubbish, we may *adore* his *justice*, and *wisedom*, and *goodness* also, and not allow our selves to *divert* from so necessary a duty, and take up eternal *complaints* and *disputes* instead of it.

* *Lev.* XVIII. 16.

4. It is certain, the practice of all known duties, and the ministring to the *Church* of *God* in those things, wherein the *inward* beauty of *Religion* consists, particularly the φιλοτιμεῖσθαι and φιλεῖν, as the *Apostle* styles it, *emulation* and *ambition*, and eager constant *pursuing* of an *universal peace* and *charity* among *Christians*, is a much more decent imployment for the greatest wits, or most dignified *Prelates*, than an insatiate contention for *power*, or *grandeur*; and our *Saviour*'s example and Doctrine have establish'd it beyond objection, that he *that will be the first of all*, must not onely in an affected *title*, but in *reality*, be the *servant of all*.

5. Meanwhile

5. Meanwhile on these premisses, more largely deduced in these foregoing debates, and now thus briefly *recapitulated*, I shall not ask his leave to conclude and assume, that the *Defense* of our *Church* in point of *Schism* (which was the *Original* ingagement) remains wholly unmoved and undisturbed by his renewed attempts; and having so far acquitted our selves, as to all that our persecuted Mother is concerned in, I shall profess to have so little solicitude for *my self*, or respect to *S. W*'s *slanders* and *contumelies*, and *captious* returns; which he here calls *manifestations* of my *shallow weaknesses*, and *trivial impertinences*, but in his *Index* hath set out in the *louder* styles of *Absurdities*, *Abuses*, *Blasphemies*, *Cavils*, *Contradictions*, *False-dealings*, *Ignorances*, *Omissions of necessary duty*, *Bringing Testimonies for*, *that are against*, &c. (all which summed up by him are but so many hundreds of *Essayes* of his *Chymical* faculty in extracting *streams*, if not *Oceans* our of *Pumice* stones) as not to account it my *interest* to lavish and mispend my own and the Reader's hours and patience, in surveighing all his *subtilties* of this kind.

6. It is to be expected, that they that are not able to *support* their cause, will *adorn* it, as well as they can, if it be but with the *names*, or *pictures* of their pretended *Captives*, and having avowed their obligation to *defame* their adversary, proceed to do it as *dexterously* and *undiscernibly*, and to that end as *confidently* and *triumphantly*, as they are able; and herein I acknowledge *S. W.* hath acquitted himself to be a great *Master* of his *Art*, having on the one first *part* of my *Replies* to the *Cath. Gent.* and the *Disarmer* (beyond which he hath not proceeded) represented such an Army of *conquer'd*, a *Catalogue* of *scattered* forces, that to vindicate them from his *aspersions*, and misrepresentations, and shew him or others, that it was but his *dream*, wherein they were *routed*, and from whence their supposed names and misfortunes were transcribed and ingrossed in his *Inventory*, would require many more sheets, than he hath spent in his *Dispatcher* (which being added to the large but necessary examination of his *grounds*, would advance to an *enormous* bulk) the *discovering* of *frauds* and *injustices* being a work of much more time, than the contriving them, unless the injured person satisfie himself with that part of the *Gospel method*, of ὡι ἀνλικτῶν, *leaving* his *innocence* to be approved to *God* and man by its *own lustre*, and referring it to every mans eyes whether *S. W.* be as *terrible*, or the *Doctour* as *deformed*, as he is painted.

7. In this I shall have the less reason to be *solicitous*, having in the first *Chapter* given (on purpose to gain liberty to spare the like afterward) a competent number of ἀξιώσεις, what trust or heed is due to this *Accuser*; nor indeed can I imagine that 'tis expected by any, that I should still give the Reader and my self the *same* exercise, or *vary* it so impertinently, as to pursue or trace his steps through all his *several* following *Sections*, either in things which are now by degrees so far removed, as to be wholly *extrinsecal* to the main *question*, or which belonging to it, own their certain dependence on the *Grounds*, which we have thus largely and particularly refuted, or which are sufficiently cleared already in the former *answers*, for that were *actum agere*, to recite what hath already been said, and 'tis more for the *Reader*'s ease as well as mine, that he *review* or *remember* what he hath formerly read, than that he be sated with *repetitions*.

8. I shall now more cursorily surveigh some part at least of the remainder of his *Reply*, not giving it that measure of consideration, which his *Grounds* have been allowed; And should I attend him but to the end of his *first* part, I should therein *imitate* him, who hath satisfied himself with the *first* of the *three* parts of mine, leaving the far greater untouch'd. But if leisure from more important business permit, I may probably enough, whilest these sheets seek their passage into the *light*, proceed to that which follows also, so far as to tire both my self, and the Reader, if it be but to give him a fuller view of *S. W*'s dealings (scarce to be parallel'd by any other) some more of the lineaments of a *new-fashion'd Controvertist*; which being done, I shall willingly, if there be ought behinde, leave it to doe its utmost, being secure that they which are willing not to be deceived, will *compare*, before they judge, and not think the worse of *David*, that *Goliah* revileth him, nor of this cause, that there is a *Chancery-bill*, a bedroll of *boasts* or *cavils* brought in against it, never an one of which, to him that hath *leasure* and *candour* to *compare* and *examine*, will be found to have the least *solidity* in it.

SECT. II.

Answer to his seventh Section. Admiration and Prodigy relative. S. W*'s guesses not creditable against our knowledge. Our denying a Fact is not our pleading the reasonableness of it: Not inflicting Censures differs much from joyning with Schismaticks.* S. W*'s interpretation of not pressing false Fundamentals. His averting our charity to their Church. What danger if our charity erred? An account of our belief that the Church of* Rome *is a true Church. The Nags-head Bishops. With what truth Fable is now revived. Mission from* Rome *in what sense.*

1. IN his seventh *Section* the *mistakes* affix'd on me in *reply* to his *Introduction*, will not move any man that shall compare *Deuter.* ch. 11. *Sect.* 1. with these suggestions.

2. For example, it being the part of a *wise man*, *nil admirari*, to *admire nothing*, and *new* and *strange* and *prodigious* effects being the onely things for which *admiration*, which hath gone for an *excess* of *minde*, is allowable or excusable, and yet *S. W.* owning *some admiration* to have been *bred* in him, I know not that I could misinterpret him, when I conceived some *great unheard-of news* and *prodigy* to be the one proper *object* of such *acknowledged admiration*.

3. As for the account of our writing *books* by *pairs* (he may now remember Sir *Roger Twisden*, and Dr. *Ferne*, and say by *Messes*) on the subject of *Schism*, I must be allowed to give the *reasons* with more certain judgement than any else, but the *Bishop* of *Derry*, and those others, and the *searcher* of *hearts*; And therefore if he will still satisfie himself with his own *auguries*, and set up his *fancie* for an *infallible* testifier, against other mens inerrable *sensations* of a *fact* within their own *cognisance*,

I shall leave him and his Reader to try it out, and not endeavour to make this impertinent breach betwixt us *wider* by debating.

3. So when I take notice of his mention of *our pleading the reasonableness of our Schism, as a* Δεῖξις, what *trust is due to him in his affirmations*? He will persuade me that I interpret his words, *as if he meant, that I confess'd it Schism.*] But it is evident to any *Reader*, that reflects on my words (*Answ.* to *Sch. Dis. Ch.* 2. *Sect.* 2. n. 1.) that I do not so *interpret* his words, but onely assume, that he saith (which are his *express* words) *that we plead the reasonablness of our Schism*, and answer, that I *grant all Schism uncapable of all plea of reasonableness, and maintain our innocence by denying the fact, and not by defending the justice of it.* And therefore, although herein he either is, or desires others should be, deceived (for my exception is still the *same* that it was, that we *deny* the *fact*, have not *divided*, or *brake* from any *Government*, that we were under, and then how can I be supposed to plead the *reasonableness* of that *fact*, which he calls our *Schism*, if I think we never committed that *fact*? and if we had, I confess we could not produce any justifiable *reason* for it) yet the farther discussing this, were but the *repeating* what hath been so oft said, that we plead not (as he oft, and fain would have us) the causes of our *division* (but deny that we ever *divided*) and that all the *breach* or *partition* that is made, proceeds from their sentences of *Excommunication*, as *inexorable*, as *unjust*.

4. So in his Reply concerning the *aim* and end of the *Churches censures*, 'tis so visible I spake not of our *not keeping our selves separate* from *Schismaticks*, on one side, nor of the *punishments subsequent to Excommunication*, on the other side, but of that peculiarly, whereof he spake before, *viz.* the whether *inflicting* or *threatning* them with the *Spiritual rod of Excommunication* (which were little less than *fury* toward a *Schism armed with might*, and so, far from *Christian*, or *charitative*, or *prudent*) that it is not imaginable he can expect farther answer to his suggestions, than is already largely afforded him.

5. His next piece [of their *not pressing us to believe false fundamentals*] as it is now interpreted by him, must signifie a special rarity, *viz.* his telling me, that they *doe not press us to believe false fundamentals*, meaning by *fundamentals*, as he saith *such points as we account fundamentals*] which being easily spelled, and put together, amounts to this, that they doe *not press us to believe such false points, as we accounted fundamentals*,] On which I acknowledge my discourse too short to make any rational reflexions, I am no *Oedipus* for such riddles, but acknowledge, that because I was so charitable as to think he spake words that would bear some *sense*, I affix'd not *this* interpretation on them, and so it is but a faint sparkling of *S. W*'s more radiant esprite, to demand now, whether it *were wrong to us to affirm that we would not speak a contradiction*] No, but it was, it seems, *superabundant charity* in me to presume he would not.

6. Meanwhile 'tis possible one passage in this discourse of the *truth* of their *Church*, p. 63. may breed some scruple, how I can acknowledge the *Church* of *Rome* a true *Church*, when I deny their *Infallibility*, which he here, as elsewhere, affirms to be the *Fundamental of Fundamentals, upon which as her sole certain ground she builds all her Faith.* Upon which his argument thus proceeds, *If the sole authority on which she builds all her faith, to wit, her infallible authority, be a ruinous falshood, she can have no true faith of any Article, and consequently can have no faith at all, nor be a true Church, since a Church cannot survive the destruction of faith*, whence he concludes, that *our ambition to honour our Nags-head Bishops with the shadow of a mission from their Church, makes us kindly speak nonsense to doe Rome a seeming courtesie for our own interest.*]

7. To all this therefore I must pay some attendance, and *first*, to reflect a while on his plain affirmation, that *their Infallibility is their Fundamental of Fundamentals, their sole certain ground on which she builds all her faith.*] I may here have leave with some astonishment to demand, if *God's veracity*, his *word* and certain *truth* of his affirmations, be not at least some *part* of their *Faith*, if not the *foundation* of it? and if they *believe that* onely upon their own *infallibility*, and not their *infallibility* on that? 2. Whether she may not equally build on this *foundation* all things in the world, which she can or shall ever believe, as she builds those *articles* which she now professeth? But this theme is too large for a παίγνιον, and hath, in an intire tract, been long since cnnsidered.

8. *Secondly* then, for our destroying their *Faith* and *Church* by denying their *Infallibility*, I shall return answer, such as I hope will justifie the reason of our *charity* toward them, though they should all be such passionate, avowed, imperswasible, and even *Platonick lovers* of hatred and strife, as *S. W.* affects to be esteemed, most vehemently renouncing their *thinking of our Church under that notion*, when they *pray for the peace of the Catholick Church* p. 78 and giving his reason why we should not have *charity*, or *conthanks* to the *humble members of the Papacy* for such *prayers*, and so here solicitously providing, and proposing *arguments* to aver our *charitable* acknowledgement, that their *Church* is a true *Church*.

9. And, 1. I might demand, what *injury* it would be to their *Church*, or *criminous* errour in us, if a few poor persecuted *Christians*, being railed at for *hereticks*, and cast out of their *Church*, did so far deceive themselves by their earnest desire to *live peaceably with all man*, and to *repay good for evil*, as without grounds *demonstrable*, or duely approveable, to *hope* or *believe* better of them than they deserve, or than they are willing we should persuade our selves, or others, that they deserve? Or how were it reconcileable with *humility* in them, to reject these no poisonous effluxions of this, *easie*, *well-meant*, (though 'twere *irrational*) *charity*?

10. But then, 2. we doubt not of the *solidity* of our grounds, whereby we conclude the *Church* of *Rome* a *true Church*, as having received and retained the *Articles* of the *Apostle's Crede*, the *one onely true faith*, *once*, or *at once*, *delivered*. And if they do also believe the *Infallibility* of the *present Roman Church*, which we account an *errour*, yet will not that (or their many other *additional* errours) be sufficient of it self to destroy the *foundation* supposed to be believed by them, any more than telling *many* falsities is unreconcileable with telling *any* truth.

11. As for his argument, founded in the *supposal* that *she builds all her faith on her own Infallible authority*, my charity still bids me hope that she doth not, but upon the *Doctrine* of *Christ*, and therefore

therefore that the *Church*, in this argument, is an ambiguous word, distinguishable into the *Ancient*, *Primitive*, *Apostolical Church truely Universal*, and the *present modern Roman Church* falsely styling it self *Universal*; and then, as I doubt not but the former of these was *infallible* in *testifying* their own *sensations*, and so in delivering down both the *Canon* of the *Scripture*, and *Articles* of the *Crede*; so I charitably persuade my self, that the *present Roman Church* believes both these upon that *Testimony* of theirs, and then that, as including the *Apostles*, and *Christ*, and so *God* himself, is their *Fundamental of Fundamentals*, their *sole certain Ground*.

12. As for their *present Church*, as far as it teaches no more than it received from them, so far it proceeds *infallibly* also, but hath not it self that *amulet* or *charm* of *Infallibility*, that although it should *believe*, and *teach*, as received from them, what really they never delivered, it should yet be *unerrable* in thus *believing* or affirming.

13. And this (if there be any kind of truth in such as do not pretend to be *infallible* in all things) is the true ground of our believing them still a *true* (yet not an *infallible*) *Church*, though how soon they will make use of their *pretended infallibility* to destroy some *articles* of the *Faith*, as they have done to introduce those that are *no articles*, I undertake not to divine, yet conceive that the divolving the whole *ground* of *faith* to the *Oral Tradition* of each present age, and defining for *Articles*, whatsoever the *present Mothers* shall teach their *children*, is as ready a way toward it, as the Devil could civilly suggest, or instill into them; But the no great *reverence* I owe to *S. W's affirmations* leaves still place for my *charity*, to believe that there be but *few Romanists* as yet, that have entred into this *temptation*. And untill it be formed into an *article*, and these *possible* noxious consequences be *actually* and practically derived from it, I shall still hope that the taking up all true *fundamental articles*, on what grounds soever, though from a book casually found among *Heathens*, much more from *Romish Mothers* (though they neither are, nor are deemed *infallible*) may, with the superstructing of *good* life, bring safe to Heaven him who hath no other means to direct him thither.

14. For I shall demand, in case a *Christian Priest*, or but a *Lay* person, should goe to the *Indies*, and there promulgate the *true Doctrine*, or (to satisfie *S. W.*) the *whole Roman* Doctrine of the *Tridentine Articles*, telling them withall, that *God* came to him in a *Vision*, and revealed this *Doctrine*, and with it gave him this command, to preach it to those *Auditours*, and in case those *Indians believe* all that he saith, his *Vision*, and his *Doctrine* too, his *Vision*, which I with *S. W.* suppose to be a *Falsitie*, and his *Doctrine*, which *S. W.* grants with my supposition to be a *truth*; shall not, I say, those *Indians*, that thus *believe* all *Catholick truth*, be acknowledged to have a *true Faith*; and if by that *Priest* they were baptized into this *Catholick Faith*, be thus far accounted *Christians*, in a state of *salvation*, if without ever discovering the falseness of the pretended Vision, they die in that *Faith*? I shall not think *S. W.* so severe to these new *Proselytes*, as to doubt of their *Faith* or *Salvability*. And I shall have the same *charity* to him and his *Church*, if, as *sincerely* as the supposed *Indians*, they *believe* all *Catholick* truth, and, as *blamelesly* as those *Indians*, continue to *believe* some *untruths*. So much may suffice for this objection.

15. To his mention of the *Nags-head Bishops* I have nothing to return, but that it seems these are times, wherein the most *refuse* trash, the most *scandalously reprobate* ware may hope to be put off to some Customers, else this which was long since driven to its *den*, and discovered to be *palpable forgery* by testimony of undenyable *records*, would not adventure the *shame* of coming upon the Stage again, as both here by *S. W.* and by another *Libeller* I hear it hath; If Mr. *Mason* hath not already done it for him; or if he do in earnest attribute ought to the *one* auxiliary, newly brought in, the pretended *Confession* of the *Bishop of Durham* in the *late Parliament*, he will soon see (if not before, this can tell him so) from evidences undenyable, what sort of *wares* those are, which now a days the *Romanist* serves out to his *Customers*.

16. Meanwhile *S. W.* hath not very reconcileably joyned the mention of the *Nags-head Bishops*, and so much as a *shadow of mission from Rome*; for I always understood the Fable of the *Nags-head* to have pretended, that those which had never been any kind of (and so not *Romish*) *Bishops* made one another *Bishops* at that merry meeting. And then they had as fair a pretension (and so *shadow*) of mission from *Constantinople*, as from *Rome*, the same that the *Sebaptistæ*, i. e. none at all from any, but *themselves*.

17. *Lastly*, I have not been acquainted with those men, whose *ambition* it hath been to *honour our Bishops with mission from Rome*, any farther, than by affirming this known truth, that those who *consecrated* our *Bishops*, as in *King Henrie's*, so in *Queen Elizabeth's* time, had, till they were *Excommunicate*, held *communion* with *Rome*, receiving *Ordination* from the *Bishops* their *Predecessors* under the *Primate* of this Nation, who by a Chain of *Succession* received it also either from the *British Bishops*, who own'd no dependence on *Rome*, or from *Augustine* the *Monk*, who was ordained by the *Bishop* of *Arles* in *France*, but being sent hither by the *Pope*, paid a special *respect* unto him, but (as was formerly insisted on) appears not ever to have exacted acknowledgement, or *performed obedience* to his *Universal Pastourship*. And whether our (whom he *libellously* styles *Nags-head*) *Bishops* had their mission uninterrupted from the *British*, or *French*, or *Romish Bishops*, it matters little to us, who doubt not but each of these had it by continued *succession* from the *Apostles*, who planted the *Faith*, and imposed hands on their *first fruits* in every of these *Regions*. And so as we have no *interests* to serve (whatever he is resolved to *fansie*) by *pretending mission* from *Rome*, so we need not *nonsense*, and it now appears we have not let fall any, in our *courtesie* (more than *seeming*) to their *Church*. And another *S. W.* could hardly have contrived so many *misadventures* into so little compass.

18. His farther inlargements concerning *Copes*, *Surplices* and *Organs*, had their satisfactory answers formerly, and have now no *new* addition of *armature*, or propriety to our present *debates*, and so I shall leave them to him that pleases to *consider* them, as I do also his addition of their *Churches possession of their belief of the Infallibility*, which hath largely been spoken to already.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Answer to his VIII *Section. His notion of good and bad. Rendring causes of Schism differs from proving we have not separated. The pretence of an external confess'd Government. The Romanists Schism.* S. W's *argument to prove it impossible, considered. Aristocracy, a Government, as well as Monarchy. The Government of the Church by Primates. Schism from Fraternal Union also. Injustice of their censures. All* [*Ifs*] *are not ridiculous. Two sins may be equal. His insertion of* [*not*] Irenæus's ἀνάπαυσιν. *Cautious expressions. The title of Catholicks no argument. St* Augustine's *testimony no proof of it. A Tract of heresie several from that of Schism. His ninth Grammatical Section passed over lightly.*

1. IN his eighth *Section*, though I cannot admire the *Rule* of his *great Masters* of *morality*, that *nothing is in it self good or bad, but as it conduces to, or averts from the attaining one's last end* ('tis sufficient to me, that some things being in their *own nature good*, and agreeable to those *Souls* which God hath appointed to have the *Government* of our *actions*, and the contrary to these in their *own nature evil*, as breaches of his *eternal Law*, *God* hath most *graciously* decreed to reward, with *eternal bliss* those *actions* of ours, which are so consonant to our *natures*, and eternally to punish our *violations* of those his most *equal Laws*, our casting off from us his ζυγὸς χρηστὸς, his *gracious* as well as *easie Yoke*) yet have I no reason to go out of my way to examine it, or any other part of his *procedure*, whereby he infers no more than what he knows I first *affirmed* to him, that there is no *just cause* pretensible for *Schismatizing*, or *separating* from any our *lawfull Governours*.

2. As for his examination of my inference, that *because Schism can have no just causes, therefore in treatting a Controversie of Schism, I ought not to heed or produce causes*] he hath on that head nothing to purpose, but a piteous *thin Sophism*, that if I doe an *external act*, *which hath the shew of Schism*, and *yet will defend my self to be no Schismatick, I must give account why I doe that action, and shew that that action is not truly Schism*] To which I answer, as formerly, that it is one thing to *render causes of Schism* or *separating* from a *Government*, another to *shew* and *prove* that we have *not separated*. This *latter* therefore is the onely thing incumbent on us, and that we undertake, and to that end, he knows, the *Tract* of *Schism* was avowed to be written; but the *former* was none of our interests, who have no *act* in this matter to give account of, being meerly *passive*, (we leave it to Mr. *S.* and his Complices, which have forsaken their persecuted *Mother*, cast off their *Governours*, under whom they were *actually* (I must suppose *duely*) placed) and therefore let *S. W.* never so long persuade, and think he *demonstrates* the *necessity*, he must excuse us, that we do not acknowledge that *necessity*, or consequently attempt to propose any such *reasons*; For how can we be required to render our *reasons* of *dividing*, when he knows we contest that we never *divided*? Would not this more than imply a *contradiction*? And then, that the contrary should be charged on us (so *p.* 72. it is) as a *pure contradiction*, is certainly the greatest and most unreconcileable *contradiction* in the world, and so fit for none but S. *W*'s *omnipotent* faculty to assume to maintain against me.

* *P.* 73. 3. As for his * *state of the question* of an *external confess'd Government at that time* (of *Henry* VIII.) he hath already heard sufficiently, *viz.* that the *Universal Pastourship*, as derived from *Christ*, was not then *confess'd* in our Kingdom; and so, that he will gain as little by his pretended *external possession* (unless the *Pope possesses* all, that he and his Factors shall affirm he *possesses*) as that which he calls my *cunning forged false state of the question*, which spake of *Supreme Legal power* here, *i. e.* such as our *Laws* acknowledged to be in *force*, or if he please, in *possession* among us.

† *P.* 73. 4. Of the same batch it is, which follows, that he will still affirm, that † *actually we were under*
* *P.* 74. *the Church of* Rome *at that time*, demanding, * *whether I can doubt, whether there was an extern apparent*
† *P.* 74. *and acknowledged authority*——and † *supposing* that I *will* acknowledge it, and that * *if they usurp'd,*
* *P.* 75. *it was not lately, but a thousand years agoe*] With what reason of his *confidence*, he or the *Reader* may
† *Ib.* now judge from what hath formerly been said of their falsely supposed *possession*, on which as his † *onely proof* he professes to build all their *right*, and which failing, 'tis necessary their *right* must *fail* also, without farther disputing whether *bare possession*, not founded in *right*, could found, or conclude a *right* in the *Possessours*.

5. For the *Schismaticalness* of their *Church*, he would perswade himself, that we accuse them *weakly* and *faintly*, and that the *light of nature and common language of mankind checks us* in it, by telling us that *the whole is not said to be broken from a part, but a part from the whole*] But this, I may say, is a most *weak supposition*, and as *faint* a *proof*, on his part; For as of the *English* Revolters, we make no question, but they have *schismatized* from that *part* of the *Universal Church*, of which they were *baptized* and *initiated* to be *members* (and that is not the *breaking* of the *whole from a part*, for sure Mr. *S.* or any other *English Revolter* is not the *whole Church*) so for the *Bishops* of *Rome*, we as little doubt of their breach of *charity* and *Christian communion* (and that is *Schism* also) in casting out their so many *fellow members*, whole *Churches* of all quarters; And that again is a breaking not of the *whole*, but of one *part* from other *parts*, and those much more diffused, and of greater *circuit*, than is the *Church* of the *Dividers*.

6. To save them from this guilt, his acumen is extraordinary, for thus he argues, that in this *supposed case*, they *can never be shewn Schismatical against Government or unity in the Church, if no such unity can be found, as it cannot*, saith he, *in that mould the Doctour hath cast Christianity, by making each Church* αὐτοκέφαλον, *independent or self-governed, since there can be no division made, where the things are already many.*] To this, as the prime considerable of this *Section* I shall accommodate some answer, 1. that by the purport of the argument we have reason to conclude, that if it were *possible* they should be *Schismaticks*, it could not be questioned but they are such; and then, they that have done as much as is *possible* for them to be guilty of that *dangerous sin*, it is but time that they should look about them, examine and throughly consider their state. 2. That 'tis too strange an *assumption* to be proposed without tender of all *proof*, that there *can be no unity in the Church, if each Church be* αὐτοκέφαλον. He cannot but know that

an

an *Aristocracy* is a *Government*, and a *Common-wealth* an *one body* (though the persons, wherein the *Government* is, are many) as well as a *Monarchy*, where it is placed in one *single* person. And so certainly the *whole Church* represented in a *General Council* by the *Bishops* of each particular *Church*, or *governed* by so many *Primates* out of a *Council*, is *one body*, as fitly and properly so called, and as exactly and firmly *compacted*, as if all their power were contracted in *five Patriarchs*, or those again molten into *one Successour* of St. *Peter*. When the great dispute was betwixt *Rome* and *Constantinople*, *Balsamon* recites the opinion of some, that the *Headship* over the *Church* was in all the *five Patriarchs*, * διὰ τὸ ἐπέχειν τὲς πέντε Παπειάρχας τόπον τῆς μιᾶς κεφαλῆς τὸ σώματος, δηλαδὴ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκκλησιῶν τῦ Θεῦ, *because the five Patriarchs supply the place of the one head of the body, to wit of the holy Churches of God.* And had they, that spake thus of the *five Patriarchs*, inlarged it to *all* the *Primates*, they had spoken agreeably to the *Canons* of all the *General Councils*, who subject all the *Bishops* in every *Province* to their *Primate*, and divide the whole *Church* into so many διοικήσεις or *administrations*, as there are *Primates*; And this would be a solving of the grand objection of *Bellarmine* and others, in behalf of the *Pope*, and against the placing the *Supremacy* in *General Councils* [that *in the Intervals of such Councils the Supremacy should rest no where, if it did not in the Bishop of Rome*] for then it is clear, it might rest in the *Primates*, and, if need required, be exercised by them, without any more numerous *convention*, and by each of these severally the so many διοικήσεις be governed, of which the whole body is made up. What judgment *S. W.* will pass on this, I am not much concerned to be solicitous, but refer it to more *indifferent judges*, if this be not an expedient of some value toward the ending this *Controversie*; I am sure it is of full force to evacuate all force of his *argument*, and then there being this way, wherein *unity* is found, it may sure be *shewn* that *the Romanist is Schismatical* from this *Unity*.

* *Medit. & Resp.* l. 7. *in Jure Græco Rom.* 4. t. p. 449.

7. Nay thirdly, 'tis so evident, that those things that are in one respect *many*, may be united in some *common* respect (as they that have not *union* of *external Government*, may yet have fraternal *communion* and *mutual concord* one with the other) that 'tis still manifest, that *Churches* wholly independent, and not *subordinate* one to the other, may yet *communicate* one with the other, and ought to have *preparedness* of *charity* to doe so; and if so, they may, by *breach* of that *communion*, divide also, and then if Mr. *S.* have no better security than this, to keep him from being concluded a *Schismatick*, 'tis time for him to consider whether it be not more eligible to return, and be *persecuted*, than to continue where he is, in the state of defiance and *bitterness* to his *old Mother*.

8. He is very confident of having defended the *Romish Church* in their *remorseless Censures*, *because this he thinks hath been the constant practice of God's Church, to excommunicate all those who renounced either the Government, or any other part of faith received from their forefathers*] But 1. he considers not, that we renounced no *Government*, that we were not really under (onely the *Pope* was very willing to *challenge*, and industrious to get *Dominion* over us) and 2. that the *errours* of our *forefathers* may be renounced, without offending against any *Church*, or provoking their *censures*; and 3. that what he calls the *Faith*, he must prove to be such, or else it may be allowed to pass with us, who undertake to shew it was not part of that *Faith* which was *once delivered to the Saints*, under the title not of the *Faith* of our *first*, but *Errours* or *Additionals* of our *immediate forefathers*.

9. As for the [*Ifs*] that he is so fastidiously displeased with, he hath, I doubt not, judgment enough, to discern that all the severals so introduced, are things that we assume to have actually *proved*, and that the *arguments* for them are evidently deduced from the *Canons* that are there mentioned *p.* 20. and other proofs that were not again to be repeated, having elsewhere been so largely deduced. And if every *hypothetical Syllogism*, the *minor* whereof is proved to be *actually* true, or if not so, yet offered to be proved by *Testimonies* of weight, to which no least *reply* is made, can be parallel'd with nothing but (the proverbial expression of impossibilities) the *falling of the Skie*, and if *S. W.* can no otherwise attempt Answer to such evidences, than by recourse to a meagre *proverb*, as far removed from the purpose, as the *Skie* from the *Larks*, I may be allowed to *admire* his faculties, but not solicitously attend him in the *exercise* of them.

10. In this place he will needs perswade himself or others, that I was willing to * *palliate Schism by pretence of some greater sin*] when yet 1. he knows that I profess no *cause* can justifie or *palliate* the *sin* of *Schism*; and therefore 2. that I undertake but *one* thing, *viz.* to shew that we are *not* guilty of any *fact* which can with any reason be called *Schism*. 3. He might know, that no pretence of *greater sin*, can *evade* or *palliate* a *sin*; I must not commit any one *sin*, to avoid another: And 4. *another* man would think it a competent evidence, that I did not seek to *palliate Schism*, when I set it out in a phrase more *comprehensive* than that which I was to interpret. But he that is to subsist by his skill in *cavilling*, must be excused, if he never give over the exercise of it, and presume he hath carryed all before him, by saying, *'tis false, and moral science assures him that no two kinds of vices are equal*, when yet he neither tenders us any grounds of his *affirmation* or that *assurance*, nor considers that when *God* saith, *Rebellion is as the sin of Witchcraft*, the result is, that those two sins are *equal* in *God*'s sight, who is the more competent *Judge* of it, than *S. W.* or his *Moral* (ἀδιαφόρυ γνῶσις) *Science* falsely so called. How it stands with the obvious interpretation of [*scarce any* (in the singular, *i. e.* any one) *is so great*] to affirm that not onely some *one*, but also *some few be greater*, I am not subtile enough to discern, nor yet concern'd enough to *debate* with this great *Master*.

* *P.* 78.

11. His mistake of my words, from which he concludes me to tell him, that *my authorities did not induce that there was none greater*] is very *strange*, when my words are expresly the *contrary*, that *my authorities did induce there was none greater*. My words are these, *I assumed not to affirm more than my authorities did induce, that there was none greater*] i. e. *my authorities did induce that there was none greater*, and I *assumed* to *affirm no more* than that. What can be more *perspicuous* on one side, or *misrepresented* on the other, what more intolerable in an Authour than to insert a [*not*] in a quotation? 'Twere well if his *haste*, which my *charity* before mentioned, as the *excuse* of his *misadventures*, could here be pleaded for him.

12. His one pertinent Reply to what was said of the *Testimony* from *Irenæus*, is, that *unless I had the testimony out of Irenæus in Greek*, *my evasion* (of ἀδωάτον being oft no more than *hard* and *difficult*) *is nothing*. To which I answer, that *Irenæus* having written in *Greek*, and ἀδωάτον in *Greek*

oft signifying no more than *very difficult*, I could not infallibly conclude any more to be meant by the *Latine* of his *Greek*, *nulla fieri potest*, than that it was *hard* or *difficult*, and this is as evident from his *Latine* Interpreter, as it could be from his *Greek* Text, if we were *Masters* of it, and found in it the expres's words ἀδιώατον γενέσθαι. And whereas the style [*It is very hard, if not impossible*] he would conclude *consistent with this sense* [*it is doubtfull*] I answer that this is but a *glos's* of his; I may abstain from *affirming* a thing to be *absolutely impossible*, though I think there be no place of *doubting*, whether it be true or no. And how could I be thought to design to leave *room for the reasonableness of any Schism*, who had expresly affirmed that no *cause* or *motive*, i. e. *reason* of *Schism* was pleadable?

13. He cites from my words *p.* 24. *l.* 11. that *my expressions were cautious*] where my meaning was evident, as my words, that the *cautious* interpreting of *nulla fieri potest*, by *'twas in their opinion very hard, if not impossible*] *seemed to me the best*. But that concludes not my expressions *chary* in condemning all *Schism*, but my care exact, not to *misinterpret* my *Authour*.

14. Next his discourse of the *Roman Church* being called *Catholick*, is somewhat extraordinary; *Custome*, saith he, *which makes words proper, forces their very enemies to call them Catholicks*; thence he *concludes they are universally called such, and then*, saith he, *according to St. Austin no Church can be universally called such, which is not truly such.*] To this I answer, 1. that his argument will equally hold for the *Gnosticks* that they were the most truely and profoundly *knowing* men, they calling themselves so, and their enemies the *Fathers* of the *Church*, confuting them under that title; whereas this *universal custome* could not prevail against St. *Paul*'s words, that their γνῶσις was ψευδώνυμος, *Science falsely so intitled*. So likewise would it hold for the *Cathari*, who were so styled by *themselves*, and by their *enemies*, and yet shewed to be *impure*, i. e. *Schismatical*, by those that called them, as they called themselves, by that title of *purity*. Thus the Authour of *Schism Dispatch'd* is both by himself, and by me, and all others called *S. W.* and yet neither he, nor I, nor any man are yet perswaded, that the Authour is any otherwise than ψευδώνυμος so called. It seems, a small argument will serve his turn, when his interest combines with it, that he can conclude from the *Pursivants asking for a Catholick house*, and *every one shewing him a Romanist's*, that therefore the *Romanist* is *properly* called *Catholick*.] That *custome* is *norma loquendi*, so far as that I shall not offend, if I speak *cum vulgo*, and that I shall know the meaning of words *abusively* applyed, and so understand, that he that is called a *Catholick* is a *Romanist*, i. e. one who thinks himself truely a *Catholick*, I had been taught; and so that he that was called *Gnostick*, was an *heretick*, that *assumed* the *title* of *profound knowledge*; but that that rule was so far to be extended, that the *Romanist* that was so styled, should be also the real *interpretation* of that name, *i. e.* an *universal*, any more than that *Pope Leo* should be a *Lyon* indeed, or *Pope Clement* a *mercifull* man, when he sent out his *Bull* of great *severity*, neither *S. W.* nor yet St. *Austin* have yet taught me.

15. For in the second place, that *Father* certainly never defined, that no *Church can* be *universally called* such, which is not *truely such*. If none were *universally* so called in his time, but the *true*, that is all that he can be imagined to *affirm*; and that concludes not, but in other times *hereticks* might assume the most *honourable* name, and by others be known, and so called by it, without ever deeming that it *truely* belonged to them. And if our *calling* them by a title which demonstrates their *assuming* to themselves more than belongs to them, shall be an argument of force that it doth really belong to them, what they assume, my *Logick* I confess hath failed me; The plain truth is, in St. *Augustine*'s days the good and Orthodox *Christians* were called *Catholici*, and *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* known by the names of their Leaders, *Novatians*, *Donatists*, &c. but that hinders not the altering of the Scene, as the *Devil* we know is not always obliged to appear in his *own* colours, he can transform himself, as far as a *title* goes, into an *angel of light*, and then *reatus impii est pium nomen, the pious name is the guilt of the impious*] (which is a known *Maxim*) would not very properly be interpreted, to this sense, that the *title* of *Catholicks* is a *certain proof*, that the *Romanists* are the onely *Orthodox Christians*.

16. That I treated of *Schism* abstracted from *heresie*, he will needs censure, as a *laying wrong grounds*.] But I answer, that I loved not to speak of *two* things at once, and therefore reserved *heresie* to be spoken of by it self, and have accordingly since the publishing that of *Schism*, given him, if he have vouchsafed to look on it, a Tract of *Heresie* also, and vindicated the *Church* of *England* from the one, as well as the other guilt.

17. His ninth *Section* of his *Grammatical* niceties and my *ten several mistakes* (his so many *calumnies*) shall sing to themselves, and entertain with their melody their own *Muses*, I will trust the most *partial* Reader to determine, whether I am guilty of but one of that *catalogue* of mistakes. All that I need say to the whole *Section*, is, 1. that whereas my *Disarmer*, a profes's'd admirer of the *Authour* and *Apologist* for *Rushworth*'s *Dialogues*, thought fit to accuse the *Doctour* for saying that the *passive* νίζομαι was of the nature of the *Hebrew Hithpael*, and that this is observable in other *passives for want of conjugations in Greek*, which the *Hebrews* have, and professes to *see no reason*, *Sch. Dis.* p. 8. *why the Doctour should complain for want of Conjugations in the Greek Language, there being more there than in Hebrew*; and now again resumes this, and raises great storms upon it; the Authour of those *Dialogues*, his other-self, makes the self same *general* (which comprehends and includes the particular) observation, * *that the Greek wants those sense-varying Conjugations by which the Oriental Languages expres's themselves.* From him therefore I hope he will receive so *obvious* an observation, though when it came from me, it was *ridiculous*, the difference being onely this, that that Authour made use of it as an argument to conclude the *New-Testament language uncertain*, and unintelligible, which with him is good *Catholick* Doctrine, but I used it to infer that dangerous conclusion, that *Schism* is a *voluntary separating* or *dividing ones self* from the *Church* of *God*.

* *Second Dial. Sect.* 10.

18. *Secondly*, that I hope I was not to blame to expect that the *Printer's* errours should be noted in the *Publisher's Errata*; and thirdly, that I have look'd on *Schism Disarm'd* p. 279. and find no such thing proved there, which here *p.* 90. he saith is there *manifested plainly*; Fourthly, that the *King* and *Bishops* of *England* renouncing the *Pope*'s *Universal Pastourship*, differ widely from *a boy calling his mother whore*, and *denying himself to be the son of his Father*; and fifthly, that they that declared the *King*'s *Supremacy* in *all causes*, and so cast out the *Papacy*, as that signifies the *Universal*

Pastourship

Pastourship descended to the *Bishop* of *Rome* from *Christ*, were not esteemed *Schismaticks* by the *Pope* himself, as hath formerly appeared, and so remained *Catholicks* in the *Romanist*'s own judgment, and must not now at this distance be condemned upon no other account, but that they have rejected *Oral Tradition*, which yet, as hath also appeared, they are not proved to have *rejected*; And this is all I shall return to his ninth *Section*.

SECT. IV.

His tenth Section answered. His contradictory answers about speaking contradictions. Authority reconcileable with fallibility. Peter's *Primacy no proof of his Universal Pastourship. This includes falling* * *at once into one kind of sin. The major part of a Roman Council peccable, or fallible. The infallibility of Apostles no way argumentative for the like of the present Church. The many charges of weakness shew'd to be so many slanders.* *

1. HIS tenth *Section* begins with a continued confident decree, which cannot be resisted, that I must be a *pleader* for *such a weak Conscience as makes a man think he ought not to communicate with the Church, though the truth be on the Churches side.* And when to his former suggesting of this, I had confronted my express words to the contrary, that *such an one is in many respects criminous*, and *particularly in this, that he communicates* not—— His reply is, that he *did not forbid me to speak contradictions.* * A little while since, when it served his turn, he could ask *whether it were any wrong to them to affirm that Doctour* H. *and his friends will not speak contradictions*] and here the onely *Reply* to plain words is, that he will *not forbid me to speak contradictions*, which is in effect to give me leave to give him the lye in his former *affirmation*. * *P.* 62.

2. But I shall not make use of his *liberality*, which his resolvedness to say somewhat, hath extorted from him, but view the *Grounds* of his conclusion, that I have *contradicted my self*, my *four* (as he fancies) *contributions to his Windmill*; Of which all that I need say is, that the *three* first are pure *negatives*, 1. *That* I *alledge nothing that will not serve others, give no distinctive sign of the goodness of mine above others*, 2. *that I pretend no rigorous evidence for our disobedience*, 3. *that I leave no grounds rationally to convince a man in errour* (to all which I answer, that I was not obliged to doe any thing toward any of these at that time, *i. e.* to handle impertinently what no way belonged to me to consider, and the same account serves for my *omission of answering his two pages*, charged on me *p.* 95.) and the fourth cited from Chap. 4 Par. 9. (when there is no such place in my book) is, my *position of the errour in some cases on the Churches side*] which how it shall found my *pleading* for those that *refuse to communicate with the Church*, when *the Church is in the right*, is a secret as yet unrevealed, it being visible enough, that they may bring full *testimony* of some *truths*, and so deserve therein to be *believed*, who are found to fail in others, and so deserve it not.

3. Accordingly the *authority* we allow our present *Church* in affirming any thing of *faith*, is that which it borrows from the *grounds* of her *affirming*, and may, one would think, be *competible* with *fallibility*, when the Pope himself hath the *Authority* of *Supreme Pastour* still allowed him by *S. W.* after that Mr. *White* hath wholly devested him of his *Infallibility*.

4. What follows of the *Infallibility* of the *Apostles*, and of the *Church* in *testifying* what the *Apostles* from *Christ* had *delivered* to them, I refer to be compared with what was said in my *Answer* to *Schism Disarm.* n. 7. and 12 of that *Sect.* 3. and shall onely note that among the *Apostolical* Doctrines * he mentions *Peter's being chief of the Apostles*, and the *Pope his Successour*, which being contradicted by other *Romanists*, as hath been shewed, is yet, if it were granted, so far short of the pretended *Universal Postourship derived from Christ*, (on which his whole cause depends, as appeared in his grounds) that it might, in a limited sense of *Primacy*, so as to found at *Rome* the *chief Patriarchate*, be acknowledged by us, and so all the rest that he hath there taken the pains to deduce about *universal delivery* or *Oral Tradition* (understanding it of that of the *Primitive Church*) without his reaping the least advantage to his cause by it. * *P.* 98.

5. For as to the † first *pretended weakness*, I answer, that the *Church*, which in some things (sufficiently *attested* to come from *Christ*) is *certain* of their *truth* and her *faith*, may on that ground justly oblige others to *belief*, though she be not, nor pretend to be *infallible* in all other things. And therefore there is a wide difference betwixt *infallibility* in teaching *attested truths*, and *absolute* or *Universal Infallibility*, for that extends to those things that are not thus *attested*. † *P.* 98.

6. In his second charge of *weakness*, he requires me to *manifest that all men may fall at once into any one self same kind of sin*, And till I can doe so, I must still be chid for *not apprehending any but Saints and Angels and God to be impeccable*] But 1. I discern not that necessity to be incumbent on me; Those are *peccable*, or subject, lyable to sin (which is all I said) that do not *fall at once into one self-same kind of sin*. 2. My advantage depending not on the proving *this* kind of *peccability* to belong to *all* men *at once*, but onely to the *Church*, in the *Romanists* notion of it, *i. e.* to the *present Church* of *Rome*, however *assembled* or *represented* for the teaching or *delivering* any Doctrine, as a Doctrine of *Faith*, 'tis most evident, that as great a number of men, as they amount to, have *fallen at once into one self-same kind of sin*; I instance in the *Idol-worship* of the *Heathens*, into which there is no question, more *nations* and *numbers* of men, than those which constitute the *Roman Communion*, have in many the *same* ages been ingulfed. But then 3. neither was it my concernment to evidence that all that make up the *Roman Communion* of any *age*, should thus be *peccable*; 'twas to my pretensions sufficient, that so great a part of an *assembly* of such, as might define an errour *conciliarly*, i. e. the *major part* of a *Roman Council*, be it that of *Trent*, or any other, might consent in commanding a *vice*, be it the *worshipping Images*, or the like. And none of his offers of demonstration can have any appearance of force against this kind of *universal peccability*. For to this there wants not such an *universal conspiration*, as he talks of, *in all men to cut their own throats to morrow.* 'Tis sufficient, if a *few* being themselves in an errour *practical*, use means, which prevail, to seduce, within the space

of the sitting of a *Council*, a *major* part of those that are present, to consent to the inacting of a *Law* for it. Or 'tis *sufficient*, if a false Doctine in any thing *practical*, do by *degrees* get such an head, that it *defie*, and discredit all Opposers. And so in like manner for *fallibility*, it is not needfull to our pretensions, that all and every member of the *Church* of *God* should *conspire* so to *mistake* or *delude*, as to tell any *damnable* and *palpable lye*, (though as great a number of men, and far greater than those which make up the *Roman Communion*, may certainly thus mistake, witness the *Mahomedanes* in believing that their *Mahomet* was the *Paraclete* promised by *Christ*) 'Tis sufficient, if either that which is *true*, but no part of the *Faith once delivered*, or that which hath not so much as *truth* in it, should by several *steps* and stages of progress get *ground*, and at length prevail with a *prevailing* part of them which met at the *Council* of *Trent*, &c. for then that which was never *delivered* by the *Apostles* as *de fide*, shall be advanced to that *presumption*, and by that means propagate it self to all that acknowledge that *Council*. And in this case, that they which thus define a *new article de fide*, or they that teach it their children as 'tis defined, shall *profess* that it is *true*, and that it was taught them by their *ancestours*, perhaps that 'twas *delivered* down from the *Apostles* themselves, is no *miracle of miracles*, no stupendious prodigy, parallel, as *S. W.* suggests, *to natures failing in the propagation of an intire species*, but that which is ordinarily and regularly consequent to those few mens having *received*, and its being their *interest* to *propagate* that *Doctrine*, which by their *diligence* proves so successfull in gaining *Proselytes*, and suffrages to its commencing an *article*. This answers all that he charges under the style of Third and Fourth *weakness* also.

7. To his *fifth* charged *weakness*, the answer is unquestionable, that I that speak of separating from an *erroneous* or but *fallible Church*, adding that *onely Saints and Angels and God have the privilege of impeccable and infallible*, could have no respect to the *Church* of the *Apostles* times, who were so far distant from mine, that I could not with any shew of reason speak of them. And though if he *asked of men doing their offices on earth*, I could not but pertinently *answer* of *Saints in heaven*, yet when the *question* was of mens *own separating* from any *Church* on earth, and he instanced in the *Church* of the *Apostles*, I might fitly say, as I did, that they are, and, at the time whereof I spoke, *were in heaven*, and therefore I could not be thought to *speak* of them. To this I add, that when two *answers* were given, his objection to the *first* took no notice of the second, which satisfied (as it was designed to do) what is now objected to the *first*.

8. And when in his *sixth* he objects to that second *answer*, that it *grants his instance to be true*, my reply is, that it is contrary to no words of mine, nor *interest* of ours, that it should be so far *true* as I granted, *viz.* that they the *Apostles* should be *infallible* by virtue of *Christ's promise*, and *Spirit*, in the *founding* of a *Church*, and *delivering all his truth* to it; For how can that come home, or be appliable to the pretended *Infallibility* of their *present Church*, any farther than that really accords with the *Doctrine* of the *Apostles*; and so far we acknowledge it *infallible*. And therefore if this be all, that the *Romanist*, as he saith, *demands or professes*, *that some men on earth*, i. e. that once were there (meaning the *Apostles* of *Christ*, of whom onely we there speak) *may be infallible in some things*, to wit, in things *necessary for the salvation of mankind*, we shall certainly agree, and I should hope never fall out again, if he would be consistent to himself, which he cannot be, when he will assert the same *Infallibility* to belong to his *present Church*, for sure that is not the proper *interpretation* of the word [*Apostles.*]

9. This gives answer to his three next accusations of *weakness*, 7, 8. and 9th, yea and to his 10th also, if it be remembred that some of those things which he pretends his *Church infallibly* to teach, as the *Pope's Universal Pastourship*, &c. are no more branches of the *Faith* truely so called, *delivered* from the *Apostles*, than is the *squaring* of a *circle*, or whatsoever else he shall please *playsomely* to instance in, and in *such* it is (and not in the matter of competition betwixt the *Goose-Pye* and *Shoulder of Mutton*) that I question their *Churches Infallibility*.

10. And then if it were granted, as in his 11th he demands, that their *Depository* or *Church cannot mistake in delivering needfull points* (as I affirm not that they *do*, and though I cannot define of their *powers*, yet I cannot but think it a strange though never so just a degree of *Desertion*, and withdrawing of abused and long provoked Grace, if ever they should come to err in those *few*, which they have under all their *corruptions* thus long continued to *believe*) yet it would still remain that they might *err in delivering* those for *needfull*, which are not, and that is all that we ever *affirm* of their *Fallibility*.

11. This therefore is answer to his twelfth charge also, which will not permit me to hold what *profess'dly* I do, because he is of the same mind with me. *My weakness*, if we will believe him, *is*, *that I unawares recur to their Rule of Faith.*] But 1. Can there be any truth in that? do I *recur* to their *Fundamental of Fundamentals*, their *profess'd sole Rule*, *Oral Tradition*, and *Infallibility of their present Church*? Is there no difference between the *Church* of *Rome* of *this* age, and the *Universal Primitive*, which had the advantage of *seeing* and *knowing*, and *infallibly testifying* what was done by the *Apostles* in their presence, being αὐτόπται and ὑπηρέται, which St. *Luke* c. 1. 2. mentions as a considerable circumstance in *testifiers*, to give *infallible authority* to their *testimonies*. 2. With what colour of reason doth he suggest that what I doe, I doe *unawares*? when he dislikes what I doe, and thinks, or is pleased to style it *falsifying*, then, to be sure, it is my *wilfull*, and deliberate action; But if I say that, from which he doth not (because he cannot with safety to his own dear *Phænomena*) dissent, then forsooth I must have said it *unawares and never mean to stand to it*] I shall stand to it, as far as my reason ingages me, but not so far as *S. W*'s *groundless application* would extend it. I shall stand to it as far as the whole *Church* shall joyntly *testifie* their own *sensations*, that they *heard* or *saw* this, or that; so the *Primitive Church* heard what the *Apostles* taught, and *saw* the *Epistles* subscribed by their *hands*, and received by messengers of indubitable faith from them; And thus their *Testimonies* safely conveyed to us, are now our *Grounds* of *faith*; But I shall not stand to it so, as to *believe* all those things to have come down from the *Apostles* (particularly the *Doctrine* of the *Universal Pastourship*) which *S. W.* tells us did come down, and hath no reason of his *affirmation*, but the *knack*, or ψευδάγυμος *demonstration* of *Rushworth's Dialogues*, which

few

few of his *own* party, by his *own* confession, beside himself, apprehend to have any the least *weight* in it, and which hath already been considered, and allowed its utmost force, and been found to build on that as *confess'd*, which is most *denyed* by us, and in every view of it, *found to be nothing worth*. Which I refer him to review in its proper place. And to his present question, *Why if the Tradition of the Primitive Church be infallible, the succeeding Church should not injoy the same privilege*] the *Answer* at present is sufficient, that the *succeeding Church* is *Infallible* also in *testifying* their *own sensations* (which was all that was affirmed of the *Primitive*) that so the *second* age *infallibly* testified the *Canon* of *Scripture* to have been delivered them by the *former*, as delivered them by the *Apostles*, and so also the *Fundamentals* of *Faith* contained in the *Creed*. But to bring in all the *Roman Additionals* under this *parity* of *Reason*, requires, as *Vincentius* tells us, (not onely the *present* testimony of some part of the *Church*, fortified by some pretended *maxim*, which hath also been proved to have no force with them, but) the *consentient testifications* of the *whole Church* in *all* and *every age*, which when *S. W.* shall pretend to, he shall have more regard from us, than as yet his *abortive demonstration*, which concludes of *all* ages from one, *i. e.* of an *universal* from a *particular*, can expect from us.

12. The 13th imputed *weakness* is no other but my *affirming* what he *himself affirms*, For when I said the *Church is not considered as a Society of Believers endowed with an inerrable privilege, but as a number of witnesses*——it was none of my concernments to have it imagined, that they *did not first believe themselves e'er they conspired to deliver it to their Children for true*; All that I had to interpose was but onely this, that the *truth* of the *points* is not *founded* on their (infallible) *judgments*, but depends solely on the *Doctrine* of *Christ*, testified by those that could not but know, that it came from him. Which when he acknowledges to be *most certainly true*, 'tis strange it should be a *weakness* in me to *say* it, *believing* it also on his very *grounds* here mentioned (though not on his elsewhere adored *Fundamental* and *onely Ground* of *faith*, the *Oral Tradition* of the *present Church*) that *points of faith are truths revealed by God, not productions of mens heads*] which sure he learn'd from some of our *wordish Testimonies*, *Faith cometh by hearing*, and the like.

13. What he adds to my *neither saying I nor no* to the *question* of the *Protestants being infallible in witnessing that twenty years agoe there were Bishops in England*] and his tragical exclamations and ovations consequent, is most perfectly the *Image* of the old *S. W.* For my expres words in that 14. Par. by him cited, are [*that they do or probably can mistake in a thing of that nature visible before their eyes, I believe not.*] Which what is it but my *affirmation*, that I *believe* them *infallible* in such matters; all that is meant by *Infallibility* in *testifying*, being this, that there can be no *probable reason* to *doubt* of the *truth* of his *testification*, and not that there is any *natural impossibility* that he should *mistake*, for thus we know *deceptions* even of *sight* are possible; And he that cannot be supposed *fallible* in a thing of his *own sight*, and therefore is a *competent witness* in that, may yet be more than *fallible* in *other* things; which as it was the onely reason of the *answer* given him in that 14 Par. so it shew'd sufficiently the no advantage he gain'd to his cause, by this kind of *Infallibility*. And so much for the multiplyed *slanders*, in which are founded the *concluding boasts* and *triumphs* of his 10th *Section*.

SECT. V.

Answer to his eleventh Section. Power without Infallibility. Captious exceptions. Distinguishing without torturing. A Church sufficiently assisted, nay actually in the truth, nay infallibly ascertain'd of that truth, yet in additionals fallible. Naturally fallible. S. W's *inferences how causeless. The Church is not supernaturally infallible. Yet the failing not in the supernatural principle. A fallible Christian Church more certain of her Faith, than* Jews, *&c. Difference between Faith,* cui non subest dubium, & cui potest subesse falsum. *Assent, and that not passionate, without belief of infallibility. Believing so far as not to disbelieve.* S. W's *mistaken triumphs. The Churches infallibility in some things. Her fallibility in others, competible with making decisions. Of inferiours acquiescing onely.*

1. HIS 11th Section proceeds to a large review of the discourse concerning Mr. *Knot's concession*, which being a mere *digression* both of the *Cath. Gentl.* and the *Disarmer* at the first (as appeared *Reply* Ch. 11. *Sect.* 3. n. 4, 5.) it must now be much more such, it being visible, that how pertinent soever it is to the *Controversie* of *Schism*, to consider the pretended *Infallibility* of their *Church*, yet 1. I had before that of *Schism* written a large Treatise of dispute with Mr. *Holland* upon that subject of *Infallibility*, which I was not therefore to repeat again; 2. with that part of my discourse which onely considered Mr. *Knot's concession*, that it was *lawfull to separate or continue in separation from the Church of Christ, in case we could not without lying be permitted to communicate with it*] 'tis as evident this hath no immediate *connexion*, and so must be look'd on as a *digression*.

2. This might pass for full answer to the whole *Section*, being a competent reason, why I should no longer insist on that which was at first a mere *digression*. However 'tis answer to what he saith in return to my (as he calls them) 2. *first Trifles*.

3. To the third I *answer*, that a *Church* which is *fallible*, may upon prevailing reasons verily *believe* that to be true, which yet she knows not by any of her own *sensations*; and giving her children those reasons, which induce her *belief*, may reasonably also oblige them to *believe* in like manner; at least not so to *disbelieve*, as to teach the *contrary* to what she so reasonably *believes*. But still this *believing* somewhat on *reasonable motives*, is neither *knowing* this, not *believing* her self *infallible* in all other things; Much more was said on this head, in that Section of the *Reply*, n. 13. to 20. to which I refer the *Reader*.

4. As for the 4th I *slipt* not the *point*, nor *leapt* from *believing* to *obeying*, but thought fit to illustrate *à pari*, that a *Church* might *teach*, and require *believe*, as well as a *Lawgiver command*, and expect *obedience*, without being either of them *infallible*. The case I still think to be the same; for

as on the one side the *fallible teacher* may propose *errours*, so the *fallible Lawgiver* may command *sins*, and the danger is as great to the *Subjects* in *practising* one, as *believing* the other, and *God* hath not placed us out of the reach of either of these *temptations*, nor is it necessary he should, as long as he leaves us rules, *Scripture* and *Tradition*, and *reason*, to try the one by, as his own *commands* and *prohibitions*, to *examine* the other. And then, where is the *affected insincerity*, that *S. W.* so loudly objects in this place? Besides, the *Church* having an *authority* to make *Laws*, as well as teach *Doctrines*, to set forth *Canons*, as *Articles*, what crime was it, in stating the *Churches power*, to advert to each of these? this I there did, to the one n. 16. to the other n. 17, 18, 19. Certainly *S. W*'s cause is a *severe Mistress*, if it require him to make up whole Volumes of such *captious* exceptions, as these.

5. Next, the *distinguishing* of *ambiguous* words, and bringing his *proposition* in *open* light, is to him the same cruelty, as cutting off his eyelids, and setting him just against the *Sun*; he expresses his impatience of it (and what is that but an *hatred* of the *light*, and he knows the *Original* of that) by his *complaint* of being * *drawn and quartered with unheard-of tortures.*] But the more he complains, the more reason there is to use him to this kind of exercise, that by *general ambiguous* affirmations he may neither *deceive* others, nor himself.

* *P.* 109.

6. After this, he proceeds to the arraigning of these words of mine, *Reply* p. 15. that *a particular Church that is in the right in all matters of Faith, and hath before it Scripture and Tradition, and skill in all those knowledges which are usefull to fetch out the true meaning of the Scriptures, and ability to inquire into the ancient path, and compare her self with all other considerables parts of the Universal Church, and then is diligent and faithfull to make use of all these succours, and in uprightness of heart seeks the truth and applies it self to God in humble ardent continual prayer for his guidance to lead into all truth, This Church is yet fallible, may affirm and teach false*, i. e. *this is naturally possible that it may, but it is not strongly probable that it will, as long as it is thus assisted and disposed to make use of these assistances and means of true defining.*] These are my words at length, which he means to *paradigmatize*, and therefore † calls for *all my friends special attention.* And I do so too, and his *friends* also shall be allowed room at the *audience.*

† *P.* 110.

7. And that neither may be misguided by him, I must require them to remember 1. that the *Church* whereof I there speak, is expressely a *particular Church*; 2. that that *particular Church* is supposed to be *in the right in all matters of Faith*; I shall now add, that it may have had those *infallibly testified* by those that had them from the *Apostles*, and so is thus far *infallibly in the right*, as long as she *adheres* to that which she hath thus *received.* 3. that though 'tis possible she may, as other *particular Churches* have, fall from the true *infallible faith*, yet I spake not of that, but of her *fallibility* in other decisions, which were not *de fide.* 4. that by *naturally fallible*] I meant that effect of *humane frailty* incident to our *corrupt* and *infirm nature*, which, when it is afforded *sufficient*, but not *irresistible* grace, is for all that *grace*, and the most diligent use of means, *subject* still, and lyable to *surprizes*, and other effects of *infirmity.* But then 5. these *surprises* are not *strongly probable*, as long as it is thus *assisted, and disposed to make use of assistances.* And therefore *lastly*, when at any time such a *particular Church* thus provided and assisted, falls into any errour of *Doctrine* though not of *faith* (I exemplify in the *Church* of *Rome* defining things which the *Apostles* never defined, *temporary pains* of souls now in *Purgatory*, benefit of *Indulgences* to those that are now in those *temporary pains*, &c.) it is by not *adhering* to these *Rules*, which she hath before her, *Scripture* and *Apostolical Tradition*; and if she doth not make right use of them, this certainly is either a *crime*, or a *failing*, a *crime*, if she *wilfully*, or through prevailing *passion* betray those succours which *God* or *reason* offers, a *failing*, if through *surprize* onely she be insnared, and drawn into that errour, verily thinking it a truth; The former is a *mortal sin*, the latter *pardonable* by the ἐπιείκεια of the *Gospel*; But still both of them certain evidences of more than *fallibility* in her that thus falls.

8. This clear explication of the case proposed, will be sure to supersede all *S. W*'s *crafts*, and silence his *out-cries* in this matter, and rebound the *absurd* affirmations on the *accuser.* For 1. how can it follow hence (what he is resolved to conclude) that *it is still equally probable that it does err*? Could any thing be more cautiously prevented, than my words prevented this, when I onely said, *it is naturally possible that it may, but not strongly probable that it will err.*

9. Secondly, can it follow from thence, what he again infers, that *the faith of that Church and all that adhere to it, hang in equal scales whether it be true or no*] when for all matters of *faith* my supposition then was, that it was *in the truth*, and my addition now is (very reconcileable with that) that it may have had these so *infallibly testified*, that in teaching these it shall be *infallible*, though not in every thing else, which is no part of the *faith.* Is the *faith* of that *Church* which is *in the truth in all matters of faith* (without adding that it is also *infallibly* ascertain'd of that *truth*) *in equal scales whether it be true or no?*

10. Thirdly, can I be blamed for saying no more than that it is *naturally fallible*? Certainly the *fallibility* that is in this case, flows from the *principle* of *natural weakness* or *corruption.* And if he will now ask, as he doth, *Whether it be or be not supernaturally impossible she should err*? I answer it is not *supernaturally impossible*, i. e. the *gracious supernatural assistance* which is afforded, doth not *irresistibly* raise that particular *Church* above *possibility* of *failing* in any point. The *grace* may be *neglected*, and not made use of at all, and then it will fail criminously; or it may not be made use of with such perfect *persevering* diligence, as to exclude all effects of *surprise* and *frailty*, and then again it fails, though not so criminously, but according to our *humane measures* of

Aſt opere in longo fas eſt obrepere ſomnum.

and so still he sees a just reason, why after, *reckoning* up *supernatural means of confirming her against erring*, I yet concluded, that she is *naturally fallible*, because still it is from the failing in *nature*, and not from any defect in the *supernatural principle*, that she at any time fails. Such important *solid grounds* as these, and no other *S. W.* constantly hath for all his most *contumelious ovations.*

11. Apply

11. Apply what hath here been ſaid, to his next *Paragraph* about the *Churches knowledge whether it err or not*, and you have prevented all that can crave anſwer on that ſubject. For how can the defining a *particular Church fallible* in *ſuperſtructures*, though therein it ſo *define*, as not to *doubt* of the truth of her definings, (when withall at the ſame time it is ſuppoſed *true*, yea *infallibly* aſcertain'd and rooted in all the branches of the *Faith*) be the making the *Church no certainer of her faith, than* Jews, Turks *and Heathens are of theirs?* Is all that the *Jews*, &c. believe, *ſuperſtructures*, or are they *infallibly* aſcertain'd of their *Fundamentals?* The like holds of all the *paſſionate Opinionatours, Hereticks*, &c.

12. Laſtly, for his profound queſtion, why if there may *ſubeſſe falſum*, may there not *ſubeſſe dubium*, or why ſhould they not be *bound* to doubt of it?] I anſwer that whereever there may *ſubeſſe falſum*, there may *ſubeſſe dubium*, but it doth not follow, that what *may* be, *is*, or *ought* to be; I *ſuppoſed* the *Church*, of which I ſpeak, not to *doubt* of the truth of a point, which ſhe defined, and therefore that ſhe rationally *defined* it; And then of that *Church* that was ſuppoſed not to *doubt*, at the ſame time to ſuggeſt that ſhe *may doubt*, is to no more purpoſe, than to ſuggeſt that ſhe *may* doe that which ſhe *doeth* not; And to think her *obliged to doubt*, when by a *concurrence* of *motives* and reaſons ſhe is *morally* obliged not to *doubt*, is to ſuggeſt *contradictions*. And this is ſtill all that *S. W*'s prime, hopefulleſt arts arrive to.

13. By the way, how doth it appear that *falſehood in things wherein the faith is concerned* (of which onely I ſpeak in that place) is *Falſehood in things concerning eternity*? Can no man, that differs from the *Church* of *Rome* (and ſo muſt by the *Romaniſt* be thought to believe *Falſehoods*) concerning *Purgatory*, &c. (wherein ſure the *Romaniſts faith is concerned*) be ſaved? Let Mr. *White*'s book of the *ſtate of ſouls* be adviſed with in this point. Meanwhile that it is *paſſion* that makes a Church, that hath not *infallibility* in all things, give *aſſent* in any thing, is one of the *grand maxims* of *S. W*'s *Ruſhworthian Divinity*, which the *Reader* that hath full leiſure, may combate with, if he pleaſe, but I have many greater ingagements before me, though for ought I yet ſee, all *Homogeneous*.

14. Such is his next diſcourſe, which will needs have me *totally deſtroy belief*, becauſe in ſome ſorts of things I think it reaſonable, that a *conſent* be by *private men given* to the *Church in that which is propoſed as moſt probable*] This is the paſſage he cites, and upon it asks, *Are they bound to believe the Church, when they have probability to the contrary*? I anſwer, I ſpake of *probability* on the *Churches* ſide, not on the *contrary*, and ſo have no obligation to go farther out of my way, to conſider his unſeaſonable queſtions; Yet I told him of a thing called a *bare yielding to the judgement of ſuperiours*; and that may take place in his propoſed caſe, and exemplifie *yielding* without a *perſwaſion* of *infallibility*. P. 113.

15. Next, his faculties improve upon his hands by uſing, for * he hath ſprung a piece of *Atheiſm in the Shell*, and from my ſpeaking of a weak ſort of *belief* in ſome *weak* perſons, unable to ſearch the Churches *probable grounds* (and that for ſome *additional Doctrines* onely, as the whole diſcourſe manifeſted) and from my defining *that* (not all their faith ſimply) to be *a believing ſo far as not to disbelieve*, he muſters up a bedroll of *abſurdities*. The firſt will give you a perfect judgement of all the reſt, being exactly *homogeneous*, *If*, ſaith he, *the meaſure of that belief to which the Church can oblige the ruder ſort, be onely to believe ſo far as not to disbelieve, then in reality ſhe can oblige them to believe nothing at all*] But who ever imagined *this* the *meaſure of that belief* indefinitely (for that is in effect of *all that belief, to which the Church can oblige them*) *to believe onely ſo far?* How came the [*onely*] into that period? or how [*the meaſure of that belief to which the Church can oblige*] 'Tis viſible, out of *S. W*'s creative *Optick*, and then let him anſwer for the ill conſequences. I have oft aſſured him of my acknowledgement, that the *Church* hath *infallible* grounds for *all matters of Faith*, in thoſe therefore ſhe may reaſonably *oblige* to *more than not disbelieving*; But of thoſe I was not bound to (nor did I) ſpeak in *that* place. Who could have thought that *S. W*'s whole Army of hopefull *triumphs*, ready to be *counted by the poll*, would ever have vaniſh'd out of his hands ſo ſuddenly? * P. 114.

16. His deſcant on the two * *propoſitions*, bears proportion with the former miſunderſtandings, and by the premiſed explication is competently ſeen through. An obligation to an *infallible* aſſent is or ought to be relative to ſome kind of *infallible authority*; Such there *hath* been, and *is* in the *Church*, of *two* ſorts, one founded in *Chriſt*'s promiſed ſpecial *preſence* and *aſſiſtence* to the *Apoſtles*, who thereby became *infallible* in *preaching* the *faith*, the other founded in a ſufficient *teſtification* of the *Apoſtles* Doctrine in all *neceſſary* things, whether by their *writings* which *Univerſal Tradition* hath conveyed to us *infallibly*, or by *word* of *mouth* as *univerſally* atteſted by the *Churches* of their *Plantations* to be received from them; And in theſe alſo both the *univerſal*, and every *particular Church*, that adheres to, and forſakes no part of their *depoſitum*, is *infallibly* aſſured, and may *infallibly* teach, and require an *infallible belief* or *conſent*, i. e. in all the matters of *Apoſtolical Faith*, the *Articles* of the *Crede*, preach'd to all (and exacting belief from all) by the *Apoſtles*, into which conſequently all are *baptized*. But for many other *leſſer* things, the ſame *particular Church* which is *infallible* in theſe, may not onely be *fallible*, but ſometimes actually *err*, and yet retain an *authority* to make *definitions*, form *Articles* for her ſubjects (the fewer ſhe makes, I ſuppoſe, the better) and require an *acquieſcence* at leaſt from all to ſuch her *determinations*. * P. 115.

17. In this ſort of *leſſer* things wherein the *Church* is *fallible*, and yet according to her beſt and ſobereſt judgement makes *deciſions*, how *vain* and ungrounded is *S. W*'s ſuppoſition? 1. That the *ſubject is certain that that is falſe, which his fallible Church propoſes to him*, 2. that *it is a point of faith which concerns ſalvation not to err in* (what two *ſuppoſitions* could bave been more contrary to the caſe ſet, and which alone was ſpoken of in that place?) And how far from truth his ſuggeſtion, that *a ſpeculative point cannot be decided authoritatively, if the inferiour be bound to acquieſce onely?* Is there no *obedience* in *ſubmitting*, and not *diſquieting the peace* of the *Church*, when I cannot *aſſent*? What if the next *Council* of *Romaniſts* ſhould define the *Pope Infallible* in his definitions, might not Mr. *White* call back his *Tabulæ ſuffragiales*, and never divulge again that that were an *Archiheretical Doctrine*, and live quietly in the *Roman Communion*? Or may he not now live in *obedience* to that *Church*, without believing a *Purgatory* of preſent *Temporary flames*? And if what I add of an *abſolute infallible belief* to none but at *abſolutely infallible Church*] be the *granting*, as he ſaith, *the very point*, affirming as much,

much, as my adversary can reasonably demand, I wonder what reason he hath to complain; The *fewer* truths I find come from him, the less forward I shall be to deny him my concurrence in any thing where I may *safely* afford it him, desiring to have as much *peace* as is *possible with every man*, and not as many *contentions*.

19. His rarity of the *whole* and *half apple* shews his faculty in making of *Contumelious parallels*, and that it seems, must serve his turn, instead of speaking or attending to plain truth. And thus much for his 11th Section.

SECT. VI.

Strictures on his twelfth Section. Faith imputed to impurity of passion. No faith, but knowledge with S. W. *His dignifying their present Church. Of the supposed impossibility for Parents to conspire to lead their children in errour. Some Fathers proceed by the Collier's faith. Mr.* White's *Confession. Communion in errour without conspiracy. Belief of a Churches infallibility a principle of general errour. Many ways of introducing errours into a Church. No demonstrativeness of Mr.* White's *new way, The present Church assured of some things, very fallible in others. The no ground of his thirteenth Section. Infallible belief of matters of fact concurrently testified. Concurrence of testimonies of fallible men, an infallible reason of belief.* S. W's *misrepresentations.*

1. HIS twelfth *Section* with the rare *Sermon* at the end of it (a special essay of *S. W*'s faculty that way) is all either *repetition* of *grounds* of their *Churches inerrability* (already refuted when formerly laid) or of *consequences* (which cannot rise above the height of their *fountain*, the pitch of the *grounds*) or mere *declamation* and *contumely*, (which must not be incouraged so much, as to have the least regard, or return made to it.)

2. Some things onely I shall briefly note in his process, and leave the Reader to consider of them, As 1. that *all assent which hath not its original from evidence* (this, I take it, must include *Faith*, which is of things *inevident*) * *Springs from impurity of passion*, i. e. *of vice.*

* P. 118.

3. So again that *God either hath left no power to oblige to assent, or if he have, it must be founded in evidence*] The necessary importance of which I suppose to be, that I cannot by *God* himself be obliged to *assent* to any thing, but what is proved to me by *demonstration*, nor to *believe* but what I *know*; which immediately concludes, that there is no *Law* of *Faith*, but onely *necessity* of *knowledge*.

4. *Thirdly*, that the *present Roman Church* (of that he must speak) *hath no other motive to oblige any heathen to assent to her Doctrine, as far as concerns its having been taught by Christ and his Apostles, but the proposal of her own authority, millions and millions of Fathers in the* (present *Roman*) *Catholick Church conspiring to witness those points of Doctrine were received from their Ancestours as from their, and so ascending upward, as from Christ.*] Which as it gives the same *authority* to their *present Churches* presumptions, as to the *universal Testification* of the first and purest times of those that were αὐτόπται and ὑπηρέται of the *Apostles*, so it *equals* the evidence of every *article*, that either this, or any one former age hath taken for *Tradition*, with the *eternal divinity* of *Christ*, the *divine authority* of the *Scripture*, or any thing which is attested to us most *infallibly*.

5. *Fourthly*, that 'tis *impossible that these Fathers* (of families, Mr. *White's connatural way* was wont to reade *Mothers*) *would conspire in any age to attest a notorious untruth, pernicious to their own and childrens eternal bliss.*] When 1. understanding it, as we do, of *additionals* onely, every such untruth is not *pernicious* to their *seduced* childrens *eternal bliss*. 2. 'Tis more than *possible* for the far greatest number of Parents to go themselves, and lead their children in the broad way whether of *pleasure*, or *profit*, that *leadeth unto ruine*; and *S. W.* hath not so numbred his *Fathers* by the *poll*, as to be able to affirm any more of any questioned *Doctrine* of any age, than that it hath been thus taught by the far *greatest* number of *Parents*. 3. 'Tis more than *possible* also, that *untruths* may by some cunning seducers be so disguised, or by *authority* plausibly and definitively proposed, as not to be *notorious* to many. 4. What is but *possible*, and so is every thing that implies not a *contradiction*, as it is evident this doth not, *it not impossible.*

6. Fifthly, that *'tis impossible those so many Fathers could either err or mistake in things so visible, or contrive a conspiracy to embrace any one errour, considering the several Countries in which they lived dispers'd, and consequently their several natures, obligations, interests, and other manifoldly varying circumstances.*] Whereas 1. every point of Doctrine is not a thing *visible* to the multitude of *Fathers* of *Families*, who perhaps never hear or know what belongs to some Doctrines, which the *Church* holds, but are * oft allowed by Mr. *White* to proceed by the *Collier's principle*, believe as the *Church believes*, though they know not what it is, or as his style is, *believe a knowing person in that wherein our selves are ignorant* (*a maxim* saith he, *that governs all our life publick and private*) 2. there is no *impossibility* for such great multitudes to *err* or *mistake*, when (whatever their *Church* is) not one of these *Fathers* mentioned is by them *believed* to be *infallible*; and then 3. there is no need of their *contriving a conspiracy to embrace an errour*, their few *Doctours* may be either *seduced*, or *overawed*, or *bribed* by persons in *greatest* power to *embrace an errour*, (as was visible when the *Emperour* was *Arian*, and in many other instances) and then they will uniformly deliver it to all that *believe* them, and understand it, and they that *understand* it not, will believe with the *Collier*, and they that *believe* not will be either *silent*, or *inconsiderable*, and soon put to *silence*, and an *anathema*, or a *fagot* will be sufficient to make any *Doctrine General*. 4. The *variety* of *Countries*, *natures*, *interests*, &c. can never produce an *impossibility*, or render it more than *improbable*; and a *thousand probabilities* are nothing, saith Mr. *White*, and as little the same number of *improbabilities*, and never were they less in any case than in this, where the one *motive* being common to all that live within the *Roman Communion*, *viz.* a *belief* of their *Churches Infallibility*, whatsoever is proposed by the *Governours* of that *Church*, may *universally* be received, by all their subjects, how distantly soever *dispersed*,

* *Apol.* p. 234. 71. 114.

diſperſed, or *natured*, or *intereſted*, nay *muſt*, by neceſſity of *immediate connexion*, when once they have imbibed the *principle*, reſolved that their *Church* is *infallible*, for then ſure ſhe which can *err* in nothing, cannot *err* in this.

7. *Sixthly*, that *'tis impoſſible that if they would and could atteſt and introduce an errour, it ſhould not be moſt viſible and palpable to the whole world*; whereas 1. the far *greateſt* part of the *whole world*, as that ſignifies the *Fathers* or *Mothers* of *Families*, do not in a whole age conſider ſome Doctrines of their *Church*, or conſequently, are capable of *comparing* the old ſtock with a *Roman Additional*. 2. If they *diſcern* it, they may either out of *love* of *novelties*, like the change, and upon tender'd advantages, *like* it better, or upon *fear* accept, and not expreſs *diſlikes*, or, upon perſwaſion of her *infallibility*, never queſtion what is entred into a *Canon* at *Florence*, or at *Trent*, and then what matters it for *viſibility* and *palpableneſs* to the *whole world*?

8. Theſe laſt *three propoſitions* of his intituled his, *treble twiſted Impoſſibility*, are the reſult of his admired *Dialogues*, and the *Apology* for *Tradition*, and as many failures as there are in them (there are many more than I have now mention'd) ſo many *evidences* there ſtand upon *record*, that the *New-Albian* way of *Oral Tradition*, on which all the *Diſpatcher's* fortunes depend, fails of its *demonſtrative evidence*; and then according to the rule in the front of this *Section*, *all aſſent* that is given to it, muſt *ſpring from impurity of paſſion*, i. e. *from vice*, and conſequently he will conclude, that *God himſelf cannot command aſſent to it*. What then muſt Mr. *White* take himſelf for, that ſo *ſeverely* and inexorably exacts it of all his *Diſciples*, that the *Pope* himſelf muſt be an *Arch-heretick*, if he come in *competition* with this more refined way, of his *Fathers* or *Mothers*, for the *Infallibility*.

9. *Seventhly*, that *their Churches ſticking cloſe to this Rule, of delivering onely what ſhe received as thus atteſted* (which was the great *begging the queſtion*, on which, in his *Grounds*, all his *demonſtration* for *Tradition* depended, the *Minor* in his grand *Syllogiſm*, not offered to be proved) is again tender'd in the like manner, without any offer of proof; But of this I muſt not again ſo ſoon enlarge, having ſo lately elſewhere ſpoken abundantly of it. P. 120.

10. As theſe *fundamental* propoſitions of his ſhall be found to have *demonſtrative* truth, ſo his conſequences ſhall be allowed the privilege of their *connexion* to them, and by the ſame neceſſity fail of all degree of *probability*, if his grounds appear to have been miſlaid, and to that iſſue I leave the whole *dozen* of them, and the *Sermon* caſt in, to make up the *weight*.

11. Onely one ſpecial prodigy more may deſerve to be call'd out from his *tenth* conſequence, that my *denying any company of men on earth* (my words apparently muſt be underſtood of *none on earth*) *to be infallible*, is no leſs than the *deſtroying at once all belief, and making it a ſin to believe any article of the Chriſtian faith, ſince if the Authority that conveys Scripture and Primitive Doctrine to us, cannot be evidenced to be infallible, no man is bound to believe either, nay he muſt needs ſin in precipitating his aſſent without evidence to ground it.*] Whereas I had thought, that the *univerſal conſent* of the *whole Church* of the *firſt* ages (that were certainly competent *teſtifiers*) might ſo be convey'd to us, as *infallibly* to aſſure us of the *Scriptures*, and all *Apoſtolical Doctrine*, and that that *Church* of this age that were thus *infallibly* aſſured in many things, might yet be *fallible* in others, ſuch as on their own *diſcourſes* and *reaſonings*, or but pretenſe of *Tradition*, they define without the like *teſtification* of their coming from the *Apoſtles*. And if my ſaying of this *be as much as he ſays or deſires* (as* himſelf confeſſes it is) one would think this might be the ſetting an end to this *controverſie*. But then, alas, our new *Preacher* that hath not been oft in the *Pulpit*, would loſe his *Text*, on which his *harangue* is prepared, and therefore it muſt be *decreed*, that I have *contradicted my ſelf*, and ſo that my condition is but ſo much the worſe, for having *gone* as far as he himſelf could *deſire* of me. When will diſputes be at an end, whilſt theſe are the *contrary* arts and ways of *eternizing* them? P. 123. * P. 123.

12. A like art it is which hath produced his whole 13th. *Section*, where from my ſaying that *'tis in vain to ſpeak of motives to return*—— (i. e. in plain terms, that we were *excommunicated* by (and did not *ſeparate* from) them, and cannot now be readmitted to their communion without *diſſembling* and *lying*, by which means our *reunion* is become *impoſſible*, and ſo 'tis a mere *vanity* to talk of *motives* to it) he makes no difficulty to conclude, that I *profeſs my ſelf uncapable to hear motives or reaſons, and that it is in vain to ſpeak of them to me*, and what greater *obſtinacy* than this? But ſuppoſe I had ſaid 'tis *vain* to ſpeak *reaſon* to *S. W.* who is ſo reſolved to miſunderſtand, and put odious colours on all that is moſt innocently ſaid and meant; would he conclude from thence, that I profeſs'd never to ſpeak *reaſon* more, and ſo were reſolved to ſubſcribe all his *infallible* Dictates? The juſtice were equal on both ſides; the caſe being clear, that what is made ſimply *impoſſible* by their *tyranny* and intolerable conditions, is thereby become *vain* to think or ſpeak of, to thoſe that will not ſin againſt *conſcience*; and then, what need we attend to more motives for what we *deſire* already, when if we *deſired* it more ardently, 'twere ſtill as *impoſſible* as ever?

13. What to my *Replies* concerning *Antiquity* and *Poſſeſſion* (*Repl.* p. 20, 21.) he hath returned p. 129, 130. I deſire the *Reader* to conſult in the places; and ſo alſo concerning the *fallibility* of the *teſtimonies* of *men* in a known matter of *fact*, as that there was ſuch a *King* as *Henry* VIII. which *teſtimonies* though in one reſpect I count *fallible*, becauſe every man that hath *teſtified* it, is, as a *mere man*, but *fallible*, yet the *concurrence* of all men, that then *lived*, and *ſince*, in thoſe *teſtimonies*, aſſures me *infallibly* of the truth of it, ſo that no imaginable motive can beget any doubt of it in me, and ſo upon the ſtrength of that *reaſon* I believe it *infallibly*.

14. When therefore he ſaith that I *account* the *reaſons of believing that* Henry VIII. *was King—fallible*, he muſt know 'tis a *miſrepreſentation*, * My words are, *The reaſons on which I believe it, are the teſtimonies of mere men, and ſo fallible*] The word *fallible* he might, if he had pleaſed, have applyed to what was next before it, [*mere men*] and then it muſt have been evidently true, for ſure *mere men* are *fallible*: But he might with more reaſon have applyed it to [*teſtimonies of mere men*] for of them 'tis viſible that I ſpake it, by what follows [*the bare fallibility of thoſe teſtimonies*] but (againſt this evidence) he muſt miſtake, and affix it to the firſt word, that the *reaſons of believing I account fallible*] Whereas 'tis plain enough, that the *teſtimonies*, as they are of fallible men, being *fallible*, yet the *concurrence* of all men in thoſe *teſtimonies* is an *infallible reaſon*, of which therefore no man can *reaſonably* doubt. * *Repl.* p. 22.

* *P.* 132. 15. *This kind of certainty*, he ſaith * *I put as a parallel of the Proteſtants uncertainty, and challenges me to ſhew the thouſandth part of it for any point wherein we differ from them.*] But this is another miſrepreſentation, † My words were, that *the fallibility of the Proteſtants, whilſt yet they are without doubting verily perſwaded that their reaſons have force in them, cannot make it poſſible for them to believe what they do not believe, or lawfull to profeſs contrary to their belief*; and this illuſtrated by *believing the teſtimonies of* Henry VIII. the *fallibility* of which *teſtimonies* (though 'twere ſuppoſed) would not make it *raeſonable* for me to *doubt* of it, nor *lawfull* to profeſs I do not *believe* it. What need then had he to take ſuch ſolemn pains to prove that it is *demonſtrable*, there was ſuch a man as *Henry* VIII. which I believe as much as he, and believe as *infallibly* as he would have me? What then follows to the end of the *Section* is unſignificant, and ſo I give it leave to paſs.

† *Reply* p. 21. *Sect.* 3. n. 34.

SECT. VII.

His fourteenth Section. Schiſm againſt the whole Church. S. W's *Logick of Sacrilege found in every theft. His ſuggeſtion of my denying authority of Councils. Power of a Council of Biſhops over one Biſhop. Omitting to enlarge of Councils is not leaving out that branch of Schiſm.* S. W's *ſtrange miſrepreſentation, by inſerting of words in my period.*

1. HIS 14. *Section* well provided with *ovation* and reports of his victories, I moſt willingly adventure to the *Readers* judgment, who ſhall compare it with *Repl.* Ch. III. *Sect.* 1. and doubt not but he will believe, that if I *vindicate* the *Proteſtant* from having *ſeparated* from any one *Father* or *Brother* in the *whole Chriſtian* world, I have freed him from *dividing* from the *whole Church*, and from the *authority* of *Councils*, it being impoſſible to ſeparate from the *whole*, without ſeparating from any one *part* of the whole, or from *Councils*, which are made up either of all the *Biſhops*, or of a *greater* or *ſmaller* number of them, in caſe he be vindicated from having *ſeparated* from any *one* of thoſe *Biſhops*.

2. What a gainleſs exerciſe then muſt it be to the Reader, ſhould I ſurvey his ſeveral arts to make this *plauſible*, which is as far from being *poſſible*, as an *univerſal affirmative* [communicating with *all*] is unreconcileable with an *univerſal negative*, ſuch is *communicating* with *none* (and [*ſeparating* from the *whole Church*] is the interpretation of that) or even with a *particular negative*, there being not any *one* man in the world, with whom I *refuſe* to communicate; For if there be *any* ſuch, he muſt be my *Superiour*, or *equal*, or *inferiour*, and that we have not *ſeparated* from any of theſe, is the undertaking, confeſs'dly, of that *Tract* of *Schiſm*.

3. His *firſt* incounter againſt that which ſo *palpable*, may deſerve to be taken notice of, as an *eſſay* of what is to be expected from the reſt. *Schiſm*, ſaith he, *againſt the whole Church is not compriſed in any one head, becauſe it is in an higher nature ſinfull, and ſo exceeds it.* As if he had ſaid, the *Virgin Mary* is not compriſed under the head of *women*, becauſe ſhe is more *excellent* than other women, and ſo *exceeds* it. His own inſtance will clear the matter as well as any could have been pickt out. *Sacrilege*, ſaith he, *and Parricide according to the common notions are found indeed in every ſimple theft and murther, but according to their ſpecifical differences they exceed them, and ſo are not compriſed in them.* As great a *miracle* in *Logick*, as Mr. *White* is ſaid to be of *wit*. For 1. is it poſſible that any man ſhould imagine that *ſacrilege* is *found in every ſimple theft*? What *ſacrilege* (in any the moſt common notion that includes *ſacrilege*, and if it do not ſo, 'tis *bare theft*, not *ſacrilege*) is found in *ſtealing* a *horſe* out of a *Lay-man's* Stable, when neither the *man*, nor the *horſe*, nor the *Stable*, had any *ſacred* relation upon them? Or what *Parricide* in each bloody *Duel*, that is fought betwixt Strangers, that met and quarrel'd yeſterday at the Ordinary? *There* is one of *S. W*'s rarities of refined *Logick*, inſtead of which, he that were guided by ordinary rules, would have ſaid that *Sacrilege* and *Parricide according to their common notions are found under the general heads of theft and murther.*

4. But had *S. W.* deſcended to this puling mean-ſpirited vulgar *idiome*, he could not have maintained life to the end of his period, for that concludes with a ſecond *rarity*, that *according to their ſpecifical differences they are not comprized in them*] Is not a *man* according to his *ſpecifical difference* compriſed in a *living creature* which contains in it both *rational* and *irrational living creatures*? And ſo, is not *ſacrilege compriſed* in *theft*, which contains purloining of any thing whether *common* or *ſacred*? and is not *Parricide* contained under *Murther*, when murther contains all *killing* whether of *ſuperiours* or *equals*? And what if killing *ſuperiours* be a greater ſin, than killing of *equals*, is not the greater compriſed in the *general* word, as well as the *leſſer*? Are not theſe fine *nets* and *Laws*, and *generical* words, that catch hold onely of the *leſſer*, and let go the *greater*? Such extracts of ſublimed ſenſe *S. W.* hath communicated to us, in his attempt to prove that a man may be guilty of the *higheſt*, when he is perfectly *free* from any even the *loweſt degree of ſin*? Might not another man's Diſciple, as well as Mr. *White*'s, have retained, without boaſting of it, as much *Logick*, as this *Magiſtery* hath appeared to arrive to?

5. Such ſtuff as this the whole *Section* is made up of, and muſt not with ordinary charity be minutely inſiſted on, onely I cannot omit to reflect on one moſt *ſcandalous ſuggeſtion* moſt cauſeleſly whiſpered againſt me, that I *ſeem to doubt whether Councils have any authority*, and *durum telum neceſſitas*] applyed to it; When he cannot be ignorant of the *authority* we allow *Councils*, and when all that I was in that place guilty of, was the framing a *Dilemma*, which part ſoever of which he took, it was manifeſt his cauſe was overthrown, thus, *Either the Councils, that are ſuppoſed to be left out of my Scheme, have ſome authority over him that is accuſed to divide from them, or they have none; If they have any, that* (ſaid I, and muſt ſtill affirm) *muſt be reducible to paternal power* (as made up of thoſe under whoſe *authority* he is placed, be it a *Diœceſane*, *Provincial*, *National*, or *General Council*) *If they have none*, (as a *Council* of *Spaniards* have none over an *Engliſh* man) any farther than by way of *council* and *advice*, that will directly fall *under the head of fraternal charity.*

6. Meanwhile

6. Meanwhile it is evident, that as I acknowledge the *just* authority of *Councils* of all sorts from *Diœcesane* to *General*, and that as *paternal* to all that are subject to each, so I * then affirmed expressly, that the *power which belongs to the Bishops in each Province* (and the proportion holds in a *Nation*, and the whole world) is united in that of a *Provincial Council*, where *all* the *Diœcesane Bishops* are *assembled* (which again he strangely disguises, and misrepresents, making me to say no more; but that the *offence against the whole was consequently an offence against any one there residing*, (he would have said against *every* one, and consequently against *all* that have *authority* over him) and the *despising of that, is an offence under the first sort of Schism*, that of *dividing* from, or *disobeying our superiours*. * *Repl.* p. 29.

7. In defense of his great subtilty he proceeds to ask an abstruse *question*, *What paternal power have a company of Bishops over a single Bishop?* I answer, the same that any *Aristocratick Government* hath over every single member of it, and this, I take it, is as *Paternal*, as in a *Monarchy*, *Monarchick* power could be.

8. But because having mentioned this of *Councils* of all sorts, I did not, for some reasons particularly mentioned, proceed to handle the *authority* of *Councils*, or any other question on that so large head of various discourse, farther than to say, that the *Emperour when those last remedies were seasonable, had power of convoking Universal Councils (as every Prince in his own Dominions National)* hence he is qualified by his gifts, to conclude that I *confess I treated not specially against Schism against general Councils*, and presently interprets that, my *confessing* my *division* of *Schism insufficient*, *which was onely objected*. But I pray how can my *omitting* to handle one part *more largely*, or contenting my self (for reasons to me convincing) to have *named* it, infer my not *nameing it at all*, or *excluding it quite out of my Scheme?* Which if I *visibly* and *confess'dly* did not, 'tis then as visible and *confess'd*, that my *division* was not *insufficient*, or maimed in that respect.

9. What he adds p. 241. of my *divination*, *that towards the end of the world I think it probable there may be a General Council*, and his *reason* which his best auguries can give of it, that *Antichrist who is to be then the Universal secular Governour, and by consequence according to D.* H's *grounds, the head of God's Church, or Supreme in Ecclesiastical affairs, will doe Christianity that favour as to gather a General Council*, adding that *this if any must be my meaning*, is, all of it put together, as unparallel'd an *unsincerity*, as *Antichrist* himself, of whom he speaks, with his τερατα ψευδους, was likely to be guilty of.

10. I (that believe *Diogenes* spake very reasonably, when beholding the *Southsayers*, he cryed out μηδεν ανθρωπος γελοιωτερον *man* was the *most ridiculous* of creatures) could not but behold with some amazement such words cited from me, that *toward the end of the world I think it probable there may be a General Council*] Could I write in so deep a *sleep*, as to transcribe what I never remember to have been the matter of my *dream*? Yet these are *S. W's* plain words [*towards the end of the world he thinks it probable there may be one*] But looking nearer, it was observable that [*towards the end*] and [*probable*] being put, as *citations*, in *Italick* letters, the [of the world] and [he thinks there may be one] were not so noted, and then 'twas obvious to smell one of *S. W's* arts, and therefore looking on my words * *Repl.* Ch. III. *Sect.* 1. n. 13. I found to my astonishment (what I could not be so uncharitable to have *suspected*) none other than these words of mine [*the congregating of the like (when possible, and probable toward the end) is recommended* p. 158. *as a supply, when there should be need of extraordinary remedies.*] * P. 30.

11. Can there be any question of the sense of these words, that when the congregating of *Councils* is 1. *possible* to be had, 2. *probable* to conduce toward the *end*, to which *Councils* have been, or should be alway designed, then I *recommended* the *assembling* of them, as *supplies*, *&c.* And behold a *metamorphosis* by one slight of hand, inserting [*of the world*] and then I that have written an intire dissertation, to prove that *Antichrist* was already come in St. *John's times*, (not, as † *Bellarmine* teaches his *Catechumeni*, *that toward the end of the world he will endeavour to deceive us*; but I say, that he was long since come) in the Infancy of *Christianity*, must now turn an extemporary *Augur*, and *Southsay* of *Antichrist*, an *Universal secular Monarch*, *towards the end of the world*, and what not, when *S. W.* hath decreed to have it so. † *Christ. Doctr.* c. 3. p. 65.

12. To all the *forty* and *four false dealings* in his *Index* amass'd together, I shall oppose this one *Peccadillo* of *S. W.* and if it do not outweigh them all (in pressing toward the *Abyss*) as much as the grossest *falsehood* can *truth*, I shall be content to lye under as great a load, as his arts can provide for me. And so I take my leave of this *Section*, (and of his *captious* suggestions, which constantly partake of *some* degree of this *craft*, though it do not always arrive to this *perfection* of visible unhappiness) having to his grand question [*why I treated not of Schism against the King*] given competent satisfaction in the *Answ. to Sch. Disar. Ch.* VII. *Sect.* 5. n. 4. if he had been at leisure to reade so far, instead of * saying, that, *as it appears, we decline to own the Supremacy of Kings in sacred matters.* How truly, he may judge by what is there largely said in defense of it. * P. 144.

SECT. VIII.

His fifteenth Section. Of retrenching the Roman Patriarchy. His mistaking the question. Difference between Metropolitical power and Patriarchate. Ruffinus's *words onely of the former, and so mine. The double use of the word Patriarch. The City of* Rome, *and* Italy *distinct Provinces. His causeless censure of the unintelligible testimony. The strange contumelies heaped on* Ruffinus, *without all provocation. Christ's precepts how much for our ease, if obeyed. St.* Jerom's *displeasure to* Ruffinus. Palladius's *testimony of him.* Erasmus's *censure common to him and* Hilary (*his mistake of* Orbis Deucaleon) *His calling* James *Bishop of the Apostles. His grounds for it. The agreement of others,* Hesychius, *the authour* de ætat. Eccl. *His rendring* Marde & *Macarius. The mistake of* Pamphilus *for* Eusebius. S. W's *rendring of the* Nicene *Canon. His proofs uneffectual, and his rendring disproved. St.* Basil's *testimony little for the Pope's credit. St.* Jerom *and he, onely for his Patriarchate of the West. So* Nilus *and* Zonaras *their words.*

1. HIS *fifteenth Section* is all spent on my *retrenching the Roman Patriarchy*, as the *Catholick Gentleman* was pleased to call it, and *vindicating Ruffinus*. And many artifices he hath made use of, to advance from thence a seeming exception against the Tract of *Schism*.

2. To clear this whole business, it must be remembred how this dispute *began*. What I first said on that subject, came in † *incidentally*, and onely as an *example* of *Metropolitical power*, in *Scripture* and the *first antiquity*, as in *Timothy* and *Titus* and *James* of *Jerusalem*, and the *Angels* of the *seven Churches*, so in the *Bishop* of *Rome* over the *Province*, or *Region* to him belonging, called the *Urbicarian* or *Suburbicarian*, as distinguished from the *Province* of *Italy*, under the *Archbishop* of *Milane*. This was then set down at large from several passages of *ancient* story, and from the observations of *Leschasser*, and Mr. *Brerewood*, and from *Ruffinus's Paraphrase* of the *Nicene Canon*. Then in the *Reply* to *Cath. Gentl.* it was resumed, and in every part vindicated, and now the *Dispatcher* comes with his renewed assault, and his first undertaking is to *evidence that the question was of the extent of the Roman Patriarchy.*] I might be allowed to know best, what was the *subject* of the *question*, but I shall not assume so much to my self, but leave it to the Readers eyes, which will find it most evident and certain (as hath been shewed from the first *proposing* of it) that it was of the *Metropolitical* power of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, never mentioned by me in any opposition to any greater *dignity*, than of the *chief Primate*, or *Patriarch* of the *West*, which he (long after *Ignatius*'s time of which I speak) obtained, but onely as a *pattern* of *Metropolitical power* in the *infancy* of the *Church*. This being adverted to, takes away the whole *dispute* between us in *this* matter, for I that confined the *Bishop* of *Rome* his *Metropolitical* power to the *Suburbicarian Region*, never doubted but his *Patriarchate* extended farther, to the whole *West*, as hath oft been granted by me.

† *See Tr. of Schism*, p. 50, 51. l. 3. p. 52. l. *ult.*

3. But, saith he, (in despight of my gainsaying, or appeal to the Readers own eyes, or *testimony* concerning my own words) *it is evident the question is of the Roman Patriarchy*. And how is it evident? Why, *both by bringing* Ruffinus's *testimony upon the stage, who acknowledg'dly spake of Patriarchal Jurisdiction*, as also by the *Doctour*'s *words Repl.* p. 33. l. 2. and p. 34. l. 4, 5. But as to the citations from my *Reply*, the Reader will easily satisfie his own eyes, that I had respect onely to the *Catholick Gentleman*'s word (and used it onely as his dialect, who had called it the *Roman Patriarchy*) and so demonstrated p. 33. that that *Province* of the *Patriarch* of *Rome* i.e. that which I had called the *Province* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, but he the *Roman Patriarchy*, extended not to all *Italy*, and p. 34. I speak expresly of the *Presidency* of the *Bishop* of *Rome*, as that which I suppose he must mean by the *Roman Patriarchy*, but therein never dream'd of that greater dignity among *Primates* whereby 'tis vulgarly known there were first *three*, and after *five Patriarchs* in the whole world, and the *Bishop* of *Rome* the *first* of these, and *Patriarch* of the whole *West*, and so of a greater extent than the *Picenum Suburbicarium*, yea than *all Italy*, which yet never belonged to his *Metropolitical* power.

4. As for *Ruffinus*'s speaking *acknowledgedly of Patriarchal Jurisdiction*, 'tis suggested without any colour of truth; for 'tis evident, I bring *Ruffinus*'s word, *Suburbicariarum Ecclesiarum solicitudinem gerere*, to declare onely the *extent* of his *Metropolitical* power. And besides I have oft shewed, that *Patriarchs*, as they differ from *Metropolitanes* and *Primates*, have no *Jurisdiction*, but onely an *addition* of *honour* or *dignity*, and if by the phrase he should mean no more, but the πρεσβεῖα or *honourable privileges* of a *Patriarch*, in distinction from a *Metropolitane* or a *Primate*, then 'tis certain *Ruffinus* is not acknowledged to have spoken of those, nor consequently I by citing the testimony of *Ruffinus*. And so there is the upshot of his evidences.

* P. 154.

5. And then with what face can he * say that I *conclude against the extent of the Patriarchal power by impugning the farther extent of the Metropolitical*, when 'tis certain I onely spake, in *that* place, of his *Metropolitical* power, and never so much as glance at his *Patriarchate* at all. 'Tis true I † after said, in another *Paragraph*, that that of *Primates* or *Patriarchs* was an *higher degree* than that of *Archbishops* and *Metropolitans*; but this is in that notion of *Primates*, wherein 'tis * known there were *fourteen* of them in the whole *Empire*, each of which might sometime be called *Patriarch*, but not in that use of the word *Patriarch* (more received) wherein there were but *three*, the *Bishop* of *Rome*, *Alexandria* and *Antioch*, (till *Jerusalem* and *Constantinople* were added to the number) and by this latter saying of mine of that *other* matter, no more can be concluded but this, that as the *Bishop* of the *City* of *Rome*, was also *Metropolitan* of the *Suburbicarium*, so he was, in another capacity, one of the *fourteen Primates*, and one, and the *chief* of the whether *three* or *five Patriarchs*; But still this is not to *confine the extent of his Patriarchy to that of his Primacy*, or the *extent of his Primacy to that of his Metropolitical power*, any more than I confine the extent of his *Metropolitical* power to that of his *Episcopal*, making the bare *City* the subject of the one, and the *Suburbicarium* of the other.

† *Tr. of Schis.* p. 54. §. 21.

* *See Tr. of Schis.* p. 57.

† P. 145.
* P. 146.

6. All this is so manifest in my first handling this matter, and since in my defence of it, that for him still to affirm with all confidence, that I † *blender* and * *mix* and *jumble authorities* toge-

ther

ther for my own ends, is a moſt palpable *ſlander*, upon which alone is founded all that he hath put together againſt me and *Ruffinus* in this whole *Section*, neither of which have ſaid a ſyllable againſt any *Romaniſt's* intereſts in *this* matter, if the *Catholick Gentleman* at firſt, and ſince *S. W* had had the *patience* to underſtand *plain* words, inſtead of feigning *adverſaries*, and then confuting them.

7. Next he arraigns my *teſtimonies* which I produced, as *manifeſtations that the Province of the Biſhop of* Rome *was diſtinguiſh'd from the Province of* Italy, which I ſaid could not have truth in them, if the *Province* of the *Patriarch* of *Rome* extended to all *Italy* (by the way, and to ſuperſede his farther miſtaking, by *Patriarch* of *Rome* muſt be underſtood in this place, the *Metropolitan* of the *Roman Province*, which the *Catholick Gentleman*, not I, but as from him, called the *Roman Patriarchy*.) Againſt my teſtimonies his *objection* is, that *there is not one word found in any of them making mention of the Patriarchy, nor yet of the Province of the Biſhop of* Rome *at all, nay the three firſt onely mention the City of* Rome.] I anſwer for the mention of the *Patriarchy*, it matters not, that was not *my* word, but the *Catholick Gentleman's*, not underſtanding or not adverting to the common uſe of words, nor is it my intereſt to maintain it, but the *contrary* rather.

8. But for the mention of the *Province* of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, it is enough that it is in every of the *teſtimonies* ſo expreſs'd, as to oppoſe the *City* of *Rome* to *Italy*, for that ſhews that theſe were not the ſame, but *diſtinct Provinces*; and to all that underſtand any thing of the ſtyle of the *old Lawyers*, or the *Notitia Provinciarum*, is known to ſignifie the *famous* diviſion into the *Province* or *Region Suburbicarian*, and the Province of *Italy*, and in the fourth or laſt of the *teſtimonies* there is expreſs mention of *Provincia Romana*, as in *Ignatius's Epiſtle* 'tis called τῆς χώρας Ῥωμαίων, the *place of the Region of the Romans*.

9. Of that fourth *teſtimony* he hath pleaſed to take ſo much notice, as to reſolve that *it is not intelligible in the Latine*, and, as I *cannot* (ſaith he) *but know, very corrupt*. The words are theſe, * *Ex urbe Roma, quos Sylveſter Epiſcopus miſit, Claudius & Vitus Preſbyteri, Eugenius & Quiriacus Diaconi. Ex Provincia Italiæ civitate Mediolanenſi Oroſius Epiſcopus, Nazarœus Lector*, and afterwards *Ex Provincia Romana, civitate Portuenſi Gregorius Epiſcopus. From the City of* Rome, *Claudius and Vitus Preſbyters, Eugenius and Quiriacus Deacons, ſent by Biſhop Sylveſter*, or *whom Biſhop Sylveſter ſent. From the Province of Italy, from the City of Milane Oroſius the Biſhop, Nazarœus the Reader. From the Roman Province from the City of Portua Biſhop Gregory*. Is not this *plain* and *intelligible Latine?* Where did the *Club* of *Wits* confer, or what ſhift have they made to perſwade any man elſe, or themſelves, that 'tis *unintelligible*, and not ſimply *corrupt*, but *very corrupt*? If *S. W's* † *Printer* have not thoſe *Wits* in his belly, I know no man on earth, that doth or can think either *corrupt* or *unintelligible*, but as *diſtinct*, and *expreſs*, as any thing could be imagined, to make difference betwixt the *City* of *Rome*, (ſtrictly taken for no more than the *City*) the *Roman Province*, and the *Province* of *Italy*, and *if it mean* (as now he ſaith) *the Pope's Metropolitical Juriſdiction*, never ſo much as naming his *Patriarchal*, that he knows, is the very thing I would have, and for the proving it, produced that, and the other *teſtimonies*.

* *Concil. To.* 1. p. 266.

† Who hath ſet it *Ex urbe Roma quod Sylveſter Epiſcopus miſit ex Provincia Romana*, onely mending in the table of *Errata, quod* into *quos*, but not inſerting the *Comma* after *miſit*.

10. What he concludes from my treating of the *Præfecti Prætorio* in *Conſtantine's* time, that the *Patriarchy of* Rome *muſt needs extend to all Italy*] hath already been anſwered, *viz.* that as a *Primacy* is of a *larger* extent, and *power*, than the *Metropolitical authority*, ſo 'tis granted, that all *Italy* was under the *Primate* of *Rome*; but he now knows I ſpake onely of the *Metropolitical power* of that *Biſhop*, and that *extended* not to all *Italy*.

11. And now what can be more *confident*, and more *groundleſs* than that *all my teſtimonies are finally reduced to that authority from Ruffinus*? When every *teſtimony* that I brought (being underſtood, as alone the *ancient* ſtyle permits them to be underſtood) and the *Subſcriptions* in the *Council* of *Arles*, expreſly and irrefragably define the very ſame thing; which alſo is farther confirmed, and I hope muſt not in any reaſon be blaſted by the *addition* of the clear words of *Ruffinus*, of which being not confident enough to ſay again, as ſo lately with no greater reaſon he did, that they are *unintelligible* and *very corrupt*, he muſt fly to *new* arts, but yet thoſe with which he hath been long acquainted, of calling him a * *great Knave*, and accuſing him of † *ſyllineſs* and *ignorance of propriety of ſpeech*, * and *doltiſh ignorance*, the *monſter of that and all future ages for eminence in that talent*, and at once concluding him † a *knave and fool both*, and as if that were not enough, with the addition of *Old Knave and old Fool*, for no other reaſon but becauſe he was an *ancient* Writer; And all this his but *juſt* reward, that he durſt ſay, what, merely for want of underſtanding, *S. W.* would not have had him ſay, though when it were duely weighed, it is as much for *his* turn, as *mine*, i. e. wholly impertinent to the main cauſe betwixt us, of *Schiſm*, and as much to the retrenching the *extent* of the *Roman Patriarchate*, the paſſage belonging wholly to the *Biſhop* of *Rome* his *Metropolitical power*, and not his dignity *Patriarchal*.

* P. 149.
† P. 151.
* P. 153.
† P. 151.

12. What an infelicity then is it to fall into the hands of a diſpleaſed *S. W.* whoſe *paſſion* will not permit him to diſcern whether *Ruffinus* have done him any wrong or no, and whoſe principles of *bitter zeal* preſently break out into *Great knave* and *fool* and *dolt* and *monſter*, wherever he but apprehends himſelf or his cauſe to have received the leaſt *oppoſition?* How much better were it to look, before he leaps into ſuch impertinent *unprovoked* rages, or to reſolve on the *Apoſtles* method towards real, much more *phanſied* enemies, of *overcoming evil with good?* What is eminently obſervable in *Chriſt's Supplemental* precepts, that they are not *additions* of *burthen* to humane life, but make the former *Laws* of *nature* more *eaſie* and *practicable*, will be very appliable to *S. W.* in this matter, for had he made *conſcience* of calling his *Brother Racha*, or *thou fool*, he had never been guilty of thoſe other exceſſes againſt *nature* and *common humanity*, of accumulating thoſe *higheſt* contumelies and ſlanders, of *Knave* and *old Knave*, on one who had not deſerved the leaſt ill of him.

13. As it is, I ſhall not I hope now need farther to vindicate him with whom I have had nothing to doe, but as he is a *Paraphraſt* of that *one Canon*) from all the *accuſations* that St. *Hierome* (and * Mr. *Daille*, onely out of St. *Hierome's* opinion, and as an inſtance how that *Father* dealt with his *adverſaries*) hath heaped upon him, as an *Origeniſt*, or a *Pelagian*, with either of which *hereſies* this *Canon* certainly is not defiled by him.

* See *De vero uſu Patr.* p. 278. & 279.

† *Hoc unum denuncio & repetens iterum iterumque monebo, cornutam bestiam petis. Hieron. contr. Ruffin, To. 2. p. 311. B.*

14. 'Tis certain St. *Hierome* was a *passionate* Writer, and † *again* and *again* tells *Ruffinus*, that he *must know* that he *deals with an horned beast*. And such indeed his severe and *goring* language approved him to be. And then no wonder at any thing that is cited from him. 'Tis certain others, which knew as well, have given another manner of character of *Ruffinus*, witness *Palladius Lausiac. Hist.* c. 118. who speaking of him, affirms, ἦν γνωσικώτερον καὶ ἡμερώτερον ἐν ἀνθρώποις οὐκ ἄν εὕροις, *there was not found among men any thing more knowing and more mild*, or *temperate, or moderate than he*; and if the *latter* of these were, or because it might be the reason, that he was not so *diligent* in *defending* himself, and paying St. *Hierome* in his own Coin, it will not be just to impute it to the *want* of the *former*.

15. 'Tis here suggested against him from *Erasmus*, that he *took to himself not the liberty of an Interpreter, but the licence of a Contaminatour of other mens writings*. This is cited from his * *Preface* to *Hilary*, but looking it there, the words ly thus, *Hilary never translated any thing out of Greek but with that liberty of rendring the sense at his own pleasure, leaving out also and adding as he thought good.* Poggius *took the same liberty in translating* Diodorus Siculus, *and* Ruffinus *in all almost that he rendred, specially in the Books of* Origene, *and* Eusebius's *History*; *But this*, saith he, *is not the liberty of an Interpreter, but the licence rather of one that contaminates other mens writings.* Where 'tis evident he charges no more on *Ruffinus*, than on St. *Hilary* himself, of whom yet in the same † *Preface* he tells us, that St. *Hierome* that *almost contemned St.* Augustine, *and attributed not much to St.* Ambrose, *doth yet with so much veneration cite* Hilary, *that he calls him sometimes the* Deucalion *of the world*, (where, by the way, I think that learned man was mistaken, applying to *Hilarius Pictav.* what *Jerom* had spoken of *Hilarius Diaconus*, that joyned to *Lucifer Calaritanus* in his *Schism*, and went farther, to *rebaptize* as many as had lapsed in time of persecution, and for that cause was called *Deucalion* by St. *Jerom*, as is manifest in his book *adversus Luciferian.*) *the Trumpet of the Latine speech, the* Rhoan *or great River of Latine Eloquence*, and much more in the profusest commendation of him.

* *ß.* 3.

† *ß.* 2.

16. Among the special *ignorances* imputed to *Ruffinus*, it is one, that he in *Hist. Eccl. Euseb.* l. 2. c. 1. *makes of James Bishop of Jerusalem, James Bishop of the Apostles*;] whether he did rightly translate *Eusebius* herein, I need not inquire, for if the *Greek* Copy before him had then, as now it is in our books, [Ἱεροσολύμων] it is sure he could not truely render that, [*of the Apostles*] But then there is as little reason to impute that misrendring to his *doltish ignorance*; for it cannot be imagined that he that *translated* a *Greek Authour*, should not know the true rendring of Ἱεροσολύμων *Jerusalem*. It is therefore unquestionable, that either the *Copies* he used, had Ἀποστόλων *of the Apostles*, where we now have Ἱεροσολύμων *of Jerusalem*, and then he is not so much as blameable in the least degree; or else, that reading as we do, he used the liberty of a *Paraphrast*, as 'tis sure he oft did, and whatever other crime this *Paraphrase* shall affix upon him, be it that which St. *Hierome* chargeth on him, of being a *Contaminatour of other mens writings*, yet still this is far enough from *S. W.*'s present charge, that of *monstrosity* for *doltish ignorance*. But even for all other guilts in this *Paraphrase*, it may not be amiss a while to examine, before we credit *S. W.* that he was the *monster of that and all future ages*. And

* l. 2. c. 1.

first in that very * place of *Eusebius*, where from *Clemens* we reade, that *James the Just was chosen Bishop of Jerusalem*, this other passage is subjoyned from the same *Clemens*, that the *Lord* παρέδωκε τὴν γνῶσιν, *delivered the knowledge* or *faith, after his resurrection, to James the Just, and John and Peter,* ὅτι τοῖς λοιποῖς Ἀποστόλοις παρέδωκαν οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ Ἀπόστολοι τοῖς ἑβδομήκοντα, *they delivering it to the rest of the Apostles, and the rest of the Apostles to the Seventy.* And if this were so, what great iniquity, or *contamination* was it, to call this *James*, which was one of those three, a *Bishop of the Apostles*, the *delivering the faith* to them being not incompetent to have given him the yet higher title of *an Apostle* (I say not, *the*, by way of eminence over *all*, because *John* and *Peter* are joyned with him in it, but *an Apostle*) *of the Apostles*. Nay farther yet, were not the *Apostles* at this time all of them members of the *Church* of *Jerusalem*? If they were, then those very *Apostles*, nay the *principal* of them, making him, whilst they abode there, *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, i. e. of the *Church* there, what *monstrous* absurdity was it to call him *Bishop of the Apostles*? as when so many *Bishops* of a *Province chuse*, and ordain their *Metropolitan*. That this had truth in the *utmost* propriety, I need not interpose my sentence, lest it solemnly commence a new head of Controversie between *S. W.* and me, every word that is said, like the *teeth* sown, being so apt to spring up into a *contention*. 'Tis sufficient to the refuting of him, if I give him some instances of the like sayings in *that* or *future ages*, for then he is not the *monster* of all; And first let him consult these passages in † *Hesychius* a *Presbyter* in the *Church* of *Jerusalem*, who styles him, in *Photius*'s *Epitome* (from whom alone we have this book, as many others) τὸν τῆς νέας Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀρχισράτηγον, τὸν τῶν ἱερέων ἡγεμόνα, τῶν Ἀποστόλων τὸν ἔξαρχον, *the chief Captain of the new Jerusalem, the Leader of the Priests, the Prince or chief Ruler of the Apostles*, adding more, which I shall reserve for another occasion, this being sufficient for the present, to keep any man from deeming it a *Prodigy*, that he that is styled the Ἔξαρχος, should be called the *Bishop* of the *Apostles*. I shall add but one more, the *Anonymous Authour de Ætatib. Eccles.* near three hundred years since, who from this very testimony of *Clemens* in *Eusebius*, thinks reasonable to conclude, *quod Jacobus super Apostolos accepit principatum, that James received a principality over the Apostles*, and *sedem Domini Jesu accepit possidendam, received the See of our Saviour to possess*; Let this serve to remove the first great prejudice against *Ruffinus*.

† *Ap. Phot.* Myriob. p 125.

Cap. IV.

17. The *second*, of *making the Greek word* μακάριος *happy, a Saint by name Macarius*, I cannot account for, not guessing, as I am not directed, what passage it refers to; but sure the errour, if it be any, is not monstrous, nor much above the proportion of those that render Θεόφιλος *Lu.* 1. and *Act.* 1. *Theophilus*, and Δόρκας, *Dorcas*, especially when a *Saint* if *dead*, is so solemnly called μάκαρ, whatsoever his name be.

18. His *third* instance of *doltishness*, is, that *he makes of Eusebius of Pamphilus heretick and Arian, Pamphilus Catholick, and Martyr*, where I shall not inquire why he chose so *obscure* a phrase, as to *English* ears [*Eusebius of Pamphilus*] must be, (The *Reader* might understand it, as well, as before he did *Simon of Cananee*) but suppose there was design in it, to make *Ruffinus*'s mistake more *gross*, and yet more *credible*, by the affinity betwixt the names, *Eusebius of Pamphilus*, and *Pamphilus*, and yet the distance betwixt the men, the one an *heretick*, and *Arian*, the other a *Catholick and Martyr*.

But

But there is somewhat more in that *agnomen* of *Eusebius* ὁ τῦ Παμφίλυ, than the Reader was to be told of. He was so called because of the *great friendship* between him and *Phamphilus* (and *S. W.* that resolves the one to have been an *heretick* and *Arian*, may learn from thence, that a *Catholick* and *Martyr* may have the closest *friendship* with some that are called *hereticks*) so we have it in the life of *Eusebius*, διὰ τὴν φιλίαν πρὸς τὸν μάρτυρα Πάμφιλον ἐπωνυμίας αὐτῦ ἠξιῶθη, *because of his friendship to Pamphilus, he had that* agnomen *given him*, And as he was his special friend, * the *dearest and most loved of all his acquaintance*, so he was his *fellow Student* too, θείας βιβλιοθήκης ἅμα Παμφίλῳ ἐπιμελατὴς ἀνιχνευτὴς, saith the Writer of his Life, he *together with Pamphilus was the most diligent Searcher of the Divine Library* (i.e. of *Origen*'s and other *Ecclesiastical Writers Books*, as *Eusebius* interprets the phrase, Βιβ. ς. κε. λβ.) This near acquaintance, I say, and communication of *studies* was the Original of this title, or *agnomen* of his, Εὐσέβιος ὁ τῦ Παμφίλυ, *Eusebius* the friend of *Pamphilus*, or *Pamphilus's Eusebius*, And then, as they *read*, why might they not *write* Books together? And so that *Apology* for *Origen* may have been lamented *between* them, and so *Ruffinus* not confound these two persons, or take one for the other, an *heretick* for a *catholick*, an *Arian* for a *Martyr* (as *S. W.* will needs have it) but say that book was written by *Pamphilus*, which yet is acknowledged to be written by *Eusebius*. That this is not a bare possibility, or *whimpering may be*, as he is elsewhere pleased to speak, but indeed the single truth of the matter, I appeal to his own *Baronius*, *Tom.* 11. *Ann.* 256. n. 40. or to a more *authentick* witness, *Eusebius*, that best knew, in his * *Ecclesiastick History*, where speaking of *Origen*, he saith, Ὅσα δὲ ἀναγκαῖα τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν διαγνῶναι ἦν, ταῦτα ἐκ τῆς ὑπὲρ αὐτῦ πεπονημένης ἡμῖν τε καὶ τῷ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἱερῷ μάρτυρι Παμφίλῳ Ἀπολογίας πάντων ἀναλέξασθαι, ὧν τῶν φιλαιτίων ἕνεκα συμπονήσαντες ἀλλήλοις διὰ σπουδῆς πεποιήμεθα. *What was necessary to declare concerning him, may be read in an Apology laboured by us and Pamphilus the holy Martyr of our time, which we labouring together composed with diligence for their sakes who love to find fault.* Which concludes irrefragably that the *Apology* for *Origen* was framed by the joynt labours of *Eusebius* and *Pamphilus*, and so that *Ruffinus* was not mistaken in citing that as written by *Pamphilus*, which *Eusebius*, that could not be ignorant, saith was written or *laboured* by *him* and *Pamphilus*. 'Tis true † St. *Hierome* expresseth his opinion, that *Eusebius* wrote that *Apology*, not *Pamphilus*, but what heed is to be given to his *conjectures*, against *Eusebius*'s express affirmation of a thing which he was so nearly concerned to know, the Reader will soon judge; But *S. W.*'s conclusion from hence, crudely put down, as his assertion of a plain matter of *fact*, that *Ruffinus makes of Eusebius of Pamphilus heretick and Arian, Pamphilus Catholick and Martyr*,] and this as an instance of his *doltish ignorance*, and proof that he *was the monster of that and all future ages for eminency in that talent*; will not be thus excused, that St. *Hierome* led him into that *errour*; for as bitter as that *Father* was against *Ruffinus*, he makes this no *instance* of his *doltishness*; if he had, we now see how unjust a temerity he had been guilty of.

* *Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* l. 8. c. 17.

* *Biβ.* ς. κεφ. λγ.

† *Ep.* 65. *ad Pam. & ad vers. Ruff.* l. 2.

19. By these instances the Reader will be satisfied, what justice is to be expected in the rest of the *suggestions* of *S. W.* against *Ruffinus*, and spare me the pains of proceeding to a view of the severals; Onely when *for an upshot*, he resolves to add the *words* (as he saith) *of their most famed Daille* (against *whom* he is *sure* I *will not take up the Cudgels*, *being a person so highly commended by the Lords* Faulkland *and* Digby) *who* l. 2. c. 4. *characters* Ruffinus *to be an arrant wooden Statue, a pitifull thing, one that scarce had any reason in what he said, and yet much less dexterity in defending himself*, which also are the very words of Mr. *White* in his * *Answer* to *Daille* and are there remark'd with a reference to those *that account of so fundamental a passage of his in the interpretation of the Canons of the Council of Nice* —— (I hope I shall not hence be accused, as *Ruffinus* was, to make *S. W.* Mr. *White*) I shall beseech the Reader to turn to Mr. *Daille*'s Book, and examine this citation, or, to save him the pains, I shall doe it for him. It is in his book *de vero usu Patrum*, p. 278, 279. where speaking of St. *Hierome*'s manner of treating his *adversaries*, how he *draws their sayings beyond their sense, and affixes most remote meanings to them, which are not in their words, and then sets upon them most hostilely with contumelies, stinging speeches* —— gives an instance first in his dealing with St. *Augustine*, and then with *Ruffinus*, the former, saith he, *he gibes as sarcastically and wittily as he can*, but deals otherwise with *Ruffinus*, for then *he fought with an inconsiderable man, and wounded a stake, who perhaps had a worse cause, and indeed had no industry to defend himself, and so after he had scoured the poor man from head to foot, and wounded him as sharply as he could, he tells him at last, that through fear of God he abstain'd from revenge, and lent not words to his raging breast, but with the Psalmist set a guard upon his mouth.* I now leave the Reader to consider, which of these two Ancients had most of Mr. *Daille*'s favour at this time, *Ruffinus*, that was thus scourged by St. *Hierome*, or St. *Hierome* that thus dealt with him, and others that he met with, and whether [*an arrant woodden Statue, a pitifull thing, one that had scarce any reason in what he said, and yet much less dexterity in defending himself*] which are *all* noted by the change of the letter, to be the words of the citation, be all to be found in Mr. *Daille*; If they are, I am sure he must be beholden to the false *English Translatour* for them, and 'twill hardly be worth my pains to persue it thither.

* P. 243.

Cum homine futili pugnabat, palo vulnera infligebat, cujus & causa ipsa fortassè deterior, industria quidem certè ad sui defensionem nulla erat.

20. But how severe soever the sentence be, that is gone out against *Ruffinus*'s person, and learning, and what liberty soever he took in *paraphrasing* that *Canon*, 'tis not imaginable how the *Romanist* should be provoked, or the *Papal* greatness suffer by it (though it is true that *Baronius*, and other jealous advocates have suspected there lay some *poyson* under it) when whatsoever can be deemed of his *Patriarchate*, 'tis certain, he was *Bishop* of *Rome*, and *Metropolitan* of the *Roman Province*, and *Primate* of a διοίκησις, and each of these of *narrower* circuit than the *Patriarchate* of the *West*; and for *Ruffinus* to set down in one place, what was the peculiar circuit that belonged to him in any of the *three* former relations, particularly as to a *Metropolitan*, 'tis impossible it should be any *prejudice* to the *fourth*.

21. And therefore for *S. W.* in this *Panick* fright, to fly to his arts of *new* interpretation, and give the *Canon* so strange a rendering, is much more unseasonable, than any thing committed by *Ruffinus* in his *Paraphrastical* translation of it.

22. His

22. His rendring of the *Canon* is not so literal, as that he should allow himself to be angry at a *Paraphrast*; The words are these, Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθὲς ἐστίν. To which *S. W.* *cannot imagine a more proper sense than this, that the Bishop of* Ægypt, Libya *and* Pentapolis *should be subject to the Patriarch of Alexandria, because the Pope had used to hold them for so.* And his proofs are two, 1. Because ἐπειδὴ *quandoquidem manifests that the words following are the reason of the decree*, 2. *because* hoc *and* τοῦτο *cannot possibly refer to any thing but the thing decreed.*] But 1. 'tis certain his proofs, gain him nothing, for in *Ruffinus*'s, and the vulgar way of rendring the *Canon*, 'tis apparent that both the *latter* part, beginning at ἐπειδὴ, is the *reason* of the former, (It is to be so at *Alexandria*, *because* it is proportionably at *Rome*, and *Antioch*) and the τοῦτο *that*, is the *thing decreed, viz.* that those lesser *Cities* and Regions of *Ægypt*, &c. should be *under the Bishop of the Metropolis*, *because* this course is *customary* in other places, at *Rome*, and *Antioch*, &c. But either or both of these *proofs* not so much as offering at that, where the onely difficulty is, are far from concluding *S. W*'s to be the *truest* rendring; for to omit that there is not in the *Greek Canon* any mention either of the word *Patriarch*, or *Pope*, (which yet were * even now *weighty objections* against my conclusion from *three* of the *four testimonies*) both which are here inserted by *S. W.* instead of *Bishop* and *Bishop*; I demand, what is there in the *Canon*, of which these words [*the Pope had used to hold them so*] are either the *version*, or *Paraphrase*? τῷ ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνηθὲς ἐστίν,] they that have any the lightest knowledge of *Greek* (and *S. W.* much † *loves the language*, though he seem not to discover any great *skill* in it) will be able to construe for him, *this is customary for the Bishop which is at Rome*, (what in the *Greek* is there answerable to [*holds them for so*]?) and so the *practice* at *Rome* is set as a *Copy* of what is to be at *Alexandria*; and is not that honour enough to *Rome*, unless withall the *Nicene Canon* be founded in the *Pope's handling and judging matters belonging to Alexandria*? Whereas 'tis clear that the foundation of the *Canon* is laid in the ἀρχαῖα ἔθη, the *Primordial customes* in *Ægypt*, &c. which sure depended not on the *Pope's judgment* or *holding them for so*.

* *Not one word is found in any of the testimonies making mention of the Patriarchy* P. 46.

† P. 18.

23. So *strange*, and *uncouth*, and *groundless* an interpretation could not well have been looked for, but from *S. W.* (yet if *Bellarmine* had it before him, *de Rom. Pontif.* l. 2. c. 13. §. *Quarta igitur*, and if *Pope Nicholas the first* suggested it to him, *Epist. ad Mich. Imper.* he must not then *enclose* the honour of it.) And by this means (one would think, sufficiently improbable) though the *Metropolitical* rights be most expressly referred to, by the latter part of the *Canon*, [ἐὰν τὶς χωρὶς γνώμης τοῦ Μητροπολίτου γένηται ἐπίσκοπος, *if any man shall be made a Bishop without the consent of the Metropolitane*] and those equally specified in *Alexandria*, *Rome* and *Antioch*, the three most eminent *Metropoles* in the whole world, yet the *Canon* is, without all colour of excuse, detorted to *Patriarchy*, and *Papacy*, and the *latter* presumed to have *jurisdiction* over the *former*, when yet in his production of *proofs* for his side, he ascends no *higher* than to his *Patriarchy* over all the *West*, which certainly is not sufficient to give him any *jurisdiction* over his fellow *Patriarchs* in other *Climes*.

P. 541.

P. 154.

24. It is therefore observable in the last place, that in case *Ruffinus*'s *Paraphrase* of the *Metropolitical* power over the *Suburbicarian Province*, should not hold, but the *Canon* were indeed to be understood of *Patriarchs* (as his testimonies out of *Basil*, *Hierome*, *Nilus* and *Zonaras* import, and being the first that ever *S. W.* produced, to my best remembrance, 'twere even pity not to be convinced by them) yet *his* interpretation, which consists in asserting the *Pope's Jurisdiction* over *other Patriarchs*, must needs destroy it self, and then I cannot imagine, why either in point of *manners*, or *knowledge* in *Greek*, or *propriety* of rendring, *Ruffinus* may not be fit to compare with *S. W.* unless it be that the one is not as *Old* as the other. And thus much for this main important affair of *Ruffinus*.

25. Meanwhile I may be allowed to make my best of that sprinkling of *testimonies* which *S. W.* hath afforded me in this place, not knowing when I shall have another such *largess* from him. And then if * St. *Basil* call the *Bishop* of *Rome* the *Coryphæus* or *head of the Western Churches* (he there mentions indeed ἀνικὴ ὀφρὺς the *Western Brow*, or *Pride*, in one place, and κορυφαῖος their *Coryphæus* in another, and betwixt them saith, that they † *neither know nor endure to learn the truth, but are prepossess'd with false presumptions, contending with those that annunciate truth to them, but by themselves establishing heresie*, and then what hath he *to doe with that Brow of the West?* as the *African Fathers* in their *Synodical Epistle* to *Boniface* mention *istum typhum*, and in their *Epistle* to *Celestine*, the introducing *fumosum typhum seculi in Ecclesiam Christi*, speaking of the *transmarine Appeals*; and *Carolus Calvus* in his *Rescript* to *Pope Adrian* II. c. 10. hath the like, *umbrosum seculi typhum* —— why then may not I conclude, that that of *Coryphæus* or *Antesignanus* of the *West*, was his *highest title*, which it must be in that *Father's perswasion*, who *asks what hath he* (and so sure *disclaims* having any thing) *to doe with him*, quite contrary to the *Universality* of his *Pastourship*, and then allowing him to have been possess'd of that by the *curtesie* of the *Church*, as the other *testimonies* express, what pretense can there be of his being *Universal Pastour* from *Christ*?

* *Epist.* 10.

† ὅτε ἴσασιν ὅτε μανθάνειν ἀνέχονται —— *Basil. To.* 2. p. 795. D.

26. So again if St. *Hierome account it the self same thing to be condemned by Damasus and by the West* (he hath indeed these words, * *hæreticum me cum Occidente, hæreticum cum Ægypto, hoc est cum Damaso, Petróque condemnent*) let *Damasus* be confined to the *west*, and allowed the *chief* there, as *Peter* in *Ægypt*, in St. *Hierom*'s time, and then what becomes of the *jus divinum* of the *Universal Pastourship*?

* *Ep.* 77. p. 252.

27. So if *Nilus* be to be heard in distributing the *climes*, and accordingly the *west* be to be allowed the *Bishop* of *Rome*, by force of the *Nicene Canon* (as I shall willingly grant to be his words, and sense, τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ Ῥώμης τοῦτο δίδοται, ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν Ἑσπερίων κρατεῖν, *it is given to the Bishop of Rome to preside* or *have power over the west*) then 1. that is a prejudice to *S. W*'s rendring of the *Canon*, for that gives him *jurisdiction* over the *East*, instead of *power* and *presidency* over the *West*, which are prettily distant; and 2. the authority of the same *Nilus* may be extended farther, as that the *Pope* having *two* things, 1. to be the *Bishop of Rome*, *as the Synods witness*, and 2. to be the *first of all Bishops*, *the former he hath from* St. *Peter*, *the latter from the holy Fathers and pious Kings a long while after*, *for orders sake*; and again, that *the privileges are given the Pope by the Fathers*, *because it was the Imperial City*, *and not because he is* St. *Peter's successour*, 2. that *Leo Bishop of* Rome *writing to* Theodosius *the Emperour*

† *De Prim. Pap.* p. 67.

P. 49.

P. 53.

P. 94.

begs,

begs it as a mighty boon (the words of the Letter are, *they do all* * μετὰ δακρύων *with tears beseech his clemency*) *that he will command a special Synod* (so ἰδικὴν, or rather εἰδικὴν, is to be rendred, as appears by the title of *Leo*'s 24th *Ep.* by that meaning a *General Synod* on a *special* occasion) *to be held in Italy*, which, saith he, *he would not so humbly have begged, if before he had had any right to it.* And many the like passages, which will yield small advantage to *S. W*'s interests, yet must in reason be taken in, to give the *due* and full sense to the words cited from *Nilus*, that it may appear what he meant by the *Patriarch* of the *West*, one that was so dignified by the *Church*, upon that accidental consideration, of *Rome* being the Seat of the *Empire*, and one that had not power enough by it to assemble all the *Bishops* of *Italy* in a *Synod*, if the *Emperour* did not issue out his *writs* for the *congregating* them.

* *Omnes mansuetudini vestræ cum gemitibus & lachrymis supplicant sacerdotes*..... *Leo Epist.* 24.

28. So if that be the meaning of the *Nicene Canon*, which *Zonaras* gives, that the *ancient custome had given to the Bishop of Rome* πρωτοδρίαν *to preside over the West*; then first, this may be allowed to be the *full* sense of it, contrary to *S. W*'s rare conjecture of *jurisdiction* over the *East*; 2. the *marginal* note of the *Romanist*, affix'd to that Exposition of *Zonaras* [that *he and Balsamon had added this, whereas the Pope was known to have had authority over the East and all the whole world*] must goe for a *fiction*, and very unnatural *gloss* upon that *Canon*.

29. *Lastly*, if the same *Zonaras*'s note on the VI. *Sardican Canon*, be of any force, to prove more than the former, *viz.* that *over and above the Provinces of the Western Empire, almost all those Provinces of the Eastern also, which lay westwardly, were granted the Bishop of Rome* (*Zonaras*'s words are [*At that time* σχεδὸν πᾶσαι αἱ δυτικαὶ ἐκκλησίαι, *almost all the Western Churches*, the *Macedonian, Thessalonian, Illyrian, Grecian, Peloponnesian and the Church of Epirus, which afterward came to be under Constantinople*) then sure the *whole world*, even in those days, was not under his *government*, and yet even of that which belonged to him much was *cut off*, and assigned to the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, and no *Schism* committed by that means. P. 368. A.

30. The *Exposition* on the same *Canon* adds, that the *Popes* had endeavoured by that *Sardican Canon to draw appeals from Bishops to them in whatsoever cause, and affirmed it to have been framed in the first Nicene Council, but being proposed in the Council of Carthage it was found not to accord with truth, it being not made by the Nicene Fathers, nor at all pertaining to all Churches, but those which were subject to him.* Which, I must suppose, concludes, that all were not so *subjected*. P. 367.

31. And now in the name of *truth* let *S. W.* reap the *fruit* of his *testimonies*. And so at length I shall dismiss his 15th *Section*.

SECT. X.

His sixteenth Section. Indicting of Councils belongs to secular Magistrates; The Popes entreaty humble not authoritative. Instances in Pope Leo *and* Agatho. *The being an act of extraordinary power, no prejudice to the being an act of sovereignty. Of this power devolving to a private man in* S. W's *judgment. Calling the Pope* Summum Genus. *His answer to the Milevitan Canon of appeals proved null. The* Africans *free from Papal jurisdiction. His answer to the Nicene and Apostolick, frustrated. A principle of Papal tyranny. The Pope's presence and consent not necessary to give the Nicene Canon force. The Primates being called head, a prejudice to the Universal Pastourship. The title of Head peculiar to the highest.* Peter *and* Paul *Heads in* Agatho. *Names not belonging, signifie Negation of power. Christ's example that Masters may be called so: His second, and third answer superseded. The Pope's refusing the Title, no modesty. His fourth answer.* S. W's *answer contrary to the Pope's words. His fifth.* St. Gregory's *humility, in denying himself to be a Priest, examined. Four answers more.* Gregory's *assuming what he disclaimed. The* Bizacene *Primate. The Pope's power from, or in subordination to the Emperour, in cases referred to him by him. Other testimonies from* Gregory *answered. The Patriarch of* Constantinople *his pretended confession of his subjection. The case of* John *of* Constantinople. *Six strange misadventures in one answer.* Pontifex maximus. Episcopus Episcoporum. Tertullian's *testimony in jeer to the Pope.* Cyprian. Balsamon. *The Canon of* Chalcedon *as schismatical as Protestants:* Phocas's *donation of the title of Universal.*

1. HIS 16. *Section*, the *last* of his *first* part, comes to the *power* of *calling Councils*, which I had mention'd to belong, *National*, to each *Prince*, and, *General*, to the *Emperour*, and to be a proof, that none is above *Primates* in the *Church*, but onely the *Sovereign Prince*.

2. To this he saith he gave in *Schis. Disar.* three answers the *two* former of which, 1. that *my proofs were nothing unless they proved that the Emperours called Councils without the Popes signifying their desires to them*, next, that *if they did it without this, I must prove they did it lawfully*] he complains, had not their due consideration from me. But having given him a complete answer to the *third*, and thereby shewed that this of *convoking Councils* is a *prerogative inseparable* from the *supreme power*, and now most challenged by the *Bishop* of *Rome*, as such, and is indeed the most eminent in it self, and most *characteristical of the supreme power*, there was no great need to cast away time on the two former.

3. For suppose there were any such *causa sine qua non*, or that there were *customarily* any such *civility* payd the *Pope*, that *Emperours* would not exercise this their *undoubted power*, till *he* thought the time *seasonable*, and the *extremities* of the *Church* so pressing, as to request the *Emperour* to repair to that *remedy*, and so when it were done, without that respect to the *Pope*, it were not done *lawfully*, as to that *circumstance*, yet what *prejudice* were that to the residing of the *supreme power* in the *Emperour*? Would it thence follow that the *Pope* could lawfully doe it without the *Emperour*? Which yet, by this arguing, he certainly might, if he were the *supreme power*.

4. But to satisfie the importunity of his *first answer* (and that being done there is no place of doubt or scruple for the *second*) I shall demand what he means by [*the Pope's signifying such his desires*] is it his *authoritative declaration* of his *pleasure*, or is it his *humble request* and *petition*? The *latter* would not much agree with a *supreme Potentate, humbly to beseech* his *Vassal*; yet in the very last *Section* I

 easily

casually gave him an example of *Pope Leo begging* it μετὰ δακρύων *with tears* of the *Emperour Theodosius's clemency*, ἵνα καλέσῃ, *that he will command a Synod to be held in* Italy, which is pretty distant from the *Pope's commanding* it, or the *Emperour's* being unable to doe it, without *authoritative signification* of the *Pope's desires*.

* *Ch. 2. Sect. 3. n. 18.*

5. I * formerly gave him another instance (on another occasion) of *Pope Agatho* in his *Epistle* to the *Emperours*, concerning the *calling* a *General Council*; where he mentions with great *veneration* and *thanksgiving*, the *Emperours purpose* to *call a Council*, † σὺν ἐπαίνῳ θαυμάζομεν διάθεσιν θεάρεστον, and ἕνεκεν τῶν θεοσεβεστάτων διὰ τῆς θειοτάτης σαρκὸς——ἱλαρυνόμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ τοιαύτῃ εὐσεβοῦς προθέσεως μετὰ τῶν ἐκ βάθους τῆς καρδίας ὑμῶν εὐχαριστεῖν ἐπῃξάμεθα, *with praise we admire your purpose well-pleasing to God* (the style was not, [*well pleasing to the Pope*) and *for these commands of yours by your divine writ we are rejoyced, and with groans out of the depth of our heart we have begun to give God thanks.* And store of the like might be afforded him; and then, what joy will he have from the *Popes* signifying their so *humble desires*, which are far from any marks of the *least*, much less of the *highest power* in him.

† *Concil. Tom. V. p. 60. E. F.*

6. Next he endeavours to reconcile this of the *Emperours calling Councils*, to his *Phenomena*, by telling us *this is no ordinary act of standing Jurisdiction, but an extraordinary affair*] so I conceive the *King's power* of *calling a Parliament* is no *ordinary act* of *every days exercise*, yet sure it belongs to the *supreme power*, and is an evidence that the *Kings* in our *Nation* have been always acknowledged such; and the more *extraordinary* the *affair* is, the more worthy it is of the *supreme power* to take care of it, and the more *unreasonable*, that any body else should assume it.

7. What he then tells me, that *if I think it inseparable from the Pope, I am in a great mistake*] might sure have been spared, for I think it so far from being *inseparable* from him, that I believe it not to belong to him at all (and not onely, as he is pleased to yield, *when the See is vacant, or the Pope unsound in the Faith, or distracted, or imprisoned, or in case there be an Antipope*——) and as little to the *Cardinals*, in defect of him, much less to any *private man*, as at last he saith, for that to such it is lawfull in any case, much less *duty*, so that he *not onely may but ought* to congregate *Assemblies*, or assume that, which belongs to the *supreme power* (if by saying [*he ought to apply his power and skill, as much as in him lies, to prevent the harm of the publick*] he mean any thing less than *assembling* of *Councils*, then sure he speaks not to his purpose) is a *maxim* in *S. W's Politicks* fit to be bound up with Mr. *White's* rare Book of *Government*, but sure is not as yet received into the number of *Aphorisms*, whereby all *Christian Monarchies* and *Churches*, yea the most *Democratical States* are content to be regulated.

8. For my great *unhappiness* in calling the *Pope* a *Summum Genus*, I am sharply chastised, but am not so fully, as I might desire, *convinced* of my *errour*; For if above all *Priests*, *Bishops*, *Metropolitanes*, *Primates*, *Patriarchs*, there be still one that is every of these, and yet somewhat more than (and *transcendentally* superiour to) all of them, I know not what either *nibbling at wit* was betrayed, or what *unfortunacy* in using this *ordinary* style; sure I am, his objection against it, *viz.* that *the summum Genus in Logick is perfectly included in every individual under it, but the Pope's power is not in every Priest*] is of no force; for as in one respect *Genus* is *pars actualis*, so in another it is *totum potentiale*, and so contains as much, and somewhat more, than any *species* or *Individuum*; and then the *species* is but part of that, and the whole on that fashion will not be *intirely contained* in every part, and in this most comprehensive notion of *Genus* I might be allowed to use the phrase, when I speak of the *Pope's supreme* assumed *power* over *Emperours* and *Kings*, as well as *Patriarchs* and *Primates*; and so much for his *hypercritical-Logick* observation.

9. Then he comes to Marshal, and survey my arguments against this *Supremacy* of the *Pope*. And beginning with the head of *Appeals*, the first is that from the * *Milevitan Canon*, where speaking of *Appeals* from their *Bishops*, the rule is, *non provocent nisi ad Africana Concilia, vel ad Primates Provinciarum suarum, they must not appeal save to the African Councils, or the Primates of their own Provinces.* To this his answer is, † *it onely forbids the Appeals of Priests from their Bishops, but leaves it indifferent whether the Bishops, Archbishops, nay even Primates themselves may appeal to the Pope.*]

* *Can. 22.*

† *P. 160.*

10. The vanity of this answer I shall thus evidence. This *Canon*, as to the substance, we have twice repeated in the *African Codex*, *Can.* XXVIII. and *Can.* CXXV. In the latter the words are, as we have already set them down, with this addition, that *he that will appeal to the transmarines*, τὰ πέραν θαλάσσης, *he shall not be received to Communion in* Africk, and in the former somewhat more largely, thus, μὴ ἐπικαλείσωσαν εἰς τὰ πέραν θαλάσσης διαιτήσεις, μηδὲ παρὰ τοὺς προκαθημένους τῶν ἰδίων ἐπαρχιῶν, ὡς καὶ παρὰ ὑμῶν τὸ ὁμοούσιον πολλοὺς ὅρισαι, εἰδὲ περὶ πραγματικῶν διαιτήσεια ἀκκαλέσωνται, παρ' ὑμῖνὸς ἐν τῇ Ἀφρικῇ ἀρχιερεῖς εἰς κοινωνίαν, *Priests and Deacons*, &c. *must not appeal to the transmarine Judicatures* (i. e. without question to the * *Roman*) *but to the Primates of their own Provinces* (the *Latine Manuscripts* in *Thuanus* and *Bochards Libraries* add, *aut ad Universale Concilium, or to an Universal Council*, and the † *Synodical Epistle* to *Pope Celestine* confirms the reading, meaning no doubt the *Universal Councils* of the *whole* διοικησις of *Africk*, called the *Councils* of *Africk*, i. e. of *all Africk* in the latter *Canon*, in opposition to their *Provincial Councils*, there being *Six Provinces* in that διοικησις) *as it hath often been defined concerning Bishops. But they that appeal to the transmarine Judicatures shall not be received to communion by any in* Africk.

* *See August. Ep.* 162.

† *Ad concilia suæ Provinciæ vel etiam Universale provocare.*

11. Here it is evident that the same Law of *Appeals* that holds for *Presbyters*, &c. holds for *Bishops* also, that they shall not *appeal* to the *Roman Judicatures*, and this as a thing oftentimes formerly resolved among the *Africans*, an instance whereof we have *Can.* XXIII. where 'tis interdicted *Bishops to goe beyond sea*, i. e. to *Rome*, in the notion of those *Canons*, εἰ μὴ μετὰ ψηφίσματος τῆς ἰδίας ἐπαρχίας τῆς ἰδίας ἐκκλησίας χώρας ὁποκόπτ, *unless it be by the consent of his own Primate of every Region.* Nothing could more particularly have prevented *S. W's* σοφὸν φάρμακον, obstructed his subtile *evasion*; he saith it belongs to *Priests* onely, the *Canon* saith expresly it belongs to *Bishops*, as well as *Priests*; I hope this will satisfie him. And what thinks he of the case of *Athanasius*, who was not a *bare Presbyter* but a *Bishop*, yet when *Julius* received him to *communion* contrary to the *Eastern Bishops*, I formerly told him out of their *Epistle*, * and *Sozomen* assures him of the truth of it, that

* *I. III. c. VII.*

ἐγκλήτους

ἐγκλήπτωνον ὡς ὑβρισμένης αὐτῶν τῆς συνόδου, καὶ τὸ γενόμενον ὡς ἄδικον καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ θεσμῷ ἀπᾴδον, ἐβδελλοντο. *They complained of it as of an injury done to their Synod, and accused the fact as unjust and disagreeable to the Ecclesiastical Canons.*

12. Let him also, if he please, consult St. *Augustine's* 162 *Epistle*, and there he will find it his resolution, that *Melchiades Bishop* of *Rome* with his *transmarine College Bishopi*, i. e. the *Pope and a Council of his Bishops, non debuit sibi illud usurpare judicium —— ought not to usurp to himself that judgment which had been determined by a Council of seventy* Africans *under their Primate*. And if the *Pope* had nothing to doe with a determination of an *African Council* of *Bishops*, and it was an usurpation in him to meddle in it, let him shew me, how the *Bishops*, *Metropolitans* and *Primates* of *Africa* were still under his *Jurisdiction*.

13. The second *testimony* was that of the *Nicene* * *Canon* out of the twelfth *Apostolick*, that *they which are excommunicated by some, shall not be received by others.*] But saith he, those words are not *universally* true; *for then there can be no appeal from a Bishop to an Archbishop, Primate or Council.* But I answer, that though it hold not so *universally*, as to exclude all *appeal* from *inferiour* to *superiour Bishops* in the scale of due *subordination*, yet it holds against *appeals* to *foreign*, *transmarine*, and so from *England* to *Roman Judicatures*. This was before evidenced to him to be the meaning of the *Canon* by the *Synodical Epistle* of the *African fathers* to *Pope Celestine*, which is in the *Roman* as well as the *African Code*, where *beseeching him that he will not for the time to come easily receive those that come to him from* Africk, *nor admit to his communion those whom they had excommunicated*, the reason is rendred ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο καὶ ἐν Νικαίᾳ συνόδῳ ὁρισθὲν ὑγιῶς ἴσχυσε — *because he might easily find this decreed at Nice also.* This if he had marked it, I had † formerly set down as the means to *secure* him of the *sense* of that *Nicene* and *Apostolical Canon*, that it did expresly belong to *appeals* to *Rome*; and if, as I put them together in a *paragraph*, the one to *interpret* the other, so he had taken them into his consideration, this *answer* of his had been anticipated; as also his return to those words of the *African* Fathers, which he proceeds to as my *third testimony*, and saith of it, that *'tis so far from gainsaying the Popes power, that being onely a request that he would not admit their appeals easily, 'tis an acknowledgment of it*, This 'tis to pull things *asunder*, and then break them single, which in conjunction were not easily to be *broken*. I hope it is not strange for *Christians* to be *civil* to their *equals*, especially to those that are more highly *dignified*, and to *intreat* such (not *command*, or *sullenly* to admonish them) not to doe them *injury* unprovoked, upon any light or no occasion. This the *Africans* there doe to the *Pope*; yet from thence I conclude not, that the *Pope* had not that *power* over them, but from the *concluding* reason, ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο καὶ — *because this* is also *determined in the Council of Nice*. The *determinations* of that *Council* the *Pope* was surely *bound* to observe, and *swears* now at his inauguration that he will observe them, and this being first a *Canon Apostolical*, which might lay a *competent obligation* on him, and also a *Canon* of the *Nicene Fathers*, they *civilly* tell him his *duty*, and 'tis not in the power of their *soft* intreating language to *prejudice* the force of those *Canons*. And so *both* his *answers* to the second and third (as he styles them) *testimonies* are perfectly superseded by putting them *together*, the *former* by the *Africans* application of it, as an interdict to *Romes* taking *Appeals* from *Carthage*, the latter by their fortifying their request with the *double Canon*, *Apostolical* and *Nicene*, which is an evidence, that he *might* not *lawfully*, not onely an *intreaty* that he *would* not (as the phrase is) *easily admit such foreign appellants* to his *Communion*.

* *Can.* V.

† *Repl.* p. 401

14. What he adds here of the *Pope's violating Laws of General Councils* (which yet we know he hath *sworn* to keep *inviolate*) *when evidence of publick good licenses him to use extraordinary authority, and to proceed now not upon Laws, but upon the dictates of nature, the ground and rule of all laws*] I shall not now take into stricter considerations, but lay it up among his *Politick Aphorisms*, which will make good room for *tyranny*, whereseever 'tis admitted (laying the proportion betwixt the *Pope* receiving an *Appeal* from *foreigners*, and *breaking laws* on *pretence of publick good*) but withall, will make the *Popes* some amends for the *infallibility*, that Mr. *White* hath deprived them of, by allowing them to be the *sole Judges* of *extremities* and *publick good*, and so giving them not a *Superiority* onely to *Councils*, which I had thought a *disciple* of Mr. *White* would not have allowed them, but also a *power* to *break* the *laws* of the most *venerable* of them, and that very frequently, and in that sense, *ordinarily*, as oft as any *foreign*, i. e. *forbidden appeal* shall be made to them.

P. 162.

15. An intimation he * gives, that the *Pope's presence* in the *Nicene Council*, and consequently his *consent to the framing that Canon*, keeps it from being any *detriment* to his *authority*; and so I think indeed, that what the *Nicene Canon* inacted, was no *prejudice* or *detriment* to any *authority* which the *Pope* before that injoyed; but this, not upon his *reason*, the *Pope's presence* and *consent* (though even on that head, if he were granted to have concluded *himself*, 'twere not reasonable for him to exercise the power, of which he had by *consent* in a *General Council* devested himself) but because, if he mark it, the *Nicene Canon* was but the *reciting* and *confirming* of the *Apostolick*, which as it was not past by the *Pope's consent*, *or* received any *validity* thereby, so it was of full force to the *obliging* him, before he *consented* to the *Nicene*.

* P. 160.

16. The *fourth* and *last testimony* that *the Bishops of every nation must account their Primate their head*] I designed against the proofs of the *Romanist* taken from the title of *head* given either to Saint *Peter*, or to his *successours Bishops* of *Rome*, and so in like manner the title κορυφαῖος to the same sense, whereas the *Bishops* being by the † *Apostolick Canon* instructed in their duty, whom they are ἡγεῖσθαι κατὰλιὼ, to *esteem their head*, they are led no farther than their *own Primate*, and that is a shrewd *prejudice* to the *Popes* being an *head* to be acknowledged by any, but those of his *own* διοίκησις, or *Primacy*, and abundantly shews, that as I said, he is not the *one onely head*, meaning by that phrase, such an *head*, as none is beside *himself*, which if he be not, he is not then the *Universal Pastour*, as he pretends, for sure *such an one*, would be the *one onely head*, there being not in *one* body more *heads* than *one*, more *Supreme Princes* in a *Monarchy*.

† *Can.* 34.

17. And therefore although *S. W.* in consideration of his particular circumstances and for his own ends is pleased to call a *Priest* an *head*, meaning of a Parish, and so a *Bishop* an *head*, meaning of

a *Dioceſe*, yet I had as little thought that either of theſe ſhould indeed have been called an *head*, as a *firſt* or *Primate*, which we know is not the title allowed the *fourth*, in relation to the *fifth* and *ſixth*; or the *ſecond*, in relation to the *third*; but onely to him which is ſimply *firſt*, in relation to all *after* him; as the *ſhoulders* are not wont to be called the *head*, in relation to the *ſides*, which are *below* them, or the *neck*, in relation to the *chin*, but ſimply, and by way of *incloſure*, the *one onely* uppermoſt part, is in all *propriety* of language afforded that title, upon the notion of the but *one head* in a *natural*, and not *monſtrous* body.

18. Yet after all this, if he ſhall ſhew me any *Canon* (of *equal authority* with that which I cited for the *headſhip* of the *Primate* in *every Nation*) for the whole worlds acknowledging the *Pope* as their *head*, or, which I acknowledge *equivalent*, for St. *Peter's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, I ſhall depart from this *teſtimony*, and yield it hath no force in it.

19. But I may be allowed the inſolence of perſwading my ſelf confidently, that this will not be done by *S. W.* in the *Apoſtolical* times, when ſo long after as *Agatho's* age, we find the ſtyle ſomewhat diſtant, that *Pope* himſelf in his *letter* to the *Emperours*, formerly cited, calling *Peter* and *Paul* οἱ τῶν Ἀποστόλων κορυφαῖοι, *the heads* or *Anteſignani*, *firſt* or *chief of the Apoſtles*, which as it equals St. *Paul* to St. *Peter* in the *Primacy*, ſo it evidently concludes, that the *ſole abſolute* Primacy belonged to neither of them.

Concil. To. V. *p.* 61. B.

20. The *ſecond* ſort of teſtimonies produced by me he calls *arguing from names and titles denyed him, as Princeps Sacerdotum, Summus Sacerdos, aut aliquid hujuſmodi, Prince of Prieſts, chief Prieſt, or any thing of the like ſort, Univerſalis, and Univerſalis Epiſcopus, Univerſal, and Univerſal Biſhop*] And truely I that thought ſuch *names* as theſe, *titles* that belonged or belonged not to *Sees*, might be a convincing argument, from which to conclude, what *power* did pertain, or not pertain to them; did adventure by *S. W's* good leave, thus to make uſe of them.

21. But, ſaith he, *firſt theſe teſtimonies come ſhort of what they are intended for, in this, that none ſpeaks of the right of Juriſdiction, but onely of names, and titles, appelletur——which denote no exception againſt the authority, but againſt the titular expreſſion of it onely, which ſounded proudly, and ſeemed inconvenient and new at that time.*] An eſſay again what feats the *wits*, when they are ſet on it, can practiſe upon a *wordiſh teſtimony*. He told me theſe *teſtimonies* were arguments from *names* and *titles*, and ſo I *intended* they ſhould be, and now he acknowledges they *ſpeak of names and titles*, and yet they *come ſhort of what they were intended for*. But how can that be, when from thoſe *names not* belonging to them, the whole *concluſion* was regularly drawn, that if the *names* did really *not belong* to them, and thereupon were *forbidden*, then the *powers* ſignified by thoſe *names* were certainly *forbidden* alſo: are not *titles* expreſſive of *powers*? Is it imaginable the *Church* ſhould acknowledge that *Chriſt* hath conſtituted the *Pope Univerſal Paſtour*, and ſo *ſupreme Governour* of all *Prieſts* and *Biſhops* in the *world*, and yet *forbid* that *title* of *Supreme Biſhop*, *Univerſal Biſhop*, *Prince* of *Biſhops* to be beſtowed on him? Can any man by *inſtinct*, or *intuition*, come to know that he is ſuch, which he muſt do, before he can *obey* him as ſuch, when the *Church*, from whom in *S. W's Scheme*, he hath his *Faith*, tells him that *title* doth *not belong* to him? Nay can that *Church* forbid him to be called by it, if it be his *due*? Doth not *Chriſt* tell them, they *doe well* in *calling him Maſter*, when indeed *he is ſo*? Did he, in his *profoundeſt meekneſs* and *humility* of *heart*, which he propoſes to be tranſcribed by his *Diſciples*, *Mat.* XI. 29. ever refuſe the title of *Maſter* and *Lord*, from thoſe *Diſciples*?

22. And why ſhould that or the like *ſeem inconvenient* or *new at that time*, or *ſound proudly* for the *Pope*, if indeed from *Chriſt* to St. *Peter*, from St. *Peter* to him it were infallibly devolved upon him? Might not the *argument* hold much better on the other ſide, that, if theſe *titles* had indeed by the *civility* of the *Church* been *given* him, without any farther proof of the *power* conferred by them, then theſe were but *titular expreſſions*? But though *titles* do not ſometimes convincingly prove *real power*, it cannot thence follow, that *denyal* of *titles*, which is the conteſting that ſuch *titles* are not his *due*, is not *denyal* of *power*, when there is no reaſon why the *title* ſhould be denyed, but that the *power* doth not belong to him.

23. If this anſwer of his ſatisfie not, you may be ſure he hath another as good, *viz.* that *it is a great weakneſs in underſtanding the nature of words* (and then there is a *weakneſs* of the *Doctours* to be ſcored up, and numbred in the *Index*) *not to advert, that the vogue of the World altering from plainneſs to complementalneſs, as it doth ſtill daily, the ſame word may be uſed without fear of pride at one time, which could not at another.*] But 1. he muſt remember, I ſpake of *Canons forbidding it*, to be beſtowed upon him, and of his own *confeſſion*, that it *belonged not* to him, and not onely of its being *counted pride*, if he *aſſumed* it; 2. *complementalneſs*, as oppoſed to *plainneſs*, muſt ſignifie giving *titles* of *civility*, that *really* do *not* belong to thoſe, to whom they are thus given. And if that be the obſervable of *latter ages*, in relation to *this* matter, then the *title* of *Univerſal Paſtour*, in latter times beſtowed on the *Pope*, is hence concluded but a *complement* of his *Flatterers*, or *civil* admirers, but no *title*, that in *plain* truth belongs unto him, and ſo *S. W.* e'er he was aware, hath *ſtated* the whole difficulty.

24. A *third anſwer* he hath for failing (and there was need of it) that *Univerſalis Papa in* St. *Gregory's time, if taken in a due ſenſe, ſeemed tolerable both by the example given in the Council of* Chalcedon *in order to Pope* Leo, *and by* Eulogius *Patriarch of* Alexandria's *letter giving it to Pope* Gregory; *but 'twas refuſed by that prudent and humble Pope, becauſe the proud Patriarch of* Conſtantinople *uſurp'd it in an illegitimate and intolerable ſenſe.* I *anſwer*, In what ſenſe the *Fathers* of *Chalcedon* gave or offered it him, may be gueſs'd by what they *Synodically* decreed, that the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople* ſhould have ἴσα πρεσβεῖα *equal privileges* and *titles* with him, and then ſure it was not in ſuch a *ſenſe*, as ſhould belong to *none*, but him *i. e.* not the modern notion of *univerſal Paſtour*; and what *Eulogius* meant by it, *S. W.* hath already minded us, by telling us, that *one age is more complemental* than the *former*. But then 3. that *Pope Gregory refuſed* it, was not to be imputed to any *peculiar humility* of his, or any peculiar motive ariſing from the conſideration of the *preſent circumſtances*, the *pride* of the *Patriarch* of *Conſtantinople*, becauſe 'tis manifeſt his Predeceſſours uniformly had done the like, and that on the ſcore of *juſtice*, not *modeſty*, *Pope Leo* in the time of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, and *all* after him, by name *Pelagius*, that ſaith that *none muſt ever uſe it*, and to that *Gregory's* reaſons, as well as *prudence*, give evidence, when he reſolves the contrary *Diabolical* and *Antichriſtian*;

tichristian; for I suppose it no eminent *modesty* to *abstain* from that, that none but the *Devil* hath *pride* enough to admit of. Lastly, I desire to be told, in what sense did the *Bishop* of *Constantinople* usurp it? I may answer my self; that it was not possible it should be in any *larger* sense than that wherein the *Pope* now assumes it, *viz.* thereby to signifie his *supreme power* over the *whole world* (meaning by that word this *inferiour world*, and not taking in *Angels*, which some Court-flatterers have added to his οἰκουμένης) I do not believe the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* meant so much; but if he had, this is no more than the *Pope* now means by it, and if that were the *intolerable illegitimate sense*, wherein that (therefore *proud*) *Patriarch* was to be blamed for assuming it, and *Gregory* was *prudent*, as well as *humble*, and therefore refused it, because that other *proud Patriarch* usurp'd it in *this sense*, then sure he would not himself assume it in that highest, and *proudest*, and most *intolerable sense*; which is all that I inferred (and I must by this his *answer* suppose now granted) from these *testimonies*.

25. But a *fourth answer* will ('tis to be expected of such a Demonstratour as *S. W.*) supply all the defects and *vacuities* of the *three* former, and it is this, that *the sense of that title in the Testimonies being this, that none could be Patriarchs but himself, and the Romanists tenet being not such as shall debar other subordinate degrees, and, in particular, Bishops and Patriarchs to be truely what they are called, it is evident likewise, that the Romanists meaning is different from what the objectours take it in.*] But we have no more reason to believe that the *Bishop* of *New-Rome* designed his title of *Universal* to the destroying of all other *Patriarchs* power, than that the *Bishop* of *Old Rome* designs the same by assuming that title. Yet *Gregory* himself tells us the natural consequences of it both to *Patriarchs* and other *Bishops*, *restat ut vos Episcopi non sitis*; And how true this was, and now is, they that know the practices of the *Papacy*, and opinions of the *Jesuites* in point of *Episcopacy*, may pass some judgment. As for *Patriarchs* alone, 'tis manifest that the *Universal Pastourship* of one, is a prejudice to that, because a *Primate*, or *Patriarch* (by the notation of each word) being *one* that hath *none* over him in respect of *authority* or *power*, and so is absolutely *first* in his own οἰκουμένης, the supposing a *supreme universal power* in one, must needs prejudge that, as much as a *Monarchick* power in *one*, is incompetible with an *Aristocracy*. And this was the very reason, why *Pelagius* and *Gregory* refused it, because they must doe *wrong* to the *rest* of the *Patriarchs* in assuming it. And if that very *reason*, for which they were bound to *refuse* it, can now be a satisfactory account, why they *might*, and now *may assume* it, then either those *Popes*, or this *S. W.* must be extremely *ill Disputants*; for otherwise, so *contrary* conclusions could never follow from the same *premisses*. And the competition being thus laid by this *answer*, which were the more *rational Disputers*, *two Popes* of the *learned'st* and *best* sort, or one *wit* a *playing* upon *wordish testimonies*, I shall not need offend Mr. *White* in pressing the *infallible authority* of the former, to cast the *scale*, at this *one* time, on the *Pope's* side. At another time perhaps he may *out-wit* or *out-dispute* many *Popes*; but at this *medium*, that *one universal supreme* excludes *five* or *fourteen equal Supremes*, the *old Popes*, which I hope are not *old*, as *Ruffinus* was, may be able to manage the *dispute* against him.

26. But, saith he, *we grant him onely such an higher degree of power over Patriarchs, as an Archbishop hath over Bishops.* And then sure *Pelagius* and *Gregory* were to blame, to be so *obstinate*, as to say, it was *prejudicial* to the rest of the *Patriarchs*; But the *Popes Ghosts* will answer, that the *Bishop* is not a *Primate*, as the *Patriarch* is, with an advantage, and therefore is not wronged in being under a *Metropolitane*, because the *Apostle* that set *Titus in Crete*, and *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, gave them power to *ordain* or *rule Bishops* under them in *every Church*, who therefore suffer no detriment by being obliged to that *subordination*; but for *Primates* and *Patriarchs*, they are simply *independent*, and *supreme* every one of them in his *Dominions*, and for that very reason they are called πρωτόθρονες, and then, unless there may be some body before the *first*, without prejudicing his *firstship* or *Primacy*, the *Popes* carry it in the *dispute* most clearly against *S. W.* as cunning an artificer as any, if he had but a *better cause*, or *keener tools* to manage, or deal in.

27. *Fifthly*, then, he must provide him better *tools*, and they are soon ready at hand, for, saith he, *No wonder St.* Gregory (*such was his humility*) *should deny to accept what was due to him, who denies himself even to be a Priest*, 4. Ep. 31.] But doth he so indeed? Let the Reader judge. The *Epistle* is to the *Emperour Mauritius*, who had, it seems, severely *reprehended* him, and, as he saith, laid to his charge (*urbanè*, more *civilly* than *S. W.* did to *Ruffinus*, who yet was, I hope, not so much under him, as St. *Gregory* acknowledges himself *under* the *Emperour*) *folly and lying*. To these two charges he replies, *Sed & si Sacerdos non sum, scio gravem esse hanc injuriam Sacerdoti, ut veritati serviens fallax credatur. But if also I am no Priest, I know it is a great injury to a Priest, that he should be believed a Lyer, who serveth the truth.* What more can be concluded from these words, but that he that was *reprehended* for *lying*, when he thought himself most *guiltless*, and most obliged, as a *Priest*, to be so (not insisting on the charge of *simplicity* and *folly*, having been indeed * *deceived by the craft of Arnulphus*, as the Reader might have been, if he had believed *S. W.*'s citation) thought he might by the same hand be accused of any thing, and debased to the *lowest* and *vilest* degree, and not acknowledged a *Priest* any longer; [*If also I am not a Priest*] saith he, *i. e.* if this will not be *believed* of me, or if it be *believed*, that by so *gross* a crime, as is *lying*, I have made my self *irregular*, &c. where yet by what follows, [that *Priests must not be injured and charged of lying*, when they are not *guilty* of it, and their *office* is to *serve the truth*] it is manifest he took himself to be a *Priest*, and so is far from *denying* it: So, † soon after in the same *Epistle*, *Sacerdotibus autem non ex terrena potestate dominus noster citius indignetur, but let not our Lord be too soon angry with Priests*, meaning himself questionless under that *title*, and so on, giving him reasons, why he should so far honour the *Priests*, as to imitate *Constantine* in burning *accusations* against them.

* *Ab Arnulphi astutiâ deceptus.*

† P. 790. A

28. But he hath also these words, to which I divine not whether *S. W.* might not refer, *Hæc non pro me, sed pro cunctis Sacerdotibus suggero, ego enim Homo peccator sum. These things I suggest not for me, but for all Priests, for I am a sinfull man.* But neither is that, the *denying* himself to be a *Priest*, but affirming that he pleads not his *own* cause to an *offended Emperour*, who, he thinks, would not heed him in that, but the cause of *all* the *Priests* in the world, which yet were very impertinent to his business in hand, if *he* were not comprehended in *that* number.

29. And now let *S. W.* himself say, if St. *Gregory denyed himself to be a Priest*, as he refused to be called *Universal*; Did he say 'twas *impious*, *Antichristian*, *Luciferian*, to assume to be a *Priest*, as he said it was to *assume* to be *Universal Bishop*? If he did no such thing, if he pleaded the cause of *Priests*, and his own evidently in that notion, then away with these artificers, that can make *testimonies unintelligible* when they please, and when it is for their turn, can understand in them what they neither said, nor meant, For so 'tis evident *S. W.* hath done in his *fifth answer*.

30. But he hath *four* more still behind, and if one of them do not hit, he is indeed very *unfortunate* in his diligence, but cannot be accused for it, for 'tis evident he hath done what might be done for a *Client*; and the truth is, I set so much *stress* upon these *Testimonies*, being so unreconcileable to the *Universal Pastourship*, as that is the *foundation* of the whole cause in debate between us, that I must in justice attend him to the utmost he hath attempted on this head, and therefore I shall yet proceed farther to the other *four*.

31. His *Sixth answer* then is, that *whosoever reads* Gregory's *Epistles sent throughout the whole Church, it is impossible but he should see, that however he denyed the word of Universal Bishop, which sounded then proudly, yet he both challenged and practised the thing it self.*] If this were true, it is evident what the consequence would be, even that *Gregory*, offended against his own conscience, and solemnest *professions*; really *assumed* that, which he acknowledged to be most *impious* to assume; and if that were the interpretation of *profound humility*, to invey bitterly at a vice in another, and give arguments, why he might not by any means *admit* it himself, and yet more than by *surprize*, or weakness admit it, even without all *modesty challenge* and *practise* it, as if he declaimed again it, to bring others out of *love* with it, that he might himself have the *incloſure* of it, I doubt not but that *humble Bishop* might have many followers at this time. But *S. W.* must pardon my charity, if I do not easily believe so ill of his profoundly modest *Pope*, lest I should come under temptation to question also the *profoundest humility*, *of equal depth with his knowledge*, which *S. W.* hath elsewhere mentioned of another, with whom he hath more familiarly convers'd than with St. *Gregory*, and may be allowed to be more *partial* to him.

32. But he hath instanced in some passages that shall prove this, *A perfect instance*, saith he *is found 7. Ep. 65. Ind. 2. Where he saith, siqua culpa*, &c. *If there be any fault found in Bishops, every Bishop is subject to the Apostolical See, but when their fault doth not exact it* (i. e. *make it necessary for him to use his authority*) *that then upon the account of humility all were his equals.*] If the Reader shall turn to the place in *Gregory* l. 7. *Ep.* 65. *Ind.* 2. he will not there meet with these words, but I desire not to take any advantage of that. In the *Epist.* 64. the words are found, *siqua culpa*—— The contexture of the *whole Epistle* lies thus; the *Bishop* of *Syracuse* had from one, that, came from *Africk*, communicated to *Pope Gregory* a *secret*, something it seems, that concerned him: *Gregory* returns him thanks, but tells him, he did not *exactly understand the business in hand*; and therefore he declares it to him, that *the Primas Byzancenus*, *Primate* (it should sure be) of *Byzacium*, (a *Province* in *Africk*, as * *Baronius* affirms, and as the subsequent mention of *Theodorus* inforces, a man of great authority in *Africk*, to whom † *Rescripts* are directed there by *Justinus* II. and also by *Tiberius* and *Mauritius*) and not of *Byzantium* or *Constantinople* (as the * *title* of the *Epistle* suggests) that, I say the *Primate* of the † *Byzacene Province* in *Africk*, *was accused of a fault*, *and the Emperour would have him judged by* Gregory *according to the Canonical Statutes*, *But*, saith he, *Theodorus a great Officer was bribed*, *that it might not be. Yet the Emperour admonished us to doe what was Canonical*—— *But now the Primate saith somewhat of his own purpose*, *and it is very doubtfull whether he say it intirely*, *or indeed because he is opposed by his Fellow Bishops. For that he saith that he is subject to the Apostolick See*, *If there be any fault in Bishops*, *I know not what Bishop is not subject*, *but when fault exacts it not*, *all are equal according to the account of humility.*

* *Ann.* 599. n. 4.
† *Corp. Jur. Civil. Dion. Gothofredi Constit. ex Juliano Antecess.*
* *De episcopo Constantinopolitano, de crimine accusato.*
† *In quodam crimine Byzancenus Primas fuerat accusatus, & piissimus Imperator eum juxta Statuta Canonica per nos voluit judicari.*

33. Here you have the total of this *testimony*, where (if we shall suppose that this *Pope* at that time did avowedly assume, what in a *private* letter to a *Bishop*, that had given him an information, he pretends to, but in this *moderate* style, *Nescio quis non*, *I know not who is not subject* in this case; Yet it must be kept in remembrance, what the case was, the *Byzacene Primate*, one which (as all *Primates*) was under no other *Bishop*, was *accused* of a *fault*. To whom was he accused? to the *Pope*? no certainly, to the *Emperour*, of whom it is said, *Piissimus Imperator eum per nos voluit judicari*, *the Emperour would have him judged by us*, and so 'tis an instance, to whom *appeals* ly from a *Primate*, viz. to none but the *Supreme* Magistrate, who in *all* causes and over all persons *Ecclesiastical* as well as *civil* is under *Christ Supreme Governour*. To which purpose it may be remembred, that in the cause of *Maximus Bishop* of *Salona*, who had been irregularly ordained, and thereupon decreed excommunicate by *Gregory*, l. 3. Ep. 20 l. 4. Ep. 34. l. 7. Ep. 1. Yet still his sentence is with this Reserve and Submission, *nisi prius à sereniſſimis Dominis cognoscerem si hoc ipsi fieri jussissent*, *unless I should first understand by my most serene Lords* (*the Emperours*) *that they commanded it to be done.* And if he will abide by that, then before we go any farther, the whole cause between *S. W.* and me is at an end, being finally decided by this *testimony*, if it be allowed to have any force in it, and if it be not, why was it *produced*?

34. Well, the *Emperour* to whom that *Primate* was subject, would not himself take *cognisance* of the *cause*, but appoints *Pope Gregory* to take it, and † *judge according to the Canons*, and according as the *Canons* should direct, and herein no doubt he did that which was very reasonable; the * *Bishops* of his own *Diocese* accused him, and therefore 'twas not reasonable to refer him to a *Council* of his *accusers*, and the *Bishop* of *Rome* was the *prime Patriarch* of the *world*, in order of *place* superiour to the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, and the other three *Patriarchs* were after him even in place.

† *Juxta Statuta Canonica judicari*, and *quicquid esset Canonicum judicaremus* Ibid.
* *A Coepiscopis suis impetitur.*

35. When the *Emperour* hath thus *remitted* the cause to be judged by him, 'tis then certain, that *Apostolica sedi subjicitur*, *he is subjected to the Apostolical See*, and the *Pope* may truely say, that he *knows not quis ei subjectus non sit*, *what Bishop*, be he never so great, may not be thus *subjected*, *siqua culpa invenitur*, *if any fault be found* in him, *i. e.* (according to the tenure of the present case) if he be *accused* to the *Emperour* of any misdemeanour, and the cause by the *Emperour* remitted to the *Pope* to be heard by him, and judged according as the *Canons*, which were in force in the *Empire*, directed.

36. And

36. And in this case, suppose the *Bishop* of *Rome* had stood, as the *Byzacene Primate* did, accused to the *Emperour* by his own *Bishops* (this case cannot be strange to be supposed, when so lately we saw from l. 4. Ep. 31. that this very *Gregory* was charged by the *Emperour* of *folly* and *lying*) might not the *Emperour* have referred this cause to be *heard* and *Canonically determined* by the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*? If he might, then what hath *S. W.* gained by this *testimony*? If he say he might not, let any tolerable account be given, why he, whose subject the *Pope* acknowledged himself to be, as hath formerly been shewed, and appears every where in his *Epistle* to the *Emperour*, might not either *judge* him himself, or appoint that other *Bishop*, next *dignified* to him, to determine the cause *Canonically*; Especially when the same *Gregory* confesses, that *cum culpa non exigit, omnes secundum rationem humilitatis æquales sunt, When fault exacts it not, all are equal according to the account of humility*; Which concludes not, that it was his *supererogatory humility* to say so, or that he *said* it not upon obligation of *justice*, but as *S. W.* renders it, upon account of *humility* (and accordingly he hath his *id est*, like other frail *mortals*, *when their fault doth not exact it*, *i. e.* saith he, *make it necessary for him to use his authority*) but that indeed they were *equal* as to any *jurisdiction*, belonging to one over the other, and that to assume *jurisdiction* over any *Primate* (or even *Bishop*, that was not *Canonically* subject to him, as *Primate* or *Patriarch*) was directly contrary to that *humility*, which was his necessary duty, expected from him by *Christ*'s ordinance, and the contrary to which he himself had so oft censured to be *Luciferian pride*, and so was in any other case, but this, when *fault exacted*, when a *Primate* was *accused* to the *Emperour* for misdemeanour, and the cause by him referred to be heard and *Canonically* determined by the *Pope*. He that were really a *Subject*, must be so, when he is *innocent*, as well as when he is *criminous*; and so this also is a prejudice to the *Supreme Pastourship*, which if it were truly his, would belong to him *always*, and not onely when *faults* had been committed.

37. And so much for his first and *perfect instance*; Those that follow, do not pretend to that perfection, yet for them we are referred to *l.* VII. Ep. 64. where, saith he, *he puts it as undoubted, that the Church of* Constantinople *is subject to the Apostolick See, and this to be acknowledged by the Emperour and Bishop of* Constantinople *himself*, and again to *another express testimony to the same purpose*, l. V. Ep. 24.

38. Here by his citation from *l.* VII. Ep. 64 I shall suppose he meant *Ep.* 63. for there in an *Epistle* to the same *Bishop* of *Syracuse*, he hath the passage here referred to, *De Constantinopolitana Ecclesia quod dicunt, quis eam dubitet sedi Apostolicæ esse subjectam? Quod & Dominus piissimus Imperator, & frater noster Eusebius ejusdem civitatis Episcopus assiduè profitentur. As to that which they say of the Church of* Constantinople, *who can doubt but it is subjected to the Apostolick See? Which the Emperour and our Brother Eusebius Bishop of the same City daily profess.* To this testimony the substance of the *former* answer will be equally appliable, as shall soon appear.

39. In the beginning of this *Epistle* we find *quod aliqui murmurant dicentes quomodo Ecclesiam Constantinopolitanam disposuit comprimere*——— Here it seems the *Pope*'s dealing with *Constantinople* is disliked, and *murmured* at by some, and his whole account for it is given in these words, that *the Emperour and Eusebius a Bishop of the same City, daily profess'd* it, and therefore *none can doubt but 'twas subjected to him.* Which in any other sense, than what we have delivered in answer to the former testimony (unless perhaps in point of *place* and *degree* of *dignity*, wherein the *Pope* by the *Council* of *Chalcedon* was allowed the *first*, and *Constantinople* the second place) cannot be imagined to have any truth in it.

40. For 1. I demand, Who was this *Eusebius Bishop of the same City*? If we can believe *S. W.* it was the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*. But, by his leave, there was never any *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* of that name *contemporary* to St. *Gregory*; *John* and *Cyriacus* are all that sate in that See within his time, witness *Zonaras*, witness their own *Baronius*, *John*, saith he, was *Patriarch* there seven years before *Gregory* came to the *Papacy*, and *Cyriacus* immediately succeeded *John*, and he out-lived *Gregory*, and still contested, and at last was cast by *Phocas* in *Boniface*'s time. All this is most evident, and assures us there was no *Eusebius Bishop* of *Constantinople* to make *daily* acknowledgments of *subjection* to *Gregory*, and so though observation of *historical* directions would not, yet the want of it may make a shift to make *wordish testimonies* unintelligible. *Zonar. Tom.* 3. p. 62. l. 56. *Baron. Ann.* 596. n. 2, 3.

41. Secondly, 'tis as evident by all *Gregory*'s *Epistles*, that the *Bishops* of *Constantinople* resisted him all his time, and were resisted by him; *John* being the man that assumed the title of *Universal*. And besides, what possibility is there, that this *Church* should at this time *profess subjection* to *Gregory*, which was so lately raised to ἴσα πρεσβεῖα, *equal privileges* with *Rome* it self, and at this very time maintain'd its own right so vigorously, yea and had the favour of the *Emperour Mauritius* in it, of whom therefore it cannot be said with any more credibility, that he, viz. *Mauritius*, *profess'd* it *daily* in this sense.

42. It remains therefore, that the *subjection* spoken of, as *profess'd* both by *Eusebius* the *Bishop*, and the *Emperour*, must be 1. no *acknowledgment* of the *Patriarch*, 2. no more than of *subjecting* him in a particular cause, to St. *Gregory*'s cognizance, no *subjecting* him to his *ordinary* or *real Jurisdiction*, much less 3. any *supreme jurisdiction* of *divine* right from *Christ*, which alone serves *S. W.*'s turn, and is sufficiently *prejudiced* (instead of being confirmed) in that it is never so much as named in either of these *Epistles*.

43. In this place I shall not ask *S. W.* why he would take upon him to *create* a *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, being himself but a *Priest*; but rather leave the *Reader* to consider more seasonably, whether [*frater noster Eusebius ejusdem civitatis Episcopus*] may not, though improperly, signifie some *Bishop* belonging to that *Patriarchate* of *Constantinople*, by name the *Archbishop* of *Thessalonica*, to whom about this time we find an *Epistle* of *Gregory*'s, *Gregorius Eusebio Thessalonicensi*, lib. VII. Ep. II. Indict. 1. and again Ep. 7 Ind. 2.

44. I should not propose this, if it were imaginable, there should be any such man so called, *Patriarch*, and, in that notion, *Bishop* of *Constantinople* at that time; And therefore if any shall dislike this proposal, I wish he would shew the contrary reconcileable with *story*. But if he cannot, then

then what other truth can there be in *Gregory*'s words, but this, that the *Emperour*, and that *Bishop*, most probably the *Metropolitan* of a City (and *Primate* of a *Region* under the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*) viz. of *Thessalonica* in *Macedonia*, did *daily profess that the Church of Constantinople was subjected to the Apostolick See*; Which as it is not the acknowledgment of the *Bishop* of *Constantinople* himself, on which alone *S. W*'s argument was built, so it is clearly agreeable to our former interpretation, that another *Primate* or *Bishop* having complained to the *Emperour* against the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*; the *Emperour* had *subjected* the *cause* (and so far the *Church* or *Patriarch*) to the *Pope*, as to the *chief Bishop*, *prime Patriarch* of the world, to pass his judgment of it; and the *Bishop* that had complained, willingly submitted his *cause* to be *heard* and judged by him, and *daily profess'd* the *Church* of *Constantinople* it self, *viz.* in this particular case, to be thus *duely subjected*.

45. But how the *Patriarch* himself liked it, is no farther here express'd, than that *some murmured* at *Gregory*, *saying*, *quomodo Ecclesiam Constantinopolitanam disposuit comprimere*? Which though it be no *convincing* argument *against*, is sure no proof of *S. W*'s conclusion, that the *Patriarch profess'd subjection* to him.

46. From what hath been said, the *Reader* will guess at the reason, that *Baronius*, who had diligently *survey'd Gregory's Epistles*, and collected arguments out of them for his assuming the power of *Universal Pastour*, Ann. 595. n. 34, 35. makes no use *there* of this confession of *Eusebius*, nor any where else, that I have observed.

47. The third *testimony* to which he refers, from L. V. Ep. 24. belongs indeed to the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, that *John* that contended for the title of *Universal*; It refers to somewhat that had pass'd before, in the case of *John* a *Presbyter*, and must be understood by reflecting on that story. But first the words are these, *Nunquid non ipse nostri quia in causa quæ à Johanne Presbytero contra Johannem Constantinopolitanum fratrem & coepiscopum nostrum orta est, secundum Canones ad sedem Apostolicam recurrit, & nostrâ est sententiâ definita? Do you not know that in the cause which by John the Presbyter was raised against John our fellow Bishop of* Constantinople, *according to the Canons it resorted to the Apostolical See, and there was defined by our sentence*?

48. Of this cause betwixt *John* the *Presbyter* and *John* the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople*, somewhat we have *Indict.* XI. l. 2. Ep. 52. where it appears, that that *John* the *Presbyter* having been *beaten in the Church*, made his complaint to *Pope Gregory*, who presently, as he saith, wrote twice about that and one other matter of the *Monks* of *Isauria* to the *Patriarch*, who it seems answered him not himself, but * *another*, a *secular* person, his *Secretary*, I suppose, *in his name*, telling him that he *knew not de qua causa scriberet*, what the *matter* was *about which he wrote*; This *answer*, it seems, † *displeased* the good *Bishop*, and thereupon he makes him this *dilemma*, that if it were *true* that he said, that indeed he *knew not the matter*, *nothing could be worse than that such things should be done against the Servants of God, and he that ought to take care of them and defend them, should know nothing of them*; But, if he *knew* it, and yet *wrote* those *words*, *Ego nescio*, *I know not*, *this must be a falsity*. Hereupon he is willing to suppose, that it was not *John*, but this other *secular* person, whom he calls *familiaris vester juvenculus*, which wrote the *letter*, and therefore *exhorts* him that he will *first correct* him, and not be *ruled by him*, or * *if he be*, he *knows that he can have no peace with his brethren*, adding that as he *earnestly desires to have peace with all men, and especially with him, whom he vehemently loves*, † *if he be the man he took him for*, so if he *observe not the Canons, but will break the Laws established by their Ancestours*, he * *knows not who he is*, disclaims that *fraternal communion*, or having any thing to doe with him. Then he tells him, that he may *evidently shew that he seeks nothing per elationem* by way of *lifting* himself up above him, that *if it were not for the power that young man holds with him*, * *he would conceal what the Canons allow him to doe, and would at the first have transmitted the Plaintiffs to him, being confident that he would charitably receive them.* As it is, he now *exhorts* him either to *receive them to their places*, and *afford them peace*, or, *if he would not, then without alteration he should observe the Statutes of their Ancestours, and the bounds of Canons*; *But if he would doe neither, he would not inferre rixam, begin the quarrel, yet neither would he avoid* or *refuse it*, *if it came from* (or were *begun by*) *John*. And then tells him what the *Canons say against Bishops that are strikers* (in relation to the *beating* of the *Presbyter*) and that he hath *sent Sabinian his Deacon to give him his Ecclesiastical answer*, *and to speak with him more exactly*. Another short † *Epistle* there is on the same subject written to *Narses*, where he professes himself much *concern'd*, and *resolved with all vigour and weight to require right to be done to the injured*, and *if he see the Canons of the Apostolick See not to be kept*, *God will direct him what to doe against the Contemners*. This is all that appears in this story, unless it be, that (as is repeated from *Narses*'s letter) before the time of this *latter Epistle* to *Narses*, the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* had * declared himself resolved to *observe the Canons*, yet, it seems, took it not well, that the *Pope* had thus interposed.

49. † *Baronius* indeed adds, according to his manner, much more to this story, that *the Patriarch acknowledged himself his subject when he was severely reprehended by him*, *and sent the acts of the cause to* Rome *to be discussed*, then that *he obeyed*, *fearing the threats brought by Sabinian*, *and sent the acts of his judgment to* Rome, *whither the appeal had before been made*. And so fain he would have it a *formal appeal* as from a *lower* to an higher judicature, and this *acknowledged*, and *pleaded* to by the *Patriarch*, and finally *obedience* payd to the *Pope's judicature*. But for all this, beside his own fancy, which was always *fruitfull* on *this theme*, he offers not the least proof, save onely from those * *two Epistles*; which therefore having now been set down, as far as concerns that matter, the Reader may judge, how far they infer his conclusion.

50. It is true, that in case of *injury* done to any by a *Primate* or *Patriarch* (there being no lawfull *superiour*, who had power over him) the injured person sometimes made his complaint to the *Bishop* of *Rome*, as being the most *eminent* person in the *Church*; and in such case he questionless might, and ought in all *fraternal* charity, to admonish the *Primate* or *Patriarch* what his duty was, and disclaim *communion* with him, unless he reform; which is the interpretation of *having no peace with his brethren* (but differs much from *jurisdiction* of a *superiour* over *inferiours*) and for this, *Gregory* pleads *ancient Canons*, and the *Bishop* of *Constantinople*, though he *acknowledged*

* *Alter mihi secularis quidam sub ejus nomine loquebatur.*
† *Obstupui. Ibid.*
* *Si illum audit, scio quia pacem cum suis fratribus habere non poterit.*
† *Si ipsi quos novi vos estis,*
* *Non cognosco qui estis.*
* *Quæ mihi de Canonibus suppetunt tacere potuissem.*
† L. 2. Ep. 63. *Indict.* XI.
* *Ipsum puto adversarium patimur, quem asseris velle Canones custodire.*
† *Ann.* 595. n. 34.
* *De qua extat Epistola Gregorii ad ipsum data.* *Greg.* l. 2. Ep. 52. & Ep. 64. *ad Narsetem.*

ledged not any of his *power*, and so expresses his *dislike* of his interposing, yet it seems, he doth justice to the *injured* person, and signifies his intention not to break but to *observe* all *Canons*; and so this is the utmost that this third *testimony* amounts to, and that which *Gregory* must be supposed to mean by saying, *the cause according to the Canons came to the Apostolick See, and was defined by his sentence*, i. e. the *Patriarch* of *Constantinople* was as carefull to *doe justice to the injured* party, as he to have him.

51. If by this, and the like passages, *Gregory* were willing to draw *some authority* and *accession* of power to his See by pretense of *Canons*, this was not any essay of his *profound humility*; yet far from any claim of *universal Pastourship* held by divine right, or donation of Christ to S. *Peter*; for I appeal to *S. W.* whether that were the interpretation of *secundum Canones*? and yet he knows that no other tenure but *that* will stand him in stead. But if he onely desired to preserve the due *reverence* to the *Apostolick* See, by which he might be able to *succour* all that were *injured*, and had none to *appeal* to, in the direct line of *superiour jurisdiction*, as some *eminent* persons in all times have had that *veneration* and so *authority* among their neighbours, and some *Princes*, through all *Europe*, that they have been the constant *Umpires* of all differences, (so our Histories tell us of our *Henry* VIII. for some years) I cannot think he did amiss, or that he thwarted, in the least, his profes'd disclaiming of *universal Rule*; especially, if either the *Emperour* or the *Canons* of the *Church* referred the case to him (always preserving that great moderation, which he requires of his *Officer* the *Defensor*, that he * goe *reverently to the Bishop*, and *intercede* for the person, that pretends to be injured, that so he *may both relieve him that desires his help*, *& jura præpositi non turbentur*, and *not disturb the right of the Bishops.*) The onely unhappiness is, that such acts of (at first) but *necessary fraternal charity*, were by *ambitious* men drawn into *example*, and means of assuming *power*; which yet as they pretend from *Christ* to St. *Peter*, on the score of *Universal Pastourship*, cannot be more vehemently *prejudiced* by any thing, than by these *examples*, which being rightly considered, pretend no higher than *Ecclesiastical Canons*, and the *Universal Laws* of *Charity*, and *relieving* the *oppress'd* by *admonishing* the *oppos'ers*, (*fraternal charity* still, not *paternal authoritative Jurisdiction*) but never made claim to any *supremacy* of *power* over all *Bishops* by *divine Institution*. So that still it appears not, after all *S. W*'s endeavours, that *Gregory* was an *hypocrite*, as he would have him, in *practising* or *challenging* that office of *Universal Pastourship* which in word he so vehemently denyed. And so much for these *three testimonies*, which make up his sixth *Answer*.

* *Lib.* 7. *Ep.* 64.

52. His 7th *Answer* is short, but yet somewhat *extraordinary*, *Those words*, *Nec etiam Romanus Pontifex Universalis est appellandus*, *are not*, saith he, *found either in the Council of* Carthage *it self*, *or in the ancient Copies*, *but are* Gratian's *addition onely*, *wherefore they are to be understood in the sense wherein Pope* Pelagius *took them*, *whose Epistle he cites to make good those words.*] I dare say never any *wit* did practise an higher piece of *self-denyal* for the avoiding the force of a *wordish testimony*, than is here discoverable.

53. For 1. what should he project in this subtile observation, that *those words*, *Nec etiam Romanus Pontifex — are not found in the Council of* Carthage *it self*?] Did any man cite them from that *Council*. 'Tis certain I did not. My words are visible, *Repl.* p. 40. n. 10. [*But to return to their Corpus Juris, so again Decret. par.* 1. *Dist.* 99. c. 4. *Nec etiam Romanus Pontifex Universalis est appellandus*, *the Pope of Rome is not to be called universal Bishop*, *citing the Epistle of Pope* Pelagius *the* II.—] 'Tis then *Corpus Juris*, i. e. *Gratian's collection* that I cite, and that is not the *Council* of *Carthage*. And it is as visible, that that *Corpus*, or *Gratian*, cite not the *Council* of *Carthage* in that place, but the *Pope Pelagius*. Who then is it, that thus cited it, and was therefore thus to be refuted, by reminding him that the *words are not found in the Council of Carthage*? Sure none but *S. W's own* fancy, that can connect any things most distant, confound *Pelagius* the *Pope*, and the *Council* of *Carthage*, rather than not add a 7th answer to an argument that lay upon his hands.

54. *Secondly*, what should he mean by the *ancient Copies*? the *ancient Copies* of the *Council* of *Carthage*? So it must be, if it signifie any thing. And then 1. what need was there of that *addition*? What other image can we have of that *Council*, held so long before our time, than by the *ancient Copies* of the *Acts* of it? when therefore he had said [it was *not found in the Council it self*] the Reader would well enough have understood his meaning, that so it was not *found* in the *ancient Copies* of it; I divine not what tolerable account can be given of this *addition*, unless he would perswade us, that having found it in some *later* Copies of that *Council*, yet searching the *ancient*, he found it *missing* there; And that were very fine, when, as hath been said, it is not so much as cited, or pretended to be fetch'd from any either *old* or new *Copies* of that *Council*, but from *Gratian's collection* out of a *Pope's Epistle*.

55. *Thirdly*, with what truth can it be said, that it is *Gratian's addition onely*? If he knows what belongs to the *Corpus Juris*, he must discern, that those words [*Nec etiam Romanus Pontifex Universalis est appellandus*] are the title of the 4th *Chapter*, that *title* written by *Gratian*, the *Chapter* it self being the proof of it, from a *testimony* in *Pelagius*'s *Epistle*, to which yet it can be no *addition*, because the words of the *Epistle* unavoidably infer it, *Nullus Patriarcharum universalitatis vocabulo unquam utatur*—*Let none of the Patriarchs ever use the name of Universal*—applying this in the conclusion to himself, being then *Pope*, as one of that number. And so, if he were *Romanus Pontifex*, and he might not be called *Universalis*, or if he were a *Patriarch*, and no *Patriarch* might be called *Universalis*, then sure here was nothing added by him, that said [*Nec etiam Romanus Pontifex*, *not even the Bishop of Rome must be called Universal Bishop.*

56. *Fourthly*, if they were *Gratian's addition onely*, as he saith they were, how can he say, *they are to be understood in the sense wherein Pope* Pelagius *took them*? Did then *Pope Pelagius* use them? so he must, or he could not take them in any sense. If he used them, and, as also he saith, *Gratian cited them from his Epistle*, how can it be true that they were *Gratian's addition onely*?

57. *Fifthly*, Is not *S. W.* a *Romanist*? If he be, then he cannot but know, that the *Corpus juris*, and that part of it which he thus despises, with the title of *Gratian's addition onely*, is in full force with his *Church*, and the *authority* as constringent, as if it had (which is impossible) been *cited* out of any *Council* of *Carthage*.

58. *Sixthly* and *lastly* (for here are misadventures enough in a *short* but *pithy* answer) the words shall submit to be *understood in the sense wherein Pope* Pelagius *took them*; But what then is that sense? On the resolving of this, the whole weight of the *answer* necessarily depended, and yet he hath not given the least *intimation* of that, nor vouchsafed so much as to pretend, that *Pelagius* took them in any sense, but what I and all men understand them in. This indeed is numbring *answers* by the *poll*, and not so much

as ever considering, whether the *Reader* be able to advance any higher with all his stock of *rational* faculties, than just to tell *seven*, or *ten*. If he can but doe that, and no more, he is a *Reader* after *S.W*'s own heart, and by the *judgment of common sense* he must resolve that the *Romanists* is the *true Religion*, else how could *S.W.* give so many *answers* to one *argument*?

59. Pass we then to his eighth *Answer*, it is this, *Equivalent terms to what they mean by those words, were far more anciently given to the Bishop of Rome* Zephyrinus *by Tertullian* l. 1. *de pudicitia, where he calls him Pontifex Maximus and Episcopus Episcoporum.*] But what are the [*those words?*] That must be supplyed from the *words* of the *Testimony* recited in the seventh *answer* [*Universalis est appellandus*] the onely *antecedent* to this *relative*. What then the *Romanist* means by *Universal Bishop*, is if we will believe *S.W. equivalent* to *Pontifex Maximus* and *Episcopus Episcoporum*. What the meaning of those words is, we cannot be ignorant, *Pontifex Maximus* was the title of the *chief Ruler* of all *sacred* things in *heathen Rome*, and was frequently assumed by the *Emperour* and proportionable to him, in *Christian Rome*, the *Supreme Governour*, at least in matters of *Ecclesiastical* cognisance, through the whole world. And so *Episcopus Episcoporum*, the *Bishop of Bishops*, is he to whom all *other Bishops* were *subject*. This then I confess to be equivalent to the *title* of *Universalis*, and then 'tis strange indeed that both *Pelagius* and *Gregory* should disclaim being called *Universal*, and censure them for *Antichristian* that received it, when yet their Ancestours assumed to be *Bishops of all the Bishops* in the world. It remains then, that we examine the *testimony* on which this is fathered.

60. And by the *first* sound of *Tertullian de pudicitia*, we know 'twas a book written in *heresie*, by a *Montanist*, in *opposition* to the *Church*, and then, though that would carry little authority with it, to prove that a *truth*, for which it were produced, yet it is hereby rendred the less probable, that he that divided from the *Roman Church* at that time, should give the *Bishop* of *Rome* the title of *Universal Pastour*, or any thing *equivalent* to it, for that were to profess himself a *Schismatick*. *Secondly* what is the interpretation of *L.1.de Pudicitia*? Did *Tertullian* write more books with that *title*? other folks have heard but of one; but who can tell, what rarities *S.W*'s greater diligence hath met with in his travails in *Antiquity*.

61. But passing by these infirmities, 'tis yet sure, that *Tertullian* in his *one book de Pudicit.* hath these words, and the Reader, if he please, may view them, soon after the beginning of the Book, where in mere *jeer* and *ironie* he saith, *Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, & quidem peremptorium, Pontifex scilicet Maximus, Episcopus Episcoporum dicit. I hear that an Edict is set out, and that a peremptory one, The High-priest forsooth*, and *the Bishop of Bishops saith*, And some *hereticks* perhaps might smile to see, how glad *Pamelius* is of this catch, *Bene habet, & adnotatu dignum, quod etiam jam in hæresi constitutus, & contra Ecclesiam scribens, Pontificem Romanum Episcopum Episcoporum nuncupet, & infra c.* 13. *bonum Pastorem & benedictum Papam, & c.* 21. *Apostolicum*. And 'tis very true he doth all this, but no man left to his own eyes could have miss'd to see, in what sense; 'tis all delivered by an enemy, in perfect *scoff*, as of a *decree* that he saith is *in prostibulis appendendum, to be hanged up in the Stews*, as *opening the way to sins by proposing impunity to them*, exactly in the same dialect, as *S.W.* would have cryed *Saint*, and *Preaching*, when he meant *heretical* and talking *nonsense*. And yet this is a *demonstrative* argument on his side, fit to be opposed to two *Popes*, *Pelagius*, and *Gregory*'s disclaiming this title; for certainly an *hereticks* jeer hath more convincing force in it with *S.W.* than two *fallible Popes* ('tis *archhæresie*, saith Mr. *White*, to hold them any other) most *seriously* and solemnly *protesting* the *contrary*.

62. But lest he may yet mistake this *jeer* for great *earnest*, when the words he gives him are capable of a good sense, I shall refer him to St. *Cyprian*, that came not long after *Tertullian*, and professes to be a great *Reader* of him, and in much more *earnest* than he, even in a *Council* of *Carthage*, *Neque enim quisquam nostrum Episcopum se esse Episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore, ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adegit, for no one of us hath made himself to be a Bishop of Bishops, or by tyrannical terrour hath driven his fellow Bishops to a necessity of obedience*. Which that it was spoken by him particularly in relation to *Stephen, Bishop* of *Rome* at that time, is resolved by * *Baronius* himself, and so needs not be more largely proved to a *Romanist*.

* *Ann.* 258. n. 24.

63. But after all this, there is a *ninth and last answer* behind, which, saith he, *puts this whole business out of doubt*; Balsamon *confesses, that that title was forbidden, to take away the arrogancy of names, and that for that reason many Patriarches did style themselves* ταπεινὸς καὶ εὐτελὴς, *vile and base*. See *Balf. Conc. Carth.* 3. *Can.* 42. *Where though he mingles something of his own Schism, yet thus far he is clear for* S. W. *that the name or title was onely treated there, not the thing or Jurisdiction.*] This is a killing answer indeed, and I shall confess with *Balsamon*, that these *names were forbid, to take away arrogance*, but can never imagine, that leaving of a *proud* name and keeping up all the *height*, that is signified by the *name*, could ever be by *wise* or *pious* men look'd on as a supersedeas for, or an *antidote* against *arrogance*. For indeed why should the *name* be *arrogant*, if the *power* that were express'd by it, were not so? and why the *shadow* conscientiously disclaimed and laid down, as long as the *solider* part, the *power*, or *Jurisdiction* were retained? If this be the *answer of answers*, and that which *puts all out of doubt*, which is no other in effect but the yielding as much as I or any other of my *dear friends* (as he saith) demand, the Reader will know hereafter, what is the meaning of *nine answers* to a difficulty, all which, I willingly consent, shall be judged of by this last *irrefragable* one.

64. Onely 'tis by the way to be observed, what it is, that in that place *Balsamon mingles of his own Schism*, even nothing in the world but his citing of the 9th *Canon* of the *Council* of *Chalcedon*, and the 6th and 7th of *Sardice*, but especially directing the Reader to *observe that of Chalcedon*, μεταγλωττέρας ὕστης, *which was the latter*, not as the *Latine Interpreter reads, quæ est antiquior, which is the more ancient*. This is all he saith in that place, beside what *S.W.* hath cited for his *own interest*, and this it seems was naughtily done of *Balsamon*, who might else, at this turn, have stood intirely upright in *S.W*'s favour, had he not cited *three Canons* of *Councils*, especially a more *late* one of *Chalcedon*; and what is that *latter Schismatical Canon*? Why, that a *Clerk must not leave his own Bishop, and flie to secular Judicatures* (which, if he remember, S. *Paul* had said, before that *Canon*) *that if he have any contention with his own Bishop, he shall be judged by the Synod of a Province, that if a Bishop or Clerk have a Controversie with the Metropolitan of the Province, he shall goe to the Exarch of the Diocese*, i.e. in the ancient style, to the *Primate, or to the throne of the Imperial City of Constantinople*.

65. This then was the crime, and *Schism*, of no less than an *Universal Council*, which the *Pope* himself

is

is ſworn not to *violate*; and with that company poor *Balſamon*, and the *Proteſtants* muſt be content to fall, in caſe *S. W.* have by *this anſwer put this whole buſineſs out of doubt*. Meanwhile if one of the *four general Councils* be not *ſchiſmatical*, 'tis as good as confeſs'd that neither are we, and to that iſſue this whole buſineſs is come, and there we are content to leave it, whilſt *S. W.* declaims and *calculates* with his *kind Reader*, the *manifold weakneſſes of this Section*. Which yet he will not conclude, till he hath conſidered the other part of my *teſtimonies* of *Phocas's giving Boniface the title of Univerſal Biſhop*.

68. On this he frames a *Dilemma*, that *if I mean the name and title before forbidden, but then firſt allowed by him, then nothing followeth againſt them who maintain a real power. But if I mean the ſupreme Juriſdiction over the whole Church, then beſides that this Juriſdiction they diſpute of, was over Kings and Emperours, and ſo not likely to be given by Phocas the Emperour, they muſt be put to imagine that an Univerſal Government in Eccleſiaſtical matters over the whole Chriſtian world could be introduced without any viſible effects of ſiding, oppoſing*, &c. and then he is gotten again into his ſafe fortreſs of *Ruſhworthian* no leſs than *demonſtrative Theology*: To that, being, before this time, become a thredbare repetition, I ſhall not, I hope, need to attend him, for as I do not take all *Ruſhworth's demonſtrations* to be ſuch indeed, many of them falling ſhort of *probability*, ſo 'tis not in the power of a *thouſand improbabilities* to prejudice one matter of *fact*, ſufficiently teſtified, it being ordinary to ſee thoſe things *actually* done, which were moſt *improbable*, and even contrary to the *greateſt*, and moſt important *intereſts* of the doers.

69. Onely to his *Dilemma* I ſhall return my ſhort *anſwer*, that all that *Phocas* can be imagined to have afforded *Boniface*, was the *title* of *Univerſal*, which being then gained from him, but no more than a *Sceleton*, being unaccompanied with *power*, hath ever ſince endeavoured its utmoſt, to gather *fleſh* and *juice*, *ſtrength* and *verdure* to it, and now takes upon it, as *S. W.* ſaith, to be a *juriſdiction over* all *Kings and Emperours*, but hath not had the deſired ſucceſs in attaining it.

70. For the *Teſtimonies* of this *donation* of *Phocas*'s, more than that of *Paulus Diaconus*, I have in this *anſwer* formerly ſpoken, and therefore this ſhall ſuffice to his 16th *Section*, and ſo we are at length arrived to an end of his *Firſt* Part.

CHAP. VI.

A Reply to his Second Part.

SECT. I.

A view of his firſt Section. His charges, of endeavouring to be witty, of denying my words, of an ill memory, of producing evidences which are none of theirs. His reducing all to Tradition of the preſent Romiſh Church. Difference betwixt a Title, and an Argument. Of calumniating their Tenent, of pleading poſſeſſion; His definition of Preſcription. Quiet poſſeſſion.

1. ALthough the variety of *S. W*'s miſtaken *grounds*, and *triumphs*, of *cavils* aſſuming to be weighty and demure objections, and of *paralogiſms* impoſed whether on others onely or on himſelf, for *ſevere*, nay *rigorous demonſtrations*, hath, in his *firſt* part (beyond which we have not yet advanced) led us on to ſo great a length, that it is now matter as much of *neceſſity*, as of *choice*, to make toward harbour; and although, if there were any thing imitable in him, his miſtaking much leſs than a *third* part for the whole, and intitling that a *Rejoinder to two Replies*, which hath not attempted to proceed beyond a *firſt third* part of *either* of my *two Anſwers*, might be the moſt juſtifiable errour I could tranſcribe from him: Yet that he may not be tempted to think, that the dealings of his two remaining parcels lie *undiſcovered*, or, which is more agreeable to his humour, conclude they are *dreaded*, not *neglected*, I ſhall give the Reader a farther view if it be but of a *tith* of his *injuſtices*, caſting his *gold wire* (which hath nothing but the *diſtenſion* to own that title) into the *cruſible*, and bringing it out in as *contracted* a form as I can, tracing his ſteps through the remaining Sections, but crowding them into as narrow a compaſs, as the *Readers* intereſts ſeem to exact from me.

2. In his *firſt Section* the precurſory part entertains it ſelf with my *miſtake*, that there being in his *prints two ſeventh Sections*, I was not ſo curious, in ſo main a difficulty, as to reſort to the table of *Errata*, to ſee whether one of them were reformed into the *ſixth*, and ſo was led to think that, which went before the firſt *ſeventh*, to be the *ſixth*, when indeed it was but the *fifth*, for which foul miſdemeanour I ask his pardon, but admire his faculties that could repreſent this as an indeavour to be *witty*, be it in never ſo *dry a way*.

3. In the inſuing paragraph I ſhall onely ask with what conſcience he can again repeat, and outface it, that *I ſaid the Romaniſts muſt manifeſt the matter of fact that it was thus in England as I* had acknowledged it to be, 2. *the conſequence of that fact*, &c. when 'tis viſible, *Tr. of Schiſm.* p. 68. l. 11. that all that I ſaid was, that *every of the many branches of the objection* (of which theſe were but *two*) *muſt be manifeſted or granted to have truth in it, or elſe the objection would be of no force.* This is not to ſay that either *all*, or that *theſe two muſt be manifeſted*, but ſome *manifeſted*, others *granted to have truth in them*, in which latter form were *theſe two*, which therefore I † expreſly profeſt to *grant*, and not *require* the pretenders to *prove*, in the ſame page l. 28. And yet to ſhew me what to truſt to in the proceſs of the *Section*, without all ſhew or colour of pretence, I am here charged with *denial of my expreſs words*, for *denying* there was the leaſt *cauſe or ground for his ridiculous colours*, in *that* paſſage of the *Tr. of ſch.* † *Ibid.* l. penult.

4. But I ſhall paſs this, and join with him onely in that which he calls the *point*, where I am charged of a *bad memory*, and expreſly (this ſecond time in few lines) of *denying my own words*, that is, if there be truth in his ſuggeſtion, of the groſſeſt whether *tergiverſation* or *falſifying*. This were an ugly charge from another hand, but from *S. W.* it ſhall go neither for *calumny* nor *contumely*, but p. 172. l. 4.

either for *glibneſs* of habit, or in his own dialect, *pure zeal* and *obligation* to the *certainty* of his *Faith*.

† *Tr.* of *Schiſ.* p. 67. The plain and whole truth of the buſineſs is, I † ſaid, *my method led me to enquire what evidences are producible againſt the Church of England, whereby it may be thought liable to the guilt of ſchiſm*, and accordingly proceeded to all the *objections* I had read in *Phil. Scot's Tract* of *Schiſm*, or ever heard of from any other; and this, both he and the *Cath. Gent.* will call my *requiring of the Catholicks to prove their*

* *Repl.* p. 44. *pretenſions*; and my * denying this *concluſion* of his to be regular, is now my great crime of *denying my own words*. But I am ſecure enough, that *his own concluſion* is not *my words*, either in ſound or equivalence, and that for their *pretenſions* in general, or in particular their pretenſion to the *ſupremacy*, I did not at that time in the leaſt-wiſe require them to produce their *proofs*, and for their pretending that we are *Schiſmaticks*, which alone came then in my way, and was my buſineſs, I neither did nor could *require* them to *prove*, or attempt to *prove that*, when I ſuppoſed that *requeſt* was already granted me, charges *actually* brought in by the accuſers.

P. 175. 5. To this he adds in a meeker ſtyle (pretending to omit it) that *the evidences I produce in their names are none of theirs.*] And yet the firſt *evidence* I produce, is that of the *Biſhop of Rome's preſumed ſupremacy from Chriſt's donation to S. Peter*, the very thing which all *Romaniſts*, before Mr. *White*, and this his ὑποφήτης, have queſtionleſs inſiſted on, as their great *foundation* of charge, and *evidence* that we were guilty of *ſchiſm*, and which he himſelf premiſes (in his *third Ground*) to have *been held in England before the Reformation*, on purpoſe that from its being held ſo, he may ſeem to make good this charge againſt us; and can he think his pretending that it was *held*, or acknowledged in *England*, a ſufficient *evidence*, and yet that the ſame preſumed, or attempted to be proved from *Scripture* and *Fathers*, ſhall not by them be deemed an *evidence?* Is there no weapon of war but what comes newly *pointed* from Mr. *White's* forge and anvil? This is not to act the *petty* tyrant Pike in our ſhallow rivers, but the *Leviathan* in the *Ocean*, not onely to aſſume the *victories*, but to incloſe all the *agones*, and allow no man elſe leave to appear in the *Palæſtra*, to be worthy to be called a *Romaniſt*, or *Oppoſer* of Proteſtants, or other but *doltiſh adverſary* (as by and by his phraſe is, near the bottom of the page) till the knack of the *Oral Tra-*

† *Apol. for Trad.* p. 1. *dition* of their *preſent Church* was thought on by the † *two kinſmen* in *practiſing their poſtures*.

6. But he gives the *reaſon* of his aſſumption; for, ſaith he, *the onely evidence we produce when we pleaſe to oppoſe, is the evidence of infallibility of Univerſal Tradition or atteſtation of our Fathers, which we build upon, both for that and other points of Faith, Nor do we build on Scripture at all, but as interpreted by the practice of the Church and Tradition now ſpoken of.*] What the [*Tradition now ſpoken of*] is, we are ſufficiently informed, the *Oral* of their *preſent Church*: And what the [*that*] muſt ſignify in our preſent debate, I, whoſe words occaſion'd it, cannot be ignorant; It muſt be, if it be any thing to the purpoſe, that we are *Schiſmaticks*, for that onely was it for which I was then *inquiring*, what *evidences* were *producible*. *Firſt* then, I demand, is this one *point* of their *Faith*, that we are *Schiſmaticks?* If it be, what *Apoſtle* revealed it to their *forefathers? Secondly*, can the *Infallibility of whatſoever forefathers atteſtation*, by him ſuppoſeable, be of it ſelf competent to *prove* us *Schiſmaticks?* Can proteſt *parties* be received as *witneſſes?* So it muſt be, if it be meant of *S. W's immediate forefathers*; or can the whole nation of *England*, that caſt out the *Papacy*, and are the more *remote forefathers*, join to *evidence* that they themſelves were *Schiſmaticks* in doing ſo? It muſt then ſure be ſomewhat elſe, which they are ſuppoſed to *atteſt*, from whence we are, by *conſequence*, concluded *Schiſmaticks*, and that muſt be, according to *S. W's grounds*, that we were *actually under the Papal Authority, as inſtituted over us by Chriſt*; and if that be it, *that* was the very *evidence* that I propoſed to examine, and ſo was not in juſtice to be chid for *miſtaking their evidences*.

7. But if I ſhall take him at his word, that this of the *Infallibility of Univerſal Tradition* (in his ſenſe, *i. e. Oral* of the *preſent Roman Church*) is their *onely evidence*, and that *Scripture is not to be built on at all, but as*, &c. then *firſt*, the Tract of *Schiſm* hath no need of farther defence, all the evidences which that examined, being by this *Diſpatcher* caſt aſide and diſowned; and *ſecondly*, All that is in the inſuing *Sections* attempted to be made probable from *Scripture*, is diſcharged alſo by conſent of parties. *Thirdly*, This one *Reſerve* of *Tradition Oral* hath now in the *foregoing Chapters* (particularly in the *third*) been removed alſo, And then why ſhould any thing that is behind be worthy our farther conſideration, ſave onely to behold *S. W's faculties?*

8. In reſpect to which, we muſt next conſider the *diſtinction*, which he next obſerves betwixt a *title* and an *argument*, p. 176. and then, either *ignorance* or obſtinacy are my portion, that *I do not, or will not know the difference between theſe*. But I both do, and will know and acknowledge that *difference*, and yet be juſt where I was before; for that which is in it ſelf a *title* for a *claim*, may in reſpect of an *oppoſer* be uſed as an *argument* to prove that *claim*, and if *S. W.* be ſo ſecure in his deemed *poſſeſſion*, as to need no *arguments*, others that are humbler than he, may think they need, and accordingly make uſe of them, and ſo be ſo mean ſpirited, as to offer *proof* for their *pretenſions*, and think *Chriſt's donation*, if they can make it good, ſuch *proof*. As for *S. W.* all that I ſaid was, that he *founded his pretenſions for the Popes ſupremacy, in the Univerſal Paſtourſhip of S. Peter*, and ſo, that (if I anſwered not his *argument*, when he vouchſafed not to produce any, yet) I *removed his foundation*, and that I think is as deſtructive to his *building*, as anſwering *arguments* is to a *cauſe*; and that may ſerve him at this time.

9. Next he charges me for *calumniating the Catholick tenent, calling it Preſcription*, for *changing* and *ſhuffling* the *name to alter the ſtate of the whole queſtion*, for *uſing arguments that are exquiſite pleas for all malefactours*] and all this, but for *asking, whether they are now in poſſeſſion of the obedience of*

Repl. p. 45. *this* nation, and if not, *concluding that by his argument, that poſſeſſion, and all the arguments deducible thence, are loſt to him, the preſcription being now on our ſide, as before on theirs*, &c. Where firſt 'tis evident that I *change* not the *terms*, nor conſequently *calumniate* their *tenent* (for that is founded in the pretended *change*) for I ſpeak expreſly of their *poſſeſſion*, and when I name *preſcription*, intend another thing by it, *viz.* an *argument* drawn from *poſſeſſion*, as when we ſay we can *preſcribe* for this, we mean we have poſſeſt it long, and have *that* means to *prove* our *right* to it. 2. That I uſe no *argument*, that can be appliable to any *malefactour*, but onely ſet down what *plea* might be made by force of *S. W's argument*, which I profeſs to think very unſufficient to prove any thing, and indeavour to ſhew it ſo, from the *inconveniences* conſequent to the uſing it.

10. Yet

10. Yet can I not think the proportion betwixt our *present possession*, and their late *pretended* one, to be the same, as betwixt that of a *thief* and the *former undoubted owner*. The difference is visible in this; the *thief* pretends no *right*, his *strength is his law of justice*, or if he should pretend a *right*, hath nothing to *shew* for it, but a *violent possession* of a day or week, which is his accusation, not his *title*; But what we now *possess*, we hold by *declaration*, and *proof* of *former right*, (not onely *original* and lost, but) *continued* and *uninterrupted*, against a *deemed* onely, but not *real* possession. See *ch.* 11. *Sect.* 2.

11. By the way, How came this great Controvertist to define *Prescription*, that *it is a title to get a right in that which was known to be none of his before*] Sure all *prescription* is not such, a man may *prescribe* for *time out of mind*: (and that is, beyond which nothing is *known*) and no *prescription* is so rational or valid as this, when no other *former owner* or pretender is producible: And so by his good leave, *Catholicks* might prescribe, if they could maintain their *possession* to have been from the *beginning*; and so I am sure the *ancient Councils* did (though little to the advantage of the modern *Catholicks*) when to maintain the right of *Primates*, they say, † Τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, *let the ancient customs remain in force*, † *Can. Nic.* vi. and * μηδένα ὑπερχῆναι τὴν ἄνωθεν τῶν ἐξαρχῶν τοῦ τόπου ——— καταλαμβάνειν, *that none should seise on or usurp* * *Can. Eph.* 8. *a Province which was not from the beginning under his hand* or *power*, *i. e.* for which he could not *prescribe*; whereas by *S. W*'s definition, he might then onely *prescribe*, when it were *known* it did not *originally* belong to him. Let him now, if he please, say that I am *against* all *immemorial prescriptions*, who profess to be *for* them; he may do it as well, as just now he suggested to the *Malefactours* the benefit they might receive from my *plea* from *possession*, both being equally mentioned by me as the consequence of *his* discourse, and not of *mine*.

12. What followed in my *Reply* p. 46, 47. (of which † he desires to make such rare game) the *Reader* † *Schis. Disp.* shall judge if it were not most sufficient to the end to which it was designed, which was onely to shew p. 182. the no force of a *bare pretended possession*, abstracted from all consideration of any *right* to it, at the time when usurpation and injustice was publickly charged on it, when the *supremacy* acknowledgly vested in the *King*, was evidenced *eo ipso* to exclude all *other* pretenders, when reasons for casting off their pretensions were largely and solemny rendred; In which case it is certain, his *possession* was not *quiet*, as he pretended it to be, the *contests* held up, the *claim* made, superseded all imagination of that, or consequently, of *prescription*; All these I there mentioned, and above all insisted, that in *Ecclesiastical matters*, *whatsoever 'tis in secular*, *prescription can be of no force against truth of right*, and this was somewhat more than to quote onely my *own book*, and *another of our own folks*, as he unjustly suggests; and herein I did all that the *Cath. Gent.* whom I answered, required (*i. e.* shewed *sufficient* cause for what we had done, by referring to a *book*, where a list of *causes* was visible) and as much as this very *Dispatcher* thinks *sufficient* to disprove the *quiet* of a *possession* wherein *prescription* is founded: for so saith he, p. 180. *Even this present book which I now write, attests that the debate is yet on foot* ——] and then how came it to be so *ridiculous* in me to appeal to my *Tr. of Schism*, and to the *Opus Eximium* in *Goldastus* for the like *attestation*? 'Twere most easie to make of the rest of this Section a sad spectacle of *unsincerity*; The Reader by comparing it with the *Reply*, to which it relates, will doe it for me.

SECT. II.

The misrepresentations in his second Section. Of Peter's *Commission limited to the Jews onely. Of undoing him. Of limiting the Jurisdiction of each Apostle. Of exclusive Provinces.* Κανὼν Ἀποστολῆς, ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος. *Apostle of the Circumcision, and Gentiles*; Christ *an Apostle of the Circumcision. Lesser Provinces.* Nicephorus's *Testimony of* Peter's, Andrew's, *&c.* Eusebius's. S. W's *mistakes cleared. Charges answered. Of interpreting Scripture, that of* Act. 1. *Lot, Place. The antecedent intent, transaction it self, the effect subsequent, nature of the phrase,* Διακονία.

1. IN the *second Section* he sets out with a competent number of misrepresentations, that I *undertake to undoe St.* Peter *by shewing his Commission was limited to the* Jews *onely, that I limit the jurisdiction of each Apostle to certain Provinces, and call them* p. 70. of Schis. *Exclusive Provinces*, that I *fetch the pedigree of these from the Lot of Apostleship*, Act. 1. and *Judas's proper place in hell*, which I will have *signify exclusive Provinces*; and then, what *tragedies* and *tempests* are, and have been raised from all these? no *Laplander* could have sold him a *wind* to have done the like.

2. But it is well my Tract of *Schism* may yet be consulted; by help of that, the truth will be visible through all these *meteors*. My words there, p. 70. are these. *'Tis evident by Scripture, that* Peter *was the Apostle of the Circumcision or Jews, exclusively to the Uncircumcision or Gentiles, which were generally another's Province*; *By Apostle, I understand a Commissioner of Christ's indued with authority by him, and this Commission given to him, as to all the Apostles, indefinitely and unlimitedly, not restrained by Christ's words to any particular Province, but extending equally to the whole world, what therefore is done in this kind, is by subsequent act of the Apostles themselves, who are testified to have distributed their universal great Province into several* κανὼς Ἀποστολῆς, Act. 1. 25. *distributions, or lots, or lesser Provinces, one or more to go one way, the other another, which is there called* πορευθῆναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, *to go to his own or proper place or assignation, for the witnessing the Resurrection. Now if the Circumcision or Jewish Christians were peculiarly St.* Peter's *Province, the lot or division assigned to him, (agreeable to which it is, that both his preaching in the* Acts *is to the Jews in Judæa and Samaria, and his Epistles are both addressed to the Jews of the dispersion, and none else) then it is not imaginable how he should be the universal or supreme Pastour or Bishop of the whole world. For the Christians of that age being either Jews or Gentiles, the Jews either those that remained in their Country, or that were dispersed in other Regions, there was but one portion of these that can reasonably be placed under St.* Peter's *jurisdiction* (by *Jurisdiction* meaning what the argument required, and what is * expresst in * P. 73. l. 12, 16. the close of that Paragraph, his *singular supremacy* there, or any *peculiar transcendent power* that belonged

to *him*, and not to *others*.) These I think are all my words, in that Treat. of *Sch.* on which his ſuggeſtions are grounded.

3. Now firſt, where do I ſay that St. *Peter's Commiſſion was limited to the Jews onely*? 'Tis viſible I ſay the direct contrary, [*this Commiſſion given to him, as to all the other, indefinitely and unlimitedly.*] Could any two expreſſions be more palpably unreconcileable and contradictory, than his [*limited to the Jews onely*] and my [*given to all unlimitedly*?] There is one eſſay of his ſincerity.

And yet 2. if I had ſaid this, how had this been the *undoing of* St. *Peter* more than any other of the Apoſtles? St. *Peter* is acknowledged the *prime Apoſtle*, by whoſe *wiſedom* after our *Saviour's* aſcent, the *firſt* acts of the *Church* were directed, *Act.* 1. 15. by whoſe *preaching* the *firſt converts* were gathered and ſuperſtructed, and united to thoſe *foundation-ſtones of a Church* that Chriſt had laid, *three thouſand* at his *firſt Sermon*, *Act.* 11. 41. and in this ſpecial ſenſe, he the *foundation*, on which the *Church among the Jews* was ſignally built; And is *he* then *undone*, onely becauſe he is not the *Univerſal Monarch* of the *Church* of the whole world, and yet all the other *Apoſtles* who founded the Church in other Regions, well dealt with by *S. W.* though they hold no part of it but in dependence from St. *Peter*? Theſe are rare meaſures of *meekneſs* and *juſtice*, by which to paſs *judgment* and diſtribute *portions* among thoſe *holy men*.

4. Secondly, Can I be ſaid to *limit the juriſdiction of each Apoſtle to certain Provinces*, any farther than they *limited themſelves*? Might not, did not they thus *limit themſelves*? and go one one way to preach, and another another way: Doth not their own *Baronius*, *an.* 44. n. 20, 21. ſay, *Singulos Apoſtolorum in eas orbis regiones eſſe amandatos, ad quos Spiritus ſanctus privato inſtinctu voluit eos proficiſci*, *That every Apoſtle was diſpatched into that region to which the Spirit by private inſtinct would have them goe*? and might not I ſay, they did ſo?

5. Thirdly, When he ſaith, I call them *excluſive Provinces*, *and fetch the pedigree of them from the lots of Apoſtleſhip and Judas's place in hell*; I anſwer 1. that from κληρὸς ἀποστολῆς *Lots of Apoſtleſhip*, Act. 1. I infer nothing but what was clear without it, *viz.* *That the Apoſtles diſtributed their univerſal great Province into ſeveral leſſer, one to go one way, another another, to preach Chriſt.* 2. For *Judas's place in hell*, my opinion is, that there is no intimation of it there, and then how can I fetch any thing from it?

6. Thirdly, The words which ſound moſt to *excluſive provinces*, are the firſt of *Sect.* 5. *It is evident by Scripture, that this Apoſtle was Apoſtle of the Circumciſion or Jews excluſively to the uncircumciſion, which were generally anothers province.* In theſe words I referred viſibly to thoſe of Saint *Paul*, Gal. 2. 7. where *Paul* is ſaid to be πεπιστευμένος *intruſted with the Goſpel of the uncircumciſion, as* Peter *was intruſted with the Goſpel of the Circumciſion* (and ſo not to *thoſe* of *Luke*, which he ſuggeſts, *Act.* 1.) Theſe it ſeems, were in like manner *intruſted*, the one with the preaching to the *Jews*, and the other to the *Gentiles*, and muſt be judged of the one by the other. Now of one it is oft ſaid elſewhere, that he was an *Apoſtle of the Gentiles*, See *Rom.* 11. 13. *Foraſmuch as I am an Apoſtle of the Gentiles, I magnifie my* διακονία, *miniſtration* (that belonged to him; which by the way, I ſee not how it differs from κληρὸς διακονίας, *Lot of miniſtration*, Act. 1.) and *Rom.* 15. 18. *The grace given to me to be* λειτουργὸς, *a Miniſter of Jeſus Chriſt to the Gentiles*, and διδάσκαλος 1 *Tim.* 2. 7. *a Teacher of the Gentiles*, and 2 *Tim.* 1. 11. *a Preacher and Apoſtle, and Teacher of the Gentiles.* Theſe, I ſuppoſe, expreſs him to be ſo an *Apoſtle* and *Preacher*, and *Doctour* of the *Gentiles*, as he was not of the Jews, and in this reſpect *excluſively to the Jews*, which were *generally another's province.* Not that his *Apoſtolical commiſſion* in its latitude extended not, or that he might not, or did not ever *preach to the Jews* (which is *his* notion of *excluſive Provinces*;) for I know he oft did, and begun with them, as Chriſt had commanded, before he turned to the *Gentiles*; but that his office principally and peculiarly lay this way, *Act.* 9. 15. to preach to the *Gentiles* (and having *converted* them he became their *Father*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 15. and as ſuch, he *exerciſes juriſdiction* over them, *v.* 19.) and not in like manner to the Jews.

7. And then by proportion the ſame I concluded of Saint *Peter* for the *Jews*, that he was an *Apoſtle of the Circumciſion*, or *Jews*, and ſo of them, as he was *not* of the *Gentiles*, and ſo, in this reſpect, *excluſively* to them, *i. e.* ſo as to allow them to be anothers *Province*, or *peculiar aſſignation*; that as * Chriſt is called a *Miniſter of the Circumciſion*, Rom. 15. 8. not that he never preached to any *Gentile*, but becauſe, as he ſaith of himſelf, he was *not ſent ſave to the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael*, and accordingly went not out of thoſe Regions of *Judæa*, *Galilee* and *Samaria*, in his preaching; So *Peter* might fitly be called the *Apoſtle* and *Miniſter of the Jews*, and ſo they his *peculiar province* (as my words diſtinctly are, of *Schiſ.* p. 71. l. 6.) Of which, that is no ſmall *intimation*, which is *S. W's* onely argument againſt it, his receiving a *Viſion* from heaven, to give him confidence to preach to *Cornelius* a *Gentile*, though alſo a *proſelyte* of the *Jews*.

* Ὁ Κύριος, Ἀποστολὴν τῶν περιτομῆς, ἀπεστάλη πρὸς ἐθνῶν. Clemens *in* Euſeb. *Eccl. hiſt. l.* 6. *cap.* 18.

8. As then, every one of the *Apoſtles* retaining their *Univerſal authority* committed to them by Chriſt, had a *portion* aſſigned him, whither he ſhould *goe* and *preath* (and preaching convert, and having converted govern) and preaching there, did certainly not preach in other places, and then he was the *Apoſtle* of that Region, and not of others, and of that *excluſively to others*, to which his *line*, in Saint *Paul's* ſenſe of that phraſe, reached not; ſo ſure it might be, and was to St. *Peter*; And of this onely it was pertinent for me to ſpeak, becauſe in this onely the force of my argument conſiſted, *viz.* that as in reſpect of the *Apoſtolical unlimited Office*, nothing accrued to him, which was not common alſo to every other *Apoſtle*, and ſo his *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* was not foundable in that; ſo that which belonged to him in *ſeveral*, was far from the whole world, the *Gentiles* were peculiarly another's *Province*, who was called the *Apoſtle of the Gentiles*; where if, by any ſuppoſition, any part of thoſe other portions ſhould be brought in to Saint *Peter*, as *Cornelius*, and ſome other *Gentiles* preacht to, and converted by him, yet ſtill if the whole remaining grand body of the heathen world (to name no more) did not thus pertain to his *province*, the argument abides of the ſame force againſt the *Univerſality of his Juriſdiction*, meaning ſtill ſomewhat elſe than what belonged to him as to an *Apoſtle*, for that could not come under the preſent conſideration, or be uſefull to the *Romaniſts* pretenſions, lying in common to every other *Apoſtle* as well as him.

9. But

9. But becauſe he ſaith, that this *limitation of the Apoſtles Univerſal Juriſdiction* (my words are) [*their* * *diſtributing their Univerſal great Province into ſeveral leſſer Provinces*] is *ſo rare a novelty, that blind antiquity never dreamt of it:* Let us conſider a little whether it be not more ſtrange, that this ſhould ſeem to any man ſuch an unheard-of Novelty, as he (having put it into his frame) ſuppoſes it to have been. Do not all *Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtories* give us narrations of this? See † *Nicephorus* l. 2. c. 35. where firſt of *Peter* he ſaith, Τὴν γλῶ διελθὼν, καὶ τοῖς ἐπὶ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἅπασιν, οἵτε Παλαιστίνη, καὶ Συρίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ σχεδὸν γῇ τὸ κήρυγμα διασπείρας, καὶ ταῖς ἀρχαῖς Νέρωνος τῇ Ρωμαίων ἐπιδημήσας δὲ ἡ μυσαρὸν Σίμωνα, *That he paſſed through the earth, and ſcattered the Preaching* (*ſowed the ſeed of the word*) *to all that were of the Circumciſion both in Paleſtine and Syria, and the reſt almoſt of the earth, and in the beginning of Nero travelled to the Romans becauſe of that abominable Simon Magus* (he may by the way mark here, if he pleaſe, that as large as his *Preaching-province* was, yet ὁι ἐκ περιτομῆς ἅπαντες, *all they of the Circumciſion* are the men peculiarly he preach'd to.)

* *Beati Apoſtoli ab invicem diviſi ſuas provincias ad fidem induxerunt.* Anon. *de ætat. Eccl.* c. 11. *Tunc quilibet dicere poterat, Ecce pueri mei, quos dedit mihi Dominus. Ib.*

† To. 1. p. 190. D.

10. So of the other *Apoſtles*, *Andrew*, ſaith he * Κλῆρὸν μὲν ἔσχε τὸν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἐξέλεξο, *he had by lot his Province aſſigned him to preach to the Gentiles*; and again, *Cappadocia, Galatia, Bithynia,* ὥστε διελάγχανον, *fell by lot to him*, i. e. were his κλῆρος, *and he went alſo to the region of the Anthropophagi, and the deſart of Scythia, and both parts of the Euxine Sea*, &c. So, ſaith he, *to Philip and Bartholomew,* Συρία καὶ Ασία ἡ ἄνω κατὰ κλῆρον, *Syria and the upper Aſia fell by lot*, or were their κλῆρος or *Province*. So *Thomas* † ἡ ἐν Ἰνδοῖς καὶ Αἰθίοψι κλῆρον λαχών, *had his lot or province among the Indians and Æthiopians. James the ſon of Alphæus* * *was for Gaza and Eleutheropolis, and the neighbouring Cities, and ſo of the reſt*, particularly † *Matthias* ὁ τὸ ἐλλεῖμμα τοῦ δωδεκάδος ἐναριθμηθεὶς, *who filled up the void place in the twelve,* ἔτος τῇ πρώτῃ Αἰθιοπίᾳ περιβαλὼν, *he betook himſelf to Æthiopia prima*, all one with *going to it*, Act. 1 as to his ὁ ἴδιος ὁ τόπος, *his own* or *proper place* or aſſignation.

* *Ib.* c. 39. 199. D.

† *Ib.* c. 4.

* *Ib.* p. 202.

† P. 203.

11. So before him * *Euſebius* of the *Apoſtles* and *Diſciples diſperſed through the world*, Θωμᾶς μὲν Παρθίαν εἴληχεν, *Thomas's lot was Parthia, Andrew's Scythia, John's Aſia,* πλὴν ἔτι, but *Peter ſeems to have preached in Pontus, and Galatia, and Bithynia, and Cappadocia, and Aſia,* τοῖς ἐν διασπορᾷ Ἰουδαίοις, *to the Jews of the diſperſion.* Here then 'tis moſt viſible what appeared ſo ſtrange, that the *Apoſtles* had each of them their *leſſer Provinces* for the exerciſe of their office, and *Peter* among the reſt. 2. That his was peculiarly the *Jews of the diſperſion.* 3. That the word κλῆρος *lot* is very proper to ſuch an *aſſignation* (as the *Jews ſeveral portions* aſſigned them by *Joſuah* in *Canaan* are their κλῆροι *lots*.) And thus I am ſure 'tis moſt frequently uſed in good Authours, See *Proclus* Biſhop of *Conſtantinople*, † ὁ θεῖος Ἰάκωβος ὁ τὴν Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν ἐκκλησίας τὸν κλῆρον λαχών, *James obtained the lot of the Church of Jeruſalem, i. e.* as there follows, *was the firſt Biſhop of that City.*

* *Eccl. Hiſt.* l. 3. c. 1.

† Περὶ Παραδ. τ. Θεὸ. Λογ. p. 156.

12. Which being thus added to what hath been formerly ſaid on this matter in the *Reply to the Cath. Gent.* and *Anſwer to Schiſ. Diſ.* all his little colours will preſently vaniſh before this light. For 1. when he proceeds after his wont, to charge me, that I am *aſhamed to father my own words, but deny that I meant them* (i. e. κλῆρος and ἴδιος τόπος, *Act.* 1.) *for evidences, or ever thought on them as ſuch*, and then cites my words, wherein I *profeſs to offer my evidences*, and *immediately proceed: And firſt, It is evident by Scripture, and no evidences from Scripture pretended in the ſame Paragraph, but theſe two miſerable miſtakes of it:*] All this is but a miſtake on his ſide, the one thing which I there ſay, *is evident from Scripture*, being immediately ſet down from thence, *viz.* That *Peter* was the *Apoſtle of the Circumciſion*, as hath now, and formerly been cleared from *Gal.* 2. 7.

13. Next, when from * *Anſw. to Schiſm. Diſar.* he cites me, telling him, that it *needed no evidencing*, and thereupon asks, *Why I went about to evidence it?* Schiſ. p. 70. l. 4.] I anſwer, he might ſee, if he would, that theſe were two things, that which I went about to evidence, was the Negative of the Queſtion of *Peter's Univerſal Paſtourſhip:* That which I ſaid, needed no evidencing, the *Apoſtles* going out not all to one, but diſpoſing themſelves to *ſeveral Provinces*; and what influence this had on my Argument, I have newly ſhewed.

* P. 38.

14. Thirdly, I am accuſed of *terrible rigorouſneſs*, and another Tragedy raiſed on that Head againſt my *love of Novelty*, reaching to my *Folio Annotations on the Bible*. And for what think you all this ſharpneſs? Why, that I advertiſed the Reader, that what he *had borrowed from the ſhort notes of the Cath. Gent. was anſwered in my Reply to him:* That this is the whole truth, I appeal to the *Reader's* own eyes, *Anſw.* p. 38. l. 15. Whether in that Reply I left any thing material unprevented, which dilating on the *Cath. Gent.* his grounds, he hath added in *Sch. Diſ.* I leave to the Reader's judgment: and ſo, whether there be any thing ſeaſonably added in his fourth charge.

15. For his harangue about *interpreting Scripture* (which is his fifth) my preſent intereſts ſuggeſt no other Reply, than that I think with him, that the *circumſtances* of each context are to be conſidered, as well as the *Grammatical importance* of the Word, or the uſe of it in other places; and onely contend at this time, that the Union of the two latter with the firſt, is the moſt convincing proof of the reaſonableneſs of my preſent interpretation. At another time it may not be amiſs to remember, that the circumſtances of the Context direct not always to any, or lie indifferent to ſeveral interpretations, and then the *Grammatical* importance of the word or phraſe, or the uſe of it in other places, muſt be the onely guides of the interpretation (reſerving always the due reſpect of all other places of *Holy Writ*, *analogy of Faith*, or *Tradition* truly *Apoſtolical*, and the judgment of the *ancient Church*, where theſe interpoſe) and in that caſe, to depart from theſe, muſt bring in all confuſion, diſturb all the *Records* and *Evidences* both of God and man; And therefore I muſt not conſent to this addition of his, that the *beſt Authours* (eſpecially when the diſcourſe was of the ſacred Penmen onely) *may miſtake or be careleſs in the right uſe of a word*] It had been more tolerable, if he had reſolved, that we judge not by their *meaſures*, are not acquainted with their *dialect*. But this is no place for theſe diſquiſitions of ſacred *Criticiſm*, which I think not to be any of *S.W*'s faculties; for the main, I demand no more than he grants, to juſtify my Expoſition of κλῆρος and ἴδιος τόπος, and whatever elſe I have ſaid in thoſe Interpretations.

16. For his ſuggeſtions to the contrary, let us briefly view them. Firſt, ſaith he, *Of their antecedent intent we have no other notice, than that they meant to make up the number of the Apoſtles by ſubſtituting one in the place of Judas, not to go to a leſſer Province, but to witneſs with them the reſurrection, which though all grant it was performed by going ſeveral ways, yet there is no ſuch thing there expreſt.*] But 1. If the *Apoſtleſhip* was to be exerciſed by *preaching to all Nations*, and that could not be done but by going *ſeveral ways*, then

then what need any more expreſſion, than that they met to chuſe one to a *void place* in the *Apoſtleſhip* to *teſtify the Reſurrection?* 2. Is not all that I pretend, competently expreſt *v.* 8. where *Chriſt* tells them, that *after the Holy Ghoſt is come upon them, they ſhall be witneſſes to him both in Jeruſalem and Judæa, and Samaria, and to the uttermoſt parts of the earth?* Here is mention of their *going ſeveral ways*, for ſure they were not every one to go to *all* theſe; and accordingly *v.* 17. conſideration is had, that *Judas the Traitour* had obtained κληρὸν τ῀ διακονίας τ῀υτης, *a lot of this miniſtery*, which is *v.* 20. his ἐπισκοπὴ *Biſhoprick*, and this ſo perfectly a *ſeveral*, that another is to be choſen to it, ἑλλειμμα ἀναπληρῶσθαι, as was ſaid, *to fill up a vacuity*, now he hath *left* it; and what can be more preparative to the chuſing *Matthias* to the κληρὸν διακονίας κ᾽ ἀποστολῆς τ῀υτης, in this notion of a *particular* and ſo *leſſer Province*, whither he ſhould betake himſelf to *preach* the *Goſpel?* 3. The *neceſſity* that *Peter* mentions, *v.* 22. that one *muſt be ordained to be a witneſs of the Reſurrection*, is a moſt proper preparative to it; For to what was it *neceſſary*, but to this of taking his *Province*, going his *ſeveral* way, to *preach?* Sure, not to make up the *number of twelve men*, πρὸς βεβαίωσιν, by ſuch a full Jury of *teſtifiers*, as an ἰσοπληθεία, to *confirm* and *ſettle* the *truth*; for 1. eleven might be competent for that. 2. There were many hundred ſuch *witneſſes*, that had *ſeen* him ſince the *Reſurrection*; and 3. There was no need of any *election* or ordination to qualify them to be fit *teſtifiers*; for 4. It was onely the *power from on high*, which brought with it the *gift of tongues* and *miracles*, that was ordained to fit them for that, and that was promiſed *every* one of them, and by that *every one* commenced a *convincing teſtifier*, though there had been never another in the world, συμμαρτυρεῖν, *to teſtify with him.* And then to what elſe was the choice of a *twelfth neceſſary*, but to this of undertaking the *Province* that belonged to this *twelfth?* and ſo this may well ſignifie their *antecedent intent*, contrary to *S.W*'s ſuggeſtion.

17. He adds again by way of Objection to this, that the phraſe, *v.* 17. [*he was numbred with us*] *ſignifies they had reflexions on the imperfectneſs of their number.*] But I ask, To what uſes could their number of eleven, more than of twelve, be deemed *imperfect*, ſave onely in order to the *quarter*, whither he was to be ſent out to preach? and ſo ſtill that is the *leſſer Province.* But, ſaith he, *Judas had not obtained a leſſer Province in his life.*] I anſwer, 1. *Judas* had queſtionleſs his part in the *Apoſtleſhip*; and at a fit time, all ſuch were to go and *preach* over the *world*, as *ſons* are to inherit after their *Fathers death*, and ſo *Judas* ſhould have done, if he had continued faithfull, and ſo now another muſt in his ſtead, and to him that enters on it, and performs it, it is a *leſſer Province*, though to him it were not, that continued not to be capable of it; and though no *man falls but from what he hath*, in ſome ſenſe, yet we know he may *fall* from what he is not yet *poſſeſt* of; a diſcharded ſon *falls* from his *inheritance* which he never *actually* had, and in like manner another may ſucceed to his κληρος, and actually come to it, though he never did; and ſo did *Matthias* here, as he very well knows, for all his *Sophiſtry.*

18. Next he argues from the *tranſaction it ſelf*, and in that, he ſaith, *There is nothing looks this way*; I anſwer, The *tranſaction it ſelf*, is the chuſing and praying God to direct their choice of a fit perſon to a κληρὸς τ῀ διακονίας τ῀υτης, *a lot of this*, i. e. a *particular Miniſtery*, a *void* place or Province (as we ſay) that wanted one to fill it, and that is all I deſire from it. And to ſay, we ought in all reaſon to *omit the phraſes in controverſie*, is to appeal to a *witneſs*, and not to let him ſpeak, or not to ſtand to the words which are ſaid and plain, when yet 'tis acknowledged there are no other.

19. From the *effect ſubſequent* he argues alſo, which is, ſaith he, *That Matthias was numbred with the eleven Apoſtles, anſwerable* to *v.* 17. *Judas was numbred with us:* I anſwer, that his being *numbred with them*, *v.* 17. is interpreted by what there follows, *he obtained a* κληρὸς *lot*, or *part of this miniſtery*, and that is all that I pretend, and directly anſwerable to that is the effect, *the lot fell, and he was numbred*, the *falling* of the *lot* on him, is the *ſettling of* Judas's void place on him, and that moſt directly introduces his *going* to it, as to his ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος, his *peculiar apartment.*

20. And now I have run through all his pretenſions, and ſhall willingly leave the Reader to judge, what one *circumſtance* reſiſts, nay whether all do not fully conſpire to *confirm* my interpretation, eſpecially when to the *circumſtances* of the intire *Context*, the *nature* and *uſe* of the words in other places do ſo exactly accord, that he hath not adventured to offer one leaſt exception againſt all that was ſaid on that Theme in the Reply, to which yet more inſtances have here been added, eſpecially that of *Proclus*, where *James* his being *Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, which ſure was a *leſſer Province*, is thus expreſt by τ῀ Ἱεροσολυμιτῶν ἐκκλησίας τ῀ κλῆρον λαχὼν, *obtaining the lot of the Church of thoſe of Jeruſalem*, and ſo alſo moſt of the *Apoſtles* going out to their *partitions* in *Euſebius* and *Nicephorus.*

21. But for the nature of the phraſe here, he asks 1. where I have read διακονία for a *place of Miniſtery*] I anſwer, he is very much out in his *Criticiſm*, for what need I make διακονία *a place*, as long as I ſuppoſe κληρὸς and τόπος to be a *place*, where his διακονία or *Miniſtery* is exerciſed? 2. He asks, *What means* τ῀τῆς] I anſwer, it means [*this*] which they were then ſpeaking of, which *Judas* had forfeited and left void by his *Apoſtaſie.* 3. He asks whether κληρὸς, *&c. do not ſignify* ἐπισκοπὴ, and *whether that be not an office?*] I anſwer, that an *office* is founded in, and hath a relation to a *Province*, and both thoſe together are there meant, and *Matthias* took both together. Now having briefly replied to all his *demands*, I ſhall add nothing to his *Contumelies*, but that I take this interpretation of mine to be, for the main, as to κληρὸς, ſo far from *new*, that I am not yet aware of a ſecond to *S.W.* that hath receded from my ſenſe of it, and for ἴδιος τόπος, we muſt leave that to the *next Section.*

SECT.

SECT. III.

The notion of ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος, *accused of singularity,* D. Th. Jackson, Τόπος *for Province, S. W's misrepresentations,* Judas's *being in hell, a secret not revealed by* St. Peter. Chrysostome's *Testimonies of* Judas's τόπος. Παρεν θεσις δικη, *Parentheses, Comma's, Charges of falsifying Scripture, what they signifie with* S. W. *Articles prepositive, emphatical: Another charge of falsifying Scripture. Of bragging,* Προσδηναι εις τοπον.— S. W's *acknowledgment of Scripture being the ground of faith.*

1. HIs *third Section* is spent on τὸ τόπον τὸ ἴδιον, *his own or proper place,*] *Act.* 1. 25. which he must needs have to signifie *Judas's own place in hell,* but I, it seems, was so bold to imagine that it signified, *Matthias's proper place* or *assignation for the witnessing the Resurrection, and proclaiming the Faith or doctrine of Christ to the world:* Thus he sets down the state and terms of the controversie between us, and I consent to his setting it, and leave it to be indifferently judged, what *Trophees* shall be found here due to him, seeing he is at leisure to return to this Contention again, when he knows, that if he were yielded the *Conquerour,* he gains but the ἆθλον of the *Olympick* games, a Crown of *leaves* onely, not the least *solid* advantage to his *Universal Pastourship,* no kind of interest of mine, having any dependance on my *interpretation* of *this phrase.*

2. And first, saith he, *Others, and among them the Cathol. Gent. and S. W. nay even all the Protestants, as far as he can hear, except D. H. make account it signifies* Judas *his own place in hell, and that 'tis absolutely impossible it should signifie in that place a lesser province, as D. H. would have it.*] Here are two things assumed, the *singularity,* and the *absolute impossibility* of my interpretation.

3. I shall say somewhat of the former. 1. That I confess I have oft heard that Mr *White* hath expresst great indignation at D. *H.* for his interpretation of *this* place, and that *S. W.* is a profest admirer of him, and of the *Cath. Gent.* and therefore the authorities of these three will amount to little more than of any one of them, and so are of no great weight in this matter; and for his *others* if they are more than these, he is so reserved as not to name them, and I shall imitate him so far as not to consider them.

4. Secondly, For *Protestants,* 'twere strange if they should be of authority with him, or if he should so much as hear what they think of this, or other the like places; When he promises to be moved by their suffrages, I may help him to some more; In the mean time I shall commend to him one as *modest* and *learned* and universally esteemed as any of his time, * D. *Th. Jackson,* and he voucheth it also from another (whether *Protestant* or *Papist* I cannot be assured, seeing he no otherwise names him, than that he is a *learned Critick of our times in matters sacred*) who points (with a *comma* after Ἰούδας,) and *interprets this verse to this sense, that he that took part of the ministration and Apostleship, from which* Judas *had fallen, might be sent that circuit, which* Judas *had he not fallen, should have gone.* * Tr. of the *Holy Cath. Church.* p. 58.

5. From this *Learned* man 'tis near forty years since I received this interpretation in his *publick* readings in that *University,* wherein I had my education, and from that day I never heard the least objection or exception against it, which made the *alarm* of the *Cath. Gent.* and advertisements of Mr. *White's* vehement dislikes, the greater surprisal to me.

6. If this will not a while allay his indignation, and satyre at my *singular* (as he supposed) *interpretation,* I shall refer him to those greater names that were produced in the *Answ. to Sch. Dis.* p. 39. and proceed to his *second* more eager impression, that 'tis *absolutely impossible it should in that place signifie a lesser province.*] But sure it implies not any *contradiction* (and I know nothing else *absolutely impossible*) to say that ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος signifies a *lesser province,* or that it signifies so *in that place,* when both a *province* is a *place,* and the word τόπος *place* is not rarely used in that sense of a *province,* witness the Title of τοπαρχίαι *Toparchies, for governments of Provinces,* in *Josephus* frequently, and in many other good Authours; Witness † *Ignatius's* ἐν τόπῳ χωρίς Ῥωμαίων, *in the place,* i. e. *Province of the Region of the Romans;* and the *Epistle* under the name of * *Anacletus, In capite provinciarum, ipsis quoque in civitatibus vel locis nostris Patriarchas vel Primates: In the head of the Provinces, and in our Cities or places, Patriarchs or Primates were constituted;* and when ὁ ἴδιος being the *confining* a *common* to an incloſure, a *general* to a *peculiar* and *particular,* must needs import a *lesser* of that kind which is spoken of: If then a plain proper direct *paraphrase* be an unreconcileable *contradiction,* S. W. hath affirmed with some reason at this time the *absolute impossibility;* but if not, we may be allowed ἐπέχειν to *demur* of the demonstrativeness of his dictates. For 2. As to this place, that no *circumstance* hinders, whether from the *antecedent intent, transaction it self,* or *consequent effect,* but that it may signifie as I would have it, hath (I hope) been competently shewed in the *last Section.* If it have not, yet I am sure nothing was suggested against it by *S. W.* which can prove it to imply any *contradiction,* such as may found his *absolute impossibility,* which is now before us, and so there is the breviate of his great feats and successes in this matter. † *In Tit. Ep. ad Rom.* * *Ep. 2. ad Epi. Ital.*

7. After this, he descends to a view of my *Reply,* p. 53. and makes this strange repetition to it [*His first argument,* saith he, *that it cannot signifie a place in hell, is drawn from the charitable opinion we ought to have of* Judas, *accusing the Cath. Gent. of uncharitableness for interpreting it so.*] And then there is an advantage gotten toward the exercise of his gifts upon the Doctour. But in this short suggestion there are two discernable misrepresentations (and then it matters not what he seems to infer from them) The first, That my *first argument pretends that it cannot signifie a place in hell,* which 'tis evident it doth not, but on the contrary yields, That the * *Cath. Gent. might have enjoyed his own judgment, without censuring them as blasphemers, that differed from him in expounding a difficult phrase.* All that I there pretend is, that there is *no inconvenience in mine;* and when I produce that argument, it is onely in this style, that there is *no indication in the context, that favours the other interpretation.* Let that serve for his first affirmation. * *Repl.* p. 52, 53.

8. The ſecond is as cauſeleſs a miſrepreſentation alſo. For I no where once mention the *charitable opinion that ought to be had of* Judas, *nor accuſe the Cath. Gent. of uncharitableneſs:* I onely ſay of St. *Peter* (and that is not the *Cath. Gent.*) *that it was ſufficient to ſay that which had been ſaid, verſ.* 16, 17. 18, 19, *&c. but he needed not to proceed to revealing of ſecrets, the ſadder conſequents which remained in arrear after death*; and to that St. *Chryſoſtome* directed me, ἰδὲ τὸ φιλόσοφον τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, *behold the Chriſtian carriage of the man, how he doth not reproach and inſult on him, but ſets down the fact ſimply, and his preſent vengeance*; From no other words but theſe, *S. W.* that inveighs oft and bitterly againſt *falſifying*, will needs conclude that my *argument* is *drawn from the charitable opinion, &c.* and that I *charge the Cath. Gent's uncharitableneſs*: what truth or fairneſs there is in both theſe, let him now judge: The utmoſt of my ſpeech is, that *Judas*'s being in hell, is a *ſecret*, and when he hath conſidered, that every man's final and eternal condition is reſerved onely to *God's Tribunal*, I hope he will give me liberty to leave thoſe dreadfull judgments on perſons, among the *abſcondita Deo noſtro*, and ſo to call them *ſecrets*; The *ſon of perdition*, I well know what it ſignifies, one that well deſerves to be deſtroyed, but that reſiſts not what I ſay, that his *actual* being in *hell* was a *ſecret*, that St. *Peter* needed not to *reveal*.

9. His next project is fetcht from the ſame mint: His ſecond *argument*, ſaith he, *is drawn from* St. *Chryſoſtome's words* (thoſe juſt now recited.) But when this was a branch of my *firſt* argument, how comes it to be called the *ſecond*? The deſign is viſible, to *divide* one into two, that each part taken alone may be the weaker. But what doth he object or reply to this teſtimony of St. *Chryſoſtome*, that St. *Peter in this place ſets down the fact ſimply and his preſent vengeance*? Hath not this *force* in it? Doth he that tells of *tranſgreſſing to go to hell*, ſet down the *fact ſimply*, and his *preſent vengeance*? All that he hath to ſay is, that I annex my *Corollary*, that *ſure the preſent vengeance is it which befell him in this world*, and then he *ſcoffs* at the weightineſs of the argument, *as if any ſpace intervened betwixt wicked mens death and their being in hell*, and to this applies *Pſal.* 55. 16. *Let them go quick into hell, which*, ſaith he, *expreſſes a vengeance preſent enough, and earlier than their vengeance in this world, to wiſh them in hell before they are dead.*] But to all this I anſwer by asking, 1. Whether *Chryſoſtome* did not mean by παρὸν δικὴν *preſent puniſhment*, that which befell him *in this world*? If ſo, then 2. Why might not I ſay, *Sure he did?* What needed I farther accumulation of Arguments to prove that which is already evident? And 3. How could this miſs of being an *argument* of *weight*, that in that *Father's* judgment thus it was; and therefore was no *ſingular* conceit of mine? To this I ſhall now farther add, that it may by that *Father's* uſe of that phraſe [*Judas's place*] be competently diſcerned, whether he favour *S. W*'s interpretation for his *place in hell*. I refer him to two paſſages, firſt on *Act.* 1. 16. where he mentions praying to Chriſt, *that he would give*, εἰς τὸν τόπον Ἰούδα τινὰ, *ſome body into the place of Judas*, ſure not to go to *hell* after him, or in his ſtead, but to fill up his place in the College of Apoſtles; The ſecond on *v.* 26. προσῆκεν ἕτερον προβάλλεσθαι, ὥστε μάρτυρα γενέσθαι εἰς τὸν ἐκεῖνου τόπον. *It is fit another ſhould be advanced, that he might be a witneſs in his*, i. e. *Judas's place*. Was this his *place* in *hell*, or in the *Church of Chriſt*? 4. The onely queſtion being, whether his *going to hell* were mentioned, what matters it to conſider how *little ſpace intervenes between the death of wicked men and their being in hell*? The pious man's *paradiſe* may as immediately attend his *death*, yet when our *Saviour* ſpeaks of their *preſent* reward (the *hundred-fold more in this life*) it is evident he ſpeaks not of the *glory after death*, but leaves to that the ſtyle of [*in the world to come everlaſting life*] and ſo ſure muſt St. *Chryſoſtome* alſo, when he ſpeaks of *preſent vengeance*, oppoſe it to that *future* in *another* world. 5. The *Pſalmiſt's* expreſſion of *going quick into hell*, I always underſtood in relation to the fate of ſuch as *Corah*, being *ſwallowed up alive* with the opening of the *earth*, the word *Scheol* there (as frequently) ſignifying the *earth* or *grave*. But whatever it is, it cannot, with *this* circumſtance, be appliable to *Judas* who ſure took *death* in his way to his *future* ſtate, and ſo ſtill his *hell* was his *future* and not his *preſent vengeance*, and could not by St. *Chryſoſtome* be meant by *that* ſtyle.

10. In the next place he would fain refute my ſuppoſal of a *parentheſis*, to include thoſe words [*from which Judas by tranſgreſſion fell*] and 1. calls this *pounding up*, &c. and confutes that by ſaying it is *too hard dealing*: I anſwer, the ſame objection holds equally againſt all *parentheſes* in Scripture, and all other authours, *i. e.* well nigh againſt every leaf in every book in the world. 2. He would know my *meaning* when I ſay, *it needs no more formal expreſſion than by putting a comma after* Ἰούδας, and then adds the *diſtinction between a Parentheſis, and that which is within comma's*, that what is *within comma's cannot oftentimes be omitted without maiming the ſenſe.*] But I anſwer, that what *always* is not, *ſometimes* is, and what but *oftentimes maims*, may as *often* not *maime*, and then the *Parentheſis*, and that *within comma's*, is all one, and ſo, I ſuppoſe, it is here, and ſo we are agreed in that matter. But, ſaith he, *how muſt a comma put after* Ἰούδας, *needs make his interpretation ſo clear and unavoidable, ſince many put the comma there, and never dream of that.*] I anſwer, that I cannot give account of all mens *dreams*, or *not dreaming*, but yet think it likely, that they that put the *comma* as I put it, and yet interpret otherwiſe than I interpret, doe it upon the liberty (which even now he obſerved) that what is *within the comma's*, ſometimes it is read in ſome kind of *conjunction* with the neighbouring words; But then ſeeing *oftimes* this is otherwiſe (as his *reſtrictive* term [*oftentimes*] acknowledged) I that meant it ſo here, and expreſt that to be my meaning, by making the *comma* after *Judas*, equivalent to a *parentheſis*, needed not require any more but that, to render my *interpretation unavoidable.*

11. But after all this, there is a terrible flaw found in D. *H.* when he comes to *reducing his doctrine of comma's to practice, for there*, ſaith he, *his words are* [*to receive the lot of his Miniſtery and Apoſtleſhip (from which* Judas *by tranſgreſſion fell) to go or that he may go to his proper place*] *where*, ſaith he, *to omit that he takes now the liberty of a formally expreſt parentheſis, though while he was begging it of us he ſeemed willing to be contented with a comma onely, to omit this, he will ask why I change the word this miniſtery into his? If I be loth to anſwer*, S. W. *will doe it for me*, and accordingly he will render no leſs than *four* reaſons for it, each of weighty importance, and then there is a *falſification* of *Scripture* for his *Index* (by good luck the *firſt* he had obſerved) and there we have it noted to this, p. 194.

and

and then my *candour and my Saintſhip, and my profeſſing*, Anſwer. p. 18. *to ſpeak the whole truth of God*, are ſeverely to be arraigned, and the poor Doctour for ever paradigmatized for a *falſifier even of Scripture*. But the hope is, the *Reader* will not have loſt his *eyes* and *patience* quite in all this duſt and clamour, but make uſe of the firſt to reade in my * words, what it was that I had *begged*, viz. *the omiſſion of a parentheſis* in that paſſage; adding that *that might be well done without more formal expreſſion of it, than putting a comma after* Ἰούδας, *as 'tis already in the printed copies.*] If then this which I demanded (and gave this reaſon for, that the *Printed Copies already had it*, and ſo it was already *granted* me by *them*) were thus, as I propoſed, admitted, it muſt follow that the *parentheſis* were *admitted*, and then what could hinder this *practice* of my *Doctrine*, the putting thoſe words in a *parentheſis*? This may briefly ſerve for that which he would ſeem willing to *omit*. * *Repl.* p. 53. l. 26.

12. As for that which he muſt not *omit* to mention, and that with pomp enough, and ſo I am obliged to account for it to the Reader, I ſhall hope it will be no vaſt exerciſe of his *patience*, when I aſſure him that it was the *Printer*, not I, that for [*this*] ſet [*his*] (if indeed he ſo *ſet* it, for to me it ſeems probable by the diſtance of [*his*] from [*of*] that the [*t*] was ſunk ſo low as to miſs making impreſſion) and that it was not reformed in the *Errata*, the account is as obvious, either that the difference was ſo light, that it paſt the obſervation of the *Collectour* of them, or that bare *literal* errours were conceived ſuch, that every Reader's pen would eaſily amend, and none but *S. W.* interpret to be *falſifications of Scripture*.

13. This being the place that hath the honour of precedence in his *Index* under that title of *Falſifications*, and thoſe *of Scripture*, I muſt beſeech the Reader to take notice what things they are that fall with him under this brand, the *Printers* omitting but *one letter*; and yet this, and ſuch like, are the means * which *wit* and *art can invent*, and ſo his *zeal* is obliged to make uſe of, to defame his brethren: His *Index* directs me to another in the very *next* page 195. and ſo again 196, 197. The former of theſe muſt here be conſidered, though what it is, truly I cannot tell, onely the competition ſeems to be betwixt *two*, one of which muſt be a *falſification of Scripture*, the other a *falſe pretence from Scripture*, for theſe are two ſtyles, and p. 195, noted to them both, the firſt is, *that I*, ſaith he, *change the words of our own tranſlation* [*that he might go*] *into* [*that he may go*] the *ſecond*, *that I ſay that a comma after* Ἰούδας, *is already in the printed Copies.*] To which of theſe the *falſification of Scripture belongs*, I ſhall not divine, the other charge is equivalent, and I am ſure they are equally guilty of either, but that of the *comma* ſeems to be repreſented by him as moſt liable, becauſe he ſaith [*it is neither in the printed Copies of Stephanus nor Arias Montanus*] and [the *Printed Copies import it is ſo in all*] But I anſwer, that my *Logick* hath taught me that an *indefinite* propoſition is *in materia contingenti* equivalent to a *particular*, not to an *univerſal*, and he yields that *ſome printed Copies* have the *comma*, and of the many, vouches but two to the contrary, and ſo I might truly ſay, *the printed Copies*, and having them for my defence, I hope I have not added ſo much as a *comma* to the *Scripture*, and then if their own *Popes* and *Cardinal Cajetan* have not fallen under the fault of *falſifying Scripture*, by various readings, or correcting of *tranſlations*, I am ſecure from the brand of his 195 page. Meanwhile, there is *another* eſſay what the ſtyle *falſification of Scripture*] in his *Index* ſignifies. * *P.* 11.

14. To my *third* (which he calls fourth) *argument*, that *hell, the common place of the wicked, cannot fitly be expreſt by ſuch a double emphaſis* as is ἴδιον τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, he anſwers, firſt by *denying that there is a double emphaſis, the firſt* τὸν, ſaith he, *being nothing but a plain prepoſitive article.*] But I reply, firſt, That *prepoſitive Articles* are oft *emphatical*, as ὁ λόγος and ὁ Χριστὸς, *the word* and *the Chriſt*, and then why ſhould not τὸν τόπον by analogy be *the place*, and that is *emphatical* though *prepoſitive*. But then 2. If the *double emphaſis* will not be concluded from the double ἴδιον, I hope it may from the addition of τὸν ἴδιον] *his own*] applied to τὸν τόπον] carrying *one emphaſis* in its nature, τὸν τόπον ἴδιον *his own place*] being *emphatically* his, and then τὸν ſuperadded to that, is the *double emphaſis*.

15. He hath *two anſwers* more; one, *That Judas had a ſpecial title to hell, another that he hath a proper place of his own there.*] But I think neither of theſe ſufficient to own the *double emphaſis*, or make it fit to affirm, that *Hell*, the *common place of all wicked men*, was by the Apoſtle pronounced to be *Judas's* ὁ τόπος ὁ ἴδιος, *the place, the proper place of him.* However the difference is diſcernable in this particular, between the appliableneſs of theſe words to *Judas*, and to *Matthias*. *Matthias's* τόπος or *province* where he is to preach, is ſo his, as it is no bodies elſe, no other *Apoſtle* is ſent to preach there; But *hell*, if that be allowed *Judas's* τόπος or *place*, is not ſo *his*, as that no body elſe *goes* to it but he. And ſo when *Judas* goes to the *common place* or receptacle of all the *damned*, and onely, hath a *place of his own there* by a *ſpecial Title*, *Matthias* may go with an *emphaſis* to the *particular province* particularly aſſigned to him and to *no body* elſe. That he may, is all that I demand, I do not aſſume to *demonſtrate* every minute, nor need I at this time ſecure this as the *undoubted* ſenſe of the place, if it be not *improbable*, it will ſerve my turn abundantly, againſt him that affirms it *abſolutely impoſſible*, and ſo ſtill I may be competently armed to come into the liſts with *S. W.* how faſtidiouſly ſoever he concludes that Paragraph.

16. My *laſt argument* he hath onely recited, *That it is not near ſo proper to ſay, he ſin'd to go to hell, as that the other was choſen and ſurrogated into* Judas's *place to go to preach to ſuch a quarter of the world.*] The truth of this he confeſſes, and yields more than I demanded, that *'tis ſo far from proper, that* 'tis *abſurd and non-ſenſe*, and then arraigns my *maimed and corrupt rendring*, *he ſinned to go to hell*;] and then the good Reader is again required to obſerve my *profeſt ſincerity* and *earneſt deſire to ſpeak the truth of God, whilſt I purpoſely annihilate God's word, which is his truth, firſt gag it, next cut out its tongue*, and then without more adoe, no leſs than two pages 196. and 197. muſt accompany the two former, and be noted in the *Index* for the diſcovery of *falſifications of Scripture*. But when his feigned rage is over, I ſhall advertiſe him, that by his favour I did not at all aſſume to *render the period* at that time, but onely recited the *double* pretending ſenſe of it, as briefly as I might, to give the Reader (that by the frequent repetition in the foregoing lines, and by my *rendring* before as he would have it, as himſelf confeſſes in *this Paragraph*, knew

the intire period well enough) the full importance of *S. W*'s notion of it: and in ſo doing, I am not yet convinced, that I have in the leaſt offended, whilſt in his diſguiſe I am one of the fouleſt miſcreants in the world: For if *Judas* παρέβη *prevaricated from his Apoſtolacy* (ſo *S.W.* approves the rendring) *to go to hell*, then ſure he *ſinned to go to hell*; to *prevaricate* ſimply is to *ſin*, and ſo to *prevaricate* from an *office* or *duty*: In like manner, *departing* and *going aſide*, which are the reſt of *S. W*'s *Synonyma* for the ſame phraſe) I ſhould rather have ſaid, *apoſtatiſing* (for ſo παραβάτης is an *Apoſtate*, and *Judas* as well as *Julian* may own the Title) ſpecially when it is *departing from ones office* or *duty*, is queſtionleſs *ſinning*, onely *ſinning* is the *ſhorter* word, and therefore I uſed it, but ſhall now, on his admonition, exchange it for his *larger* expreſſion, and appeal to the Reader, as before I did, whether it be near ſo *proper to ſay*, Judas *prevaricated from his Apoſtleſhip to go to hell, as that* Matthias *was choſen to* Judas's *place to go to ſuch a quarter*. However, I hope the latter of theſe, for which I am concerned, is not abſolutely impoſſible (and that is as much as I need ask againſt *S.W.*) and ſo ſtill this is all he hath gained by theſe *loudeſt* clamours.

17. Thus much for his Animadverſions on the *Reply to the Cath. Gent.* in this matter; Now becauſe in my *Anſw. to Schiſ. Diſp.* to allay his diſpleaſure for the *novelty* of my interpretation, I had produced ſome teſtimonies of the *Ancients*, and even ſome of his own ſide, ſome to *approve*, and ſome to *teſtify* that my ſenſe was not *novel*, he muſt exerciſe his diſcipline on this. And his method is, firſt to tell the Reader, *I brag that theſe teſtimonies are juſt the ſame with the Doctours, meaning my ſelf*] and that this is a *Pyrgopolynices humour to brag that mine and thoſe are juſt the ſame.*] Where again I am to ſeek whereon the *bragging* is faſtened; whether on uſing the word *Doctour*, which I confeſs I have ſometimes done, both in the Title Page and other places of the Book, but was never done before, but by a *Quaker*, that this was *bragging*; or whether it was for ſaying, my interpretation *was juſt the ſame with thoſe ancient Scholiaſts* (which is all he hath mentioned to own the charge) or whether it be for ſome expreſſions he hath not repeated, as that I asked, *Would ever any have thought, that all theſe ſhould have been thus adventurous to mention ſuch a blaſphemous interpretation?* If this were *bragging*, I muſt ſubmit to that *cenſure*, rather than lie under the greater vanity of affecting *ſingularity* and *novelty*; but for the *Pyrgopolynices* humour, *i.e.* the aſſuming to have *conquered many forts*, I cannot well be deemed guilty of that, who confeſs I have had none ſuch to aſſault, ſince I was acquainted with *S.W.*

18. His ſecond project is to repeat the Teſtimonies, and becauſe none of them mentioned the phraſe [*leſſer Province*] therefore to conclude that they *are nothing at all to my purpoſe, but ſo perfect an abuſiveneſs to my Readers, that will be able ever hereafter to diſhearten my beſt friends from crediting*—— But I muſt demand that Juſtice, 1. That it be remembred, what the preſent queſtion is between *S. W.* and me; I interpret the phraſe πορεύθηναι εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, *to go to his own place, of* Matthias *his going to his own or proper place, or aſſignation, for witneſſing the Reſurrection.* The *Cath. Gent.* and after him *S.W.* pronounce this to be a *blaſphemous explication*, a *relinquiſhing the ſenſe of the whole Catholick World*; and now, no leſs than a *double blaſphemy*, a fair inlet to all *Atheiſm*, and muſt needs have it applied to *Judas's going to hell*: If then the Authours, whoſe Teſtimonies I have brought, underſtand the words of *Matthias* and not of *Judas*, as every one of the four evidently do; Is not this a ſufficient proof, that all the *whole Catholick World* doth not apply it to *Judas?* and again, that unleſs theſe were guilty of the *double blaſphemy* and *Atheiſm*, I was not guilty? Doth all the blaſphemy lie hid in the phraſe [*leſſer Province*] is that the onely *mormo*, without addition of which I had been innocent?

Of Schiſ. p. 71. l. 1.

19. Secondly, Though three of theſe *Scholiaſts* proceed no farther than to interpret ἴδιον τόπον *his own place* to be *that place which* Matthias *ſhould obtain*, the *Epiſcopacy*, the *place* or *order* of a *Biſhop*, yet the *ordinary gloſs* expounding the whole phraſe, reads, *ut abiret in locum ſuum, i.e. ſortem Apoſtolicam,* [d] *that he might go to his own place*, [*of*] i.e. *the Apoſtolical Lot*, and this was it which I ſaid was *juſt the ſame with the Doctours*; having ſaid of the former, that they were *perfectly to my ſenſe*; and for both theſe I now render my reaſon (though before I apprehended it not needfull) taken from the πορεύθηναι, *to go*] applied to *Matthias*. For taking it of *Matthias*, as it is evident all four take it, what other ſenſe can [*going to his own place*] bear, than that of going to *a particular aſſignation? The office of Apoſtle*, ſaith *S.W.* But firſt, how is that ἴδιος τόπος (either with, or even without the *emphaſis*) is that *his own*, or *proper*, or *peculiar place*, which is common to *eleven more?* Or again ſecondly, How is that *a place* to which he ſhould go? Can the going be referred to any thing but the *going to preach the Reſurrection*, which was the very end of the *Election* of a *twelfth*, *v.* 22. and can he go for this end to τὸν τόπον τὸν ἴδιον, *the place, the proper* or *own place*, in any other notion than that I contend for, and to which all *Hiſtorians* ſay he (as the reſt alſo) *went*, *i.e.* every man to his *ſeveral Region?* and then that is the very *leſſer Province*, that *S.W.* is all this while ſo vehemently diſpleaſed with. I now appeal to the Reader, friend or enemy, what *perfect piece of abuſiveneſs* this is, *how blaſphemous to the honour due to God's Word, or to the Faith?* The *double blaſphemy* which now (to make me amends) he hath faſtened upon it, and with great earneſtneſs proved for two Pages together, and then ſolemnly *gibitted*, in his *Index*, for *two Blaſphemies againſt Faith and the ground of Faith*, with what colour of Juſtice let him now judge: All that I ſhall farther note, is, that (for once) it ſeems the Scripture is made the *ground of Faith* (and then what is become of his *onely Ground, the Oral Tradition of the preſent Church?*) or elſe the *Satyr* and *Index* are not found in the ſame tale. And ſo much for his *third Section.*

SECT.

SECT. IV.

S. W's Challenge and high displeasure, and strange proof of my Confession. As strange of my contradicting my self, and denying my own words. More testimonies of the distribution of the Gentiles to Saint Paul, *the Jews to Saint* Peter: Clemens, Chrysostome, Jerome, Eucherius, Baronius, Epiphanius. *S. W's strange dealing. Of medling with a Gentile. My nine self-contradictions cleared, And his Arts discovered, The unlimitedness of Commission from* Christ *is no proof of Universality of Jurisdiction.*

1. HIS fourth Section is after the image of *Jehu*'s driving, with incredible *vehemence*, and incitation, resolved to cast all that is ill (nine *self-contradictions* is the least part of it) into his *Chancery-bill.*

2. To this purpose he first recites a *challenge* which he had formerly made, and then without more adoe, this he calls a *most grievous, heavy, and unheard-of charge, a fault gross, palpable, visible to the eye of every Reader*; then again the Reader must reflect on the *grievousness of the charge, and make full account there must be* (no less than) *most open knavery, and perfect voluntary unsincerity on one side or other*, and it being easily supposable, that this is not by him designed as a piece of *shrift*, an act of *confession* and accusation of himself, it remains fairly at my door, and I must take it in good part, having, if *S. W.* may be believed, *my self confest in my Reply and Answer.*

3. What I have there confest, he hath not punctually expressed, but leaves the Reader to collect, who cannot reasonably understand it of other than of the whole charge, and that is no less than *most open knavery.* If I shall now demand in what part of my *Reply* or *Answer*, I have made this so strange *confession*, he is so reserved, as to point to none, but contents himself with the general assertion: *D. H. himself hath confest in his Reply and Answer.* If I demand what my words are, wherein this *confession* is made, all that I can hear of, is, that *seeing it impossible to shew any one word in all that army of Testimonies which I mustered up there, limiting Saint* Peter's *jurisdiction to the Jews, or excluding it from the Gentiles, which yet was there pretended, I have recourse for my justification, to the most unpardonable shift that ever was suggested by a desperate cause,* viz. *to deny that I meant exclusiveness of Jurisdiction.* But where do I deny I meant that? No least direction is afforded for that neither; And this is *S. W*'s method of bringing in, and *proving* his *charges.*

4. Had there been any such *expres* words in either of those Books (as I know there is not any) 'tis not imaginable, that he that can set down *page* and *line* so distinctly elsewhere, would here, where so great a weight is set upon the particular, as is not I think on any in the whole Book, have omitted it; and had there been any, though not *expres*, yet *dark* phrase, from which his *Limbeck* could have extracted it, one would have thought that he that can doe *miracles* that way, should have vouchsafed us an experiment of his art, and pointed out the place from whence he was resolved to *extort* this *denial*: And even this would have stood us in some stead, for by seeing the words, on which the charge was laid, the Reader would also have had some guess at the designed meaning of them, and discerned how far and in what sense I denied, and in what I granted *exclusiveness of Jurisdiction.* In the *second Section* he told me *I call them exclusive Provinces*, but told me not where, and I that had no-where used that *very phrase*, but some other words very near it, have never averted his *expression*, but oft told him what I meant by those words, and how my argument was founded in that understanding of them; and because he can have no exception to this, he will outface the Reader, that I *deny my own words*, and then am guilty of *open knavery*, and 'tis mercy that M. *Dailles* portion from M. *White*, is not mine from *S. W.* of *impudent lying knave*; and what fence can the perfectest innocence have against such *flails* as this?

5. In this case the utmost that I think can be expected from me, in answer to so foul a charge, is,

1. To give some account of that his former challenge.
2. To set down from the *Tr. of Sch.* my words concerning *exclusive Provinces* and *Jurisdictions.*
3. To manifest my constant accord with them both in my *Reply* and *Answer.*
4. To give my plain meaning of this, such as wherein my argument is founded, and against which his exceptions produced have no force.
5. To add, if there should need, or however to cast in *ex abundanti*, somewhat more to confirm the truth of my sole pretention in this matter.

6. For the first then, that *challenge* was given in *Schis. Dis.* p. 52. That *if among those many Testimonies there be but found any one sentence, line, word, syllable or letter, which excludes St.* Peter's *authority from the Gentiles, more than what I put in of my own head, he would yield the whole controversie.*] To this my * Answer was, In these words, *what follows there of the agreement made between St.* Peter *and St.* Paul *concerning the division of their Provinces, the one to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles, and is matter to* S. W. *of such challenge and triumph, is cleared in the same Chap. of the Reply*, Sect. 3, 4. *to be a mistake in him, and all that I pretend, manifested from Scripture, to which I now add the plain words of St.* Ambrose——] setting down much more to confirm the truth of what I had said, and the reconcileableness of it with St. *Peter*'s acknowledged *preaching* to *Cornelius.* * P. 39.

7. Here it is evident, why I gave no farther answer to his *challenge*, having (as I thought) sufficiently forestalled it in my *Reply* to the *Cath. Gent.* and what then could be required more of me, than to refer him to the place, which I did accordingly? And yet it falls out, that the *Disarmer* being pleased † again to repeat his *challenge*, though upon a strange mistake of some words of mine; I * did, for all that, so far *answer* it, as to offer him *three* of those places, from whence I doubted not to infer the *conclusion*, that in *Rome* it self, St. *Peter*'s *Jurisdiction* was *restrained to the Jews onely*, and *exclusively* to the *Gentiles.* How well those places conclude it, belongs not to this place to consider, where the onely concernment is, what return hath been made to his *challenge.* Let this serve for the first Point, where I hope the *fault* is not so *gross or palpable*, nor the Doctour liable to the *grievous heavy unheard-of charge.* † P. 73. * *Answ.* p. 502.

Sect. 2.

8. Secondly, Then for my words in the *Tr. of Schiſ.* they muſt needs be thoſe which were juſt now recited from the *Tr. of Schiſ.* p. 70. l. 5. *It is evident by Scripture, that this Apoſtle* Peter *was the Apoſtle of the Circumciſion or Jews, excluſively to the Uncircumciſion or Gentiles, which were generally another's Province*; and again, p. 71. l. 5. *The Circumciſion or Jews, were peculiarly St.* Peter's *Province, the lot or diviſion aſſigned to him*; and again, *the Chriſtians of that age being either Jews or Gentiles, the Jews thoſe that remained in their Country, or that were diſperſed in other Regions, there was but one portion of one of theſe which can reaſonably be placed under St.* Peter's *juriſdiction.* Again, p. 73. l. 18. the *Uncircumciſion* or *Gentile Chriſtians* were not St. *Peter's Province*, but peculiarly St. *Paul's*, and other the like. Thus near I have approached to the phraſe *excluſive Provinces* or *juriſdiction.*

9. Now for the *third*, the manifeſtation of my conſtant *accord* with theſe, both in my *Reply* and *Anſwer*; I refer the Reader, 1. To the *Reply*, *Ch.* 4. *Sect.* 3. *n.* 3. in theſe words; *The Poſition which is here ſaid to be ſo directly againſt Scripture, was to my underſtanding the expreſs affirmation of Scripture it ſelf, naming* Gal. 11. 7. What the *Poſition* is, muſt be learnt from the *Cath. Gent.* (to whom the *Reply* is made) in theſe words, *He telleth us firſt, that* Peter *was the Apoſtle of the Circumciſion excluſively to the uncircumciſed or Gentiles.* And then after a few lines, *His poſition is directly againſt Scripture:*] What now can be plainer? What I had firſt ſaid in *Tr. of Sch. was evident by Scripture*, in the *Reply* I ſay (in expreſs oppoſition to him) *was to my underſtanding the expreſs affirmation of Scripture it ſelf*, and recite the words whence I conclude it, and confirm that ſenſe of them; Is this to *deny* that I *meant excluſiveneſs of Juriſdiction?* So again, n. 5. ſpeaking of *diſtribution by agreement of Fellow-commoners*, to which I reſemble this, I ſay, that the *proportion of one is ſo his, that it belongs to no other, that part his, excluſive to any other part, his ſtanding to any ſuch diviſion cuts him out, and ſo excludes him from any farther right*; and in the application, the *Jews are become S.* Peter's *peculiar, or portion, or Province, and that ſo his, as the Gentiles were not his*, adding, *and that I expreſt by that phraſe*, Peter *was the Apoſtle to the Jews excluſively to the Uncircumciſion.* Here again the very words recited and owned, and ſo certainly not *denied* either in ſound or ſenſe: Then n. 7. and 9. I ſhew how *Peter's preaching to Cornelius* was very competible with my *Poſition*, and prevented in the *Tr. of Sch.* by the clear explication of my meaning, which is ſo far from *denying*, that it is the *vindicating* it: Then n. 8. reflecting on the *Tr. of Sch.* I ſay, *I have already expreſt how far this agreement extends, and how far excluſive it is*; and I hope that is adhering to what I ſaid before, and no denying it. So again, *Sect.* 5. *n.* 4. *It hath already been cleared, in what ſenſe the Apoſtle of the Gentiles——was ſo peculiarly or excluſively to the Jews*, and *n.* 5. *The argument drawn from hence, that in the Text to the* Gal. *there is no word of excluſion, is of little force*; *If there were any agreement and diviſion, and ſeveral aſſignation of Provinces, it muſt follow, that what was ſaid to be one man's Province, is his ſo, as it is not the others, and ſo peculiarly, and ſo, as far as that agreement holds, excluſively his.* Thus much for the *Reply*, which ſure hath been guilty of no *tergiverſation*, retracted nothing that had been before ſaid, and when will *S. W.* make ſatisfaction for the injuſtice of this ſuggeſtion, and the groſſeſt contumelies affixt to it?

10. Turn then to the *Anſwer to Schiſ. Diſarm.* and ſee whether that can yield him any relief, *ch.* 3. *ſ.* 4. *n.* 4. there you have theſe words; *What follows of the agreement made between S.* Peter *and S.* Paul *concerning the diviſion of their Provinces, the one to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles, and is matter to* S. W. *of ſuch challenge and triumph, is cleared in the Reply to be a miſtake in him, and all that I pretend, manifeſted from Scripture*; *To which I now add the plain words of S.* Ambroſe.—No more diſclaiming here, it ſeems, than was in the *Reply*, where it hath appeared to be aſſerted, and yet farther proofs here brought to the *confirming* (and that ſure is not the denying) it: So *n.* 6. *I ſaid——That the Circumciſion was peculiarly S.* Peter's *Province or diviſion aſſigned to him*; and again, *When I ſay*, Peter *was the Apoſtle of the Circumciſion excluſively to the Uncircumciſion, the meaning is evident, that he was ſo the Apoſtle of the one as he was not of the other, or as* Paul *was and is in Scripture ſaid to be of the other.* Thus much alſo from the *Anſwer* joined with the *Reply* in the Charge, and equally removed from all degree of guilt of it, and that will ſuffice for the third ſtep.

11. As for the fourth, my *full meaning in this point*, &c. it hath ſo oft, and was now again ſo lately ſet down, *Sect.* 2. *n.* 6. that I have no more to doe, than to refer the Reader to what hath formerly been ſaid; The ſhort of it is this (he knows it well enough) that as in the *diviſion* of the whole world into *Provinces*, ſome part of the *Jews* of the *diſperſion* were S. *Peter's Province*; Some *John's*, &c. and the *Gentiles* (though he could not move to all of them) *peculiarly* aſſigned (by *Chriſt* immediately) to be S. *Paul's*, ſo thoſe two Apoſtles, and *James*, conferring with *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Gal.* 2. agreed that (when they *met in the ſame City*) one ſhould betake themſelves to the *Jews*, and the other to the *Gentiles*, and from thence came the ſeveral *cœtus* of *Jews* and *Gentiles* in the ſame Cities.

12. Now for the fifth ſtep propoſed, though that be no way needfull, to vindicate me from the preſent charge, nor to confirm the truth farther; yet to ſhew how little 'tis my intereſt or inclination to renounce what I have thus hitherto affirmed, I ſhall *ex abundanti* caſt in a few more teſtimonies, as an *auctarium* to thoſe in the *Anſw.* p. 39, 40. to avouch all that I pretend in this matter: And 1. *Clemens* in * *Euſebius* ſpeaking of S. *Paul's* Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, and reaſons why he prefixt not his name, *Paul* an *Apoſtle*——as in other Epiſtles, this for one is rendred from one of the Ancients, ἐπεὶ ὁ Κύριος ἀπόστολος ὢν παντοκράτορος, ἀπέσταλη πρὸς Ἑβραίους, διὰ μετριότητα ὁ Παῦλος ὡς ἂν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη ἀπεσταλκὼς, οὐκ ἐγγράφει ἑαυτὸν Ἑβραίων Ἀπόστολον, διά τε τὸ πρὸς τὸν Κύριον τιμᾶν, διά τε τὸ ἐκ περισσοῦ καὶ τοῖς Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλειν ἔθνων κήρυκα ὄντα καὶ Ἀπόστολον, *Seeing* Chriſt *being the Apoſtle of the Almighty, was ſent to the Hebrews*, Paul *through modeſty, as being the Apoſtle of the Gentiles, inſcribes not himſelf Apoſtle of the Hebrews, both for honour to the Lord, and becauſe it was beſide*, or *pertained not to his office to write to the Hebrews, being Preacher and Apoſtle of the Gentiles.* This † *Tertullian* calls *officii diſtributio, diſtribution of their office*, whilſt both retained the *unity of the preaching*, or ſociety of the Goſpel. Next * S. *Chryſoſtome*, Τὸς μὲν Ἰουδαίους ἐπίστρεψε τῷ Πέτρῳ, τοῖς τε Ἕλλησι διὰ Παύλου ἀπέστειλεν ὁ Χριστὸς, Chriſt *committed the Jews to* Peter, *but conſtituted* Paul *over the Gentiles, and one of theſe*, ſaith he, † κατὰ διαστολὴν, *by way of oppoſition to the other*, (ſo * elſewhere in this matter Ἰουδαίων λαὸν ἀπιδιαστέλλων τοῖς ἔθνεσι, *contradiſtinguiſhing the people of the Jews to the Gentiles*) and this, ſaith he, † *after the manner of a wiſe King, which commits the horſemen to one, and the command of the foot, to another*: So, ſaith he, *Chriſt divided his army* into two parts, and committed the

* *L.* 6. *καφ.* 1δ.

† *Adver. Marcion.* l. 1. c. 20.

* *Hom. in Gal.* 2. 11. *Tom.* 5. p. 403. l. 18.

† L. 23.

* *Tom.* 3. p. 729. l. 22.

† *Tom.* 5. p. 403. l. 26.

Jews

Jews to Peter, and the *Gentiles to* Paul; and the reason of this œconomy he † at large renders: So * again speaking in the persons of the *three Apostles* and of *Paul*, ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι διειλάμεθα τὸν οἰκεῖον, κἀγὼ μὲν τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἔλαβον, καὶ τὸ τῷ θεῷ δοκοῦν, *We have divided the world in preaching, and I received those that came from the Gentiles, and they the Jews, according to that which pleased God.* So † S. *Hierome*, *Providentia Dei alius Apostolus circumcisis datus est, alius in præputio constitutis, by God's providence one Apostle was given to the Jews, another to the Gentiles*; and proposing this Question, whether *then* Peter *might not, if he found a Gentile, or* Paul *a Jew, bring him to the Faith, he solves it*, (as I should) by granting he might, and saying, that *the principal mandate was given to each, to one over the Jews, to the other over the Gentiles, that those that defended the Law, might have whom to follow, and that there might not want a Doctour, and one to go before them that prefer grace before it*; both meanwhile *joining in one common purpose of gathering a Church of all Nations*: So * *Eucherius Lugdunensis*, *Electi duo præcipui ad duorum populorum salutem*, Petrus *ad Judæorum*, Paulus *ad Gentium*, *Two principal persons were elected to the saving of two people*; Peter *to the Jews*, Paul *to the Gentiles*.

† p. 404. &c.
* Tom. 3. p. 729. l. 24.
† In Gal. p. 125.
* In Hom. in Nat. Petri & Pauli.

13. Instead of more of this kind from the *Ancients*, take their own *Baronius* in several passages; First, of *Antioch*, that † *though the dispersed Disciples spake not the word to any but the Jews, yet there was no small number of Jews there, from whom, though the door of faith were not opened to the Gentiles, a Noble Church might be gathered there*, cui peculiariter præesset *Petrus* Apostolus, *over which* Peter *the Apostle should peculiarly preside*; *but when the Gentiles came to the Faith, then* Barnabas *was sent thither from* Jerusalem; *nothing then hinders*, saith he, *but before this*, Peter's *Antiochian See might be erected, of those that believed of the Circumcision.* Here then is St. *Peter*'s Church at *Antioch* onely of the *Jews*, and when the *door was opened to the Gentiles*, they are not of *Peter*'s *cœtus*, nor under his *See* or *jurisdiction*, but *Barnabas* is sent thither to receive and manage them, and he, we know fetcheth *Paul* to them. To this matter yet * farther, on occasion of the difference among the Ancients, what Bishop immediately succeeded *Peter* at *Antioch*, *Euodius* or *Ignatius*, he cites it from *Clement's constitutions*, which, saith he, *most holy and most learned men have used, that over the Church of* Antioch Euodius *was created Bishop by* Peter, Ignatius *by* Paul, nec sanè unum post alium, ut de cæteris dicitur, sed simul, *and not one after the other, as in the rest it is said, but together*; rendring the reason of it, from the *dissention* between the Jewish and Gentile Christians, during which, that remedy was used, *ut uterque sederet, that both should have their Sees, alterque eorum præesset, and one of them should preside over those of the Circumcision, the other over those that from the Gentiles came to the Church.* The same must be his meaning afterwards, when he saith on the death of *Euodius* † *Subrogatur qui aliquando collega sedisset* Ignatius, Ignatius *succeeds, who for some time had sate his Cellegue*, i. e. had been Bishop at the same time in the same City with him, which abundantly convinces the *duo cœtus*.

† To. 1. Ann. 39. n. 14.
* To. 1. Ann. 45. n. 13, 14.
† Tom. 1. An. 71. n. 11.

14. And what he saith of *Antioch*, is as evident of *Rome*; To the testimonies I have before given of it, I shall now add one more out of * *Epiphanius*, which moves me to change my opinion in one little particular, concerning *Cletus* and *Anacletus*, ὅμως ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἡ πρὸ ὀπτακαίπων διαδοχὴ τοιαύτην ἔχει τὴν ἀκολουθίαν, Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος, Λῖνος καὶ Κλητὸς, Κλήμης, which I suppose is thus to be understood, that *as* Peter *and* Paul *sate certainly together, Bishops at once*, one over the Jews, the other over the Gentiles, and being martyred together, could not succeed one the other, so *Linus* and *Cletus* sate immediately after them, *Cletus* succeeding *Peter*, whose *Deacon* he was, as *Linus* did *Paul*, whose *Deacon* he was, as *Ignatius* tells us; Then *Clement* succeeded *Cletus*, being also S. *Peter*'s Deacon and so Successour on the Jewish side, who outlived *Linus*, and so both the *cœtus* were joined under him; for as to that conceit of *Clemens* being *chosen* and *refusing first*, and (after the death of the other two in *Peter*'s life-time) his being ordained by *Peter* for his Successour, though it be mentioned by *Epiphanius*, and the ground of it from some words of *Clement's*, ἀναχωρῶ, ἄπειμι——yet neither hath he any † confidence of it, nor are those words, which we are now acquainted with in *Clement's first Epistle* to the *Corinthians*, any way appliable to that matter. See the place, p. 65.

Tr. of Sch. p. 76, 77. and Repl. p. 63.
* Hær. 27.
† Εἴγε ὅπως ἐπιτύχω, διανοοῦμαι γὰρ οὐκ ὀλίγα ζητεῖν. *Ibid.*

15. But as I said there was here no need of this addition of Testimonies, nor of any thing else but of *silence* and *admiration*; that any man living should without any the least pretence or colour by him tendred, or really to be found, quite contrary to all evidence, impose upon the Reader with so much pomp of ill language (the known School of such Rhetorick could not have yielded worse) so gross an untruth as is this of my *denying*, *I meant exclusiveness of Jurisdiction.*

16. And yet this is but the first pang of his approaching birth; Having once said this, he makes no stay nor scruple to affix upon it what he counts the utmost of possible or imaginable *prevarications.*

1. *My denying my own express words.*
2. *My denying the whole tenure of my discourse*; then
3. *My denying the main scope and intention of that Chapter.*

And lastly, *My changing and altering the state and face of the whole Question*, and then to see what this is improved to in the Index.

1. 'Tis *contradicting four places of my own*, noted with p. 204, 205. then 'tis contradicting six other places of my own, noted with *Ib.* then 'tis prevarication from my own most express words, the whole tenour of my discourse, the main scope of my most substantial Chapter, and lastly from the whole Question, which being noted with p. 202. to p. 207. visibly relate to this passage. And what is the interpretation of all this? Why, that he hath produced out of the *Tr. of Sch.* and the *Reply*, ten places wherein I have affirmed what he tells the Reader, but offers no word to prove that I have denied. And what shall be replied to such an artificer as this, but Μακάριοι ὅτων ὀνειδίσωσιν—— and then גם זו לטובה * *Blessed be God for all this.*

* El. Lev. Thibi, p. 49.

17. What he next adds to make good his four charges by setting down my words, *&c.* wherein I asserted the exclusiveness of the Provinces, being, as far as my words are recited, willingly granted by me, can expect no other answer from me. As little can his next stage that leads him to shew my *self-contradictions*, for those may well be supposed to be founded in the former, nor indeed can it be imagined, but that I who have so often asserted what he saith I deny, shall be found to contradict that feigned personated self, which he imposes on me. Yet in the former of these, one thing hath so little connexion

nexion with the reſt; and the *ſelf-contradictions* in the ſecond, are ſome of them ſo cunningly repreſented, that they may deceive ſome, and therefore I ſhall not paſs them over untouched.

P. 206. 18. In the former part he ſuppoſes it evident, that I muſt mean S. *Peter's juriſdiction was ſo limited to his ſuppoſed Province, that he had no juriſdiction or power at all to meddle with a Gentile, but that it was againſt right, and unlawfull for him to doe ſo.*] Here when he joins together Juriſdiction limited to his ſuppoſed Province, and power at all to meddle with a Gentile; he uſes the fallacy *plurium interrogationum*, and joins things that ſhould not be joined: He that hath a *Province*, and a *juriſdiction* limited to that *Province*, is no way obliged *not at all to meddle* with others to whom his juriſdiction extends not; he may meddle charitatively, and if need require, miniſterially, *i. e.* he may reveal the truth of God, and upon accepting it, and demanding *baptiſm*, he may afford it him; eſpecially if by a ſign from Heaven, God warn him to doe it; May not now, after the moſt exact diviſion of *Provinces*, a Dioceſan Biſhop take pains in bringing in an *Alien* to the *faith*, who belongs not to his, nor indeed as an *Alien*, † 1 Cor. 3. 12. to † any man's *Province*, without any guilt of ἀλλοτριεπισκοπία, invading any other man's Biſhoprick? But for the preventing of this, I have formerly ſpoken enough, both from the words of S. *Ambroſe* and S. *Hierome*, and by explicating the whole matter, as far as my argument depended on it.

19. Now for the *ſelf-contradictions*.

1. He ſaith, that *Anſw.* p. 38. parag. 2. *I make the point I was to prove, to be no more but this, that the Apoſtles went not all to one, but diſpoſed themſelves over all the world to ſeveral Provinces*, from whence he concludes, We have quite loſt the Queſtion: But the Reader, if he will truſt him, muſt quite loſe his eyes; for all that in that Paragraph is ſaid, is but this, that the κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς, *Act.* 1. was not by me thought on as my evidence to prove, that the Apoſtles went not all to one Province, but that indeed, that was ſo plain that it needed no evidencing. And then, how doth this belong, as the Diſpatcher would now have it, to my making the point to be no more than this, and conſequently the Queſtion to be loſt? Thus is one detortion cured or recompenced with another, and that is *S. W.*'s way of replying to Anſwers.

20. And 'twere well if it were but with one ſingle other, but his ſecond *ſelf-contradiction* is inferr'd from the very ſame words, my ſaying that what was ſignifyed by κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς, is evident by its own light, and needs no evidencing; when yet, ſaith he, I ſet my ſelf formally to offer evidences for that point, and proſecuted my intent from *par.* 5. to 20. with ſuch clouds of Teſtimonies, as may very near if not perfectly equal all the reſt that are found in my whole book.] But this was objected before, and * *Sect.* 2. *n.* 13. before * anſwered, that the cloud, as he calls it, of Teſtimonies was brought to prove one thing, and the κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς ſignified another.

21. His third *ſelf-contradiction* is, That when my words were for *excluſive juriſdiction*, yet *I call his acception of my words in that ſenſe, a miſtake, and that I do it twice*, Anſ. p. 39. *l.* 34. and p. 41. l. 7.] Let the Reader conſult the places; the firſt is in theſe words, not long ſince recited, 'What follows there, "of the agreement made between S. *Peter* and S. *Paul* concerning the diviſion of their Provinces, the one "to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles, and is matter to *S. W.* of ſuch chalenge or triumph, is cleared "in the ſame fourth Chapter of the Reply, *Sect.* 3. *and* 4. to be a miſtake in him, and all that I pre-"tend, manifeſted from Scripture. Here indeed is the word *miſtake*, but nothing more toward his concluſion. Did I here ſay that his miſtake was in *taking my words in the ſenſe of excluſive Juriſdiction?* No ſuch matter; but in thinking, *excluſive Juriſdiction* denied S. *Peter* power to preach (when God appointed him) to *Cornelius* a Gentile Proſelyte. And other miſtakes there were noted in the *Reply*, but certainly not that, of his *thinking I meant excluſive Juriſdictions:* So much for the firſt place. But his ſecond is ſomewhat more violenced, to ſound his way. The art is to cut my words off in the midſt, for he ſaith, 'I complain that *S. W.* would conclude from my words that he would have all the Apoſtles to "have ſeveral Provinces limiting their Juriſdictions and excluſive of one another's right, which, *ſaith* "*he*, I call a miſtake and diſtortion. But if the Reader look, he ſhall find, that theſe are my words. "His Ninth Section hath ſomewhat new, as firſt, That he will conclude from my words, that I "will have all the Apoſtles to have ſeveral Provinces, *&c.* and from thence making the Circumciſion "or Jewiſh Chriſtians peculiarly S. *Peter*'s Province, and the Gentile Chriſtians peculiarly S. *Paul*'s, I "have gotten all the Apoſtles leave to play.] Here it is evident what in that place I complain of, *viz.* That which is *new in the Ninth Section*; and what is that? why, his concluſion, *That I have gotten all the reſt of the Apoſtles leave to play*; But this I could not, with juſtice to him, ſet down, without premiſing the *grounds*, on which he inferr'd it, and therefore I ſet them down, the *grounds* acknowledged by me, but the *concluſion*, after his manner of *demonſtrating*, without the leaſt *probability*, deduced from them, which I there ſhew, by inſiſting on this one thing, that I had ſaid no word of concluding *all* the *Jewiſh Chriſtians under S.* Peter's *aſſignation*, or *all the Gentiles under S.* Paul's, from which alone his concluſion of the *play for the reſt* is inferred: Let the Reader ſee the place, *p.* 41. *l.* 25, *&c.* and nothing is more manifeſt, than that the *miſtake* I noted was this; That when I had placed ſome of the *Jewiſh Chriſtians expreſly under S.* John, and ſo not all of them under S. *Peter*, and ſo in the reſt, he concluded *I had left no Province* to any but S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*.

22. The *fourth ſelf-contradiction* is founded in this laſt place again, and ſo needs no farther anſwer, than that my complaint is miſtaken by him.

23. The *fifth* is the production partly of his own *id eſt's*, which I ſhould have been rebuked for ſeverely, and partly of a *change* of my words: For having cited from me, that S. *Peter's Province is ſo his, as excludes him from any farther right*, he adds his interpretation, *i. e. from any right to preach to another's Province*, and when I had ſaid, *it was not unlawfull for* Peter *to preach to a Gentile*, he recites it, *to preach to Gentiles*, † See *Repl.* p. 56, 57. with another *id eſt, that is, to thoſe of St.* Paul's *Province*. But to omit all † other *Anſwers* given already for the reconciling of S. *Peter's preaching to Cornelius*, with the Jews being his *Province excluſively to the Gentiles*; it is ſufficient to avoid the ſelf-contradiction, if I tell him, that *Gentiles*] *indefinitely*, which he hath put in, ſignify much more than a *Gentile*, or *Cornelius* and his Family, of which I ſpake, and that though the *Gentiles* were S. *Paul's Province*, yet all *the Gentiles* were not, nor particularly *Cornelius* and his Family, that I ever heard of, who (by the way) were Jewiſh *Proſelytes* before *Peter* came to them.

24. His *ſixth* is, that I ſay, the *particular aſſignations of S.* Peter *to the Jews and S.* Paul *to the Gentiles, were not by any particular aſſignation of* Chriſt's, *but by agreement among themſelves: Reply*, p. 55. And yet,

Of

Of Schiſ. p. 74. l. 4. *I ſay* Paul *had his aſſignation immediately from Chriſt:*] I anſwer, that theſe two places belong to two ſeveral matters, and ſo are no *contradiction*, for that muſt be an *affirmation* and *negation* of the ſame Subject. The former is of the Agreement made between the Apoſtles mentioned, *Gal.* 2. and that was not by any *aſſignation of Chriſt*; The latter was of *Paul's Apoſtleſhip* to the Gentiles, and that was by *direction* and *aſſignation immediately from Chriſt*, as that is oppoſed to *Commiſſion received from*, or *dependance on S. Peter*; See the places, and the difference of matter and circumſtances is moſt evident.

25. The ſeventh is from the conſequence formerly mentioned, of *getting the reſt of the Apoſtles leave to play*, and is already cleared in anſwer to the ſecond; whatever new inforcement there is (all but his *contumelies*) is ſoon anſwered and evacuated, by telling him (what he knows) that I never interpreted the committing the Goſpel of the Circumciſion to *Peter*, to ſignifie that *all of the Circumciſion were his Province*, but that others, namely *John* had part of them.

26. His eighth is grounded on a ſuppoſition of *Peter's* being in *Britanny*, which I mentioned as *Simon Metaphraſtes* his affirmation, and not as mine opinion, and onely concluded, That *if he were there, it would ſtill hold that he preached there to the Jewiſh part, and left the Gentile to Joſeph of Arimathea, or Simon Zelotes*, (the unqueſtioned planters of the Faith in this Iſland) as he did in other places to S. *Paul*; and in caſe the ſuppoſition were (as it is not) poſitive, what contradiction were there in this? There were other Apoſtles of the Gentiles beſide Saint *Paul*, as well as other Apoſtles of the Jews beſide Saint *Peter*, and each might have and content themſelves where-ever they came, with their own *Provinces*.

27. The ninth he draws from my making Saint *Paul's peculiar Province to ſpring onely from the Jews refuſing and rejecting his Doctrine*. But the [onely] on which the whole weight lies, is a mere inſertion of *S. W.* (ſee *Repl.* p. 58. n. 5.) and all he hath to ſalve this is, to confeſs the *addition* his, yet grounded in my ſaying, That *till the Jews refuſed and rejected it, he did not betake himſelf ſo peculiarly to the Gentiles, whence*, ſaith he, *follows in all likelihood*— But 1. His *all likelihoods*] by Mr. *White's* Rule, are no proofs; 2. I am ſure they are not here, when (as was newly mentioned in that place) in *Paul's Commiſſion* from Chriſt, it was peculiarly expreſt, that he ſhould *preach to the Gentiles, and he and* Peter *and the other Apoſtles were determined, he to the Gentiles, the other to the Jews, by their mutual agreement.*

28. Thus have I as briefly as I could paſſed through his no leſs than nine *ſelf-contradictions*, every one the brood of his own fruitfull invention; and yet I am never the near, for he ſtill reſolves there are others, which it ſeems he is too reſerved to communicate at this time. But one *Dilemma* he will add, which ſhall conclude the Section, as convincingly, as they all could have done. It is this, *Either St.* Peter's *authority was ſo limited by his pretended deſignation to one Province, as he had no power to preach to another, or it was not, but ſtill remained illimited and univerſal.*] To this I anſwer from *p.* 70, *&c.* of the Original *Tr. of Sch.* (our μῶλον λεγων) that his *commiſſion* from Chriſt was, as to all the other Apoſtles, indefinite and unlimited, and by that no doubt he might preach to *Cornelius* a Gentile (though *Jewiſh* Proſelyte) when God called him. But this can no more found an Univerſal juriſdiction to him, than to every other of the twelve Apoſtles, and *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and ſo *S. W's* cauſe neither gains nor ſaves ought by this conceſſion. The *limitation* of juriſdiction came from agreement of him and thoſe other Apoſtles, with *Paul* and *Barnabas* afterward, and ſo is not concerned in his *Dilemma*.

29. And ſo much for this extraordinary *Section*, which if it diſcourage not my *friends from ever crediting me*, then *S. W.* is not ſo profound an *Augur* as he undertakes to be.

SECT. V.

S. W's pretended mercy; His many objections anſwered. Inſtances may be explications. Of excluſiveneſs onely when they met in the ſame City. Peter's *Supremacy unreconcileable with that. The Lydian Aſia under* John, *not* Peter. *Amplitude without Univerſality. The Union under* Clemens *no proof of Univerſal paſtourſhip. Of the fancy of promiſcuous Authority.* S. W's *fanſied hurly-burly. Task and Government, difference betwixt theſe, in reſpect of confinement.*

1. HIS fifth Section is not quite ſo furious, but as befits the weaker leg of our *Controvertiſt*, comes more meekly after the other, yet hath its meaſure of cunning and miſrepreſentments alſo.

2. Firſt, he pretends to mercy, in not taking notice of all, but onely *that part of the Reply which he finds moſt pertinent to the point in hand.*] The interpretation of which is, that whereas there are in two or three Sections of the Reply, ſeveral Anſwers, each ſufficient to ſatisfie his one Objection againſt my Notion of *excluſive Provinces*, taken from their *Preaching to ſome others*, Peter to *Cornelius*, and the like; one paſſage there is, of which he hopes to ſerve himſelf, or at leaſt by carping at it, to offer the Reader ſome *divertiſement*, and then all the reſt is not to be taken notice of, but onely that which by ſome Midwifery of his, may be taught to bring forth what he would have it. Yet how little favourable *Lucina* hath been to him, will ſoon appear. * Ch. 4. ſect. 3, 4, 5.

3. The words of mine that he pitches on, are theſe, "I have ſufficiently expreſt (*Tr. of Sch. ch.* 4. *par.* 7.) how far this agreement extended, and how far excluſive it was; not that it ſhould be unlawfull for *Peter* to preach to a Gentile, or for *Paul* to a Jew, but when they met at the ſame City (as at *Antioch* certainly they did, and at *Rome* alſo, I make no queſtion) then the one ſhould conſtantly apply himſelf to the Jews, receive Diſciples, form them into a Church, leave them to be governed by a Biſhop of his aſſignation, and the other ſhould doe in like manner to the Gentiles. Theſe I acknowledge to be my words; what hath he to except againſt, or to conclude for his advantage from them? Why 1. ſaith he, *I bring theſe words as an explanation of my meaning, whereas in the place cited it is onely put as an inſtance of their imagined excluſive Juriſdictions.*] I anſwer, the words were indeed an Anſwer to his Objection from *Peter's preaching to Cornelius*, yet if they were alſo propoſed, as an

nexion with the reſt; and the *ſelf-contradictions* in the ſecond, are ſome of them ſo cunningly repreſented, that they may deceive ſome, and therefore I ſhall not paſs them over untouched.

P. 206. 18. In the former part he ſuppoſes it evident, that I muſt mean S. *Peter's juriſdiction was ſo limited to his ſuppoſed Province, that he had no juriſdiction or power at all to meddle with a Gentile, but that it was againſt right, and unlawfull for him to doe ſo.*] Here when he joins together Juriſdiction limited to his ſuppoſed Province, and power at all to meddle with a Gentile; he uſes the fallacy *plurium interrogationum*, and joins things that ſhould not be joined: He that hath a *Province*, and a *juriſdiction* limited to that *Province*, is no way obliged *not at all to meddle* with others to whom his juriſdiction extends not; he may meddle charitatively, and if need require, miniſterially, *i. e.* he may reveal the truth of God, and upon accepting it, and demanding *baptiſm*, he may afford it him; eſpecially if by a ſign from Heaven, God warn him to doe it; May not now, after the moſt exact diviſion of *Provinces*, a Dioceſan Biſhop take pains in bringing in an *Alien* to the *faith*, who belongs not to his, nor indeed as an *Alien*, † 1 Cor. 3. 12. to † any man's *Province*, without any guilt of ἀλλοτριεπισκοπία, invading any other man's Biſhoprick? But for the preventing of this, I have formerly ſpoken enough, both from the words of S. *Ambroſe* and S. *Hierome*, and by explicating the whole matter, as far as my argument depended on it.

19. Now for the *ſelf-contradictions*.

1. He ſaith, that *Anſw.* p. 38. parag. 2. *I make the point I was to prove, to be no more but this, that the Apoſtles went not all to one, but diſpoſed themſelves over all the world to ſeveral Provinces*, from whence he concludes, We have quite loſt the Queſtion: But the Reader, if he will truſt him, muſt quite loſe his eyes; for all that in that Paragraph is ſaid, is but this, that the κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς, *Act.* 1. was not by me thought on as my evidence to prove, that the Apoſtles went not all to one Province, but that indeed, that was ſo plain that it needed no evidencing. And then, how doth this belong, as the Diſpatcher would now have it, to my making the point to be no more than this, and conſequently the Queſtion to be loſt? Thus is one detortion cured or recompenced with another, and that is *S. W's* way of replying to Anſwers.

20. And 'twere well if it were but with one ſingle other, but his ſecond *ſelf-contradiction* is inferr'd from the very ſame words, my ſaying that what was ſignifyed by κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς, is evident by its own light, and needs no evidencing; when yet, ſaith he, I ſet my ſelf formally to offer evidences for that point, and proſecuted my intent from *par.* 5. to 20. with ſuch clouds of Teſtimonies, as may very near if not perfectly equal all the reſt that are found in my whole book.] But this was objected before, and * *Sect.* 2. *n.* 13. before * anſwered, that the cloud, as he calls it, of Teſtimonies was brought to prove one thing, and the κλῆρος Ἀποστολῆς ſignified another.

21. His third *ſelf-contradiction* is, That when my words were for *excluſive juriſdiction*, yet *I call his acception of my words in that ſenſe, a miſtake, and that I do it twice*, Anſ. p. 39. *l.* 34. and p. 41. l. 7.] Let the Reader conſult the places; the firſt is in theſe words, not long ſince recited, 'What follows there, "of the agreement made between S. *Peter* and S. *Paul* concerning the diviſion of their Provinces, the one "to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles, and is matter to *S. W.* of ſuch chalenge or triumph, is cleared "in the ſame fourth Chapter of the Reply, *Sect.* 3. *and* 4. to be a miſtake in him, and all that I pre- "tend, manifeſted from Scripture. Here indeed is the word *miſtake*, but nothing more toward his concluſion. Did I here ſay that his miſtake was in *taking my words in the ſenſe of excluſive Juriſdiction?* No ſuch matter; but in thinking, *excluſive Juriſdiction* denied S. *Peter* power to preach (when God appointed him) to *Cornelius* a Gentile Proſelyte. And other miſtakes there were noted in the *Reply*, but certainly not that, of his *thinking I meant excluſive Juriſdictions:* So much for the firſt place. But his ſecond is ſomewhat more violenced, to ſound his way. The art is to cut my words off in the midſt, for he ſaith, 'I complain that *S. W.* would conclude from my words that he would have all the Apoſtles to "have ſeveral Provinces limiting their Juriſdictions and excluſive of one another's right, which, *ſaith* "*he*, I call a miſtake and diſtortion. But if the Reader look, he ſhall find, that theſe are my words. "His Ninth Section hath ſomewhat new, as firſt, That he will conclude from my words, that I "will have all the Apoſtles to have ſeveral Provinces, *&c.* and from thence making the Circumciſion "or Jewiſh Chriſtians peculiarly S. *Peter's* Province, and the Gentile Chriſtians peculiarly S. *Paul's*, I "have gotten all the Apoſtles leave to play.] Here it is evident what in that place I complain of, *viz.* That which is *new in the Ninth Section*; and what is that? why, his concluſion, *That I have gotten all the reſt of the Apoſtles leave to play*; But this I could not, with juſtice to him, ſet down, without premiſing the *grounds*, on which he inferr'd it, and therefore I ſet them down, the *grounds* acknowledged by me, but the *concluſion*, after his manner of *demonſtrating*, without the leaſt *probability*, deduced from them, which I there ſhew, by inſiſting on this one thing, that I had ſaid no word of concluding *all* the *Jewiſh Chriſtians under S.* Peter's *aſſignation*, or *all the Gentiles under S.* Paul's, from which alone his concluſion of the *play for the reſt* is inferred: Let the Reader ſee the place, *p.* 41. *l.* 25, *&c.* and nothing is more manifeſt, than that the *miſtake* I noted was this; That when I had placed ſome of the *Jewiſh Chriſtians expreſly under S.* John, and ſo not all of them under S. *Peter*, and ſo in the reſt, he concluded *I had left no Province* to any but S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*.

22. The *fourth ſelf-contradiction* is founded in this laſt place again, and ſo needs no farther anſwer, than that my complaint is miſtaken by him.

23. The *fifth* is the production partly of his own *id eſt's*, which I ſhould have been rebuked for ſeverely, and partly of a *change* of my words: For having cited from me, that S. *Peter's Province is ſo his, as excludes him from any farther right*, he adds his interpretation, *i. e. from any right to preach to another's Province*, and when I had ſaid, *it was not unlawfull for* Peter *to preach to a Gentile*, he recites it, *to preach to Gentiles*, † See *Repl.* p. 56, 57. with another *id eſt, that is, to thoſe of St.* Paul's *Province*. But to omit all † other *Anſwers* given already for the reconciling of S. *Peter's preaching to Cornelius*, with the Jews being his *Province excluſively to the Gentiles*; it is ſufficient to avoid the ſelf-contradiction, if I tell him, that *Gentiles*] *indefinitely*, which he hath put in, ſignify much more than a *Gentile*, or *Cornelius* and his Family, of which I ſpake, and that though the *Gentiles* were S. *Paul's Province*, yet all *the Gentiles* were not, nor particularly *Cornelius* and his Family, that I ever heard of, who (by the way) were Jewiſh *Proſelytes* before *Peter* came to them.

24. His *ſixth* is, that I ſay, the *particular aſſignations of S.* Peter *to the Jews and S.* Paul *to the Gentiles, were not by any particular aſſignation of* Chriſt's, *but by agreement among themſelves: Reply*, p. 55. And yet,

Of

Of Schiſ. p. 74. l. 4. *I ſay* Paul *had his aſſignation immediately from Chriſt.*] I anſwer, that theſe two places belong to two ſeveral matters, and ſo are no *contradiction*, for that muſt be an *affirmation* and *negation* of the ſame Subject. The former is of the Agreement made between the Apoſtles mentioned, *Gal.* 2. and that was not by any *aſſignation of Chriſt*; The latter was of *Paul's Apoſtleſhip* to the Gentiles, and that was by *direction* and *aſſignation immediately from Chriſt*, as that is oppoſed to *Commiſſion received from*, or *dependance on S. Peter*; See the places, and the difference of matter and circumſtances is moſt evident.

25. The ſeventh is from the conſequence formerly mentioned, of *getting the reſt of the Apoſtles leave to play*, and is already cleared in anſwer to the ſecond; whatever new inforcement there is (all but his *contumelies*) is ſoon anſwered and evacuated, by telling him (what he knows) that I never interpreted the committing the Goſpel of the Circumciſion to *Peter*, to ſignifie that *all of the Circumciſion were his Province*, but that others, namely *John* had part of them.

26. His eighth is grounded on a ſuppoſition of *Peter's* being in *Britanny*, which I mentioned as *Simon Metaphraſtes* his affirmation, and not as mine opinion, and onely concluded, That *if he were there, it would ſtill hold that he preached there to the Jewiſh part, and left the Gentile to Joſeph of Arimathea, or Simon Zelotes*, (the unqueſtioned planters of the Faith in this Iſland) as he did in other places to S. *Paul*; and in caſe the ſuppoſition were (as it is not) poſitive, what contradiction were there in this? There were other Apoſtles of the Gentiles beſide Saint *Paul*, as well as other Apoſtles of the Jews beſide Saint *Peter*, and each might have and content themſelves where-ever they came, with their own *Provinces*.

27. The ninth he draws from my making Saint *Paul's peculiar Province to ſpring onely from the Jews refuſing and rejecting his Doctrine*. But the [onely] on which the whole weight lies, is a mere inſertion of *S. W.* (ſee *Repl.* p. 58. n. 5.) and all he hath to ſalve this is, to confeſs the *addition* his, yet grounded in my ſaying, That *till the Jews refuſed and rejected it, he did not betake himſelf ſo peculiarly to the Gentiles, whence*, ſaith he, *follows in all likelihood*— But 1. His *all likelihoods*] by Mr. *White's* Rule, are no proofs; 2. I am ſure they are not here, when (as was newly mentioned in that place) in *Paul's Commiſſion* from Chriſt, it was peculiarly expreſt, that he ſhould *preach to the Gentiles, and he and* Peter *and the other Apoſtles were determined, he to the Gentiles, the other to the Jews, by their mutual agreement*.

28. Thus have I as briefly as I could paſſed through his no leſs than nine *ſelf-contradictions*, every one the brood of his own fruitfull invention; and yet I am never the near, for he ſtill reſolves there are others, which it ſeems he is too reſerved to communicate at this time. But one *Dilemma* he will add, which ſhall conclude the Section, as convincingly, as they all could have done. It is this, *Either St.* Peter's *authority was ſo limited by his pretended deſignation to one Province, as he had no power to preach to another, or it was not, but ſtill remained illimited and univerſal.*] To this I anſwer from *p.* 70, *&c.* of the Original *Tr. of Sch.* (our μᾶλλον ἐεὶ ☉) that his *commiſſion* from Chriſt was, as to all the other Apoſtles, indefinite and unlimited, and by that no doubt he might preach to *Cornelius* a Gentile (though *Jewiſh* Proſelyte) when God called him. But this can no more found an Univerſal juriſdiction to him, than to every other of the twelve Apoſtles, and *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and ſo *S. W's* cauſe neither gains nor ſaves ought by this conceſſion. The *limitation* of juriſdiction came from agreement of him and thoſe other Apoſtles, with *Paul* and *Barnabas* afterward, and ſo is not concerned in his *Dilemma*.

29. And ſo much for this extraordinary *Section*, which if it diſcourage not my *friends from ever crediting me*, then *S. W.* is not ſo profound an *Augur* as he undertakes to be.

SECT. V.

S. W's pretended mercy; His many objections anſwered. Inſtances may be explications. Of excluſiveneſs onely when they met in the ſame City. Peter's *Supremacy unreconcileable with that. The Lydian Aſia under* John, *not* Peter. *Amplitude without Univerſality. The Union under* Clemens *no proof of Univerſal paſtourſhip. Of the fancy of promiſcuous Authority.* S. W's *fanſied hurly-burly. Task and Government, difference betwixt theſe, in reſpect of confinement.*

1. HIS fifth Section is not quite ſo furious, but as befits the weaker leg of our *Controvertiſt*, comes more meekly after the other, yet hath its meaſure of cunning and miſrepreſentments alſo.

2. Firſt, he pretends to mercy, in not taking notice of all, but onely *that part of the Reply which he finds moſt pertinent to the point in hand.*] The interpretation of which is, that whereas there are in * two or three Sections of the Reply, ſeveral Anſwers, each ſufficient to ſatisfie his one Objection againſt my Notion of *excluſive Provinces*, taken from their *Preaching to ſome others*, Peter to *Cornelius*, and the like; one paſſage there is, of which he hopes to ſerve himſelf, or at leaſt by carping at it, to offer the Reader ſome *divertiſement*, and then all the reſt is not to be taken notice of, but onely that which by ſome Midwifery of his, may be taught to bring forth what he would have it. Yet how little favourable *Lucina* hath been to him, will ſoon appear.

* Ch. 4. ſect. 3, 4, 5.

3. The words of mine that he pitches on, are theſe, "I have ſufficiently expreſt (*Tr. of Sch. ch.* 4. "*par.* 7.) how far this agreement extended, and how far excluſive it was; not that it ſhould be unlawfull for *Peter* to preach to a Gentile, or for *Paul* to a Jew, but when they met at the ſame City (as at "*Antioch* certainly they did, and at *Rome* alſo, I make no queſtion) then the one ſhould conſtantly apply himſelf to the Jews, receive Diſciples, form them into a Church, leave them to be governed by "a Biſhop of his aſſignation, and the other ſhould doe in like manner to the Gentiles. Theſe I acknowledge to be my words; what hath he to except againſt, or to conclude for his advantage from them? Why 1. ſaith he, *I bring theſe words as an explanation of my meaning, whereas in the place cited it is onely put as an inſtance of their imagined excluſive Juriſdictions.*] I anſwer, the words were indeed an Anſwer to his Objection from *Peter's preaching to Cornelius*, yet if they were alſo propoſed, as an

explanation of my meaning, they might well be ſo, his argument notwithſtanding, for what is more ordinary than to explain by inſtances? and then that which was there an inſtance of my poſition, may here be appeal'd to for the explication of my meaning in it; This ſatisfies his firſt objection.

4. His ſecond is, That "the excluſiveneſs of juriſdiction which before made ſuch a loud ſound, is "now onely come to be ſuch when they met at the ſame City, and by conſequence abſtracting from "that one circumſtance, St. *Peter* had univerſal authority.] In this Objection there are theſe conſiderable miſcarriages. 1. That in reciting my words in this place he hath put in the reſtrictive [*onely*] upon which the whole weight of this objection, and of moſt that follows, depends: I ſaid, *It excluded not ſo far, as that it ſhould be unlawfull to* Peter *to preach to a Gentile*, &c. *but that when they met at the ſame City*, &c. No way excluding at that time all other but that one of *meeting at the ſame City*; And he makes no ſcruple to caſt in the word [*onely*] and ſo thinks to ſet my diſcourſe quite contrary to it ſelf. 2. If it were granted to his hearts deſire, that the *excluſiveneſs of Juriſdiction were onely in this one caſe when the two Apoſtles met in the ſame City*, this were ſufficient to refute his whole pretenſion founded in the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip of* St. *Peter*. For ſure one (if it be but one) *particular Negative* is perfectly ſufficient, without acceſſion of aid, to deſtroy an *Univerſal affirmative*; and then the *Juriſdiction* which extended not to all *Rome* or *Antioch*, will never be extenſible to the whole world, but by caſting theſe Cities out of it. However, what is not in terms immediately affirmed, may by deduction and conſequence be concluded, and then 3. What reaſon can be imagined, why when St. *Paul* and St. *Peter met*, St. *Paul* ſhould be abſolute, and yet at all other times he ſhould be ſubjected and ſubordinate to St. *Peter*? 4. His conſequence, that *abſtracting from that circumſtance* St. Peter *had univerſal authority*;] is of little force. 1. Becauſe when it is certain they did really meet, it is really impoſſible, that they ſhould not have *met*, and ſo his juriſdiction being in that caſe *limited*, cannot be totally unlimited: And 2. Becauſe if we ſpeak of that unlimited power which belonged to him as an Apoſtle, that belonged in like manner to every other Apoſtle, and ſo this kind of *Univerſal Juriſdiction* being granted St. *Peter*, will conclude nothing more for the benefit of the Pope his Succeſſour, than the ſame in Saint *John* will conclude for his Succeſſour at *Epheſus*, and ſo in the reſt alſo.

5. His third Objection is, "That ſince theſe two Apoſtles never met thus, ſave at *Rome* and *Anti*-"*och*, it follows that as far as I know his *Juriſdiction* was unverſal over all beſides and at all other times, "except thoſe ſhort ſeaſons wherein they met.] But he muſt again remember, that if there were any time or place after Chriſt's Aſcenſion, wherein he had not the pretended *Supremacy*, then his *ſupreme Univerſal Paſtourſhip* was not given him by Chriſt; and then all *S.* W's pile is fairly on the ground. Much more might be ſaid (I muſt put that in, to prevent the [*onely*] in his next *Reply*) were not this ſufficient for ſuch arguing.

6. His fourth is, That it follows, *That the Pope's authority is not limited, ſave onely where he meets*, St. Paul's *Succeſſours* (or perhaps St. *John's*) *and then he conceives it will be very ample.*] But 1. what is very ample, is not *Univerſal*, and I need no more than that. 2. If St. *Paul* were the Apoſtle of the Gentiles, and, as he ſaith of himſelf moſt truly, he *labcured more abundantly than they all*, that alone will be a great prejudice to the [*very ample*] at leaſt in compariſon with St. *Paul's plantations*. 3. His mention of St. *John*, though it come in very unſeaſonably at this time, where he ſpeaks of *Peter's meeting* St. *Paul* (which refers to the *agreement* of going one to the *Gentiles*, the other to the *Jews*, whereas St. *John* was for the *Jewiſh* part, as well as St. *Peter*) yet it is a farther prejudice to the *Pope's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*; thoſe large Provinces of *Jewiſh* believers, that were converted and governed by St. *John* in the *Lydian Aſia* (his ſeat of reſidence being placed at *Epheſus*) cannot well be ſuppoſed to be under St. *Peter's juriſdiction* in his life-time (the *different cuſtomes* there, from thoſe at *Rome* introduced by St. *Peter*, are, beſide many other, ſome argument of it) much leſs that *Apoſtle* himſelf and his *Province* too, under the *Biſhop of Rome*, after St. *Peter's* death. 4. I know not why ſome place ſhould not be left for the ten other Apoſtles alſo, yea and ſome for *James* the *Lord's Brother*, who was in this agreement, *Gal.* 2. as well as St. *John* and St. *Peter*; and then, as ample as theſe premiſſes will render it, I ſhall moſt willingly allow it, but ſtill ſee not that ſuch *amplitude* is *Univerſality*.

7. His fifth is. That *ſince I grant both Congregations of Jews and Gentiles were joyned in one under Pope* Clement, *that Pope by conſequence ſucceeded them both*—and then he concludes, *that unawares I grant the Pope as much as they deſire, and then great joy and ſcoff* is built on this argument. But ſure the anſwer is not difficult, that the *two Congregations* that were joyned under *Clement*, were but the *Congregations* at *Rome*, not thoſe at *Antioch* thoſe were not joyned under *Clement*, but ſeveral under *Euodius* and *Ignatius*, and joyned at length under the *latter*) much leſs in all other parts of the world: If there had been no other *cœtus*, but thoſe at *Rome*, and all the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Chriſtians* of the world had been members of thoſe, he had had ſome colour for his conſequence; but as it is, *Clement's Succeſſour* muſt be content, for ought I know, with the portion that *Clement* had, *i. e.* the *Roman cœtus* thus *united*, and thoſe that regularly depended on that *Metropolis* or *Primate's* See.

8. The ſixth is wholly founded in the word [*onely*] which being his inſertion, is to be anſwered for by himſelf.

9. His ſeventh is, That I *have no word in any Teſtimony to prove their excluſive juriſdictions, in* Rome *and* Antioch, *but onely thoſe which affirm that they preacht, were Biſhops in* Rome, *and founded the Church in both places, All which might eaſily be done by a promiſcuous authority.*] To this I anſwer.

1. That 'twere enough for me, if they were proved in other places, where the *Apoſtles* going ſeveral ways, there is no place for their *promiſcuous authority*.

But then 2. my fundamental proof from *Gal.* 2. was much more than he here mentions, for there as *Peter* was *Apoſtle* of the *Circumciſion*, and *Paul* of the *Uncircumciſion*; So they agreed one to betake himſelf to the Jews, the other to the *Gentiles*, and as this muſt belong both to *Rome* and *Antioch*, ſo it cannot be explicated of their *promiſcuous* but their divided labours there.

3. If they were both of them at the ſame time *Biſhops*, as at *Antioch* firſt, ſo after at *Rome*, then this is a competent proof of the *ſeveral cœtus* in each of thoſe Cities, over whom thoſe *Biſhops preſided*, and that again an evidence of their ſeveral and not *promiſcuous authorities*, each preſiding over thoſe whom he

he had converted, and not medling beyond his line, and then that is all I do or need pretend to.

4. Beſide their preaching and being Biſhops, and *founding the Church* in both places, I add Teſtimonies of their leaving ſeveral Biſhops after them; *Euodius* at *Antioch* ſucceeding one and *Ignatius* the other, *Linus* at *Rome* ſucceeding *Paul* and *Anacletus*, and after him *Clement* St. *Peter*. And then what greater prejudice could have been imagined to their *promiſcuous authorities*, or proof of the *different cœtus*? And yet to theſe I have alſo added many other Teſtimonies, as thoſe * of the *two great Apoſtles* ἰσοτιμία *equality of honour*, one having the *Primacy in founding the Church of the Jewiſh Converts*, the other of the *Gentiles*, the *full authority* of the one in the former, and the *perfect authority* of the other in the latter; and now many more, of their *dividing* the two ſorts of the world (though not all of either) betwixt them, one taking, *i. e. adminiſtring* one, the other the other, quite contrary to their *promiſcuous labours or authority*; and many teſtimonies of *Baronius* himſelf for the *different cœtus*, which one thing of it ſelf hath great force in it to the whole matter. * *Anſw.* p. 39, 40.

10. His eighth is founded in my *uſing the phraſe, that one ſhould conſtantly apply himſelf to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles, which*, ſaith he, *falls ſhort of excluſive Juriſdictions, becauſe prudent conſideration of circumſtances may determine one to doe conſtantly this thing, another to doe conſtantly another without inferring that either loſt their right to doe the other.*] But I anſwer briefly to this deep conſideration, that I ſpake of an *agreement to doe* thus, and from that *agreement* I concluded, not from their *conſtant* doing this; Ταῦτα ἐκατέρωθεν ἐδόκει, ſaith † *Chryſoſtome*, καὶ ἐκείνοις Ἰουδαίοις κηρύττειν ὅπου καὶ τῆπερ τοῖς ἔθνεσι, *Both parties conſented, both that they ſhould thus preach to the Jews, and he to the Gentiles.* † *Tom.* 3. p. 729. l. 11.

11. His ninth, tenth and eleventh (as much as is ſerious or can pretend to crave anſwer) are already totally ſuperſeded, by diſcovering his inſertion of [*onely*] to my words. For the agreement made betwixt the Apoſtles, that one ſhould go to the Jews, the other to the *Gentiles*, though it had place, when they *met* at the ſame *City*, yet not *onely* then. And ſo his whole ludicrous fabrick is blown down; for ſuppoſing St. *Peter* to come *firſt to the City*, and to *preach to the Jews*, and St. *Paul to come* after, and *preach to the Gentiles*, or St. *Paul* coming firſt, and being as *Chriſt* foretold him *rejected by the Jews* (to whom yet in obedience to the Ἰουδαίοις πρῶτον, he *firſt* addreſt himſelf) preſently to *turn to the Gentiles*, there is no occaſion of the *hurliburly* he dreams ſo: St. *Peter*, according to the *agreement*, and as the *Eccleſiaſtick Hiſtorians* have related the matter of fact, preached to the *Circumciſion* peculiarly, and formed a *Church* of them, and left them with a Biſhop of his *creating*, and ſo St. *Paul* of the *Gentiles*, and thus they continued *diſparate cœtus*, till the wall of *partition* between them was by time and God's bleſſing taken down. Of this let him believe his own *Baronius*, if my other Teſtimonies are of no force with him; what he will fanſie upon *Paul's departure*, and *leaving behind him a Biſhop of his aſſignation over the Gentiles of a City*, viz. *that* St. *Peter's juriſdiction ſhall bud forth afreſh to thoſe Gentiles*, is very ſtrangely concluded, when the ſole end of St. *Paul's leaving that Biſhop*, was to preſerve the *cœtus* under him, and the main of the *Apoſtles agreement* was to this, that one ſhould betake himſelf to the *Jews*, and the other to the *Gentiles*, and neither meddle beyond his own line, or put his *ſickle* into his *harveſt*; and therefore for his *merry monſter of* the *two Gentile Biſhops* in a City, he now ſees the parents of it, his *fancy*, and ſomewhat elſe can beget many ſuch *monſters* as this, on a very ſmall warning.

12. As for his *profound jealouſie*, in caſe a *Gentile ſhould come in, whilſt* St. Peter *was preaching, that then all muſt be huſht preſently, and the Sermon quaſht, or elſe the Gentile in a civil parentheſis deſired to withdraw*, at which he requires his *Reader* not to *refrain ſmiling*, I leave it accordingly to that way of *anſwer*, which he moſt deſires, elſe I might ſoon remind him, that the *believer* of one *Dioceſe*, among us, of this age, may be permitted to be preſent at the *Sermon* of the *Biſhop* of *another Dioceſe*, and yet I hope their *Dioceſes* are *excluſive* enough, and ſo may St. *Peter's province*, ſtill for all his *pageantry*.

13. When therefore he again Queſtions, what *I mean by ſaying it is not unlawfull to preach to another's province*, and yet *ſaying he had no right to doe it*, it is but another dreſs of the *fifth ſelf-contradiction* in the former Section, and is ſoon anſwered, either by asking again, what he means by *preaching to another's province*? (for if it be no more than immediately before he was ſpeaking of, to *preach* where a *Gentile* is preſent, or as elſewhere, to *Cornelius*, I never ſaid he had no right to doe that) or if he pleaſe, by reſorting to the * places, whence the words by him are cited, where is no appearance of ſuch contrariety: In the one, onely this, *That it was not unlawfull for* Peter *to preach to a Gentile*; In the other, *that as after agreement and diſtribution between Fellow-Commoners, from thenceforth that which is the portion of one, is ſo his, that he hath no right to any other part; ſo after the agreement made between the Apoſtles concerning the two parts of mankind, to which they were to preach, and among whom to preſide, the Jews are become* St. Peter's *peculiar, or portion, or province, and that ſo his, as the Gentiles were not his, they being left to* St. Paul *and* Barnabas: Where the proportion lies thus, that as after *agreement* and *diſtribution*, the *Fellow-Commoner had no other right to any part but his own*, So the *Jews were become* S. Peter's *peculiar, or portion and province, to which to preach and among whom to preſide, and ſo his, as the Gentiles were not his, and that by agreement*. Two things he may obſerve, are there put together, *preaching and preſiding*, the one a *task*, the other a *government*: The *task-part* he is no otherwiſe confined in, than to be aſſigned his *Sphere* of *motion* peculiarly among the *Jews*, that there he ſhould be bound to preach, not that any opportunity of obeying any direction of Chriſt, or benefiting others ſhould be loſt by it, as when ſervants in a family have their ſeveral offices aſſigned them, there are beſides, ſaith *Ariſtotle*, ἐγκύκλια διακονήματα, ſome ſervices that remain common to all, and again, 'tis more than lawfull for any ſuch ſervant, on emergent occaſions, to perform ſome work, which by that aſſignation doth not belong to him. But the governing part wherein onely our Queſtion is concerned, is of another nature; he that preſides in one *cœtus*, is not to aſſume or exerciſe *juriſdiction* over thoſe, that by his own *agreement*, or by the *common Maſters* diſpoſition, or by any other way of acquiring a *right* (ſuch is that of the *Spiritual Father*, begetting to *Chriſt*) are aſſigned, and regularly appertain to another. * *Rep.* p. 56. l. 2. p. 57. l. 19.

14. The remainder is ſpent in repeating what was ſaid and anſwered before, and I ſhall not need imitate him in that. And ſo much for this whether *Scene* or *Section*.

SECT. VI.

The true foundation of our inference againſt Univerſal Paſtourſhip: An explication of Gal. 1. & 11. *Defects in* S. W's. *way of explicating. Right hand of fellowſhip. Of the Circumciſion being thoſe in Judæa. Multitudes of Jews in other regions. Synagogue of Libertines, &c.* Theophylact's *and* Jerome's *words anſwered.* Πεπίστυμαι. *Gal.* 11. *Agreement may interpret that, without being the ſame with it.*

1. IN his *ſixth Sect.* he propoſeth to come to the *point it ſelf, Excluſiveneſs of Juriſdiction*, and in it conſiders 4. *Poſitions*, the *laſt* of which onely, ſaith he, *concerns our preſent queſtion*, which if it have truth in it, I ſhall not need trouble my ſelf or the Reader by reflecting on the *three* former. This *laſt* he ſets down in theſe words, *that their Juriſdiction was included within ſuch a Province, and excluded from all other imagined Provinces.*] But by ſetting it down was in words ſomewhat different from theſe, *viz. that this Apoſtle was the Apoſtle of the Jews, excluſively to the Gentiles, which were generally another's province.* And in ſuch changes his aimes commonly are to gain ſomewhat. Yet if by *all other imagined provinces* he mean no more than the *reſt of the Provinces*, each pertaining to ſome other Apoſtle, I ſhall make no ſcruple to accept it in his terms, for then ſtill, if ſo many *provinces* belonged to others beſide S. *Peter*, as certainly they did, then each of thoſe others was to have his Juriſdiction intire with-in his own province, as well as S. *Peter* within his, and then there is an end of his *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, farther than as it was likewiſe given to every of the Apoſtles, and ſo belongs not ſingularly to S. *Peter*.

2. Againſt this *Poſition*, he 1. commemorates what feats he hath done; and I may now anſwer, that I have examined them ſeverally, and ſhewed they have no force in them to invalidate it, in this my notion of it. 2. he adds, that *it comes not home to the queſtion*, asking *what inference is this? Each Apoſtle was immediate overſeer of his own Province, therefore one of them was not over all the reſt?*] But to this I anſwer, that this is none of my *inference*. And that he cannot but know, it is not, and therefore is to blame thus to indeavour to impoſe upon the Reader contrary to his own expreſs knowledge; For hath not he all this while ſuppoſed me to aſſert *excluſive juriſdictions*? Hath not this been the *ground* of all the *clamour*, ſince the beginning of this *ſecond* part? And was not S. *Peter* one of the perſons concerned in this? If he were ſo, then 'tis manifeſt that from that *excluſiveneſs* it was that I argued (and not barely from *each Apoſtle being overſeer of his own Province.*) And thus I ſtill hope the argument will hold, *Peter was Apoſtle of the Jews excluſively to the Gentiles, which were S.* Paul's *Province*; Theſe being peculiarly under S. *Paul*'s were not under S. *Peter's juriſdiction*; and yet farther, all the *Jews* were not S. *Peter's Province*, but ſome of them peculiarly S. *John's*, ſome left under the government of *James* the *Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, and yet not intruſted or delegated to him by *Peter*, as one placed *over* all, but either by *Chriſt* immediately, and ſo without dependence on S. *Peter*, or elſe by ſo many as made a *Synod* of *Apoſtles*, *Peter* being but one of them (And this being the leaſt that my *antecedent* can be truly ſaid to conſiſt of, the inference will be more rational) *Ergo. Saint Peter was not Univerſal Paſtour.*

3. He next proceeds to conſideration of *Gal.* 11. 7, 8, 9, 10. inſiſted on by me as my evidence, and indeed makes ſtrange work of it, mixing ſome things true but no-way pertinent (ſpecially the *firſt* part p. 224.) or ſatisfying the *rational* importance of the *context*. The *deſign* of the *Epiſtle*, which muſt be the clue, is not adverted to, *viz.* to *maintain* the *Chriſtian liberty* againſt the *Judaical yoke*, which the *Judaizers* would have impoſed ſtill upon the Diſciples of Chriſt: This S. *Paul* calls *another Goſpel*, c. 1. 6. diſclaims it, though it ſhould pretend from an *Angel*, *v.* 8, 9. avouches his doctrine of liberty from Chriſt himſelf, and his immediate revelation. *v.* 10, 11, 12. tells the ſtory of his former life and converſion, and *miſſion Apoſtolical* particularly to the Gentiles, *v.* 13, 14, 15, 16. and withall, his no miſſion from or dependance on any man, no not from the College of Apoſtles themſelves, *v.* 16, 17. but his proceeding wholly on the authority given him by Chriſt, and preaching unto the Gentile Cities (the Jews not enduring, and laying wait for him there, and) the *Churches of Judæa* not ſo much as knowing him by face, ſave onely *Peter* and ſome few at *Jeruſalem*, whom he viſited, but hearing of a perſecutour converted, and preaching to the Gentiles, and yet never complaining that herein he did any thing amiſs, as now the *Judaizers* complain, but bleſſing God for him, *v.* 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. Then he proceeds in his relations, that fourteen years after he *went up to Jeruſalem*, on no other errand but to declare to them his whole ſtory, and to juſtifie his actions againſt all the *Judaizers* pretentions, no-way complying with them, on apprehenſion of any ſpies or dangers, c. 11. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. and the effect, ſaith he, was, that the *Biſhop of Jeruſalem* and the two great Apoſtles that were with him, neither objected nor diſliked any thing that he had done, but approved all, and concluded, that he was deſigned by Chriſt to be the Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, as *Peter* of the *Jews* (this appearing viſibly, 1. By the *Call*, and 2. By the *powerfull aſſiſtances* that were from Chriſt afforded to each in their *ſeveral Provinces*, and 3. The *ſucceſſes* proportionable) *v.* 6, 7, 8. and diſcerning that thus Chriſt had indeed revealed, and given him Commiſſion to be *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, they chearfully ſubmitted to it, and reſolved each to go on their former courſe, *Paul* to keep to the *Gentile-pale*, and to preach the Goſpel of *liberty* to them, and receive them without any obſervation of *Jewiſh rites*, and ſo to compact aſſemblies of *Gentile believers*, and place *Biſhops*, and govern them after that manner, and *Peter* to doe proportionably with the Jews, allowing them to retain their Jewiſh Ceremonies, and ſo when they happened both to *preach*, and have *Converts* in the ſame City, ſtill this method ſhould be obſerved, *v.* 9. (till a better underſtanding could be had between theſe diſtant parties;) what follows, *v.* 10. *of remembring the poor*, is no more to this purpoſe than thus, that they made no more demand to *Paul* but this, that in his *Province* of the *Gentiles*, he would take care to relieve the diſtreſſes of the *Jewiſh Chriſtians*, which were very great in *Judæa* (and probably in their diſperſions alſo) and he very willingly conſented to doe ſo.

4. This

4. This explication of the whole place, I ſhall not adventure to compare with the other of *S. W*'s forming, but leave the Reader to judge which is moſt agreeable to all circumſtances, and words, and parts of the Context, and which keeps cloſeſt to it; As for ſome defects in his, I may be allowed to mark them.

1. That by being *Apoſtle of the Gentiles*, or being intruſted with that *Goſpel of liberty*, he will underſtand no more but *preaching to them, and not to them onely*] when ſure it ſignifies *preaching to them Chriſt's reformation* and *Chriſtian liberty, compacting them into cœtus*, wherein the Judaical Rites were not obſerved, which were conſequently of neceſſity to be diſtinct from thoſe of the *Jewiſh believers*, which retained them, and admitted no ſociety with thoſe which rejected them.

2. That he makes the deſign of his *coming to Jeruſalem*, Gal. 2. 1. to be to *give an account of his doctrine, and efficacy of his preaching to the Gentiles*; whereas it was certainly that of *Act.* 15. of *debating the lawfulneſs* of omitting the *Moſaical rites*, in order to which he declares the ſtory of his *converſion* and revelations, and peculiar commiſſion to the Gentiles, without reſpect, nay in oppoſition to the *Judaizers*; and in this again is built the difference of obſervances among his from thoſe of the *Jewiſh converts*, and conſequently the diverſity of their *cœtus*.

3. That the *giving the right hands of fellowſhip* ——— *ſignified* onely their *acknowledging him a true and fellow-Apoſtle, and that onely upon the ſcore of his thriving beſt among the Gentiles, he ſhould go to them, and* Peter *remain in* Judæa; whereas 1. the *giving the right hand*] is a vulgar perſpicuous phraſe for a pact or agreement mutual, συνεφώνησαν, *they agreed*, ſaith *Theophylact*, and with κοινωνίας *fellowſhip*] with it, a kind of *aſſociation* to the great work of Chriſt, the advancing the Goſpel among all, ſo ſaith that *Scholiaſt* ἵνα ἐγὼ, *they agreed that I and Barnabas ſhould preach to the Gentiles*, αὐτοὶ δὲ *but they to the Jews*. 2. The foundation of that compact was Chriſt's revelation concerning S. *Paul*, and his *commiſſion* to him to be the Apoſtle of the Gentiles. 3. The effect of it, that he ſhould proceed accordingly, leave the *circumciſion* or *Jews* to them, and betake himſelf peculiarly to *preach the Goſpel of liberty*, and ſo to *gather* and *form a Church of ſuch*, as ſhould come in on thoſe terms, *Peter*, &c. being left to thoſe that adhere to the *Moſaical Rites*, and that not onely in *Judæa*, but *James* peculiarly in *Judæa*, he being, long before this, *Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, and ſo of all that *Province*, and *John* of the *Lydian Aſia*, and *Peter* of that other diſperſion, to which his Epiſtle is addreſt, and which *Eccleſiaſtick* Writers aſſure us was his *province* or *aſſignation*, as hath been ſhewed, *ſect.* 2.

5. On this particular he * farther inſiſts, and ſaith, that the *circumciſion, v.* 9. *he takes to be Judæa, or the Jews there, not thoſe in diſperſion, and the Gentiles to be thoſe out of Judæa.* But this, as hath been ſaid, is quite contrary to all Hiſtory, *Euſebius* particularly, expreſſing that *Peter*'s diviſion was *Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia* and *Aſia, the Jews in diſperſion there*, and at length *Rome*, the laſt of which, and alſo *Antioch*, *S. W.* afterwards allows to have been S. *Peter's province*, and yet theſe were not ſituate in *Judæa*. 2. 'Tis certain that *Jeruſalem the Metropolis of Judæa*, and ſo by conſequence all under it were committed to *James* the *Lord's Brother*, and when *Peter* had freely given his ſuffrage to the ſetling him in that See, 'tis not to be imagined that he himſelf continued his reſidence there. 3. To his *excluſive phraſe* [*not thoſe of the diſperſion*] the addreſſing of his *Epiſtle* peculiarly to them, is a competent prejudice. But then 4. What means he by the *Gentiles being thoſe out of Judæa*? I hope he means not all indifferently, Jews and Gentiles too, that are out of *Judæa*; If he do, that is indeed conſonant to the former part of the interpretation, that the Circumciſion are onely thoſe in *Judæa*, but this would enlarge *Paul*'s, and as his phraſe is, cramp up S. *Peter's Province* into a narrower compaſs, than I have done: He hath ſoon after theſe other words, that *Paul was over the Gentiles without Judæa*, which indeed confines him ſeemingly to the *Heathens* (and if that were it before, as the words will alſo bear, I have nothing to diſlike in that part) but his making the ſole ground of the diviſion this, that *the efficacy of* Peter's *preaching to the Circumciſion had been experienced within Judæa, and* Paul's *out of Judæa*, and ſo the oppoſition ſtill not betwixt Jews and Gentiles, but betwixt *within Judæa* and *out of Judæa*, would make it ſeaſonable to ask, whether this be his meaning or no, but that no advantage ariſing to him from it, I conclude from thence it is not. And then, as I ſaid, I have no exception to that part of his period.

* P. 226.

7. But he offers no leſs than ſix arguments to prove this main point, That the *Circumciſion* to which S. *Peter was to apply himſelf, was onely the Jews in Judæa*: The firſt is that now rehearſed, *becauſe the efficacy of S.* Peter's *preaching to the Jews, had been experienced within Judæa, S.* Paul's *over the Gentiles without Judæa, and their ſevering themſelves being*, ſaith he, *on this account, ſhould mean this.* But I anſwer, 1. That this was not the *ſole account* of their diviſion, but that other, which I have mentioned, *Chriſt's revelation to* S. *Paul*, committing the *Goſpel of liberty to him*, and leaving others to plant the *faith* among thoſe that were tenacious of the *Moſaical Law*: And 2. If it were, yet before this time, *Peter* had had experience of the power of Chriſt afforded him in preaching out of *Judæa* among the *diſperſed Jews*, particularly at *Antioch*, See *Baronius* in the place † forecited, of *Peter's Antiochian See being erected of thoſe that believed of the Circumciſion, before the door of Faith was opened to the Gentiles there.*

† *To.* 1. *Ann.* 39. *n.* 14.

8. His ſecond is, *That the Jews do not live united in any conſiderable confluence ſave in Judæa, nor the Gentiles but out of it.* But I anſwer, that the queſtion being onely of the *former* (the latter being willingly granted) there is no truth in that, *Act.* 6. 9. we find mentioned the *Synagogue*, i.e. *Jewiſh cœtus*, of *Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Aſians*, all of them Jews, and ſo likewiſe of many other Countreys that come to *Jeruſalem* at the *Feaſt*, Act. 11. *Joſephus* and *Philo* will ſhew him before this, great multitudes in other regions, and now upon a very late account (the perſecution that aroſe about *Stephen*) the * Text is expreſs, that they *that were then ſcattered abroad, travelled as far as Phœnice, Cyprus and Antioch, preaching the word to none but to the Jews onely*, which they could not well doe, if there were not ſtore of ſuch there.

* Act. 11. 19.

9. Againſt his third, which from *their deſiring* Paul *that he would remember the poor, concludes that* Paul *was to go out of Judæa*, I ſhall not conteſt, willingly yielding that part of the concluſion, that *Paul* is concerned in, and denying the other onely about S. *Peter*.

10. The

SECT. VI.

The true foundation of our inference againſt Univerſal Paſtourſhip: An explication of Gal. 1. & 11. *Defects in* S. W's. *way of explicating. Right hand of fellowſhip. Of the Circumciſion being thoſe in Judæa. Multitudes of Jews in other regions. Synagogue of Libertines, &c.* Theophylact's *and* Jerome's *words anſwered.* Πεπίστυμαι. *Gal.* 11. *Agreement may interpret that, without being the ſame with it.*

1. IN his *ſixth Sect.* he propoſeth to come to the *point it ſelf, Excluſiveneſs of Juriſdiction*, and in it conſiders 4. *Poſitions*, the *laſt* of which onely, ſaith he, *concerns our preſent queſtion*, which if it have truth in it, I ſhall not need trouble my ſelf or the Reader by reflecting on the *three* former. This *laſt* he ſets down in theſe words, *that their Juriſdiction was included within ſuch a Province, and excluded from all other imagined Provinces.*] But by ſetting it down was in words ſomewhat different from theſe, *viz. that this Apoſtle was the Apoſtle of the Jews, excluſively to the Gentiles, which were generally another's province.* And in ſuch changes his aimes commonly are to gain ſomewhat. Yet if by *all other imagined provinces* he mean no more than the *reſt of the Provinces*, each pertaining to ſome other Apoſtle, I ſhall make no ſcruple to accept it in his terms, for then ſtill, if ſo many *provinces* belonged to others beſide S. *Peter*, as certainly they did, then each of thoſe others was to have his Juriſdiction intire within his own province, as well as S. *Peter* within his, and then there is an end of his *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, farther than as it was likewiſe given to every of the Apoſtles, and ſo belongs not ſingularly to S. *Peter*.

2. Againſt this *Poſition*, he 1. commemorates what feats he hath done; and I may now anſwer, that I have examined them ſeverally, and ſhewed they have no force in them to invalidate it, in this my notion of it. 2. he adds, that *it comes not home to the queſtion*, asking *what inference is this? Each Apoſtle was immediate overſeer of his own Province, therefore one of them was not over all the reſt?*] But to this I anſwer, that this is none of my *inference*. And that he cannot but know, it is not, and therefore is to blame thus to indeavour to impoſe upon the Reader contrary to his own expreſs knowledge; For hath not he all this while ſuppoſed me to aſſert *excluſive juriſdictions*? Hath not this been the *ground* of all the *clamour*, ſince the beginning of this *ſecond* part? And was not S. *Peter* one of the perſons concerned in this? If he were ſo, then 'tis manifeſt that from that *excluſiveneſs* it was that I argued (and not barely from *each Apoſtle being overſeer of his own Province.*) And thus I ſtill hope the argument will hold, *Peter was Apoſtle of the Jews excluſively to the Gentiles, which were S.* Paul's *Province*; Theſe being peculiarly under S. *Paul*'s were not under S. *Peter's juriſdiction*; and yet farther, all the *Jews* were not S. *Peter's Province*, but ſome of them peculiarly S. *John's*, ſome left under the government of *James* the *Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, and yet not intruſted or delegated to him by *Peter*, as one placed *over* all, but either by *Chriſt* immediately, and ſo without dependence on S. *Peter*, or elſe by ſo many as made a *Synod* of *Apoſtles*, *Peter* being but one of them (And this being the leaſt that my *antecedent* can be truly ſaid to conſiſt of, the inference will be more rational) *Ergo. Saint Peter was not Univerſal Paſtour.*

3. He next proceeds to conſideration of *Gal.* 11. 7, 8, 9, 10. inſiſted on by me as my evidence, and indeed makes ſtrange work of it, mixing ſome things true but no-way pertinent (ſpecially the *firſt* part p. 224.) or ſatisfying the *rational* importance of the *context*. The *deſign* of the *Epiſtle*, which muſt be the clue, is not adverted to, *viz.* to *maintain* the *Chriſtian liberty* againſt the *Judaical yoke*, which the *Judaizers* would have impoſed ſtill upon the Diſciples of Chriſt: This S. *Paul* calls *another Goſpel*, c. 1. 6. diſclaims it, though it ſhould pretend from an *Angel*, *v.* 8, 9. avouches his doctrine of liberty from Chriſt himſelf, and his immediate revelation. *v.* 10, 11, 12. tells the ſtory of his former life and converſion, and *miſſion Apoſtolical* particularly to the Gentiles, *v.* 13, 14, 15, 16. and withall, his no miſſion from or dependance on any man, no not from the College of Apoſtles themſelves, *v.* 16, 17. but his proceeding wholly on the authority given him by Chriſt, and preaching unto the Gentile Cities (the Jews not enduring, and laying wait for him there, and) the *Churches of Judæa* not ſo much as knowing him by face, ſave onely *Peter* and ſome few at *Jeruſalem*, whom he viſited, but hearing of a perſecutour converted, and preaching to the Gentiles, and yet never complaining that herein he did any thing amiſs, as now the *Judaizers* complain, but bleſſing God for him, *v.* 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. Then he proceeds in his relations, that fourteen years after he *went up to Jeruſalem*, on no other errand but to declare to them his whole ſtory, and to juſtifie his actions againſt all the *Judaizers* pretentions, no-way complying with them, on apprehenſion of any ſpies or dangers, c. 11. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. and the effect, ſaith he, was, that the *Biſhop of Jeruſalem* and the two great Apoſtles that were with him, neither objected nor diſliked any thing that he had done, but approved all, and concluded, that he was deſigned by Chriſt to be the Apoſtle of the *Gentiles*, as *Peter* of the *Jews* (this appearing viſibly, 1. By the *Call*, and 2. By the *powerfull aſſiſtances* that were from Chriſt afforded to each in their *ſeveral Provinces*, and 3. The *ſucceſſes* proportionable) *v.* 6, 7, 8. and diſcerning that thus Chriſt had indeed revealed, and given him Commiſſion to be *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, they chearfully ſubmitted to it, and reſolved each to go on their former courſe, *Paul* to keep to the *Gentile-pale*, and to preach the Goſpel of *liberty* to them, and receive them without any obſervation of *Jewiſh rites*, and ſo to compact aſſemblies of *Gentile believers*, and place *Biſhops*, and govern them after that manner, and *Peter* to doe proportionably with the Jews, allowing them to retain their Jewiſh Ceremonies, and ſo when they happened both to *preach*, and have *Converts* in the ſame City, ſtill this method ſhould be obſerved, *v.* 9. (till a better underſtanding could be had between theſe diſtant parties;) what follows, *v.* 10. *of remembring the poor*, is no more to this purpoſe than thus, that they made no more demand to *Paul* but this, that in his *Province* of the *Gentiles*, he would take care to relieve the diſtreſſes of the *Jewiſh Chriſtians*, which were very great in *Judæa* (and probably in their diſperſions alſo) and he very willingly conſented to doe ſo.

4. This

4. This explication of the whole place, I ſhall not adventure to compare with the other of *S. W*'s forming, but leave the Reader to judge which is moſt agreeable to all circumſtances, and words, and parts of the Context, and which keeps cloſeſt to it; As for ſome defects in his, I may be allowed to mark them.

1. That by being *Apoſtle of the Gentiles*, or being intruſted with that *Goſpel of liberty*, he will underſtand no more but *preaching to them, and not to them onely*] when ſure it ſignifies *preaching to them Chriſt's reformation* and *Chriſtian liberty, compacting them into cœtus*, wherein the Judaical Rites were not obſerved, which were conſequently of neceſſity to be diſtinct from thoſe of the *Jewiſh believers*, which retained them, and admitted no ſociety with thoſe which rejected them.

2. That he makes the deſign of his *coming to Jeruſalem*, Gal. 2. 1. to be to *give an account of his doctrine, and efficacy of his preaching to the Gentiles*; whereas it was certainly that of *Act.* 15. of *debating the lawfulneſs* of omitting the *Moſaical rites*, in order to which he declares the ſtory of his *converſion* and revelations, and peculiar commiſſion to the Gentiles, without reſpect, nay in oppoſition to the *Judaizers*; and in this again is built the difference of obſervances among his from thoſe of the *Jewiſh converts*, and conſequently the diverſity of their *cœtus*.

3. That the *giving the right hands of fellowſhip* ——— *ſignified* onely their *acknowledging him a true and fellow-Apoſtle, and that onely upon the ſcore of his thriving beſt among the Gentiles, he ſhould go to them, and* Peter *remain in* Judæa; whereas 1. the *giving the right hand*] is a vulgar perſpicuous phraſe for a pact or agreement mutual, συνεφώνησαν, *they agreed*, ſaith *Theophylact*, and with κοινωνίας *fellowſhip*] with it, a kind of *aſſociation* to the great work of Chriſt, the advancing the Goſpel among all, ſo ſaith that *Scholiaſt* ἵνα ἐγὼ, *they agreed that I and Barnabas ſhould preach to the Gentiles*, αὐτοὶ δὲ *but they to the Jews*. 2. The foundation of that compact was Chriſt's revelation concerning S. *Paul*, and his *commiſſion* to him to be the Apoſtle of the Gentiles. 3. The effect of it, that he ſhould proceed accordingly, leave the *circumciſion* or *Jews* to them, and betake himſelf peculiarly to *preach the Goſpel of liberty*, and ſo to *gather* and *form a Church of ſuch*, as ſhould come in on thoſe terms, *Peter*, &c. being left to thoſe that adhere to the *Moſaical Rites*, and that not onely in *Judæa*, but *James* peculiarly in *Judæa*, he being, long before this, *Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, and ſo of all that *Province*, and *John* of the *Lydian Aſia*, and *Peter* of that other diſperſion, to which his Epiſtle is addreſt, and which *Eccleſiaſtick* Writers aſſure us was his *province* or *aſſignation*, as hath been ſhewed, *ſect.* 2.

5. On this particular he * farther inſiſts, and ſaith, that the *circumciſion, v.* 9. *he takes to be Judæa, or the Jews there, not thoſe in diſperſion, and the Gentiles to be thoſe out of Judæa.* But this, as hath been ſaid, is quite contrary to all Hiſtory, *Euſebius* particularly, expreſſing that *Peter*'s diviſion was *Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia* and *Aſia, the Jews in diſperſion there*, and at length *Rome*, the laſt of which, and alſo *Antioch*, *S. W.* afterwards allows to have been S. *Peter's province*, and yet theſe were not ſituate in *Judæa*. 2. 'Tis certain that *Jeruſalem the Metropolis of Judæa*, and ſo by conſequence all under it were committed to *James* the *Lord's Brother*, and when *Peter* had freely given his ſuffrage to the ſetling him in that See, 'tis not to be imagined that he himſelf continued his reſidence there. 3. To his *excluſive phraſe* [*not thoſe of the diſperſion*] the addreſſing of his *Epiſtle* peculiarly to them, is a competent prejudice. But then 4. What means he by the *Gentiles being thoſe out of Judæa?* I hope he means not all indifferently, Jews and Gentiles too, that are out of *Judæa*; If he do, that is indeed conſonant to the former part of the interpretation, that the Circumciſion are onely thoſe in *Judæa*, but this would enlarge *Paul*'s, and as his phraſe is, cramp up S. *Peter's Province* into a narrower compaſs, than I have done: He hath ſoon after theſe other words, that *Paul was over the Gentiles without Judæa*, which indeed confines him ſeemingly to the *Heathens* (and if that were it before, as the words will alſo bear, I have nothing to diſlike in that part) but his making the ſole ground of the diviſion this, that *the efficacy of* Peter's *preaching to the Circumciſion had been experienced within Judæa, and* Paul's *out of Judæa*, and ſo the oppoſition ſtill not betwixt Jews and Gentiles, but betwixt *within Judæa* and *out of Judæa*, would make it ſeaſonable to ask, whether this be his meaning or no, but that no advantage ariſing to him from it, I conclude from thence it is not. And then, as I ſaid, I have no exception to that part of his period.

* P. 226.

7. But he offers no leſs than ſix arguments to prove this main point, That the *Circumciſion* to which S. *Peter was to apply himſelf, was onely the Jews in Judæa*: The firſt is that now rehearſed, *becauſe the efficacy of S.* Peter's *preaching to the Jews, had been experienced within Judæa, S.* Paul's *over the Gentiles without Judæa, and their ſevering themſelves being*, ſaith he, *on this account, ſhould mean this.* But I anſwer, 1. That this was not the *ſole account* of their diviſion, but that other, which I have mentioned, *Chriſt's revelation to* S. *Paul*, committing the *Goſpel of liberty to him*, and leaving others to plant the *faith* among thoſe that were tenacious of the *Moſaical Law*: And 2. If it were, yet before this time, *Peter* had had experience of the power of Chriſt afforded him in preaching out of *Judæa* among the *diſperſed Jews*, particularly at *Antioch*, See *Baronius* in the place † forecited, of *Peter's Antiochian See being erected of thoſe that believed of the Circumciſion, before the door of Faith was opened to the Gentiles there.*

† *To.* 1. *Ann.* 39. *n.* 14.

8. His ſecond is, *That the Jews do not live united in any conſiderable confluence ſave in Judæa, nor the Gentiles but out of it.* But I anſwer, that the queſtion being onely of the *former* (the latter being willingly granted) there is no truth in that, *Act.* 6. 9. we find mentioned the *Synagogue*, i. e. *Jewiſh cœtus*, of *Libertines, and Cyrenians, and Aſians*, all of them Jews, and ſo likewiſe of many other Countreys that come to *Jeruſalem* at the *Feaſt*, Act. 11. *Joſephus* and *Philo* will ſhew him before this, great multitudes in other regions, and now upon a very late account (the perſecution that aroſe about *Stephen*) the * Text is expreſs, that they *that were then ſcattered abroad, travelled as far as Phœnice, Cyprus and Antioch, preaching the word to none but to the Jews onely*, which they could not well doe, if there were not ſtore of ſuch there.

* Act. 11. 19.

9. Againſt his third, which from *their deſiring* Paul *that he would remember the poor, concludes that* Paul *was to go out of Judæa*, I ſhall not conteſt, willingly yielding that part of the concluſion, that *Paul* is concerned in, and denying the other onely about S. *Peter*.

10. The

10. The fourth, that *all the Phænomena of circumſtances favour it*, ſignifies little, till he tells what circumſtances he means, which he hath not formerly named, or make it appear, that any one *circumſtance* favours that part of the concluſion which is denied by me, *viz.* that of *Peter's continuing in Judæa*, and not going to the *diſperſion*.

11. His fifth, taken from the words of *Theophylact*, is not pertinent to the proving that part of the concluſion, but onely the other, for ſo are the words, *Paul being come to Judæa departed thence, both becauſe he was ſent a preacher to the Gentiles, and becauſe he would not build on another's foundation*; where no leaſt mention being made of St. *Peter*, no art can infer, *therefore* Peter *was to apply himſelf to the Jews in Judæa, not to thoſe in the diſperſion:* If he reply, that *Peter* is implicitly mentioned in that phraſe [*another's foundation*] I anſwer; 1. That thoſe words of *Theophylact* being on *Gal.* 1. 21. can no more refer to *Peter* than to *James* the *Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, who is together with him mentioned, v. 19. and then the *foundation* might be *James's*, as well as *Peter's*; and 2. if it were *Peter's foundation*, yet *James* being by the *Synod* of the *Apoſtles* and particularly by *Peter* ſet to *govern* whom *Peter* had converted, *Peter* might then be free to leave them, and goe to the *diſperſion*.

12. His laſt is taken from S. *Hierome's* words of St. *Paul*, *me miſit ad Gentes, illum poſuit in Judæa, he ſent me to the Gentiles, and put him in Judæa.* And that may have had truth, in its time, of *Chriſt's commiſſion*, but no way reſiſts their *latter* fact of *committing Judæa* to the *Biſhop James* (as all *Hiſtorians* † *Hypotyp.* l. 5. ſay they did, particularly *Euſebius* from † *Clemens*) and then *Peter* and *John* going to ſeveral parts of the *diſperſion* of the *Jews*, and one of them at length to *Rome*, where ſuch were *ſcattered*.

13. On the back of this he adds, [*Yet Dr.* H. *from this place gives St.* Peter *an excluſive Province, to wit, the Gentiles, nor any Gentiles, but thoſe of the diſperſion out of Judæa onely.*] The Reader may perhaps think that by [*this place*] he means the *laſt* cited from St. *Hierome*, but that cannot be, for I remember not to have produced that place at all, and then I cannot have made *this*, or any *concluſion* from it. I rather think he means the place, *Gal.* 11. which he had been explicating, and then 'tis true, that from the *pact* between *James* and *John* and *Peter* on one ſide, and *Paul* on the other, I do conclude *that part onely of the Jews to be* Peter's *Province, which was not committed to* James *as Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, nor yet aſſigned to *John*, that other *Apoſtle* of the *Jews*. What he means by thoſe words [*to wit the Gentiles, nor any Gentiles, but thoſe of the diſperſion out of Judæa onely*] I underſtand not, nor am directed by the table of *Errata* how to help it, yet I ſuppoſe *Gentiles* are miſtaken for *Jews* in both places, and then I acknowledge this to be my *concluſion*, in no-wiſe wreſted from me by his *ſix* arguments.

14. The remainder of the *Section* is an indeavour to ſmooth over the former explication, by repeating it in other words, but adding no farther weight of reaſon to it, and I ſhall leave it to be compared with the *paraphraſe* of the whole place, which I have now given. Onely when in the * *Rep.* p. 55. l. 12. cloſe he cites * words of mine, that the *agreement between the Apoſtles was the interpretation of the* πνεῦμα, *and thence concludes it my acknowledgment that there is no farther deſignation over and above Chriſt's ſpecial cooperation, ſignified by the right hands of fellowſhip*, &c. *Gal.* 11. 9. here is a double miſrepreſentation, 1. *Chriſt's* ſpecial *cooperation with thoſe Apoſtles* is made to be all one with the πνεῦμα, or *Commiſſion* from *Chriſt* (*Chriſt's cooperation*, I confeſs, ſignifies not the *ſevering* of *Juriſdictions*, but his *diſtinct Commiſſions*, or *intruſting* one with the *Jews*, the other with the *Gentiles*, do, and thus 'tis expreſly ſaid, that *Paul* was the *Apoſtle of the Gentiles*) 2. that when I ſay the *agreement is the interpretation of the* πνεῦμα, and viſibly mean no more by ſaying ſo, than that the *matter* of both is the *ſame*, and ſo what the matter of one is, may be reſolved by what is expreſt of the other (they now by *pact divide* themſelves as *Chriſt* had by his *Commiſſion divided* them, ſending *Paul* to the *Gentiles*, as *Peter* was left to the *Jews*) he will infer that *pact*, and that *deſignation* of *Chriſt's*, to be by me made to *ſignifie the ſame thing*; and ſo conclude that I hold the ſame point my ſelf, *viz.* that there was *no new and farther deſignation*, as if *two acts* by being converſant about the *ſame object*, were inferred to be the *ſame act*, *Chriſt's* precedent *deſigning*, and the *Apoſtles ſubſequent*. By his good leave, thoſe may *interpret* one the other, which do not ſo *ſignifie* as to be the *ſame thing*, the community of the *matter* is ſufficient for the *former*, but the *identity* of the *act* is required to the *latter*. And let that ſerve for his *ſixth Section*.

SECT. VII.

S. W's cutting a Teſtimony in pieces. The uſe of Eccleſia *for leſs than the whole Church.* Peter *and* Paul, Κορυφαῖοι, Μαχαίρα Νας, Πέτρος, &c. *Paul's* perfecta authoritas *among the Gentiles,* Ἰσοτιμία, *in* Theophylact, *&c. His interpretation of perfect authority, for greater powerfulneſs;* ἐνεργῆσας, Gal. 11. *Of a prudent conſent to act, without making a pact. The Apoſtles deſire of uniting Jews and Gentiles, yet keeping their* cœtus *apart. Of the* 14 *years betwixt the paſſages,* Gal. 1. *and* 2. *His skill in Chronology. My ſubſtituting* Pelagius *for St.* Jerome, *accounted for. Of* Bellarmine's *proofs that the leſſer Comments are* Pelagius's. *An Heretick's Teſtimony in a matter of fact not belonging to his Hereſie. An Heathen's.*

1. THE ſeventh Section undertakes to anſwer my Teſtimonies, and begins with that of St. *Ambroſe*, and is very well worth the conſideration of any Reader that is not ſufficiently acquainted with *S. W's* artifices. But to another it will be of leſs importance.

2. His way is that which he hath formerly made uſe of, firſt cutting a Teſtimony in pieces, and leaving out the greater part of it, and then dealing with the Remainder, as he pleaſes, and when he hath done ſo, at length taking notice of the other part. The half which he ſets down is, *Petrum*—— "he names *Peter* alone, and compares him to himſelf, becauſe he had received the Primacy to found "the Church, and he likewiſe is choſen to have the Primacy of founding the Church of the Gentiles.] and from hence, if onely Primacy be allowed to ſignifie *Primacy of Juriſdiction* (as I willingly acknowledge

knowledge it doth in that place] then he concludes it impoſſible to imagine a Teſtimony more expreſly for their Tenet of St. *Peter*'s Univerſal Juriſdiction, and greater than St. *Paul*'s, than this which I alledge againſt it; and then poor I am reminded of my old and bold trick of gulling the Reader to his face, without either ſhame or conſcience, and much more of the ſame dialect. But 1. If I had cited no words but theſe, had I ſo utterly forfeited my cauſe? Let us try that a while.

3. In the proceſs of this anſwer, he hath theſe words, St. *Peter is not here at all particularized to any part of the Church; but extended to all, unleſs* D. H. *will ſay, that the word* Eccleſia *Church ſignifies a piece of the Church onely*:] This then is the utmoſt that the ſuppoſed impoſſibility is built on, the great abſurdity that the word *Eccleſia* ſhould ſignifie no more than a part of the Church: Whether this be ſuch an unheard of abſurdity, let the circumſtances of the place help us to judge.

4. And 1. here is a *double Primacy* mentioned, that is clear, St. *Paul* had one of them, and St. *Peter* another; and can two Primacies to the ſame be imagined any fitter way than by underſtanding them of ſeveral parts, eſpecially if the two *Primates* were ἰσότιμοι of equal dignity, as I there brought *teſtimonies* in a parentheſis to prove that theſe two were, for if one have the *prime juriſdiction* of the whole, every other that hath juriſdiction over a part muſt be inferiour to him, and ſo not have an *equal Primacy of Juriſdiction*.

5. Secondly, St. *Paul's Primacy* is here expreſly ſaid to be a *Primacy* of this kind, of *founding a part*, viz. *the Churches of the Gentiles*; and can there be any neceſſity that St. *Peter*'s ſhould be underſtood in another notion, of *founding* the *whole Church*? The Church is a *body*, and ſo bears analogy with the *natural body*, the whole Church with the whole body, and the particular Churches with parts of the body, and the *Primate* with the head. And then to me it is not obvious to diſcern, how one ſhall be acknowledged the head of one part, if it be but of the hand or foot, much leſs of a far greater part of the body, and yet another to remain the head of the *whole body*. It is much eaſier to conceive that the Gentile Chriſtians are conſidered as one body, and the Jewiſh as another, and ſo each of them have their ſeveral heads. I need not now ſay, that this muſt unavoidably be ſo, 'tis ſufficient to me at preſent againſt the Diſpatcher's aſſertion, *that thus it may be*, for then this Teſtimony, even after his mutilation of it, is not the *moſt expreſs againſt me imaginable*.

6. Thirdly, I ſhall propoſe to conſideration, whether when a *parity of manner* is ſaid to be obſerved in their *Election* (as the * words of the Teſtimony by him recited affirm) it be more reaſonable to make the compariſon of *Primacies in founding*, betwixt that of the whole, and that of the part, or betwixt one of one part, and another of another part. This latter I am ſure is no news, *viz.* for one of theſe *Apoſtles* to be ſaid to found one part, and the other another, and from thence for them to be joyned together as † two heads, which I think muſt refer to two bodies. So St. *Chryſoſtome* in his ‖ *Oration* on the *martyrdom of theſe two*, having called them * κορυφαίους *heads* or *principal perſons*, and that in reſpect of *men that come to ſalvation by them*, he ſoon adds † Πετρὸς τῶν ἀγγωμόνων Ἰουδαίων ὁ χάλινθ, Παῦλος τῶν ἐθνῶν ὁ διδάσκαλθ, Peter *the bridle of the ignorant Jews*, Paul *the teacher of the Gentiles*, and in that reſpect, ſaith he, *Peter a fiſher was intruſted with the Jews*, ‖ ἐβυθίζετο γὰρ ἡ δόξα τῶν Ἰουδαίων, *for the glory of the Jews was ſunk into the deep*; *and to* Paul *the tentmaker he committed the Gentiles, that he might cloth their nakedneſs*, &c. and then * Ὦ μακαρία δύας, *O bleſſed two, which are truſted with the ſouls of the whole world*, † οἱ ζευκτοὶ βόες τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *the pair of Oxen of the Church, that carry the croſs for their yoke*, joyned now, in relation to the whole Church, as they were ſevered, in reſpect of the parts, and ſo both together in his Θration on theſe two *Apoſtles*, † τῆς ἐκκλησίας πέτρα, *the rock or foundation ſtone of the Church* in the ſingular. And if all this have any truth in it, or becauſe it is poſſible it may, 'tis certain I have not produced ſuch an unfortunate treacherous teſtimony, as he would perſwade his credulous Reader.

* *Pari modo electus.*

† κορυφαίοι μαθηταί, and κορυφαίοι Ἀπόστολοι. *Niceph.* To. 1. p. 196.

‖ T. v. p. 992.

* L. 8.

† L. 16.

‖ L. 19.

* L. 27.

† L. 33.

Ib. p. 995. *l.* 18.

7. But then 2. it muſt ſtill be remembred, that there was another large parcel of St. *Ambroſe*'s words ſet down at length by me, but left out wholly in this place by *S. W.* no doubt on the ſame account, becauſe they manifeſt the Church in the former words to be the *Church of the Jews onely*, and not the whole Church; which was mine, but not *S. W*'s intereſt. The words are, *Ita tamen ut & Petrus prædicaret Gentibus, ſi cauſa fuiſſet, & Paulus Judæis, nam uterque invenitur utrumque feciſſe, yet ſo, or notwithſtanding ſo, that* Peter *preached to the Gentiles alſo, if there were cauſe, and* Paul *to the Jews, for both of them are found to have done both.* By this (e'er we proceed) the matter is evident; for 1. what ſenſe could there be in the *ita tamen, yet ſo*, if *Peter* had before been reſolved the *Primate* in *building of the whole Church*? for then there could be no doubt of his *preaching to either* part of it. 2. What ſenſe in the *& alſo*? for ſure the *Gentiles* were no addition to the *whole Church*; and 3. What proportion between his preaching to *the Gentiles if need were*, and *Paul to the Jews*, if the forementioned *Primacy* of the one, were not confined to the Jews, as the other was expreſly to the Gentiles?

8. But this is not all yet, for there is ſtill another part, and it farther follows in the *Teſtimony*, *Sed tamen plena authoritas Petro in Judaiſmi prædicatione data agnoſcitur, & Pauli perfecta authoritas in prædicatione Gentium invenitur. But yet* (though *Peter* when there was cauſe, preached to the Gentiles, and *Paul* to the Jews) *the full authority is acknowledged to be given to* Peter *in the preaching to the Jews, and* Paul's *perfect authority is found in preaching to the Gentiles.* This is enough (I need not add the ſmall remainder of the *Teſtimony*) to clear this matter that is now in debate betwixt us: For ſure if *Peter's full authority* were given him in *relation to the Jews*, and St. *Paul* had a perfect *authority in reſpect of the Gentiles*, the *Church*, in *founding* of which *Peter's Primacy* conſiſted, muſt needs be the *Church of the Jews*, and not the *whole Church*, the *Church of the Gentiles* in like manner belonging not to his, but *Paul's Primacy*. Thus much for the firſt *Teſtimony*, which (by the way) was brought by me, not onely to prove that the Jews were *Peter's Province*, and not the Gentiles, and the *Gentiles* St. *Paul's*, and not the *Jews*, but withall to ſhew how reconcilable this poſition was with his *preaching to Gentiles*, when occaſion required, and ſo was full anſwer to his one *argument* fetcht from his *preaching to Cornelius*, &c. But this *S. W*'s intereſts lead him not to take notice of.

9. The

9. The words of *Chryſoſtome*, that St. *Paul* ſhews himſelf to be ὁμότιμον *equal to them*, and *compares himſelf with* Peter *the chief of them*] I brought in by way of parentheſis, to explicate and confirm the words of St *Ambroſe* of the *double Primacy*, and ſo I did the words of *Theophylact* alſo, *he ſhews himſelf* ἰσότιμον *equal* or *equally dignified to* Peter. And theſe he will call my ſecond and third *Teſtimonies*, thereby to inhanſe the *number* of his victories. To the former of theſe his anſwer is, that τιμὴ *ſignifies any kind of extrinſecal honour, whether it ſprings from better parts, greater efficacy, more induſtry in preaching, and from whatſoever cauſe, and not onely from dignity and juriſdiction*; And then 2. *The ſubject matter*, Gal. 2. 8. *referrs it onely to efficaciouſneſs of preaching to Jews and Gentiles, and not to juriſdiction*; and that ſo it muſt needs be, he infers from the *conſequents in* Theophylact, *for he that had given* Peter *efficacy of preaching to the Jews, gave me the ſame toward the Gentiles.*] To all this I reply, 1. That I am not concerned in enquiring the *ſpring* of his honour, any farther than that ſignifies the *grace* or gift of Chriſt; To that ſpring St. *Chryſoſtome*, and to that St. *Paul*, *v.* 9. refers it: But the *honour* it ſelf, from whence ſoever that come, it hinders it not from ſignifying the *honour of juriſdiction*. 'Tis confeſt on both ſides, that St. *Peter* had ſuch *honour of juriſdiction*; and then, 'tis not well imaginable how St. *Paul* could be ὁμότιμος, and how he could *compare himſelf to him*, unleſs he had the *ſame honour* alſo; ſo ὁμότιμος ſignifies, or *equal*, ſo ἰσότιμος, and then ſtill that muſt be *juriſdiction*; This is farther expreſt in *Chryſoſtome* by τὴν αὐτὴν ἑκάτερος ἀπέλαυσεν ἀξίαν, *each enjoyed the ſame dignity*, which as it need not ſignifie the *dignity of juriſdiction onely*, ſo it can with no reaſon exclude that of *juriſdiction*, the *equality* whereof cannot more fitly, nor is by any other phraſe more frequently expreſſed, than by ὁμοτιμία and ἰσοτιμία, the *ſameneſs and equality of dignity*.

10. Secondly, for the *ſubject matter*, Gal. 2. 8. it is not barely, as he mentions, *efficaciouſneſs of preaching*, but *Chriſt's operating in him to the preaching*: and why may not *Chriſt's Commiſſion* be part of his operating *in* or *on him*? If it be not, it is yet evident by the γάρ, *for*, that that *v.* 8. is ſet as a *proof* of the 7. and that is of *Chriſt's Commiſſion*, expreſt by πεπίστευμαι *being intruſted*; So offices, we know, are committed to the truſt of *Stewards*, and thoſe, I hope, bring *juriſdiction* with them.

11. Thirdly, For *Theophylact*, It is far from true that he refers the ἰσοτιμία *equality of dignity onely to efficaciouſneſs of preaching*: He ſets down three verſes 7, 8, 9. together, and then gives his brief *Scholia* joyntly upon them, and at the foot of *v.* 7. where the *Apoſtle* mentions his being *intruſted with the Goſpel of the uncircumciſion, as* Peter *of the circumciſion*, he adds ἐνταῦθα δὲ δείκνυσιν ἑαυτὸν ἰσότιμον τῷ Πέτρῳ, *but*, or *mean while in that place* (what *place*? why evidently *v.* 7.) *he ſhews himſelf to be equally dignified with St.* Peter; proceeding then, as the Text led him, to *v.* 8. Ὁ γὰρ δοὺς— *for he that gave him the energy of the Goſpel to the Hebrews, gave the ſame alſo to me to the Gentiles*, which is a *proof* indeed, and ſo is produced by him, of the truth of the foregoing verſe, an argument of his ἰσοτιμία, *Chriſt's diſpenſing his gifts*, as he doth his *commiſſions*, but is no way the explication of the former words, or leaſt intimation that the ἰσοτιμία ſignified not *juriſdiction*, but onely *efficaciouſneſs of preaching*: Nay, it is an argument to the contrary, for no wiſe man attempts to prove the ſame by it ſelf: So little heed is due to *S. W.* when he ſaith of his ſenſe, that nothing *can be more evident*] the contrary to which is moſt true.

12. The fourth Teſtimony forſooth, is the other part of St. *Ambroſe*'s words, which he now confeſſes is rather *the ſecond part of the firſt*, and had he let the Reader know it then, there had been no room for his *Anſwer* to it. All that he pretends for this dealing is, that it *ſculks under a parentheſis in which the two late Teſtimonies are found*,] What this *ſculking* here ſignifies, I divine not; the *two laſt* out of *Chryſoſtome* and *Theophylact* were indeed in a *parentheſis*, and being there, were ſo viſible to him, that he made them, above what they aimed at, a *ſecond* and a *third* teſtimony; but this other part of St. *Ambroſe*'s was not in the *parentheſis*, and therefore could not *ſculk under it*, but indeed was left as *viſible*, as any line in the book, to be joyned with the words before the *parentheſis*, and ſo it was but his artifice to hide it from the Reader, when it would have ſuperſeded his *anſwer*; and now, to tell him, *it ſculks*, as if it were *aſhamed* to be ſeen, when he cannot but know, that he alone was guilty of denying it the *light*.

13. By this trick he thinks he had gained another advantage alſo, for the *one* teſtimony being thus cut into *two*, the firſt thing it now ſaith is, *Ita tamen ut & Petrus prædicaret Gentibus, but ſo, that both* Peter *ſhould preach to the Gentiles, if cauſe were, and* Paul *to the Jews, which*, ſaith he, *is expreſly contrary to* D. H. *this granting that each might preach to either, he denying they had right to doe ſo*; Repl. p. 56. *and that* Peter *had no juriſdiction*, &c. *Of Sch.* p. 71.] But to this I anſwer, 1. That I no-where ſaid, that *Peter might not, or had not right to preach to any Gentile, if cauſe were*; but in the place which he cites from the *Reply*, I join *preaching* and *preſiding*, as was ſhewed, *Sect.* 5. and ſay, *the Jews were his peculiar, or portion, or province, and that ſo his, as the Gentiles were not his*, not ſo his, as that he *might preach to no other*; and in the other place, expreſly ſpecified *juriſdiction*. 2. That if theſe words had been permitted to be joyned with the former, they had not onely ſhewed that St. *Peter*'s *Primacy* was confined to the Church of the *Jews*, as St. *Paul*'s was to the *Gentile Churches*, but alſo that his preaching, when God directed him, to *Cornelius*, and his family, was reconcileable with the *Jews* being his *peculiar* (or, as he ſaith, *excluſive*) *province*, and ſo would have been ſo far from contradicting me, that, as I have now ſhewed, it would have teſtified all that was my purpoſe or my intereſt to affirm.

14. But there is yet *another* part of this *Teſtimony*, *that* Paul *had perfect authority in the preaching to the Gentiles and* Peter *full in preaching to the Jews*, and what will he make of this? why, ſaith he, *that is onely meant of greater powerfulneſs and authoritative efficacity in preaching, not of fuller power of Juriſdiction.*] But 1. how come *perfect authority* of the one, and *full* of the other, to ſignifie, *onely greater powerfulneſs*? Doth *full* and *perfect* ſignifie *onely greater*? or doth *authority* ſignifie onely *powerfulneſs*? Certainly this cannot be, till we have gotten both new *Grammars* and new *Dictionaries*: I ſhall make one trial whether he will ſtand to this himſelf: If *authority* be no more than *powerfulneſs* or *authoritative efficacity*, then why ſhould not ἐνέργεια *efficacy* ſignifie *authority*? If it do, then ἐνεργήσας, *Gal.* 2. 8. is in all reaſon to be rendred *Chriſt's giving* Peter *authority for the Apoſtleſhip of the Jews, and*

Paul

Paul *for the Gentiles*; and then his whole Scheme, founded in the *bare efficacity* in that verſe, is utterly ruined; Whereas if I, in compliance with him, grant ἐνέργεια to ſignifie *bare efficacity* there, yet the *Commiſſion*, v. 7. is ground enough for the *authority* which I contend for, and ſo unleſs *authority* ſignifie *efficacity* excluſively to *juriſdiction*, i. e. unleſs it ſignifie *not authority*, there can be no place for the *onely* in his interpretation.

15. *Yet*, ſaith he, *it cannot be otherwiſe neither proceeding upon grounds common to us both, theſe words being the explication and comment on the greater efficacity of preaching*, v. 8. But 1. though the words are written on *v.* 8. what hinders but the *data authoritas*—may refer to the *Commiſſion* precedent, *v.* 7. of which the *proof* is brought, *v.* 8. for ſhould that be the interpretation of ἐνεργήσας, *v.* 8. it muſt follow that the ἐνέργεια or *efficaciouſneſs* there, muſt be *authority*, which is more than I demand. The truth is, St. *Ambroſe*'s words are, *data agnoſcitur*, and *invenitur*, *their full authority being acknowledged, and found to be given*; and to this the *efficacity* of their *preaching* was uſefull, and ſo this is a Comment on the 8. verſe, the delivering the *authority* being ſet down, *v.* 7.

16. What he adds from my grounds, *who*, ſaith he, *make no deſignation of Provinces till the agreement*, v. 9. hath ſurely no truth in it; for where have I ſaid this? He is wont to cite *page* and *line*, but here he cites neither, becauſe certainly he cannot, for I have always affirmed *deſignation of Provinces* from the πιστευμα *intruſting* or *commiſſion*, v. 7. as well as from the *agreement*.

17. Yet once more, to render this place *impoſſible* to *ſerve D.* H's *turn*. *Let us*, ſaith he, *look*, Anſw. p. 51. l. 26. *where he contends, that preaching and converting is nothing to the matter of Juriſdiction.*] But how doth my ſaying ſo, infer this *impoſſibility*? Though *bare preaching* do not infer *Juriſdiction*, becauſe I may *preach* to him, who is neither mine, nor any other man's *province*: yet *full* and *perfect authority in preaching to a peculiar province*, as the *Jews* and *Gentiles* here, may infer it, and ſo muſt the *Primacy in founding Churches* in the beginning of the *Teſtimony*, which ought to be allowed ſome regard in interpreting the end of it.

18. Now follows my fifth Teſtimony from St. *Hierome*, that the *Churches of the Jews ſeorſim habebantur*—*were held apart, nor mingled with thoſe of the Gentiles, and that the agreement was made that St.* Paul *ſhould preach to the Gentiles*, Peter, James *and* John *to the Jews*. To this his firſt application is, that the *latter part of it, is already anſwered, and ſhewn that it was a prudent conſent to act in ſuch a ſort*—*to act*, ſaith he, *not to make a formal and perpetual pact*.— But 1. (to omit that this latter was not before brought, and then how could it be *anſwered*, but by *divination*?) I ſee not how I am prejudiced by the *prudence* of the *conſent*; If it were, as he ſaith, a *prudent conſent*, and that *mutual*, I ſhall deſire no more of it, for that to my ears ſignifies a *prudent agreement*, and it is no intereſt of mine to queſtion the *prudence* of it; and then 2. I ſhall allow it to be a *conſent to act*, and not require him to add *to make a pact* (for a *conſent* or *agreement to make a pact*, is, I think, an *agreement to make an agreement*) and it will ſerve my turn, if they *agreed to act* after this manner, without agreeing ſo to *agree*. Laſtly, If the *agreement* were made, if the *conſent* were mutual, I think, no more wanting to make it *formal*, and being not limited to a time, I ſee not how it can eſcape being *perpetual*, at leaſt as long as the occaſion laſted, *i. e.* the partition betwixt *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Chriſtians*.

19. Now then for the firſt part, he confeſſes the *Apoſtles* did *prudently let them uſe their devotions apart, as long as the Jewiſh cuſtomes were in freſh obſervation*—but he denies *abſolutely that which can ſerve D.* H's *turn*, viz. *that they uſed their endeavours to keep them ſtill apart for the future, which they had done, had they conſtituted diſtinct Biſhops over them to govern them as contradiſtinct Provinces*. To this I anſwer, that if it be granted that the *Apoſtles prudently let them keep their devotions apart*, it will alſo be as reaſonable to conceive that their *ſeveral cœtus* were *ſeverally governed*, their diſtant Cuſtomes ſo requiring; and that being granted, my turn is ſerved, without their uſing *any endeavours to keep them ſtill* (as that ſignifies *perpetually*) *apart for the future*. For I doubt not, but their *Union* and *Communion* was the Apoſtles mutual aim, but they did not yet ſee it a time to attempt it, the *Jewiſh Cuſtomes* being (as himſelf ſaith) *in freſh obſervation*, and ſo certainly they continued beyond this time, referred to, *Gal.* 2. and then ſo long they were to be governed as *contradiſtinct cœtus*, and then this *agreement* was reaſonable, and then St. *Peter* was in all reaſon to obſerve his part of it, and then he could not exerciſe *juriſdiction* over the *Gentile cœtus*, and that is all that I contend for.

20. As for their conſtituting diſtinct Biſhops over them, I refer him to his own * *Baronius* formerly cited, out of the *Conſtitutions*, that *over the Church of Antioch* Euodius *was created Biſhop by* Peter, *and* Ignatius *by Paul*, and that together, upon account of this diſtinction betwixt theſe Jewiſh and Gentile Chriſtians; and ſo he now ſees whoſe fault it was, that he did not ſooner (as he after complains) *hear news from antiquity of ſuch Biſhops over the Jews or Gentiles onely*, and of their *reuniting* afterwards alſo: Which in like manner he might have done, and that it was at *Antioch*, under *Ignatius*, as under *Clement* at *Rome*; But 'tis not his intereſt to uſe *clues*, and then he muſt remain in *mazes*. * *To. 1. An.* 45. n. 13, 14.

21. His next approach is by obſerving, that the *two parts of that Teſtimony of St.* Hierome *were the firſt on the firſt, and the ſecond on the ſecond Chapter to the Galatians, and this*, ſaith he, *happened fourteen years after that, as is clear*, c. 2. 1. *and indeed much longer, the ſcandal between the Jews and the Gentiles having been much ancienter, and ever ſince the beginning of the preaching of the faith to both*, and then this is my abuſing the Reader. To this I anſwer, that what he hath here pleaſed to obſerve of my addition, was by me freely told the Reader before, and in no-wiſe endeavoured to be concealed from him; I ſaid *one was*, c. 1. 22. *the other on this v.* of c. 2. and then how it could be the abuſing any man, I know not. 2. That the ſpace between *Gal.* 2. and *c.* 1. *v.* 22. is of no concernment to my Teſtimony; for if ſo long before, the *cœtus* were kept ſeveral, and ſo continued to this time, and beyond it, as it is certain they were, then ſtill the more reaſon was there for this *agreement* to be made, for one to go apart to the *Jews*, and the other to the *Gentiles*, and then he that preſided over the former, could not have the government of the latter, which is all that my cauſe required: How neceſſarily it will follow hence, that *theſe ſeveral Provinces, as deducible from this Teſtimony, were*, as he ſaith, *four-*

teen years before they were, he may now judge. But then 3. when he ſaith *this of* Gal. 2. *was much longer than fourteen years after that which is recounted*, c. 1. 22. his skill in *Chronology* doth not diſcover it ſelf to his advantage.

* *Ann.* 51. n. 6. 22. For 1. if he conſult his own * *Baronius*, he will find it the conſent of all, that this of *Gal.* 2. is of the ſame date with the *Council at Jeruſalem*, Act. 15. then, that theſe *fourteen years* were to be reckoned from *Paul*'s converſion, and not to begin three years after his converſion, *c.* 1. 18. And then *v.* 22. being after *v.* 18. and deſcribing the time following, the concluſion muſt be, that the time ſpoken of, *Gal.* 2. can be but *eleven years* after the time ſpoken of, *c.* 1. 22. and I hope *eleven are not much longer than fourteen years*. And what if the *ſcandal between the Jews and Gentiles was ever ſince the beginning of the preaching of the faith to both*? Will that prove that it was *much longer than fourteen years*? How many years was the *Goſpel preacht to the Gentiles* before the ſtoning of *Steven*, and the immediate conſequent of that, *Paul's converſion*? and yet ſaith *Baronius*, it was but *fourteen* from that: It is pity to inſiſt longer on this.

23. But the fierceſt impreſſion is ſtill behind; for, ſaith he, *What if this Teſtimony be not St.* Hierome's, *but another Authour's, and he too an Heretick, and in all probability the Arch-heretick* Pelagius, *and this confeſt by all ſides, and moſt unlikely to be unknown to* D. H. *What character ſhall we think ſuch a Writer deſerves, who characters himſelf ſo earneſtly to deſire to ſpeak the whole truth of God*, &c. And great circuit of words is uſed to prove this a *wilfully affected unſincerity*; and then, as ſuch, it is ſolemnly lifted in the *Index*, as *falſely ſubſtituting the Arch-heretick* Pelagius *his Teſtimony for St.* Jerome, noted with p. 239, 240, 241.

24. But after all this noiſe, what is it that D. *H.* hath committed? In the utmoſt of truth, no more but this, that to ſatisfie himſelf and the Reader, what underſtanding the Ancients had of St. *Paul*'s words, *Gal.* 1. and 2. among others he reſorted to St. *Hierome*, as he was ſet out by *Mar. Victorius* in the *Coloine Edition*, and there finding what he thought pertinent, he put it into his anſwer to *S.W.* And who would have thought this would have been thus criminous? It is true, there are two ſorts of *Comments* on that *Epiſtle* ſet out in thoſe works, the one *larger* and the other *briefer*, and I had reaſon at that time, of full force with me, to look into the latter and not the former: The reaſon was that of the three Volumes of that Father, the ſecond, which contained thoſe *larger*, had been ſnatcht from me by theſe evil times, and onely the firſt and third Volume (wherein the latter is) were remaining by me. Since that time I have had commodity to look into the larger, and there alſo I find what is ſufficient for my purpoſe, that

* To. 2. *in Gal.* 2. p. 126. H. *ſeeing the Gentiles, being of age, could not reaſonably be circumciſed, when it would torment but profit them nothing, nor required to abſtain from meats to which they had been accuſtomed, and ſeeing the believing Jews that had been circumciſed, could not be brought to contemn thoſe things wherein they gloried, therefore by the providence of God one Apoſtle was given to the circumciſed, who ſhould ſeem to acquieſce in the ſhadows of the Law, another to them that were in uncircumciſion, who ſhould not think the grace of God to be a ſervitude but a free* faith: Other Teſtimonies to my purpoſe I have here formerly produced thence: Where now was the *unſincerity* at all, much leſs the *wilfulneſs* or *affectedneſs* thereof?

25. But he will not in kindneſs to me ſuſpect, that *I could be ignorant, that this leſſer Comment is a known heretick's.*] I anſwer, he can think me *ignorant* enough in greater matters, when his intereſt leads him that way, and I ſhall make no ſcruple to diſclaim all title to his good opinion, when it is ſuch an ἄδωρον δῶρον, ſo viſibly deſigned to my hurt. The truth is, I had not, that my memory ſuggeſted to me, any leaſt ground of ſuſpicion of the authority of the book, but now upon his advertiſement (the firſt by which I have edified) I have lookt among their Writers, and find that † *Bellarmine verbatim* ſaith, what without citing him *S.W.* hath tranſcribed from him, concluding it to be *Pelagius*'s, becauſe St. *Auguſtine* ‖ ſaith *he had read ſome ſhort Comments of* Pelagius *upon all the Epiſtles of St.* Paul; *and after*, * ſaith he, *alledges words out of the Comment on* 1 Cor. 7. *which are here found*; and again, *that Pelagian Opinions are found in them* in the places which *S.W.* hath ſet down. To this I might reply, 1. That *Sixtus Senenſis* doth from St. *Auguſtine* alſo, 3. *de Bapt.* give a competent reaſon, that they are not *Pelagius*'s. 2. That when in the † place firſt cited hy *Bellarmine*, St. *Auguſtine* ſaith, he had *read ſome writings of* Pelagius, *Viri, ut audio, ſancti, & non parvo profectu Chriſtiani, an holy man, as he heard, and a Chriſtian of no ſmall proficiency*, and ſets down from his *Comment* on *Rom.* 5. 12. *quandam eorum argumentationem, qui negant parvulos peccatum originale geſtare, an argumentation of thoſe who deny that Children have original ſin*, ſetting down, as he ſaith, *the* ‖ *very words of that Authour.* * *Hi autem inquit, qui contra traducem peccati ſunt, ita illam impugnare nituntur.*—— There are now no ſuch words to be found in that ſhort Comment on that place, as the Reader that will compare, ſhall ſoon find, which to me is an unanſwerable argument, that theſe are not the *Comments* which St. *Auguſtine* aſſigned to *Pelagius*. 3. That when it is ſuggeſted, that on 1 *Cor.* 7. St. *Auguſtine* cites words from *Pelagius* that are found here, the truth is no more than this, St. *Auguſtine* ſpeaking of *v.* 14. of that *Chapter* hath theſe words, *aut ſic eſt accipiendum, quemadmodum & nos alibi, & Pelagius cum eandem—— tractaret, expoſuit, quod exempla jam præceſſerant & virorum quos uxores, & fœminarum quas mariti lucrifecerant Chriſto, & parvulorum ad quos faciendos Chriſtianos voluntas Chriſtiana etiam unius parentis evicerat*—and the Authour of theſe ſhort Comments hath theſe, *Exemplum refert, quia ſæpe contigerit ut lucrifieret vir per mulierem*, citing the words of St. *Peter*, that *if any believe not the word, they may by the converſation of the wife be gained without the word*: Where, to omit that St. *Auguſtine* cites from himſelf alſo, what he cites from *Pelagius*, it will be hard to look into any Commentatour on the place, whoſe words ſhall not come as near St. *Auguſtine*'s, as that Authour's do; So little of evidence can be fetcht from that correſpondence. 4. Whether there be *Pelagian* paſſages in theſe *Comments*, is too long a work to be tried in this place, when it muſt be conteſted by conſulting the Comments indefinitely, on five Chapters to the *Romans*, one to the *Corinth.* two to the *Philip.* and one to *Timothy*, and when in caſe ſuch ſhould be there found, they will no farther prove them written by *Pelagius*, than it can be demonſtrated, that no other perſon but he could write ſuch.

† *De ſcriptor. in Hieron.*

‖ *De Pec. mer. & Rem.* l. 3. c. 1.

* c. 12.

† *De Pec. mer. & Rem. l.* 3. c. 1.

‖ *Iiſdem verbis quibus eam legi.* Ibid.

* c. 2. *in init.*

26. But to conclude this matter (without beginning a new examination of *Rivet*'s arguments, who I doubt not will readily take *Bellarmine* at his word in ſuch an argument as this) ſuppoſe it granted

that

that no other but the very heretick *Pelagius* wrote these Comments, what hinders but he, an heretick, as long as he was in his wits, in a bare matter of *fact* or *historical* truth, as distant from any point of his heresie, as *Abraham*'s begetting *Isaac* was, and as probable to come within his cognisance, as St. *Hierome*'s (being his contemporary) should be beleived, and consequently appealed to in that matter, wherein no ancient Writer contradicts him? what is more ordinary than (for the Traditions of the Church, *&c.*) to fetch Testimonies out of *Tertullian*, and he was an heretick, a Montanist, and that even from his book *de Corona militis* especially, which yet was written either after he was in heresie, or at least when he was inclining to it? And was not *Origen* an heretick with a witness? And yet sure 'tis ordinary to fetch Testimonies from him even for points of Doctrine, and I have seen it done sometime by *S. W*'s friend, for a point * bordering very near on his heresie: Finally, if *Pelagius* were an *Arch-heretick*, yet (to omit St. *Augustine*'s Elogy of him, even now mentioned, much higher than belongs to many that are no hereticks at all) neither will this yet so utterly prejudge his Testimony. Do not all Catholick Writers in the like cases appeal even to Heathens, to *Dio*, *Ammianus Marcellinus*, nay, to the Arch-heathens, *Zosimus* and *Lucian* themselves, when their own Superstition and Idolatry, or malice are not concern'd? Undoubtedly they do; and then what a foul crime was it in me to cite a Testimony of that kind from one that *S. W.* and *Bellarmine probably* believe to be the authour that St. *Augustine* calls *Pelagius*, when the very thing that I cite from him, is asserted by *Baronius* their own great Master of history?

* See M. *Wh. de Med. Anim. Stat. Dim.* 8. p. 57.

27. Thus much for this heavy charge, that makes such a noise here and through the remainder of this Dispatcher: As for his additional accusation (that nothing may remain unattempted) that I have *falsified the words of this Testimony also*] that will soon be dispatcht. I said that St. *Hierome* added on *Gal.* 2. 8. that the agreement was made, that *Paul* should preach to the Gentiles, and *Peter* and *James* and *John* to the Jews: whereas, saith he, there is no news of any agreement expresst in this place. But if those short Comments be consulted, it will be found, that these words which he confesses to be there, *dextras dederunt ita nos docere debere, they gave hands that so we should teach*] do contain this; For what [so we should teach] signifies, must, as a relative, be understood by looking back to the antecedents, the *Scholion* of the former verse, *ut prædicem in Gentibus, sicut illi Judæis, that I should preach among the Gentiles, as they to the Jews*; *They*] are *Peter, James and John*; *and we*] *Paul and Barnabas: Our so teaching*] (not *teaching thus and thus*, as *S. W.* would render it,) but in reference to the antecedents, teaching or preaching to the Gentiles as they to the Jews, and then *dextras dederunt ita debere, they gave hands that so we should*] can be no less nor more than *making an agreement that they should doe thus*; which is all that I cited from thence. And so much for this Testimony.

SECT. VIII.

S. W's *imputing all to prudential Considerations.* Paul *was directed to the Gentiles by Christ. He averts building on another's Foundation. His Commission not unlimited. My self-contradictions cleared. Of falsifying by omitting some words. Same rarities of* S. W. *My falsifying a Testimony from* Chrysostome *largely examined.* Eusebius's *Testimony of* Peter's κλησις. S. W's *Observations on St.* Hierome's *words evacuated.*

1. HIS eighth Section proceeds to a view of the words of *Theophylact*, which he calls my sixth Testimony, though if I had been to make my own Inventory, it could have been but the third in any justice; But the more numerous they are, the more they adorn his *Victories*, being sure to be carried in triumph by him.

2. The words of the *Testimony* are, that St. *Paul* being *come to Judæa departed thence, both because he was sent a preacher to the Gentiles, and because he would not build on another's foundation*; His first answer to this is, *that unless he says he could not build on another's foundation, or as D.* H. *expresses it, Repl.* p. 56. *had not right to doe it, these words are nothing to him, who desires not that* Paul *should doe imprudently*, i. e. *leave a place where his preaching was most needfull, and most particularly fruitfull; and stay in another where it was needless, and not so particularly fruitfull.*] But I reply 1. That this *Testimony*, being produced in the *Answ. to Schis. Dis.* and not in the *Reply* to the *Cath. Gent.* was brought to prove the *division of provinces*, which was then before me, and not all that I had at any other time spoken of that matter, or particularly what I had insisted on in the place of the *Reply*, to which he refers, and thence concludes me to affirm the *no right*. As for the particular at which it was aimed, to that the *testimony* is of force, though it did not say [*he could not*] the two reasons which are there given for his *leaving Judæa*, being pertinent to this purpose, though he added not a third of a greater efficacy.

3. Secondly, He that makes the prudential consideration the onely reasons of St. *Paul's* leaving *Judæa*, should in all reason shew at least, that there is any place for it in this testimony, and not impose on a Father's words what is no way deducible from them; *Theophylact* renders two reasons expresly, why St, *Paul* leaves *Judæa* without preaching in it; and he imputes the action wholly to a third, which he doth not mention; this is an excellent way of answering Testimonies, especially when it no way appears that St. *Paul* at this time had preacht to the Gentiles, and then how could his preaching be particularly fruitfull among them, as he yet saith it was, and in that onely founds the prudential consideration?

4. But then 3. Seeing it would by his own confession have force with him, in case it had been [*he could not*] or [*had not right to doe it*] let this be applyed in the latitude, to his preaching in *Judæa*, and then I shall propose to his consideration, and demand what it is that in his imagination should give a right to any man to be the Apostle of such a Province? Is it not fundamentally a Commission

from Christ? If then St. *Paul* was thus *commissionated* to be a preacher to the Gentiles, and not to the people of *Judæa*, nay, if he were by Christ expresly commanded to leave *Jerusalem*, and at the same time, and by the same expres *command commissionated* to this *Apostolacy of the Gentiles*, in opposition to those of *Judæa*, what can he demand more to make good the [*he could not, or had no right*] to continue and preach in *Judæa*? And is not this the importance of St. *Paul's* own relation of Christ's words, *Act.* 22. 21. *Depart* (from *Jerusalem*, *v.* 18.) *for I will send thee far hence unto the Gentiles*; and so likewise of the first part of this testimony (which seems to be founded on that *Revelation* mentioned in that Text) *that he departed from Judæa, because he was sent a Preacher to the Gentiles*, which to my senses hath this force in it (I know not how the *wits* may make a shift to transform it) that he that was by his *Commission* from Christ directed to leave *Judæa*, and *preach far off to the Gentiles*, could not, or had no right to stay and preach in *Judæa*; But *Paul* was by his Commission from Christ thus directed, Therefore——

5. I need not now farther enquire, whether it were simply unlawfull for him to build *on another's foundation* (and so whether he could not, or had no right to doe that) it is sufficient that we know he disclaims doing it, *Rom.* 5. 20. and saith, he studiously and solicitously avoided it, directing his actions by this as by a rule, not to be transgrest [*yea so have I strived to preach the Gospel not where Christ was named, lest I should build upon another man's foundation*] and so likewise 2 *Cor.* 10. 16. where he averts this very thing with some earnestnes, under the repeated style of *boasting of things without his line, measure*, v. 13. *the measure of the rule that God hath distributed*: And it may be observed, *Heb.* 13. 7. what a strict conjunction there is between those that have the rule over them, and those who have spoken to them the word of God (in the notion which critically belongs to that phrase, speaking or preaching the word of God, for preaching the Gospel to them that had it not before, and so laying the foundation among them) and that the command of remembring them (expounded, *v.* 17. by *obeying* them) belongs jointly to them; and then it will be no more lawfull to build on another man's foundation, than ἀλλοτριεπισκοπεῖν, to pretend power over another man's province. But I say, I need not farther examine this, seeing his Commission, which certainly was his rule, determined him to the Gentiles, and to leave *Judæa*; and that therefore he did it, are the words of the Testimony.

6. But this first answer of his being of no greater force, we were in justice to expect a second, and that he is ready with, *viz.* that the words [*being sent a preacher to the Gentiles*] are meant of Christ's Commission, acknowledged by D. *H.* of *Sch.* p. 70. *to have been unlimitedly given to all the Apostles, not restrained by Christ's words to any particular Province, and in particular speaking of St.* Paul's *Province*, Rep. p. 55. l. 31. *So that the bringing this proof for lesser Provinces, is*, saith he, *perfectly frivolous and self-contradictory*] and there is a prize for the inriching of his *Index*, this being at least a first of the two self-contradictions promised to be shewed in *p.* 244. But this is soon answered, that the Commission from Christ, which I said was given *unlimitedly* to all the Apostles, was that of his mission to preach given to the twelve, *Matt.* 28. and cannot be imagined applicable to St. *Paul*, who was not then a Christian; and after he was called, had also a Revelation, *Act.* 22. 21. that he should be the Apostle to the Gentiles, and that is not unlimitedly. As for the words in the Reply, which he saith are in particular of St. *Paul's Province*. I know not what they are brought to prove; If the citation be pertinent, and in connexion with his former words, the meaning of it must be, that in that page and line of the *Reply*, speaking of St. *Paul's Province*, I acknowledge that *Christ's mission was unlimitedly to all*; But whosoever will look, shall find no such matter in that place, but onely that the *assignation of Provinces* then spoken of (*viz.* that *when they met at the same City mixt of Jews and Gentiles*, Peter *and* John *should betake themselves to the Jews, and* Paul *and* Barnabas *to the Gentiles*) was not *by any particular assignation of Christ's, but by agreement among themselves*, which sure may have truth in it, notwithstanding this *precedent assignation* from Christ of the Gentiles for St. *Paul's* Province.

7. But he hath a third answer, and that will utterly defeat all force of this Testimony, by remembring that it is spoken by *Theophylact* on *Gal.* 1. 21. more than fourteen years before his coming to *Judæa*, Gal. 2. when this distribution by agreement is pretended to be made; and then, here is *shame for the Doctour*, &c. and if the *Index* may be heeded, *a second self-contradiction* also in *this one Testimony*. But to omit his false *Chronology* (formerly noted) of *fourteen years*, which cannot with any pretence be more than *eleven*, I answer, that as I confirm the *assignation of lesser Provinces* from the *agreement* between the *Apostles* themselves, *Gal.* 2. which indeed was after, *Gal.* 1. so nothing hinders, but I may lay an earlier *ground* of it, in the *assignation of Christ* himself, who by *direction* of his spirit poured on the *Apostles*, gave the *twelve* their *several distributions*, where they should plant the Gospel, and after calling St. *Paul*, assigned him the *Gentiles* peculiarly for his portion.

8. But there is yet more *shame* due to me by *S. W's* award, that I have *put down the testimony in indifferent terms, being come to Judæa he departed thence, without any distinction when this coming was, before or after the pretended agreement, whereas had it been known that it was at his coming onely to see* Peter, *&c. It had been manifestly discovered to be perfectly useless*--] And hereupon he is pleased to set down the *testimony* intirely, διὰ τὸ— *Coming to Judæa onely to see Peter* — Here is a foul fault indeed, that setting down a *testimony*, I did not transcribe all that that authour said, but onely as much as I conceived was to the purpose. And would it not now be some news that this should prove an instance of the *many egregious and most wilfull falsifications of the Fathers and other Authours*? Such his *Index* proclaims to be discovered p. 245. Where yet nothing is discovered but this, which I have now set down from him. But I shall hope that this is some mistake, and that this may be allowed to pass under the milder style of *falsifying in jest*, which he here uses, or in yet civiller terms, *design and artifice of omitting*, *&c.* To this therefore I answer, that 'tis true indeed, I onely recited those words, ἔρχεσθαι τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, *coming to Judæa* — and omitted to express the *occasion* of his *coming*, which I thought perfectly unnecessary to be mentioned; and the reason I so thought, is plain, 1. Because of what time soever the words were spoken, it was equally to my *interest*; nay the longer it were before the *agreement*, *Gal.* 11. the *more* it were for my turn; for if his being *sent to the Gentiles*, caused him *then* to

leave

leave Judæa, as *another man's foundation*, and ſo belonging to another, and not to him, then much more would this be of force afterwards, when he and *Peter* had made their *agreement*, the one to *go to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles*. 2. Becauſe if the *occaſion* of his *coming* were of any importance to be known, that was otherwiſe ſufficiently provided for, by ſaying the words were delivered on *Gal.* 1. and not *Gal.* 11. Which having been carefull to advertiſe the *Reader*, I hope I am not yet diſcovered *falſifying*; How I ſhall eſcape the force of his no leſs than *five next pages*, which are all affirmed to have made the ſame *diſcoveries*, I muſt now proceed to conſider.

9. And here my *friends* are *more particularly ſummoned*, and *S. W.* moſt meekly *even ſubmitteth himſelf to their cenſure, if I be found excuſable*, proclaiming that 'tis *falſifying in earneſt*, and *ſo openly and manifeſtly as is impoſſible either to be cloaked with evading gloſſes, or excuſed by ignorance or miſtake*, and no leſs than five intire pages ſpent in the arraigning of it.

10. But what is it all this while, that is thus confidently accuſed? I muſt not tranſcribe his pages to ſet it down, but leave the *Reader* to ſee it in them p. 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250. Where after the brandiſhing his weapon, thus he ſets out. [*His ſeventh teſtimony*; *where after he had told us that* Paul *and* Barnabas *had a province intruſted to them by giving the right hands of fellowſhip, which he calls their agreement to doe ſo, he undertakes to prove it, beginning his* 4th. *Paragraph thus. And this is the ſpecial importance, ſaith St.* Chryſoſtome, *of the* ἀλλὰ τἀναντίον *but contrariwiſe, &c.*] Setting down all my words to almoſt (within two or three lines of) the end of the *Paragraph*, and when he hath done ſo, he next ſets down words out of St. *Chryſoſtome*, telling the Reader they are the *comment upon that place which is the teſtimony related to by Dr.* H.] And then follows the full voley of the *many wilfull falſifications*, which were promiſed to be charged upon me.

11. In this rare ſcheme of his, what truth there is, the Reader ſhall now be allowed to judge. And 1. It may not be amiſs to inquire with what propriety this can be called my *ſeventh teſtimony*, when if it be at all a *teſtimony*, 'tis certain it muſt be either the *firſt* or rather the *ſecond* (either of which is far from the *ſeventh*) being as he cites it, in the *Reply* to the *Cath. Gent.* which he knows was written before the appearing of *Sch. Diſar.* (much more of the *Anſwer* to it, from which he pretended to fetch the *ſix* former *teſtimonies*.) This I the rather note in paſſing, to diſcover ſome groſs affected miſadventures of this *Diſpatcher* in this place, as when p. 247. to aggravate my crime, or, as he calls it, my *compound forgery*, he ſaith *my Diſarmer had ſhewed that I had no word expreſſing my poſition in any teſtimony alledged* in the *Tr. of Schiſm.* And that *therefore it is expected that I ſhould produce new ones which were expreſs, in my Reply and Anſwer.*] And accordingly fetches this as a Teſtimony out of my Reply, when it is notorious to all, that my Reply was publiſht before the Diſarmer appeared in the world, and therefore could not by any ſenſible man be expected to repair the defects, which the Diſarmer is pretended to have diſcovered. So again p. 250. when to lay more weight on the Doctour's falcification in this *Teſtimony* in the Reply, he ſaith, *that ſince* id eſt *which ſtickled ſo much before (in the Tr. of Sch.) was ſhamed out of countenance by Sch. Diſarmed, now he adds what words he pleaſes without any* id eſt *at all.*] Here again *Sch. Diſarmed* (to ſet off a fancy of *S. W's*) muſt be believed to be publiſht *before* the *Reply*, which he knows it was not, or by a ſtrange ſuppoſition, not imaginable without more than ordinary *divination*, have an influence on the framing of that which was before it. This muſt needs be a godly engagement, a zeal founded, in the certainty of his Faith, which brings forth ſuch rarities as theſe.

12. But what if it prove not a *Teſtimony* at all? Let this, though not neceſſary to be maintained or inſiſted on, be examined a while. In that Reply my method led me not to produce any one *Teſtimony* of Fathers to prove my aſſertion, but becauſe he ſaid my *poſition was directly againſt the Scripture*, my undertaking was, *in perfect oppoſition to him, to ſhew that it was the expreſs affirmation of Scripture it ſelf*, Gal. 2. 7. from whence alone as from a ſelf-ſufficient ground in that third and fourth *Paragraph*, I endeavoured to deduce it, ſetting down my *Paraphraſe* of the place: Onely becauſe therein I thought it poſſible he might queſtion or cavil at my explication of ſome phraſes, I took St. *Chryſoſtome's Scholia* along with me, and in two particulars which I thought moſt liable to ambiguity, I made uſe of his name to ſhew they were not my *ſingular* interpretations. This I did once in the third, and once in the fourth *paragraph*, and both theſe were equally *teſtimonies*, or equally no *teſtimonies*; If they were *Teſtimonies*, why did he not ſet down the *former* of them, as well as the *latter*? If he had, then that would have been, as I ſaid, the *firſt*, and this the *ſecond Teſtimony* (which is not the *ſeventh*) but he did not ſo, nor at all take notice of the firſt, as a *Teſtimony*, and therefore I make bold to conclude, from parity of reaſon, that in his own ſerious judgment, he could not deem this a *teſtimony*, and then the very *foundation* of all his charge is defeated.

13. By *Teſtimony* 'tis plain he underſtands a citation from an *Author* brought to prove a *poſition*, and accordingly here he introduceth it in theſe words, *His ſeventh Teſtimony*; *where after he had told us*, &c. *he undertakes to prove it, beginning his paragraph thus, &c.*] Here 'tis viſible he ſuppoſeth me to produce the following words both as from St. *Chryſoſtome*, and as a *teſtimony* to prove my *poſition*, viz. *that* Paul *and* Barnabas had a *province intruſted to them by their agreement*; but for that, it is certain they were never produced by me as a *teſtimony*. For firſt, this ſuppoſed *poſition* is neither my words, nor meaning, nor to my underſtanding intelligible ſenſe, confounding their *having the province intruſted* to them (viz. by *Chriſt*) with their *own agreement*. My meaning (I ſuppoſe the ſame with the *Apoſtles*) is evident, that they were firſt *intruſted by Chriſt* with *preaching to the Gentiles*, and ſo the *Gentiles* were the *province* aſſigned them by *Chriſt* (as *Chriſt* * ſaith to *Paul*, *I will ſend thee far hence unto the Gentiles*, bidding him *depart out of Judæa*) and then afterward, they and *Peter*, &c. *agreed* accordingly, that *we*, ſaith *Paul*, *ſhould go to the heathen, they to the circumciſion*. Secondly, this poſition as far as it was ſenſe, and mine, *i. e.* as I now interpret it, was, and ſtill is, to my ſeeming, the expreſs words of that text, and ſo being confirmed from an Apoſtle, needed not, neither pretended to any other authority to prove or confirm it; for when I had produced and aſſumed to juſtify it by St. *Paul*, why ſhould I apply my ſelf to any Father to confirm what St. *Paul* had ſaid? when

* Act. 22. 21.

there

there was ambiguity in St. *Paul*, I might vouch a Father's concurrence with my interpretation, and ſo twice I did, but if that were *citing a teſtimony*, it was in another notion of it, than what *S. W.* ſpake of, onely to ſhew that St. *Chryſoſtome* interpreted St. *Paul*'s phraſes as I interpret them, not to prove, as he ſaith, my poſition by them. And this I thought uſefull to premiſe to the diſcovery of the perfect injuſtices and calumnies, which he hath heaped up in this matter, founding it on the *ſly inſinuation* of this being my *ſeventh teſtimony*, to *prove my poſition*, when beſides his deforming my poſition, 'tis manifeſt I, in that place, pretended to no *humane teſtimony* to prove it.

14. But this is not all, nor indeed any neceſſary part of my anſwer, but onely preluſory, and πρὸς ἔνστασιν, and to make way for that which follows. For ſecondly, when he ſets down four lines of words in Greek out of St. *Chryſoſtome*. And aſſures the Reader, *theſe are his Comment on that place which is the teſtimony related to by Dr.* H. either there is a manifeſt fallacy in it, or elſe it is impoſſible he ſhould juſtify it from being another miſrepreſentation. For either he muſt mean, that the place, on which St. *Chryſoſtome* comments, is my Teſtimony, and then he comes near the truth, that the words of St. *Paul*, *Gal.* II. 7. taking in alſo v. 9. are indeed my teſtimony, and if ſo, then how came my teſtimony to be vouched from St. *Chryſoſtome*? Or he muſt mean, that thoſe words produced by him out of St. *Chryſoſtome* are the Teſtimony by me related to, and that will have no truth in it, as ſhall thus appear.

15. Firſt, I do no otherwiſe refer to any place or particular words in St. *Chryſoſtome*, than by naming that Father; I refer not to any *line* or *page*, as is manifeſt to any that ſhall look; and why may it not be in ſome other place, and words, than thoſe which he hath recited? Nay, why ſhould I not in any reaſon be ſuppoſed to have referred to that, or thoſe places, one or more, where the words are found, which he ſaith *I cited from Chryſoſtome*, than to that one place where very few of the words are found, and where there are many words to which I could have no manner of reſpect?

16. If he ſhall ſay I did ſpecifie the place by relating to the words [but *contrariwiſe*] in the Apoſtle, and thence ſtill endeavour to conclude, that they are thoſe, which he hath recited, beginning with τὸ δὲ ἐναντίον: *What is contrariwiſe?* I anſwer, that he is ſtill doubly wide of his mark; for 1. I related not ſimply to the Apoſtles words [but *contrariwiſe*] but (as he will ſee if he look again) to thoſe words *but contrariwiſe* (*the beginning of v. 7.*) *as that is oppoſed to their adding to him, v. 6.* Hence then, *i. e.* from his *Comments* on thoſe two phraſes in thoſe two verſes, that which he calls my *Teſtimony* was to have been fetcht, and that he did not endeavour to doe thus, was his firſt miſcarriage: His ſecond, that faſtening on the latter onely, he takes in the τίνες φασι, what St. *Chryſoſtome* ſaith ſome ſaid, but himſelf utterly rejected. For how could that be referred to by me, as any part of that *Father's Teſtimony*, which was quite contrary both to mine and his ſenſe, and as ſuch diſcarded by him, and not ſo much as named or thought of by me? yet this is a full half of that which muſt needs be called my *ſeventh Teſtimony*.

17. This is very ſtrange dealing, and the bare narration thereof, fit to tire the Reader (as well as writer) who hath ſmall intereſts a driving, whilſt he is forced to be preſent at ſuch *gainleſs* diſcoveries. That his patience may approach toward the end of its exerciſe, I will as perſpicuouſly and ſuccinctly, as I can, lay (as far as I was or can be concerned) the whole matter before him: The plain and brief of it is this: *For the explaining* the paſſage between the *Apoſtles*, Gal. 2. 6,7, 9. I named, and put together ſeveral expreſſions out of St. *Chryſoſtome*, not as they lay in one place, but as being diſperſed in him they concurred to make up the ſenſe I ſought for, yet ſet them not all down as his, but marking a few in the *Italick letter* as a citation, I left the other to be read as my own, for which I ſhall by and by give my reaſon; and becauſe *S.W.* finds not all the words together in one period, which of his own accord, not on my directions, he pitches on, in that Father, he makes full ſpeed to call all my friends together, and proclaims me the groſſeſt falſifier.

18. What he might look for in my citation, was ſufficiently told him in the beginning of the *Paragraph*, viz. the *ſpecial importance of* ἀλλὰ τἐναντίον *but contrariwiſe, v. 7. as that is oppoſed to* προσανέθεντο *their adding to him, v. 6.* Accordingly my citation was in theſe words of his, τὸ γὰρ ἐναντίον τῷ μέμψασθαι τὸ ἐπαινέσαι, *for the contrary of oppoſing or finding fault, is commending*, which without ſetting down the Greek, but onely marking the two words [*oppoſing* and *commending*] by *Italick* letters, I interweaved into the *ſeries* of the interpretation, which I applied to a few verſes of that Chapter, yet affixing no more to *Chryſoſtome* but this, *James*, ſaith he, *and* Peter *and* John *were ſo far from oppoſing any thing that he had done, from adviſing him any thing more, from telling him any circumſtance more than before he knew, that they not onely approved but commended what he had done.* This was the utmoſt that he can pretend I *cited* from St. *Chryſoſtome* as the importance of τἐναντίον *contrariwiſe, &c.* But the truth is, I cited not ſo much; not that I think St. *Chryſoſtome* would not own this, but becauſe I ſaw an errour in the Copy, ſo groſs that I could not but diſcern it to be an errour, yet ſo unconſiderable to our debate, that I could as little deem it reaſonable to go out of the way to take notice of it, but choſe rather to leave ſome of the words in the common letter, than conteſt them to be St. *Chryſoſtome*'s: What this was, I ſhall now think my ſelf obliged to tell him, to remove all miſpriſion: In one paſſage of that Father on *v.* 7. the words lie now thus in Sir *H. Savile's Edition*, which I uſe, ὃ τοίνυν τοῦτο βούλεται εἰπεῖν τἐναντίον λέγων, ἀλλ' ὅτι μόνον οὐκ ἐπετίμησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόσῳ ἀπέχον τοῦ μέμψασθαι, ὅτι καὶ ἐπήνεσαν, i. e. *he therefore means not this, when he ſaith, contrariwiſe, but that onely they reprehended not, but alſo that they were ſo far from finding fault, that they alſo commended.* Now to ſpeak plainly, I take not this to be *ſenſe*, but think it unqueſtionable, that ὐ *not*, is wanting here, and that it ought to be ἀλλ' ὅτι ὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐπετίμησαν, *but that not onely they reprehended not, but alſo* ------ (What ſenſe S. W's [*ſave onely that*] will bear, whereby he interprets ἀλλ' ὅτι μόνον, I will not now queſtion) this being the truth of the buſineſs, but not worth the pains of a ſolicitous diſcovery, ſo much out of its ſeaſon, what could I do fitter, than what I did, ſet down in the vulgar letter, as if it were in my own words, a plain explication of *Chryſoſtome*'s, which I know I could juſtify to be his ſenſe, nay expreſs words in ſeveral places, *viz.* that Peter *and* James *and* John *were ſo far from oppoſing any thing that he* (Paul) *had*

had done, from adviſing any thing more, from telling him any circumſtance more than before he knew, that they not onely approved but commended what he had done. The ſubſtance of theſe words is already evidenced to be delivered in the citation now ſet down, and for the other words which are added, though but by way of *explication*, and might be allowed to be my *Engliſh* paraphraſe of his, or, by his direction, of the *Apoſtles Greek*, are yet, as I ſaid, in the lines immediately precedent, on v. 6. to be read in *him* alſo; for whereas I uſe *oppoſing*, where, in the words already ſet, it was μὴ μεμφαδαι *finding fault*, I had that from him, as the interpretation of their *adding nothing to him*, † οὐκ ἀναπιάδησαν, ſaith he, *they oppoſed me not*, were *not contrary* to me, whereas I add, *adviſing any thing more, telling any circumſtance more than before he knew*, I had that alſo from him, οὐκ ἐδίδαξαν, ὃ ἐδιώρθωσαν, ὃ πλέον τι φροσέθηκαν ὧν ἤδεσαν, i. e. literally, *they taught not, they adviſed* or *rectified not, they added not any more than I knew.* † P. 728. l. 6. *Ibid.* l. 8.

19. Where now is the *egregious* and *moſt wilfull falſification?* I cited this as *Chryſoſtome's* interpretation of [*contrariwiſe*] *as that is oppoſed to their adding to him*, and I have now avouched it all from thence; Onely it was not every word in one and the ſame period (though all in the compaſs of very few lines, all in his explication of thoſe words to which I affixt them, and the ſubſtance of all in thoſe very words, that S. *W.* was pleaſed to take notice of.) And ſo much for this long and diſmall Tragedy, this diſcovery of *ſtrange unparallel'd falſifications*, undoubtedly never thought of by any but himſelf, if yet it be credible that he ſhould in any earneſt think them ſuch.

20. But 'tis poſſible it may ſtill be demanded, Do not there follow more words in that period of mine yet, which are, ſeemingly at leaſt, by me father'd on, but no where to be found in St. *Chryſoſtome?* *I anſwer*, theſe words there follow. [*And to ſet the things the more unqueſtionably for the future, they made this agreement with him and* Barnabas, *that whenſoever they ſhould come to the ſame City mixt of Jews and Gentiles*, Peter *and* John *ſhould betake themſelves to the Jewiſh, and* Paul *and* Barnabas *to the Gentile part of it.*] Thus far and no farther are my words in that place, as he himſelf, moſt for his advantage, hath ſet them down. But 1. 'Tis viſible to any man, that knows what a citation is, that theſe words there, pretended not, nor are either by *Italick* letter, or any other marke, imaginable to pretend to any, and ſo not to St. *Chryſoſtome's* patronage, but as words of my own, to expreſs that *agreement*, which I conceived notified by the following verſe, *Gal.* II. 9. *That they gave the right hand of fellowſhip to me and* Barnabas *that we ſhould go to the Gentiles, and they to the circumciſion.* And what if they were not ſevered from the former by any more than a *Comma*, (which is his onely tender of *proof*, that they are part of the *Teſtimony*) the reaſon of that is clear, becauſe I was by way of *Paraphraſe* deducing the ſenſe of thoſe verſes, as they depended the one on the other, and were not ſevered by any *full ſtop.*

21. Can I then be imagined to *falſify* St. *Chryſoſtome*, onely on this acount, that thoſe words are not found in him, which I never cited from him? I truſt I cannot. And yet if I had done this alſo, which I did not, ſetting aſide the forms of tranſition, and what is merely extrinſical, or needed no proving, which therefore he cannot think I cited from him) the *ſubſtance* again of theſe my words is to be found in that *Father* in that part of theſe *Comments* where any man in his wits would look for them, *viz.* on v. 9, and 10. I refer him not onely to thoſe words, ταῦτα ἐκατέροις ἐδόκει καὶ ἐκείνοις Ἰουδαίοις κηρύτειν ὅπω, καὶ θεῖον τοῖς ἔθνεσι· *It was decreed betwixt them on both ſides, that they ſhould ſo preach to the Jews, and he to the Gentiles* (where the *ſo preaching* muſt infer *the preaching*, and this as a proof of their συμφωνία *agreement*) but eſpecially to * theſe, ἐν μὲν τῷ κηρύγματι φησὶ διειλόμεθα τὴν οἰκουμένην, καγὼ μὲν τὰς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, ἐκείνοι δὲ τὰς Ἰουδαίους ἔλαχον κατὰ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ θέλημα, *In the preaching we divided the world, and I took thoſe of the Gentiles, and they the Jews, according to God's good pleaſure.* P. 722. l. 10, 11. * *Ibid.* l. 24.

22. Here their *dividing the world*, the *one taking the Jews the other the Gentiles* for his *preaching-province*, what is it but their *giving the right hands of fellowſhip*, and thereby ſignifying their *mutual agreement*, the one pair to *preach to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles*, *v.* 9. and this agreeable to what had been avouched from *Chriſt's intruſting*, or *Commiſſion*, *v.* 7. and ſo according to God's good pleaſure: Onely indeed here is no expreſs mention of their *ſettling things unqueſtionably for the future, of their coming to the ſame city mixt of Jews and Gentiles*, and he cannot pretend that I ſeemed to ſay there was; Yet ſuppoſing what here is expreſly ſaid, that they *divided the world between them*, that this was there *by giving hands*, by *agreement*, and one *took* (i. e. *adminiſtred*) *the Jews*, the other the *Gentiles*, and it being certain that this was a *ſettlement* for the future, and not the time paſt, and that there were *cities* thus mixt of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, and again that theſe *Apoſtles* after this came both of them to *theſe Cities*, by name to *Antioch* and to *Rome*, I need not thank any man for admitting the *concluſion*, that *whenſoever they ſhould come to the ſame City thus mixt*, their *agreement* ſhould then take place, and ſo one pair ſhould *betake themſelves to the Jewiſh*, the other to the *Gentile part* of it. And as *S. W.* himſelf confeſſes, *p.* 248. that this is *expreſly and full to my tenet*, ſo the aſſuming of this, cannot be in the leaſt-wiſe ſtrange to him, that knows and weighs any thing of thoſe times; For ſuppoſing, as the truth was, that the *Jewiſh* converts adhered morofely to the *Moſaical Law*, and the *Gentile*, would not be *circumciſed*, there is no other way imaginable how they ſhould be peaceably adminiſtred, but by *diſtributing* them into ſeveral *cœtus*, one to be governed by an *Apoſtle* that favoured the *Jewiſh Obſervances*, another by him that taught and practiſed the true *Chriſtian* liberty.

23. Having thus far travelled for the *Reader's* ſatisfaction in the diſcovery of this prodigious charge, by laying down the poſitive truth, ſo far removed from the leaſt cauſe or colour of juſt exception, I ſhall now adventure him to ſee through all *S. W's* arts, induſtriouſly multiplied, to diſguiſe this dealing, and not tender the leaſt word of *Reply* to them, the worſt ſort of calumniatours being wont to fly the *trial*, when the clear *light* appears, as I doubt not it hath done by this time to the eye of the unkindeſt Reader.

24. But it ſeems there is another *Teſtimony* yet behind, which muſt now take its turn to the bar, having by the help of a *parentheſis* gotten the favour of *Cyclops's* friend, to be the laſt that is devoured. The *ſecond* and *third* Teſtimonies being in *one parentheſis* together, were yet eaſily diſcovered, and no notice taken of their *poſture*, this being then uſefull to *S. W.* (as we formerly diſcovered) and then a-

gain

* P. 233. l. 13. gain that which was out, was yet ſaid to * *ſculk under a parentheſis.* But now this, that was ſurely as viſible at leaſt as thoſe, is feigned to *hide it ſelf ſo nicely in a parentheſis*, that it *ſcap't his* obſervation. Theſe be very little arts, and 'tis pity any man ſhould have need of them.

25. The *teſtimony* is that which we have here formerly ſet down more at large, from *Euſebius* of St. *Peter*, that he *preacht in divers nations* τῆς ἐν διασπορᾷ Ἰουδαίοις *to the Jews that were of the diſperſion*; but againſt this, he firſt objects that there *is not a word to that purpoſe found in the place alledged.* To which I anſwer, that the *Printer* miſtook, and ſet *l.* 1. for *l.* 3. and in that place, *c.* 1. he ſhall not fail to find it. Secondly, when he asks, *how can onely his preaching to the Jews of the diſperſion, countenance that they were his province, ſince 'tis known and granted that he preached alſo to the Jews in Judæa*] I anſwer, that having indeed firſt preached to the *Jews* in *Judæa*, as did alſo *John* and his brother *James*, yet they ſoon left that, and committed it to a *ſingular Biſhop*, whoſe *Province* from thenceforth it was, *viz.* *James* the *Lord's Brother*, as hath elſewhere been manifeſted. This then being *James*'s was no longer *Peter*'s province, and *Euſebius*, ſetting down the κλῆρος or lots of the ſeveral *Apoſtles*, aſſigns St. *Peter* diſtinctly not *Judæa*, but the *Jews* in the *diſperſion* in *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Bithynia*, *Cappadocia* and *Aſia*, and at length *Rome*: which therefore is the ſum of this *Teſtimony*, and thus anſwers for it ſelf, how it pretended to *countenance that they were his province.*

26. But 3. he complains, that *here is no excluſion at all*, and ſo *no word to our purpoſe*, it being, ſaith he, *granted, that each Apoſtle preached to any ſect or nation as their occaſions invited.*] But he might conſider, if he pleaſed, that the place in *Euſebius* relates the ſeveral κλῆροι, *lots* or *aſſignations* of the Apoſtles, *Thomas*'s *Parthia*, *Andrew*'s *Scythia*, *John*'s *Aſia*, as was expreſly premiſed, and ſo likewiſe *Peter*'s the *Jews* of the diſperſion in *Pontus*, &c. and at length *Rome*; Whereon I demand, was not *Parthia Thomas's lot excluſively to Scythia*, and *Scythia Andrew's excluſively to Aſia*, and *John's the Lydian or Proconſular Aſia excluſively* to *Pontus* and the reſt of the *leſſer Aſia*, and to *Rome?* If it were, then by the parity of reaſon, the *lot* alſo aſſigned St. *Peter* was *Pontus*, &c. excluſively to all the former, and to the Gentiles too, which were another's province, and that is as much as I ever pretended to deduce from hence, or as my *hypotheſes* required; not doubting meanwhile but each might *preach to others*, as *their occaſions invited*, having often ſhewed in anſwer to the inſtance of *Cornelius*, that this is reconcileable with the *limitation of provinces*, moſt ſtrictly conſidered.

27. But this Section muſt not yet be concluded without one other attempt. To this inſtance ſo oft mentioned of *Cornelius*, he pretends to recite my anſwer, in *Rep.* p. 57. that it was before the deſignation of Provinces, and then replies, that "'tis St. *Hierome*'s argument upon *Gal.* 2. where he moves "the preſent queſtion in theſe words, *Occulta hic oritur quæſtio*—] But

1. I anſwer. That I ſaid not in the plate cited, that it was before the deſignation of provinces, but that it was before the agreement made at the time of *Paul*'s going up to *Jeruſalem*, not denying but ſuppoſing that there was a deſignation of Provinces before that.

2. That as St. *Hierome* propoſes the argument, ſo he anſwers it alſo, which ſhews him to be of my ſide (and ſo I formerly made uſe of his words) and not on the Objectour's.

3. That that which I have ſo often ſaid of the reconcileableneſs of the paſſage of *Cornelius* with the diſtribution of Provinces, is the ſame in effect with St. *Hierome*'s anſwer to the *occulta quæſtio*, hidden queſtion. This hath ſo largely been ſhewed already, that I might adventure the Reader with the reſt which he adds to the end of this Section, onely in reflexion on this paſſage in that Father. But becauſe he is reſolved to ſet ſuch a weight upon it, as the moſt expreſs for our controverſie that antiquity affords, and that perfectly for him and againſt me, and to incline it to be ſo, makes his eight Obſervations upon it, I muſt attend him through every of theſe alſo.

28. His firſt Obſervation is, that the *very queſtion between D. H. and him, is moved by St.* Hierome, *concerning the excluſiveneſs or not excluſiveneſs of thoſe Apoſtles Juriſdictions.*] I anſwer, that this of *excluſiveneſs* of their *Juriſdictions* is rather ſuppoſed, than queſtioned by St. *Hierome* in that place, as generally the truth is granted, before any man proceeds to propoſe and anſwer objections. And ſo there is no force in that obſervation.

29. His ſecond is, That *whereas D. H.* Rep. p. 59. *places the excluſiveneſs onely in their meeting in the ſame place, if St.* Hierome *had been acquainted with any ſuch, it had been impoſſible not to expreſs it here.* To this I anſwer, 1. That though *Rep.* p. 59. I ſaid the agreement, *Gal.* 2. 9. *concerned onely thoſe Cities and Regions where they met*, yet I neither there, nor any where elſe ſeemed to doubt but there was diſtribution of provinces before, at the Apoſtles aſſigning one another their lots, and Chriſt's ſending *Paul* to the Gentiles, refer'd to in that 2. to the *Gal. v.* 7. and this ſometime *before this agreement*, *v.* 9. and then St. *Hierome* ſpeaking of the former of theſe, might very poſſibly omit to enlarge (out of its place, impertinently) on the latter.

30. And therefore, when in his third obſervation he addes, *it was ſtrange he ſhould not anſwer, the particular addiction was by Apoſtolical agreement.*] I anſwer that St. *Hierome's queſtion*, or *objection* being as it was [*What then, might not* Peter *if he had met with a Gentile, have brought him to the faith?*] the anſwer that *S. W.* would put into his mouth, had been very unfit for it, a mere begging the queſtion, not anſwering the objection; he therefore anſwers pertinently (and I hope that is not ſtrange) that their ſeveral charges did not prejudice their *common care* of congregating a Church of all *Chriſtians*; and I ſay ſtill the ſame, and ſo that *Peter*, notwithſtanding his *excluſive Province*, might preach to *Cornelius* when God appointed him.

31. His fourth Obſervation is, That *his Anſwer inſiſts onely upon the principal charge, to apply themſelves thus ſeverally, and expreſſes it not as an act of diſtinct juriſdiction, but of a prudent œconomy, that either ſide might have whom to follow*] I anſwer, 1. That it were very ſtrange indeed, if a *principal mandate*, and that of Chriſt, to one over the Jews, and a *ſpecial mandate* to another over the Gentiles, ſhould not be expreſs enough to ſignifie *diſtinct juriſdictions*, when the one proper original of juriſdictions is Chriſt's mandates or Commiſſions, and no other way imaginable of limiting or diſtinguiſhing them, but by giving them thus ſeverally to one over the Jews, to the other over the Gentiles. 2. that the prudence

prudence of the œconomy is no leaſt prejudice to this, unleſs Chriſt ſhould blaſphemouſly be imagined to doe, what he did imprudently. 3. That the particular end to which St. *Hierome* ſaith it was deſigned, *that each might have whom to follow*, is by me fully agreed to, and from thence my inference ſtill intire, that if the Jews had one aſſigned them to follow, the Gentiles another, theſe their leaders thus aſſigned them by Chriſt, had ſeverally, and neither joyntly nor promiſcuouſly, the rule over them.

32. His *fifth*, that *this mandate was from God, and ſo is expreſs againſt Dr.* H. *who holds that the Commiſſion given to each Apoſtle is unlimited*] is ſoon anſwered, by diſtinguiſhing times, or Commiſſions given to the Apoſtles. The Commiſſion which I ſay was given them unlimited, was that of *Matth.* 28. whereas that which I ſay aſſigned them to their particular provinces, was of a latter date, when the Apoſtles by the ſpirit of God, as their own * *Baronius* told them, were diſpatched or commiſſionated to their ſeveral regions, and when Chriſt by ſpecial appointment ſent St. *Paul* to the *Gentiles.*

* *Ann.* 44. *n.* 20, 21. *ſingulos Apoſtolorum in eas orbis regiones eſſe amandatos ad quos ſpiritus ſanctus privato inſtinctu voluit eos proficiſci.*

33. His *ſixth* is, that the *ſpeciale mandatum prejudiced not their intentions to preach to all nations, as is expreſt by in commune vero*, and *legimus enim*] And I anſwer, that as far as thoſe two paſſages do expreſs, I freely acknowledge it, for that is no more than this, that they had in common this purpoſe to congregate a Church of all Nations, and that *Peter baptized* the *Gentile Cornelius*, and *Paul* oft *preacht Chriſt in the Synagogues of the Jews*, both which being in St. *Hierome*'s judgment reconcileable with *Chriſt*'s *ſpecial mandates* to one for the *Jews*, to the other for the *Gentiles* to follow, and ſo for theſe diſtinct preſidencies and provinces, if this may be granted me from St. *Hierome*'s words, I have no more to demand in this matter.

34. His *ſeventh* tranſcends all the former, that St. *Hierome doth the ſame as the Cath. Gent.* viz. *makes account that St.* Peter's *preaching to* Cornelius *prejudices their excluſiveneſs*; *So that if D.* H. *have any thing to ſay againſt the Cath. Gent. let him go and wrangle firſt with St.* Hierome.] But I anſwer, that as St. *Hierome agrees with the Cath. Gent.* in objecting the preaching to *Cornelius*, againſt my poſition, ſo he exactly agrees with me againſt him in *anſwering* it, and ſhewing that indeed the *objection* hath no force to prejudice it; and ſo I leave *S. W.* to take his utmoſt comfort of that ſo ſoon fading and treacherous advantage.

35. His *eighth* and laſt is, that St. *Hierome bringing this paſſage on* Gal. 2. *where the agreement is ſuppoſed by D.* H. *ſhews, that either he made account there was no agreement, or that things ſtood in the ſame manner after as before.*] To this I might anſwer, that the agreement is mentioned, *v.* 9. and ſo that St. *Hierome*'s paſſage on *v.* 7. precedes the agreement; But I need not that, but can yield him the whole demand, that *things were in the ſame manner after as before the agreement*, the *Gentiles* being before it intruſted to the *Apoſtle* St. *Paul*, as the *Jews* to St. *Peter*, and ſo 'tis affirmed in that *v.* 7. on which St. *Jerome* ſtarts this *Queſtion* or *Objection*, and accordingly anſwers it, ſo perfectly to the intereſt of all my pretenſions in this matter, that 'tis very ſtrange *S. W.* ſhould hope to perſwade the *Reader* the contrary, did he not place a vaſt confidence in that cloud, which his eight Obſervations were to interpoſe between the Reader's eye and that Father's words, which being now alſo diſpelled, there is no more to be added in this buſineſs.

SECT. IX.

Singular Supremacy, Culmen ſingularitatis *in St.* Gregory. *Ariſtocratick Supremacy.* Clement *his Teſtimony of conſtituting* James *Biſhop of Jeruſalem.* Πεντεπιμωμένοι. *No priority of juriſdiction without priority of dignity. Contention moſt probable among equals.* Ἐπιδιχάζεσθαι δόξης. *Dividing of one Teſtimony into two.* Δοκοῦντες εἶναι στῦλοι. *Inequality infers not Supremacy. Twelve foundations.*

1. HIS *Ninth Section*, after the prœmial declamation, pitches on the paſſage in *Tr. of Sch.* of taking off all *pretenſions of St.* Peter *in the ſingular Supremacy there*, i. e. *at Jeruſalem*, and 1. he will *ask again*, as he ſaith the *Diſarmer* before did, *what I mean by the ſingular ſupremacy, an odd and uncouth Epithet*, ſaith he, *and ſuch as the Pope's power was never dreſt up in before*, and 2. what by *adding the word* [*there*] *the Supremacy in debate being neither ſubject to heres nor theres but Univerſal*] To the firſt I anſwer, that this being punctually anſwered before, he needed not have asked it again; but having done ſo, I again anſwer as before I did, that by *ſingular Supremacy*, which is the *Engliſh* of *Monarchick power*, I mean ſuch as was not *common* to others with him, or which he could pretend to in this matter, more than thoſe others could, who together with him advanced the *Brother of the Lord* to the *Biſhoprick of Jeruſalem*: As for the pretended *oddneſs* or *uncouthneſs* of the phraſe, I refer him to *Pope Gregorie's Epiſtle* l. 4. Ep. 38. where the very Title of *Univerſal Biſhop*, which *S. W.* deems ſo contrary to it, is yet exemplified by *culmen ſingularitatis*, which one before him, not very imitable, had aſpired to.

2. By *there*] he knows I mean *Jeruſalem*, and when to that he objects, thus *the Supremacy in debate is not ſubject to heres and theres, but univerſal*: I reply, that without *begging* the grand *Queſtion* this can have no truth in it, the whole debate being whether *Peter's Supremacy be univerſal or no*, and the diſcourſe, whereof a part is now before him, tendred as a proof, that it is not *Univerſal*, concluding in the ſame manner, as a particular *negative* doth to the diſproving an *univerſal affirmative*; for if the *government* of that *Metropolis of Judæa* belonged to *James* the *Juſt*, and not to *Peter*, then he had not the rule of *all the Jewiſh Converts*, but onely of thoſe in the *diſperſion*. This was the thing which in the *Tr. of Sch.* was, in the place here referred to, undertaken to be proved. But becauſe it might be ſuggeſted, that *Peter* conferred this power upon him, and conſequently that *Peter* was ſtill *ſupreme* there,

and he ſubordinate to *Peter*, ſome care was there taken to prevent this objection, by giving the affirmations of the *Ancients* concerning this, ſome ſaying that he was ordained their Biſhop by *Chriſt*, others by *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles*, others by the *Apoſtles* alone, three of them ſpecified by *Clemens*, *Peter*, *James* and *John*. And though herein was ſome variety, yet which ſoever of the affirmations were accepted, no advantage would by it accrue to St. *Peter*, above others, at leaſt above *James* and *John*; therefore no *ſingular ſupremacy*. And thus ſtood the force of this argument in the *Tract* of *Schiſm*, and the reſult of it this, that if *Peter* had no other ſupremacy at *Jeruſalem*, the mother City of *Chriſtendom*, than what was common to him with others, and that made evident by their joint coequal power exerciſed, and avouched in conſtituting the firſt *Biſhop* there, then his *ſupreme Paſtourſhip* was not over the whole world, and ſo not *Univerſal*, the direct contradictory to his grand pretenſion.

3. The ſum of this *Anſwer* being formerly given, he next hath leiſure to take notice of it, and to ſcoff at it, for being, as he ſaith, *as wiſe as the Text it ſelf*, and is not able *to conclude from it any more than this, that I intimate they had each ſupremacy there, but St.* Peter's *was not ſingular or above theirs, which*, ſaith he, *would ground this pretty contradiction to the former, that none at all were ſupreme but all equal* (and then there is an act of mercy and ſpecial grace, if this be not poſted in the *Index* for a *new ſelf-contradiction.*) To this I anſwer, that it were a rare *contradiction* indeed, if three men in the ſame reſpect were each of them ſupreme, as that ordinarily ſignifies higher than all others; but ſure I never ſo much as intimated this to be my ſenſe, no, nor that all *three* together were in power ſuperiour to the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, reſolving, as he knows I do, that they are all coequal. He that had not ſo many eyes, nor ſuch choice *Optick glaſſes* as *S. W.* is furniſhed with, might have diſcerned ſuch a thing as an *Ariſtocratick Supremacy*, not veſted in any one ſingle perſon, but in a *Community*. For example in a *Council* and not *in a Pope*, and then 'tis no ſuch unimaginable thing for a *College of Apoſtles*, whether all twelve together, or as many of them as made a *Synod*, i. e. three, the moſt *dignified* of any by our Saviour's ſpecial favour) to be, and to act as ſupreme, without placing the *ſupreme* power either in each or any of them, or even in all theſe three, in reſpect of other their fellow Apoſtles.

4. This was the plain truth, and before viſible enough, but that as *S. W*'s zeal obliges him to make all that is ſaid by his adverſary non-ſenſical, ſo it is one ſymptome of that zeal to *ſtop the ears*, and *run* violently, as another to *gnaſh upon with the teeth*, and *S. W.* either was, or affected to appear to be in a fit of the former of theſe, at this time, as at other times the latter hath not been a ſtranger to him.

5. But if this will not ſucceed, he hath another ſetch, and then forſooth he *accepts of my Comment, and lets me mean ſuch a Supremacy or Authority as was not common to the other two eminent Apoſtles*, but asks, *how I take off St.* Peter's *pretenſions to it.*] I have here anſwered this already, 1. That if the pretenſion be to the ſame power in *Judæa*, which he had over the *Jews* in the diſperſion, that is evident to have been in the *Lord's Brother*, not in *Peter*. 2. If the pretenſion be to a *tranſcendent* power, whereby he might be deemed to have conferred this on the *Lord's Brother*, then this was not *ſingular* to him, but *common* at leaſt to the two other, that are joyned with him in *conſtituting* him *Biſhop* there.

6. Here now comes in his rejoynder in theſe words [So that the argument ſtands thus, *St.* Peter *cannot be higher in authority, unleſs he doeth all things alone by himſelf.*] I anſwer, This is a piece of ſubtilty in him, but not very difficult to be ſeen through. He will needs have that go for *my argument*, which is moſt evidently my *anſwer*, and not my *objection*. 'Tis true I aſſume to prove, that *Peter* had not the *power over Judæa*, by its being in the hand of the *Lord's Brother*. But then to the evidence of that, there being one onely exception imaginable, *viz.* that *Peter* gave him this power, to this I then *anſwered*, by way of *prevention, that whatſoever* Peter *did in giving him the Biſhoprick of Jeruſalem, he did in common with the other Apoſtles*; as I made appear out of *Clement*'s words; and what is this but my anſwer to that ſuppoſed pretenſion of the *Romaniſt*? and my anſwer is not my argument. And yet upon this ſole account it is, that he goes on, and arraigns my *Logick* (as fit to be *hiſt out of the Schools in a freſh-man*) that when he brought an inſtance of an *Archbiſhop* taking two *Biſhops* with him to *ordain a Biſhop*, yet not *prejudicing the ſuperiority of his authority, I catch at his inſtance, and tell him it will never be made appear by* S. W. *that St.* Peter *was an Archbiſhop in reſpect of thoſe two other ſuffragan Biſhops.*] To this I anſwer, that if this had been my *argument* to diſprove St. *Peter's Supremacy*, as he pretends, my *Logick* had been faulty; but it being not ſo, but onely my anſwer to his ſuppoſed pretenſion or exception againſt the argument, the failure in *Logick* is on his ſide, not mine, and he is bound to make good his pretenſion, that when *Peter*, *James* and *John* made the *Brother of the Lord Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, they did it either as an Archbiſhop and his Suffragans, or after ſome manner, of which that is a proper inſtance, for elſe my *concluſion* remains as it did in the *Tract of Schiſm*, that the *ſingular ſupremacy* in the *Church of Jeruſalem* and all *Judæa*, was in the *Lord's Brother*, and not in St. *Peter*.

* *Anſ. p.* 42. 7. This I had in effect * formerly told him, ſaying expreſly, that *I did not in Tr. of Sch. undertake to prove their equality by this argument, being about another matter, the extent of St.* Peter's *province*, that it *extends not to Judæa*; and at the beginning, in the *Tr. of Schiſm*, ſpeaking of the *Juriſdiction* in *Jeruſalem being intruſted to* James *by St.* Peter *alone*, I add in a parentheſis (*Which might conclude ſome peculiar tranſcendent power of St.* Peter *there*) evidently looking on that, as an *objection*, and accordingly denying the force of it, and ſhewing that it was not by him *alone*, but by *James* and *John together with St. Peter*. But of all this *S. W*'s *zeal* and the *certainty* of his *faith* obliged him to take no notice, nor of any thing, but what might render my diſcourſe *Nonſenſical*: and the ſame *zeal* requires him to repeat it over and over again, in hope that in ſo many forms, never an one being the true, it may be ſure to *beguile* the inobſervant reader.

8. When

8. When this is done, he ſaith *I add a teſtimony out of* Clemens, *and ſay it deſerves to be conſidered.*] But that this may not help on the deceit, by perſwading any, that I brought this *teſtimony* to confirm what he calls my *argument* foregoing, I muſt tell the Reader, on what account I *added* it; Having in the *Anſw. to Schiſ. Diſar.* ſhewed him that his *inſtance of the Archbiſhop and his ſuffragan* did him no good, againſt my anſwer of not *Peter alone*, but *James* and *John* with him; and with all reminded him, that I endeavoured not to prove the *Apoſtles equality* by this argument, but had another buſineſs in hand, which onely then I perſued, I yet told him (as *ex abundanti*) that *to one that had that concluſion in his eye, the words of* Clemens *might have deſerved to be conſidered*; and whether they might or no, let us now examine.

10. The *teſtimonie* is that of *Clemens*, that *Peter, James and John being by our Lord preferred or honoured before the reſt, did not contend for dignity, but choſe* James *the firſt Biſhop of* Jeruſalem. Of this then he now *asks* (and gives me leave to chuſe) *what the word* προεπεμψάνοι *ſhall ſignify there, preeminence in authority and juriſdiction, or ſome other priority of favour, gifts, &c.*] I anſwer by making my choice unqueſtionably of the *latter* (and then I need not reply to all he after adds on the former head) reſolving, he well knows, that all the *Apoſtles* were inveſted by *Chriſt* with *equal* power of *Juriſdiction*. To this choice his onely *reply* is, *Then what doth it concern our queſtion which is about Juriſdiction?*] Let it then be remembred what the queſtion was, the *equality* of the *Apoſtles*, and I ſhall ſo far comply with his demands, as to add, *equality of Juriſdiction*. And to this ſenſe I ſtill think this paſſage might *deſerve to be conſidered*, though the word προεπεμψάνοι ſignify no more than *priority of favour*.

11. For thus the *argument* drawn from thence will lie. If among the *Apoſtles*, executing an act of *power*, ſuch as the *conſtituting* the *Metropolitan* of all *Judæa*, there was no πρωτιμία, taken notice of in any, no *preference* of one before another, but onely ſuch as belonged in *common* to *three* of them, and ſo was onely a *priority* of *honour* or *dignity*, from ſome *eminent* degree of *Chriſt's favour*, &c. in his life, no way of *Juriſdiction*, and that, whatever it was, in *three*, not in *one*, then it ſeems not probable that *Peter*, that was but *one* of theſe *three*, ſhould be the one *ſupreme ruler* of all the *Apoſtles*. Were this a bare *negative argument*, it might deſerve as much as I beſpake for it, viz. to be *conſidered by him that had this concluſion in his eye*. For although all *precedence* in πρωτ honour or *dignity*, do not infer *preeminence* of *juriſdiction*, yet ſurely *preeminence* of *juriſdiction* infers *priority* of *dignity*; and if it do ſo, then he that hath not ſo much as the *latter*, muſt certainly have none of the *former*, and ſo *Peter* though preferred before *nine Apoſtles*, yet *two others* of them, even when this *preference* is taken notice of, being joyned with him in this *preference*, and ſo *equally dignified* with him, he cannot be imagined to be *ſuperiour in juriſdiction* to all of them. If *S. W.* did not conſider this before, let him now reflect whoſe fault it was. If he did, why would he put this trope upon his reader with ſuch confidence, that unleſs πρωτιμία *ſignified preeminence of Juriſdiction, it could not concern our queſtion?*

12. After all this, he will endeavour to prove from this very *teſtimony*, St. *Peter's ſupremacy*: *In* (no leſs than) *all probability*, ſaith he, *it makes rather for us*] But how will this be rendred ſo *all probable*? Why, his *argument* is by *asking*: *What ſtrange matter was it, or worth taking notice of, that they ſhould not contend for dignity about chuſing him, if they were all equal in chuſing him?*] Here then is a pattern of *S. W's* faculty, which he will ſhew us, if but in *triumph*, when he profeſſes *to have no need of it*, and in compariſon with this, *Dr.* H. muſt be put in the *freſh-man's gown*; and *hiſt out of the Schools*, whilſt this great Maſter that reigns in, and gives law to that art, can out of any the moſt *unimprovable materials*, and at a time when he hath no kind of *need*, freely and *ex abundanti* deduce his *concluſion*; let *him* but charm the teſtimony that was aimed *againſt* him, and 'tis preſently *tranſformed*, and becomes *uſefull* to him. And *firſt* his *asking what ſtrange, &c.* implies that it is *no ſtrange* thing for *equals not to contend*, but much *ſtranger* for thoſe *not to contend for priority*, of whom one is acknowledged the *ſuperiour* inſtituted by *Chriſt*; Whereas the truth is, in this caſe to *contend*, is to *rebell*, and among *honeſt heathens*, much more *diſciples* of *Chriſt*, and *Doctours* of his *Church*, there can be no place for *ſuch contention*. 'Tis ſure leſs *ſtrange* for *contention* to ariſe among thoſe, of whom no one is by any *law* of *God* or *man* ſetled in *authority* over the reſt, the ſtate of *equality* being deemed the ſtate of *common hoſtility*, every man being more apt to challenge an appropriate right in that, which is *equally* his with all others, than in that, the *propriety* of which is *legally* veſted in another, and ſo cannot be pretended to by him, without violation of known *right*, 2. *Clement's* bare *taking notice of their not contending* (for he mentions it not with any *wonder* as a *ſtrange* matter, and things may by an *Hiſtorian* be *taken notice of*, or by another be *related*, which are not *ſtrange*) muſt with *S. W.* be a *proof* they were not *equal*, but one *Superiour* to the reſt. I ſhall then ask back again. Are all that *do not contend, unequal*? Of the *twelve diſciples* we reade expreſly but of *two* that *contended*, or pretended for *ſuperiority* above the reſt, doth it follow thence, that all the other *ten* were *unequal*? If this be the *Idea* of diſputing, I ſhall be content to be ſtill out of *S. W's* favour for being unable to attain to it.

13. But to mend the matter, he hath alſo transformed the *teſtimony*, and on the back of ἐπιδιάζεσθαι δόξης *contending for dignity*] inſerted [*about chuſing him*] as if the ſole poſſible matter of *contention* were who ſhould *chuſe James, one alone*, or *all three*, when the words are clear enough, without that inſertion, that they challenged not, contended not for the *honour* or *dignity* of *Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, one to have it before the other, but all *three* joyned together, as a *council of Apoſtles*, to *chuſe a fourth*, which was not an *Apoſtle*, *James the Brother of the Lord*, and that was it, to my underſtanding, which *Clement* thought fit to *take notice of*, yet not as any great *novelty* or *ſtrange* paſſage among *Apoſtles*, who were preſumable to doe all things to the beſt advantage of the *Church*, without conſidering their *own dignity*. Which whether it be not a greater intimation that that dignity of the *Biſhop of Jeruſalem* was an addition to that of an *Apoſtle*, than that *Peter* was *ſupreme at Jeruſalem*, over all the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, and over the very *Biſhop* of that city, I ſhall leave the Reader to judge for himſelf, it being no intereſt of mine to conclude it hence.

14. His ſucceſſes in this teſtimony, ſuch as they are, have ſo elevated him, that what remains, is but the object of his *triumph* and *ſcorn*; *After this worthy teſtimony*, ſaith he, *comes hobbling in a ſcripture-proof, to make good all that went before, in this form. And ſo alſo in the place*, Gal. c. 2, 9. James *and* Cephas *and* John *are equally dignified by St.* Paul, *and have all there the ſtyle of* δοκοῦντες στυλοι εἶναι *ſeeming to be pillars*] For the undoing of this, his firſt art is, after his manner formerly exemplified, to *cut* it into two. *This teſtimony*, ſaith he, *hath two parts, as it is put by Mr.* H. *the firſt that they were equally dignified by St.* Paul *in the* 9. *v. the ſecond that they are all three called pillars.*] But I that brought the teſtimony; may be allowed here to ſpeak for it, as the true mother did to *Solomon* for the child, that it may not *be divided*; I am ſure I meant it but for one, to this ſenſe, that as a token of their *equal dignity*, *St. Paul* gives them *three* the *common* title of δοκοῦντες εἶναι στυλοι, *ſeeming to be pillars*; and I doubt not but any impartial reader will acknowledge this the obvious ſenſe of the words, as they are *put by Mr.* H. What demonſtrative proof he can produce for the diſmembring, I ſhall not divine, but am ſure he hath not yet vouchſafed to aſſign any, beſide his own *affirmation*, which hath long agoe ceaſed to be ſo much as *probably* argumentative.

15. Yet from this onely way of evidence, the *affirmation* commences *ground*, and as great a weight of *declamation* built upon it, as upon any almoſt in the book: For *there being no other note*, ſaith he, *in that place of their being equally dignified, ſave onely that theſe three are named together, ſtreightway the Dr. of Divinity is turned leveller, and ſhould he hap to find the King, and Tom Fool, and John a Noke's named together, he concludes them all equally dignified.* Were I now of *S. W*'s humour, I know not how I could reſiſt the temptation of entring the debate, whether it were not *John an Okes* which he hath put into another form, and then aggravating the dangerous errour of this *miſnomer*; but being otherwiſe diſpoſed, I ſhall leave this for no unconſiderable ingredient in his *character*, and not conſider the prodigies that would be conſequent to that *concluſion*, which is owned by none but his own *fancy*.

16. But then for that which he calls the *ſecond part* of the *Teſtimony*, *that*, ſaith he, *is nonſenſe in Ela too, they are all called pillars, go, they are all equal, cryes the Dr. as if one pillar could not be higher than another.*] And then thrice as much more ſatyr yet againſt the *levelling logick, cities, common-wealths, horſes, books, noſes, mountains, ſtars, and all things elſe called in to teſtify againſt me.*] But if he mark it, his pretenſions are ſomewhat more, than the poſſibility of one *pillar* being *higher* than another, will amount to: It is *Peter's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, which alone will ſerve his turn, and that infers the *ſubordination* and *ſubjection* of all others, and ſhould it be yielded which he propoſes as poſſible, that *one pillar ſhould be higher than another*, and ſo one of theſe *Apoſtles* more *dignified*, yet this will not avail to his being the Prince of them which is the onely matter of our queſtion.

17. The force of the argument therefore ſtill remains, notwithſtanding this *Reply*, as far as ever it pretended, *i. e.* not to be *apodictical*, or *demonſtratively* to prove the *equality*, but *ſo as might deſerve to be conſidered in conſent* with what went before and after, the mention of the πρωτιμία *preference*, not in one but all three of them, and the ἰσοτιμία *equality of dignity* by the *Fathers* obſerved in all of them: *Paul*, ſay they, being equally and in the ſame manner dignified with *Peter*, which if *James* and *John* were not alſo, then *Paul* muſt be in like manner ſuperiour to them, which I think *S. W.* will not pretend for him, or if he doth, it will be ſome ſuch kind of ſuperiority (as that he laboured more abundantly than they all) which as it hath truth in relation to St. *Peter* as well as them, ſo either that, or the like to that, may without any damage to us be allowed St. *Peter* alſo.

18. Mean while, it may be conſiderable to others, though it will not to *S. W.* that when St. *Paul* compares himſelf with the moſt eminent *Apoſtles*, under a double phraſe, *they that were accounted to be ſomething* (*i. e.* ſaith *Theophylact*, μεγάλοι καὶ ἔξαρχοι *great and principal Apoſtles*) and *that were accounted pillars*, i. e. the principal parts, as being the ſupporters of the *Church*, he gives no leaſt mark of difference or preference to St. *Peter*, but puts them in the very ſame ſtyle of eminence, and that ſuch, that unleſs *Peter*, that is ſtyled a pillar with them, be alſo ſomewhat more than a pillar, it will gain *S. W.* nothing; and he can be nothing more in a building, *i. e.* the Church, unleſs it be a foundation or *baſis* of the pillar, as that is diſtinguiſht from it, and yet even that Title too is common to him with all other the *Apoſtles*, as hath elſewhere been manifeſted.

19. But 'tis poſſible his anſwer of *one pillar being higher than another*] may be aſſiſted by what follows, the diſtinction which he requires me to obſerve *betwixt a community and equality*; but I am not of his mind, when the ſubject of the diſcourſe is *pillars*, the principal parts of a building, it being evident that three Senatours do connotate an equality, though three men do not, and that whatſoever ſuperiority of degrees can be imagined among them, a ſupremacy of power cannot be imagined in any one of ſuch three. The like may be ſaid of *abſolute Princes*, ſuch onely being parallel to *pillars*, and in this ſenſe, if I had found the Lord Mayor of *London*, as he ſaith, and the Mayor of the meaneſt City together, and reſolved from their being both Mayors that the one was not ſubject to the other, I ſee not how I had miſtaken. The like I think of *Common-wealths*, which he alſo ſpecifies, which by being each ſupreme, are ſecured from being ſubject one to the other, though one may have the priority of dignity, and ſo he knows one Apoſtle is allowed to have for another, I ſhall make no ſcruple to take in all the reſt he is pleaſed to name Cities, horſes, books, noſes, mountains, ſtars, the inequality ſuppoſable betwixt any of which, will infer nothing proportionable to *ſupreme Paſtourſhip*, in any of them.

20. He ſees by this, that I may be a little excuſable, if I have not edified ſo much under his diſcipline, as he ſeems to have wiſhed, though he now deſpair; His anſwers muſt have more depth and ſolidity in them, or his Reader that is moſt favourable to his cauſe, will think him ſuborn'd to *betray* it, for what can leſs defend it, than ſo much of noiſe and oſtentation, and cavil, and ſo little force of true reaſon to juſtifie the one or make reparations for the other?

21. What

21. What he addes in reference to another paſſage of *twelve foundations*, &c. which he takes ſo indignly to be produced as a proof of equality, if he look on * *Tr. of Schiſm*, where 'tis produced, he ſhall find that it is not by me, as he pretends, brought as a proof on our ſide, but as an anſwer to the *Romaniſts* argument from the name *Peter* Πέτρος, a *rock* or *foundation ſtone*, undertaking to evacuate the ſupremacy pretended from thence (which it cannot miſs to doe, unleſs twelve be one) and onely adding *ex abundanti*, that other circumſtances belonging to that title, lying in common to all, are a prejudice (inſtead of a ſupport) to the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*. And on this account I might with ſome juſtice of retortion arraign *S. W*'s Logick, were it worth the pains, and were there not ſomething elſe culpable in every period. As it is, I have done with his ninth Section. * *Ch. 4. ſect. 24. p. 90, 91.*

SECT. X.

S. W's Proofs againſt evidence of Fact. James's *precedence in the Council. S. W's ſincerity.* James's *pronouncing the ſentence,* ἐγὼ κρίνω. Chryſoſtome's *teſtimonies defended againſt S. W's exceptions. His citing of* Dannæus. *His inſertion of* [onely.] *My omiſſion of* ἀπὸ νόμ. *The emendation of* ἐκ ἀποστόλ, ἀποστόλων. *More teſtimonies.* James *his acting in the Council as the Biſhop and chief there.* Heſychius *Presbyter. Author de ætatibus Eccleſiæ. The Court of* Paris.

1. THE tenth Section profeſſes to come to the point it ſelf concerning St. *James*, and is an inſtance of *S. W's* great conſtancy of mind, not to be moved out of his courſe by the importunity of any arguments. Elſe it is impoſſible to imagine, how this of St. *James* ſhould ſtill be the point between *S. W.* and me, when the *Tr. of Sch.* the ground of the debate, pretended no more of him, than that the *Jews*, *Gal.* 2. 9. being peculiarly *Peter*'s Province, yet all the Jews were not ſo, the Jews in *Judæa* being all ſubjected to the *Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, which was *James* and not *Peter*. On this head, his being *Biſhop* there, it is as viſible as any line in any book, that all is ſpoken, which is added, of *James* in that place.

2. This being once miſtaken by the *Diſarmer*, endeavours were uſed to reduce him to a right underſtanding, and to mind him both from the plain words, and the evidence of my ſenſe, how impoſſible it was that this ſhould not be his *miſunderſtanding*. Yet after all this, and notice expreſly taken of it, he will adhere to his way, and pretends to give proofs, that I did *intend* that, which is as clear as the day I did not intend; This makes it ſuperfluous to give heed to his feigned reaſonings or *probabilities*, (which can never have the leaſt force againſt our *ſenſes* in a matter of *fact*) and ſo to debate this with him, though he ſhall ſtill pleaſe to call it *ſaying and unſaying*, and brand it twice in his *Index* for *ſelf contradictions*, pretended to be diſcovered, p. 263, 264. the pages wherein he manages this buſineſs.

3. But, in my anſwer, if he may be believed, I have *ſpoild* all, and denying to make St. *James* at *Jeruſalem ſuperiour to* St. *Peter*, p. 43. *I go about to prove it in expreſs words*, p. 45. That *James in this Council was clearly ſuperiour to* St. *Peter*, which is *clearly contradictory*. But there is no truth in the firſt part of this ſuggeſtion. That which I denyed was in expreſs terms, his being † *ſimply ſuperiour to Peter*, his ‖ *priority of dignity or greater authority*. That which I affirmed, and undertook to prove, was, that he *had at the* * *Council at Jeruſalem* (as in his *own See*) *the principal place*, even *before* Peter *and John*, and † in *this Council was clearly ſuperiour to* St. *Peter*. And theſe I hope are not thus *contradictory*; and then how can he ever again expect to be believed in his citation of *expreſs* words, with the greateſt confidence, to accumulate the *greateſt* weight of guilt, where there is not any colour of the *leaſt?* † *p.* 43. *l.* 12. ‖ *L.* 20. * *P.* 43. *l.* 15. 28. and *p.* 44. *l.* 4. † *P.* 44. *l.* 34.

4. So when he will out-face it, *that principal with* me *founds no priority at all*, 'tis manifeſt from his own *acknowledgment* it doth, viz. *priority of place* in *his own See*, elſe how could he believe himſelf, when he ſaid, *I went about to infer that James* in this *Council was clearly ſuperiour to St. Peter*. Did I endeavour to prove him *clearly ſuperiour in the Council*, and yet allow him no *priority at all*; What *ſincerity* is there in this *zeal?*

5. In reciting my pretences of teſtimonies for *James* having the *principal place*, *the firſt*, ſaith he, *is, that he is named before* Peter, *and unleſs that conclude, their argument from* Peter's *being firſt named muſt be prejudiced*,] and to this he anſwers 1. that *their argument is drawn from his being conſtantly named firſt, and not onely once, which might happen without any great myſtery.* 2. *That their argument from* πρῶτος Σίμων *is that he is in theſe words expreſt to be firſt of the Apoſtles.*] I anſwer, 1. that all that I pretended to prove, was his having the *principal* place at *Jeruſalem* or in *the Council*, or in his *own city*, which are all my words expreſly, and that in oppoſition to his *having indefinitely* or *abſolutely the ſo much as principal place.* 2. That the whole force of my *teſtimony* to prove that, was from his being *firſt named* in *one* place onely, *Gal.* 2. as that *one* place related to that *Council*, for why ſhould *Peter* that had elſewhere *conſtantly the firſt place*, and is ſtyled πρῶτος Σίμων, be at this time deprived of his *precedence*, but that it was in ſome alteration of *circumſtances*, *viz.* in his *Metropolitical See*, where the preference belonged to him? 3. I had thought that *conſtancy* had noted never failing; how then can the Argument for *Peter*'s place, be drawn from the conſtantly being named, when at this time 'tis confeſt he is *not firſt named?* 4. Though the Argument from πρῶτος Σίμων be taken from his being expreſt to be firſt, yet as long as no other *Primacy* can be duly inferred from thence, but that which is collected alſo from his being *firſt named*, and which I acknowledge duely to be drawn from thence, I might be allowed to joyn theſe together, and if theſe were two arguments on St. *Peter*'s ſide, the more to confirm that *James* was not *ſuperiour* to *Peter*, I had the more reaſon to take notice of it, that in the *Council of Jeruſalem* St. *Paul* names *James firſt*, and to conclude it probable, there was ſomewhat in the circumſtance of the time or place, that cauſed that variation.

6. My ſecond pretenſe of teſtimony for *James*'s principal place in that *Council*, is from his giving the ſentence, v. 19. And his firſt exception againſt it and me, is very extraordinary, from our own tranſlation rendring the words, διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω, *wherefore my ſentence is*, by this means making it onely his judgment in the matter, and yet, ſaith he, *Dr.* H. *Tells us, he ſtill believes it ſignifies the ſentence.*] And why ſhould I not thus tell him, that I ſtill believe that ſentence is ſentence; or what difference is there betwixt my ſaying, he gave the ſentence, and our tranſlation making him ſay, *my ſentence is*? Could any man doubt but it was his ſentence which he gave? Or is ſentence one thing in our tranſlatours words, and another in mine? 2. What difference is there betwixt *ſentence* and *judgment* in the matter? or what gained, by making it onely his judgment, unleſs that ſignifie the judgment onely of him, and not of others, or as in *Sch. Diſar.* he had ſaid (but now hath diſcreetly left out that word) his *opinion* onely, in either of which ſenſes as it would have no truth in it, and therefore cannot juſtly be affixt to our *Engliſh tranſlation*, ſo it was particularly prevented by me, profeſſing to
* *Anſw. p.* 45. pretend no more for *James* * than that the *ſentence* was pronounced by him, being agreed to by the reſt, and founded as a conciliarie ſentence ought, in the *ſeeming good* (which is more than his *bare opinion*) *to the Holy Ghoſt* and the Council.

7. But he proceeds to conſider the grounds of my belief.] Not, I hope, of my believing the word *ſentence* to ſignifie ſentence; 'Tis true I never did, and it were pity I ſhould trouble any man with producing my proofs, or grounds of that; but that ἐγὼ κρίνω, *I judge*, ſignifies, as our *Engliſh* tranſlatour ſaith (on my ſide, if he mark it, not on his) *my ſentence is*, not as he formerly would have it, my *opinion*, or *judgment* (in the ſenſe of *opinion*) in the matter.

8. But what are my *Teſtimonies*; or how doth he deal with them? When I had brought St. *Chryſoſtome*'s ſenſe of the point before us, fully coming home to all I had ſaid, in four expreſſions of his, 1. That his ſpeaking laſt was founded in his being *Biſhop*, 2. That he decrees, ordains theſe things, making his ſentence a decree, 3. That he was intruſted with the principality, and that obſerved from his behaviour there, 4. That he ſpake more mildly, as beſt becoming him that was in great power or authority; Theſe, forſooth, muſt be four *Teſtimonies*, and if each of them taken ſingle, do not infer all, that I brought all of them to infer, then is the *Doctour a moſt unfortunate gatherer of Teſtimonies.*

9. To the firſt he asks, *Could not he be Biſhop there and ſpeak laſt both without giving ſentence?*] I anſwer, if he could, it was then well done of me to ſay, he added on *v.* 19, 20, 21. εἰκότως πάντα ἐπιτάττει, *he rightly decrees, ordains theſe things*, it being ſufficient that from the former words it appeared that his *ſpeaking laſt* was an indication of his *Epiſcopal dignity* in that City. But on this head he hits it with *two queſtions*, 1. *Was there no worthier perſons preſent? 2. Did the thing concluded onely concern his See, or did it at all concern it, the Reſcript being directed to the Gentiles?*] I anſwer to the firſt, that the Apoſtles were in ſome reſpect worthier perſons than *James*, which was none of the twelve, and therefore it was onely in his own See, that I pretend from St. *Chryſoſtome*, that he had the *principal place*: To the ſecond, that the *Reſcript* concluded and ſent to the Gentiles, was to allow them a liberty which the *Jewiſh Chriſtians* allowed them not, *Act.* 15. 1. and to repreſs theſe, or examine their pretenſions, the Council was aſſembled, v. 2. and ſo that was the obvious concernment of *James* his See in this matter.

10. But this is not all, for whilſt one piece of *S. W.* was a picking holes in this *Teſtimony* at home, and had done his part againſt it, the other is ſent to *forage* at the *Stationers*, and ſee what booty he could get there by turning to the place in *Chryſoſtome*; And then though he confeſs the *firſt teſtimony is full and expreſs* (which yet even now was *nothing to the purpoſe*) yet *unfortunate man!* ſaith he,
P. 265. l. 5. *nothing will ſucceed with him*, and the obſervation is made indefinitely, that when the *Teſtimonies hap to be full and expreſs, then they come off worſt of all*, which if it have truth, 'tis eaſily ſeen whoſe blame it is; ſure, not his that brought the *proofs full and expreſs*, but whoſe malignant eyes had the power of faſcinating and inchanting them.

11. And what is the matter after all this? Why, ſaith he, *let him look into their own Edition of St.* Chryſoſtome, *and* Dannæus *his Notes, and he ſhall ſee what is become of his* [*therefore he ſpeaks laſt*] *upon which onely he builds*, verba hæc, *ſaith he*, interpres non agnoſcit, *the interpreter doth not acknowledge theſe words, neither truly do they ſeem to be fitly placed, for in regard he was a Biſhop he ought in that reſpect to ſpeak firſt not laſt*] And then *Io Pæan* to *S. W.* who is thus got quit of an expreſs Teſtimony; Did he not well and truely foreſee that the Wits could doe wonders of this kind? But he is not the firſt that hath loſt the day after the *Trophees* are ſet up. Let him therefore now reckon his own *infortunacies* in ſtead of mine.

And 1. That there is no ſuch man as *Dannæus* that wrote notes on Sir *H. Savile*'s, or the *Eton Chryſoſtome*, which he cites, is known to all men that ever lookt upon the Book; And if he look again or ask thoſe that are more skilfull in the point, and be told that his Printer may eaſily bear the blame of that (onely taking in his *own eyes* into part of it, that did not obſerve it, in gathering the Table of *Errata*) *Donneus* being eaſily miſtaken for *Dannæus*. Yet

2. Neither will that relieve him, for *H.* at the end of that note doth not ſtand for *Andrew Downes*, by any poſſible Cypher, but for another perſon not unknown to any that ever dealt in that edition of this Father.

3. That all that firſt part of the Teſtimony pretended, was the proving him *Biſhop* by his *ſpeaking laſt*, and if the ſame concluſion be in terms expreſt in that part of the *Teſtimony*, which the *Interpreter* and *Annotatour*, and *S. W.* all acknowledge, what have I loſt by all that he now pretends, if granted him? Did I infer any more from *Chryſoſtome*'s obſervation of his *ſpeaking laſt*, than *Chryſoſtome*'s concluſion of his being *Biſhop* there? This then being granted from half the words, I need not be ſolicitous for the reſt, that ſome body hath *lurched* from me.

But then 4. This *Annotatour* founds his note onely in the *Interpreters not acknowledging theſe words* [*wherefore he ſpeaks laſt.*] and I do not think it a ſafe courſe for any man to reform *Originals by Tranſla-*

Translations, without the consent of *Manuscripts* (which is not pretended here) or some weighty important reason, and the want of this at this time, nay the force of it to the contrary, makes me without any manner of scruple depart from the judgment of that my very *Learned Friend* M. *J. H.* in this matter, for nothing is more ordinary in voting in assemblies, than for the principal person to give his *judgment last*, and, if it be that of the *major* part, then τὸν κεῖνειν to *decree* or *determine* the *question*.

13. Now for the second part, ταῦτα ὅπτα δίδ, *James* ordains *or decrees these things*] which I thought did expresly prove, that *James gave the sentence*. To this he replies. As if, saith he, *the decree were not manifestly made by all present, but by* James *onely*.] But who bid him insert [*onely*] here? He knows neither I nor any of my interests, which are all well satisfied that the *decree* should be κοινὸν δόγμα made in common by all the *Assembly*, and onely conclude hence (what I cannot miss to obtain) that he gave the sentence, and did it as *Bishop of Jerusalem*, in which respect he had the *principal* place in that *Assembly*, though not simply or in other places, any so much as *priority*, in respect of *Peter* or *John*. Before he leaves this, he will be jealous, and ask a shrewd question, Why I leave out ἀπὸ τῦ νόμυ, *from the law, which was immediately joyned in context with the former, thus he ordains those things out of the law*? And I might ask him, why I should take it in, but that, as he doth not, so I know he cannot assign any reason for it; for what gain is it to his, or prejudice to my pretensions, that 'tis from the law that he makes his decree? Sure I never desired he should *decree without or against law*? But 2. it happens that St. *Chrysostome* furnishes me with a pregnant reason of my omission; Let *S. W.* look in the place, and he shall find him saying, *That he duely decreed from the law that he might not seem to evacuate it, yet he leaves not them to hear these things from the Law, but from himself*, saying, κεῖνω ἐγὼ, τετέςιν, ἐξ ἐμαυτῦ, ὐχ ὡδὶ τῦ νόμυ ἀκῦσαι, *I judge or decree*, i. e. *from my self, not having heard from the Law, and* concludes εἶτα λοιπὸν κοινὸν τὸ δόγμα γίνεσθω, *then from thenceforth it becomes a common decree*.

14. The third part of the Testimony he will needs set down more largely, and makes many lines of that which was most fully set down, as far as the Question was concerned, in these few words, *setting down their* εὐταξία, *good order observed in their speaking*; *After* Peter, *saith he*, Paul *speaks*, James *forbears and interposes not, for he was intrusted with the principality*. And by the more words he will set down, what shall he gain? Why, saith he, εὐταξία *good order consisted in this, that they did not interrupt one another in speaking, not in this, that such an one spake first, this man second, another last*.] And although I have more to say to him on this head, yet it will suffice, that I assure him, I never produced those words to prove *James spake last* (the second part of the Testimony having fully done that for me) or aimed at ought like that, when I specified the εὐταξία *good order to be there observed in speaking*, which that it was, appears by the plain words that follow, *After* Paul *speaks*—and then what if John *speak not*? the εὐταξία *in speaking* is for the orderly *speaking* of them that did speak, or that none that speak, speak disorderly; and though the Latine Interpreters *bene composita omnia* be but a paraphrase not rendering, and his paraphrases can expect no more respect from us, than *S. W.* would afford *Ruffinus*, when he rendred not, but plaied the *Paraphrast*, yet I may at this time yield him the advantage of it, for if in the *Council all things were well composed* or *ordered*, then so was their speaking, which was the special conciliary act. Mean while all that I aimed at in the words, was unquestionably deduced both from this, and the fourth, that *James* behaved himself as the *decorum* of the Bishop in his See required; and from that one clue, that part of the words which I brought must have the interpretation, which *S. W.* hath wholly mist, for lack of it; And first, he reads ὐκ ἀπεπιδὲ (*corruptly*, and against the light of an undeniable *correction*) James *forbears and leaps not back*, or, as he will render it, *represseth himself and doth not dissent*, without any propriety of sense to the Text of Scripture, or to the business in hand, as might easily be shewed, or even to the word ἀπεπιδὲν for *dissenting*, whereas the true reading directed to by γρ. in the margent (the note of necessary emendation, and not ἰσ. of *conjecture*) hath, ὐκ ὀπεπιδὲ, James *forbears, and interposes not* with any *earnestness* (so ὀπεπιδὲν is known to signifie, to *break* out violently on any, and is all one with his *speaking more mildly*, that follows *l.* 33. 2. He leaves out the [δὲ *for*] on which all the sense depends, James *forbears, behaves himself mildly, uses no violence, for he was intrusted with the government*, saith the Father, but he again from the *Latine* interpreter (which without all truth he after tells us, *that my own side defer much to*, but cannot pretend any one doth defer the least either in this or that place, or imagines it competent of it self to controll common sense, or to give law to the Greek) and this without all *consideration* or care of *connexion*, reading thus, *he was intrusted with the principality*, *Bishoprick*, and leaving no pretense of occasion to introduce it, and yet after all his prosperous endeavours (who now is the unfortunate man?) Yeilds me full as much, as I need crave from the words, that James *was lookt upon in that Council as the principal person*, for such must he needs be, that is *intrusted with the principality*.

15. Nay, lest these should conclude his prosperities, he will 3. (to avoid the force of what I aimed at, and the words clearly and solely import) have the mention of his principality import, that the *charge he had, seemed to ingage him rather to favour the Jewish party*, as if his being *Bishop* of those that taught *false* doctrine, and prest a yoke of bondage on those whom *Christ* had made free, could so much as seem to ingage him to promote there design, to favour *dogmatizers*, or indeed to doe any thing but repress them. Well may *S. W.* profess love to *Greek learning*, but 'tis certain he at this time will understand no more, if so much of a plain *Testimony* in *Greek*, than the corrupt *Latine* could help him to; where the want is, in the man, or in his awfull obedience to his *Hypothesis*, let himself Judge.

16. After this he hath one art more to assist this section, the leaving the fourth part of the *Testimony* (which was expres for *James* his being ἐν μεγάλῃ δυνασείᾳ, *in great power*, and accordingly behaving himself there) to be considered at a distance, by it self, in the next section, lest it should either *lend*, or *borrow* any assistance, from its neighbours; And because he hath done so, and hopes to gain such advantage by it, I shall also make some stay, e'er I proceed to it, and cast in a few more *Testimonies*,

if

6. My ſecond pretenſe of teſtimony for *James's* principal place in that *Council*, is from his giving the ſentence, v. 19. And his firſt exception againſt it and me, is very extraordinary, from our own tranſlation rendring the words, διὸ ἐγὼ κρίνω, *wherefore my ſentence is*, by this means making it onely his judgment in the matter, and yet, ſaith he, *Dr.* H. *Tells us, he ſtill believes it ſignifies the ſentence.*] And why ſhould I not thus tell him, that I ſtill believe that ſentence is ſentence; or what difference is there betwixt my ſaying, he gave the ſentence, and our tranſlation making him ſay, *my ſentence is*? Could any man doubt but it was his ſentence which he gave? Or is ſentence one thing in our tranſlatours words, and another in mine? 2. What difference is there betwixt *ſentence* and *judgment* in the matter? or what gained, by making it onely his judgment, unleſs that ſignifie the judgment onely of him, and not of others, or as in *Sch. Diſar.* he had ſaid (but now hath diſcreetly left out that word) his *opinion* onely, in either of which ſenſes as it would have no truth in it, and therefore cannot juſtly be affixt to our *Engliſh tranſlation*, ſo it was particularly prevented by me, profeſſing to
* *Anſw. p.* 45. pretend no more for *James* * than that the *ſentence* was pronounced by him, being agreed to by the reſt, and founded as a conciliarie ſentence ought, in the *ſeeming good* (which is more than his *bare opinion*) *to the Holy Ghoſt* and the Council.

7. But he proceeds to conſider the grounds of my belief.] Not, I hope, of my believing the word *ſentence* to ſignifie ſentence; 'Tis true I never did, and it were pity I ſhould trouble any man with producing my proofs, or grounds of that; but that ἐγὼ κρίνω, *I judge*, ſignifies, as our *Engliſh* tranſlatour ſaith (on my ſide, if he mark it, not on his) *my ſentence is*, not as he formerly would have it, my *opinion*, or *judgment* (in the ſenſe of *opinion*) in the matter.

8. But what are my *Teſtimonies*; or how doth he deal with them? When I had brought St. *Chryſoſtome's* ſenſe of the point before us, fully coming home to all I had ſaid, in four expreſſions of his, 1. That his ſpeaking laſt was founded in his being *Biſhop*, 2. That he decrees, ordains theſe things, making his ſentence a decree, 3. That he was intruſted with the principality, and that obſerved from his behaviour there, 4. That he ſpake more mildly, as beſt becoming him that was in great power or authority; Theſe, forſooth, muſt be four *Teſtimonies*, and if each of them taken ſingle, do not infer all, that I brought all of them to infer, then is the *Doctour a moſt unfortunate gatherer of Teſtimonies.*

9. To the firſt he asks, *Could not he be Biſhop there and ſpeak laſt both without giving ſentence?*] I anſwer, if he could, it was then well done of me to ſay, he added on *v.* 19, 20, 21. εἰκότως τοῦτο ἐπιτάττει, *he rightly decrees, ordains theſe things*, it being ſufficient that from the former words it appeared that his *ſpeaking laſt* was an indication of his *Epiſcopal dignity* in that City. But on this head he hits it with *two queſtions*, 1. *Was there no worthier perſons preſent?* 2. *Did the thing concluded onely concern his See, or did it at all concern it, the Reſcript being directed to the Gentiles?*] I anſwer to the firſt, that the Apoſtles were in ſome reſpect worthier perſons than *James*, which was none of the twelve, and therefore it was onely in his own See, that I pretend from St. *Chryſoſtome*, that he had the *principal place*: To the ſecond, that the *Reſcript* concluded and ſent to the Gentiles, was to allow them a liberty which the *Jewiſh Chriſtians* allowed them not, *Act.* 15. 1. and to repreſs theſe, or examine their pretenſions, the Council was aſſembled, v. 2. and ſo that was the obvious concernment of *James* his See in this matter.

10. But this is not all, for whilſt one piece of *S. W.* was a picking holes in this *Teſtimony* at home, and had done his part againſt it, the other is ſent to *forage* at the *Stationers*, and ſee what booty he could get there by turning to the place in *Chryſoſtome*; And then though he confeſs the *firſt teſtimony is full and expreſs* (which yet even now was *nothing to the purpoſe*) yet *unfortunate man!* ſaith he,
P. 265. l. 5. *nothing will ſucceed with him*, and the obſervation is made indefinitely, that when the *Teſtimonies hap to be full and expreſs, then they come off worſt of all*, which if it have truth, 'tis eaſily ſeen whoſe blame it is; ſure, not his that brought the *proofs full and expreſs*, but whoſe malignant eyes had the power of faſcinating and inchanting them.

11. And what is the matter after all this? Why, ſaith he, *let him look into their own Edition of St.* Chryſoſtome, *and* Dannæus *his Notes, and he ſhall ſee what is become of his* [*therefore he ſpeaks laſt*] *upon which onely he builds*, verba hæc, *ſaith he*, interpres non agnoſcit, *the interpreter doth not acknowledge theſe words, neither truly do they ſeem to be fitly placed, for in regard he was a Biſhop he ought in that reſpect to ſpeak firſt not laſt*] And then *Io Pæan* to *S. W.* who is thus got quit of an expreſs Teſtimony; Did he not well and truely foreſee that the Wits could doe wonders of this kind? But he is not the firſt that hath loſt the day after the *Trophees* are ſet up. Let him therefore now reckon his own *infortunacies* in ſtead of mine.

And 1. That there is no ſuch man as *Dannæus* that wrote notes on Sir *H. Savile's*, or the *Eton Chryſoſtome*, which he cites, is known to all men that ever lookt upon the Book; And if he look again or ask thoſe that are more skilfull in the point, and be told that his Printer may eaſily bear the blame of that (onely taking in his *own eyes* into part of it, that did not obſerve it, in gathering the Table of *Errata*) *Donneus* being eaſily miſtaken for *Dannæus*. Yet

2. Neither will that relieve him, for *H.* at the end of that note doth not ſtand for *Andrew Downes*, by any poſſible Cypher, but for another perſon not unknown to any that ever dealt in that edition of this Father.

3. That all that firſt part of the Teſtimony pretended, was the proving him *Biſhop* by his *ſpeaking laſt*, and if the ſame concluſion be in terms expreſt in that part of the *Teſtimony*, which the *Interpreter* and *Annotatour*, and *S. W.* all acknowledge, what have I loſt by all that he now pretends, if granted him? Did I infer any more from *Chryſoſtome's* obſervation of his *ſpeaking laſt*, than *Chryſoſtome's* concluſion of his being *Biſhop* there? This then being granted from half the words, I need not be ſolicitous for the reſt, that ſome body hath *lurched* from me.

But then 4. This *Annotatour* founds his note onely in the *Interpreters not acknowledging theſe words* [*wherefore he ſpeaks laſt.*] and I do not think it a ſafe courſe for any man to reform *Originals by Tranſla-*

Tranſlations, without the conſent of *Manuſcripts* (which is not pretended here) or ſome weighty important reaſon, and the want of this at this time, nay the force of it to the contrary, makes me without any manner of ſcruple depart from the judgment of that my very *Learned Friend* M. *J. H.* in this matter, for nothing is more ordinary in voting in aſſemblies, than for the principal perſon to give his *judgment laſt*, and, if it be that of the *major* part, then τοῦτο κεῖνειν to *decree* or *determine* the *queſtion*.

13. Now for the ſecond part, ταῦτα ἐπιτάσσει, *James* ordains *or decrees theſe things*] which I thought did expreſly prove, that *James gave the ſentence*. To this he replies. As if, ſaith he, *the decree were not manifeſtly made by all preſent, but by* James *onely*.] But who bid him inſert [*onely*] here? He knows neither I nor any of my intereſts, which are all well ſatisfied that the *decree* ſhould be κοινὸν δόγμα made in common by all the *Aſſembly*, and onely conclude hence (what I cannot miſs to obtain) that he gave the ſentence, and did it as *Biſhop of Jeruſalem*, in which reſpect he had the *principal* place in that *Aſſembly*, though not ſimply or in other places, any ſo much as *priority*, in reſpect of *Peter* or *John*. Before he leaves this, he will be jealous, and ask a ſhrewd queſtion, Why I leave out ἀπὸ τῦ νόμε, *from the law, which was immediately joyned in context with the former, thus he ordains thoſe things out of the law?* And I might ask him, why I ſhould take it in, but that, as he doth not, ſo I know he cannot aſſign any reaſon for it; for what gain is it to his, or prejudice to my pretenſions, that 'tis from the law that he makes his decree? Sure I never deſired he ſhould *decree without or againſt law?* But 2. it happens that St. *Chryſoſtome* furniſhes me with a pregnant reaſon of my omiſſion; Let *S. W.* look in the place, and he ſhall find him ſaying, *That he duely decreed from the law that he might not ſeem to evacuate it, yet he leaves not them to hear theſe things from the Law, but from himſelf, ſaying,* κεῖνω ἐγὼ, τετέκην, ὀξ ἐμαυτῦ, ὄκ ἀκῦσαι τῦ νόμε, *I judge or decree*, i. e. *from my ſelf, not having heard from the Law, and* concludes εἶτα λοιπὸν κοινὸν τὸ δόγμα γίνεται, *then from thenceforth it becomes a common decree.*

14. The third part of the Teſtimony he will needs ſet down more largely, and makes many lines of that which was moſt fully ſet down, as far as the Queſtion was concerned, in theſe few words, *ſetting down their* εὐταξία, *good order obſerved in their ſpeaking*; *After* Peter, *ſaith he*, Paul *ſpeaks*, James *forbears and interpoſes not, for he was intruſted with the principality.* And by the more words he will ſet down, what ſhall he gain? Why, ſaith he, εὐταξία *good order conſiſted in this, that they did not interrupt one another in ſpeaking, not in this, that ſuch an one ſpake firſt, this man ſecond, another laſt.*] And although I have more to ſay to him on this head, yet it will ſuffice, that I aſſure him, I never produced thoſe words to prove *James ſpake laſt* (the ſecond part of the Teſtimony having fully done that for me) or aimed at ought like that, when I ſpecified the εὐταξία *good order to be there obſerved in ſpeaking*, which that it was, appears by the plain words that follow, *After* Paul *ſpeaks*—and then what if John *ſpeak not?* the εὐταξία *in ſpeaking* is for the orderly *ſpeaking* of them that did ſpeak, or that none that ſpeak, ſpeak diſorderly; and though the Latine Interpreters *bene compoſita omnia* be but a paraphraſe not rendering, and his paraphraſes can expect no more reſpect from us, than *S. W.* would afford *Ruffinus*, when he rendred not, but plaied the *Paraphraſt*, yet I may at this time yield him the advantage of it, for if in the *Council all things were well compoſed* or *ordered*, then ſo was their ſpeaking, which was the ſpecial conciliary act. Mean while all that I aimed at in the words, was unqueſtionably deduced both from this, and the fourth, that *James* behaved himſelf as the *decorum* of the Biſhop in his See required; and from that one clue, that part of the words which I brought muſt have the interpretation, which *S. W.* hath wholly miſt, for lack of it; And firſt, he reads ὐκ ἀπεπηδᾷ (*corruptly*, and againſt the light of an undeniable *correction*) James *forbears and leaps not back*, or, as he will render it, *repreſſeth himſelf and doth not diſſent*, without any propriety of ſenſe to the Text of Scripture, or to the buſineſs in hand, as might eaſily be ſhewed, or even to the word ἀποπηδᾶν for *diſſenting*, whereas the true reading directed to by γρ. in the margent (the note of neceſſary emendation, and not ἰσ. of *conjecture*) hath, ὐκ ἐπιπηδᾷ, James *forbears, and interpoſes not* with any *earneſtneſs* (ſo ἐπιπηδᾶν is known to ſignifie, to *break* out violently on any, and is all one with his *ſpeaking more mildly*, that follows *l.* 33. 2. He leaves out the [τὸ *for*] on which all the ſenſe depends, James *forbears, behaves himſelf mildly, uſes no violence, for he was intruſted with the government*, ſaith the Father, but he again from the *Latine* interpreter (which without all truth he after tells us, *that my own ſide defer much to*, but cannot pretend any one doth defer the leaſt either in this or that place, or imagines it competent of it ſelf to controll common ſenſe, or to give law to the Greek) and this without all *conſideration* or care of *connexion*, reading thus, *he was intruſted with the principality*, *Biſhoprick*, and leaving no pretenſe of occaſion to introduce it, and yet after all his improſperous endeavours (who now is the unfortunate man?) Yeilds me full as much, as I need crave from the words, that James *was lookt upon in that Council as the principal perſon*, for ſuch muſt he needs be, that is *intruſted with the principality.*

15. Nay, leſt theſe ſhould conclude his improſperities, he will 3. (to avoid the force of what I aimed at, and the words clearly and ſolely import) have the mention of his principality import, that the *charge he had, ſeemed to ingage him rather to favour the Jewiſh party*, as if his being *Biſhop* of thoſe that taught *falſe* doctrine, and preſt a yoke of bondage on thoſe whom *Chriſt* had made free, could ſo much as ſeem to ingage him to promote there deſign, to favour *dogmatizers*, or indeed to doe any thing but repreſs them. Well may *S. W.* profeſs love to *Greek learning*, but 'tis certain he at this time will underſtand no more, if ſo much of a plain *Teſtimony* in *Greek*, than the corrupt *Latine* could help him to; where the want is, in the man, or in his awfull obedience to his *Hypotheſis*, let himſelf Judge.

16. After this he hath one art more to aſſiſt this ſection, the leaving the fourth part of the *Teſtimony* (which was expreſs for *James* his being ἐν μεγάλῃ δυνάμει, *in great power*, and accordingly behaving himſelf there) to be conſidered at a diſtance, by it ſelf, in the next ſection, leſt it ſhould either *lend*, or *borrow* any aſſiſtance, from its neighbours; And becauſe he hath done ſo, and hopes to gain ſuch advantage by it, I ſhall alſo make ſome ſtay, e'er I proceed to it, and caſt in a few more *Teſtimonies*,

if

if there can ſeem need, farther to confirm this truth, that *James* the *Lord's Brother* did act as the principal perſon in this *Council*, not as having any authority over the *Apoſtles*, or as ſimply *Superiour* to all, or any of them, or particularly to St. *Peter*, but that as *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, this thus belonged to him in the *Council* there.

* *Vid. Phot. Bib. p.* 1525.

17. And firſt I refer him to the words of * *Heſychius Presbyter* of that *See*, *Jeruſalem*, who not onely ſtyles *James* the *chief commander of new Jeruſalem*, the leader of the *Prieſts*, the *Chief Ruler*, or *Exarch of the Apoſtles* (as was formerly cited in defence of *Ruffinus*) but alſo ὁ ἐν κεφαλαῖς κορυφαῖος, He that was the top or *Crown* or uppermoſt among the heads, ὁ ἐν λύχνοις ὑπερλάμπουλα, *among the lamps one that had the ſupereminent luſtre*, ὁ ἐν ἄστροις ὑπερφαίνουλα, *he that over-ſhined among the ſtars* (all ſtyles of eminence and priority, in reſpect of this is *Metropolitical ſee*, of the once *whole Chriſtian* word) Adding yet more expreſly, Πέτρος δημηγορεῖ, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβος νομοθετεῖ, καὶ ὀλίγαι λέξεις τὸ τῆς ζητήσεως συνέσχλαν μέγεθος, ἐγὼ κείνω— Peter *diſcourſes*, *but* James *gives the law*, *and a few words comprehended the greatneſs of the queſtion*, *I judge*, *ſaith he* — I hope this is clear enough, till the *wits* come with their cloud to caſt over it, and deprive us of the *words*, or our underſtandings.

† *c.* 4.

18. So the forecited † *Author de ætatibus Eccleſiæ*, concluded from *Clement*'s words, *Quod Jacobus ſuper Apoſtolos accepit principatum*, *that* James *received a principality over the Apoſtles*, *being*, ſaith he, *made Biſhop of the Apoſtles*, i. e. *Superintendent*; by all this meaning, I ſuppoſe, no more, than the laſt words incline theſe, *Sedem Domini Jeſu ſuſcepit poſſidendam*, *that he took and poſſeſt the See of the Lord Jeſus*, i. e. The *Chriſtian Church of Jeruſalem*.

‖ *Art.* 58.

19. I ſhall add onely one more at this time, the ‖ *Article* of the *Court of Paris*, in their *Defence* of the *Liberties* of the *Gallicane Church*, preſented to *Lewis the Eleventh*, requiring *the Pope* to follow Peter's *example in remitting the ordinary juriſdiction to Biſhops*, upon this acount, *Nam cum Hieroſolymis quæſtio de legis obſervatione exorta eſſet*, *Petro tum præſente*, *Jacobus qui Hieroſolymorum Epiſcopus erat*, *ſententiam de ea re pronunciavit*, *For when at Jeruſalem a queſtion aroſe of the obſervation of the law*, Peter *being then preſent*, James *who was Biſhop of Jeruſalem pronounced the ſentence*, *citing from* * *Vincentius*, that that cauſe could not, but by way of appeal, be transferred to any other, whether by *ad alium* he mean other perſon, or aſſembly rather of the *Apoſtles*, I here ſhall not need ſolicitouſly to inquire, taking leave to ſuppoſe, it could not well be to *Peter alone*, who was one of the perſons in this *Council*, and already concluded in the decree. Thus much, above my account, to this *Section*.

* *Spec. Hiſt. c.* 9.

SECT. XI.

St. James's *ſuperiority in his See.* Μεγάλη δυναστεία. *A Biſhop depoſeable by a Council.* Judæa *was not St.* Peter's *Province.* Abulenſis, *and* Eſtius *of* James's *Preſiding in the Council.* S. W's *caſe of the Biſhop of* Rocheſter *and St.* Peter, *or the Arch-biſhop of* Canterbury. James *giving the ſentence*, *the Reſcript grounded on his ſentence. The much diſputing*, *Act. XV.* 7. *The occaſion of St.* Peter's *ſpeech there.*

1. HIs eleventh *Section* having ſingled out, and now gotten to it ſelf the fourth part of the *Teſtimony* from St. *Chryſoſtome*, we muſt attend, to ſee what work he will make with it. The *Teſtimony* is ὅπου δὲ ἂν χρὴ— *for thus* (ſpeaking of James) *it behoves him that is in great authority*, *to leave the ſharper things to others*, *&c.* Whence I inferred that *Father* to make *James* in *this Council clearly Superiour* to St. *Peter*. Onely let it be remembred, that I ſaid not indefinitely, or *abſolutely*, but with this expreſs *reſtraint*, in this *Council*, aſſembled at his *Metropolitical See*. Againſt this what hath he now to ſuggeſt? Why, 1. *That I bring not theſe teſtimonies to prove greater power of any in this Council*, *but onely the principal place of* James, *and then what means the* μεγάλη δυναστεία? *Doth that ſignify greater place*, *as that is contradiſtinguiſht from greater power?*] I anſwer, μεγάλη δυναστεία ſignifies the great authority which *James* had in this place, his peculiar See, and that devolves on him many privileges, among which one was, to have the principal place in a *Council*, held in that *Metropolis*, though in the preſence of the chief of the *Apoſtles* themſelves; and therefore from the μεγάλη δυναστεία I do infer (which is not by it to *render*) the *Superiority* of *James* in this *Council*. And this being ſo clear before as nothing could be more, let him now judge who was that forgot what he was about, as he ſaith, when he next proceeds to impugn my tenet, by ſuppoſing I meant his *Superiority* of power to † St. *Peter*, which is expreſly contrary to my oft repeated words, and ſo when he undertakes to combate that, he fights with his own *phaſm* onely, and ſo I muſt leave him for a while, whether to *conquer* it is indifferent to me, or to be defeated.

† *p.* 271.

2. But this ſecurity muſt not avail me to the gaining of a minutes reſt, for he preſently arreſts me, and adjures, or asks me on my conſcience, whether I do think that thoſe Apoſtles who had authority to conſtitute *James Biſhop* there, had not authority to remove him, if they ſaw it convenient? *If they had*, *then they had authority ſuperiour to* James *in his own ſee.*] To this adjuration, remembring our *Saviour*'s obedience to the force of the like (though with this conſiderable difference, that that was from a lawfull Magiſtrate) *Mat.* xxvi. 63, 64. I ſhall not deny mine, that I doubt not, but upon ſuppoſition that *James* ſhould have deſerved it, the *College* of the *Apoſtles*, or thoſe three that were left in *Jury* and were a competent number to make a *Council*, and being thus qualified, elected and conſtituted *James* in this *Metropolis*, might in like manner have depoſed him; and thus I ſuppoſe a *Council* may depoſe a *Pope* on juſt cauſes. But how doth this infer that *James* had not the principal place, or was not *Superiour* to any of theſe ſingle, in this his See, any more than it would infer, that the *Pope* hath not the principal place in a *Council* at *Rome*?

3. If this will gain him nothing, then in ſomewhat a meeker ſtyle he would ask D. *H.* even on his own grounds, why *Peter* ſhould not be his *Superiour* ſtill, as well as St. *Paul* was yet *Superiour* to *Timothy* and *Titus* after they were fixt *Biſhops*, St. *James* being conſtituted *Biſhop* in *Judæa*, ſhewn to have been

been St. *Peter*'s province, such as he is pretended to have had, as well as the *Gentiles*, over which *Timothy* and *Titus* were constituted *Bishops*, were pretended to be St. *Pauls*?] To this question also I pay my obeisance, and answer according to those, on which he saith he proceeds, as my grounds; 1. That according to them, *Judæa* was not St. *Peter's province*, any more than the two other *Apostles*, St. *John*'s and St. *James*'s, all those three being by *Clement* affirmed to have constituted the *Brother* of the *Lord Bishop there*, as formerly was cited from *Eusebius*; And all antiquity, that speak of this point, agrees in this, that not *Peter alone*, but either *Christ*, or *Christ* and the *Apostles* in the plural, or the *Apostles* indefinitely, or those *three Apostles*, constituted him *Bishop* there. Testimonies of this he hath had in the * *Tr. of Scb.* Which both confirm the truth of it, and assure him that these were unquestionably my grounds. * p. 72.

4. And then he sees, what to think of the one foundation of his question, *Judæa* being shewn to be St. *Peter's province*, meaning his onely, and the no proportion also betwixt St. *James* at *Jerusalem*, in relation to St. *Peter*, and *Titus* or *Timothy* in respect of St. *Paul*. Had he gone, as he saith, according to my grounds, he had taken *Euodius* left at *Antioch* by St. *Peter*, and set him parallel to *Titus* at *Crete*; but then indeed, that had not been *James* at *Jerusalem*, and who can help it? This being premised, I can yet yield to him the utmost that his conclusion demands, *viz.* that *Peter* is still *Superiour* to him (speaking absolutely, as now he doth) having no farther at this or any time pretended for *James* his *Superiority*, than in his own See. And this answer will stand good, though he again, and again, if he please, dress up the same question in other words. Once more he will ask what those words of *D. H.* should signifie, *Ans. p.* 43. That in his See *James* was considered as *Bishop*, and so had the principal place even in *Peter*'s presence?] I answer, it was there manifest, what they signified, *viz.* that as *Bishop* of that *Metropolis* he had the principal place in the Council celebrated there; and if this be strange to him, I refer him for more to his own *Abulensis* on *Mat. c.* 10. *Qu.* 38. And if he please, to *Estius in Gal.* 11. 6. *Jacobum primo loco nominat, ob honorem Domini cujus erat frater, Et quia Hierosolymarum Episcopus erat ubi hæc gerebantur, St.* Paul *names* James *first, for the honour of the Lord whose brother he was, and because he was Bishop of* Jerusalem *where these things were acted.* And thus, I take it, in *Provincial* or *National Councils* the *Primate* of the place ought to preside, though the *Pope's Legate* be there.

5. But what shall be replied to his endless trifling demands in this matter? First he will pitch on the *Bishop* of *Rochester* in *England*, first supposing the *Apostles* to have constituted him there, and then assembled themselves there in Council; must then, saith he, the honest *Bishop* of *Rochester* sit before St. *Peter* and the rest of the *Apostles*?] I shall ask him again, whether he expect to be answered in earnest? If not, I am not in the drolling humour; If he do, he must first explain himself farther, whether this supposed Council be a mere *dioceſane*, or no? If it be, it was somewhat ill ordered that the *Apostles* were supposed to convocate it, for in his own *dioceſe* it belongs sure to the supposed (as long as *honest*) *Bishop* of *Rochester*, to call it first, then to preside there, when 'tis called, who ever happen to be present there; the *Court* of *Paris* their reason being very good, when 'tis taken from St. *Peter*'s own example, that all things of ordinary jurisdiction should be remitted to each *Bishop* in his *Dioceſe*, and such is the *convoking* and *presiding* in a *Dioceſane Synod*. But if the *Council*, he so wisely supposeth assembled at *Rochester*, be an *Oecumenical Council*, such as he may have heard of, once called at *Nice*, then as I think this is to be ruled by that example (the *Bishop* of *Nice* not presiding there, but the chief *Bishop* of the *world*, and in like manner not the *honest Bishop* of *Rochester* here) so I think he hath gained nothing to his pretension by this *question*.

6. What then will he obtain by the next, changing his supposition, or at least determining it to a *National Council met at* Rochester, and then *asking whether the Bishop of* Rochester *ought not to give place to the Archbishop of* Canterbury?] *I answer*, without all *question* he ought, the *Archbishop of Canterbury* being *Primate* of the *Nation*, from whence the *Council National* is convened, and the *Metropolitane of Rochester*, where the *Council* is met. But still this is as wide as ever from the case in hand, where neither the *Bishop of Jerusalem* is the mere *Dioceſane Bishop*, but the *prime Metropolitane* at least of all *Judæa*, if not of all *Syria* also; Nor *Peter* on the other side, the Archbishop there; and so still no part of proportion observed in these deep demands of his.

7. One question more he will yet ask, but by good luck, that being formerly proposed, as an *Objection*, is answered already when he was told, how St. *James* as *Bishop* of the *Jewish Christians in Judæa*, was concerned in the business of the Council. And having submitted to that impertinent task of answering all his Questions, I may now have leave to ask one, whether *ranting* and *asking Questions* be the new severe and rigorous mode of answering Books? If it be, *S. W.* shall have my vote for an able Controvertist.

8. But now he proceeds to my *next Testimony*, and there is some *art* in that transition, for by this means the Reader is obliged to believe, that this next is exactly on the same head with the former, and if it come not home to that, the Doctour is *to blame*, and so he here immediately resolves, and saith it *makes neither for him nor against us.*] But the Reader must remember, that by his own account there were but *four Testimonies* of his last batch, four parts of one, as I, that produced it, thought, but as he with greater authority resolved, four, and three of them were viewed in the last Section, and the fourth questioned, and interrogated at least in this; and yet now he insensibly glides into the next *Testimony*, and that being nothing to the former matter, is *nothing to the purpose*. The short is, I had said of *James*, *he gives the sentence*, and proved it from the words ἐγὼ κρίνω, *I judge*, *Act.* 15. 19. and upon his despising that proof *in Schis. Disar.* I gave him a farther account both of the use of the word in St. *Paul* for censures, 1 *Cor.* 5. 12. 13. 3. and then added St. *Chrysostome*'s *Scholion* κρίνω ἐγὼ ἀντὶ τοῦ μετ' ἐξουσίας λέγω, *I judge, in stead of, I say with power*, or as other Copies reade, φησὶ καλῶς μετ' ἐξουσίας τὸ κρίνω ἐγὼ, *he well saith, with power I judge.* Now I appeal to any man, whether this do not make for me, as far as proving what I undertook to prove, can make for me, *i. e.* whether this do not prove that *James* gave *the Sentence*, which was all I went about to prove from it.

9. Yet this he would fain disprove, and to that end sets down other words of that Father, which he will believe are more largely the same thing, of which this is the breviate, and then having endeavoured to draw them to another sense, these must be so drawn in like manner. But 1. it falls out, that these words I have touched on before, and there is little reason to review them, any farther than to remind him, that the larger set of words had something I acknowledge parallel to these, *viz.* ταῦτα ἐπιτάττει, *he enacts these things*, but withall, reflects on some circumstances, which these do not; *viz.* his *enacting from himself*, and *not citing it from the law*; and so allowing them parallel where they are so, there arises no least appearance of necessity from thence, to presume them so, where they are not. 2. 'Tis observable, that there is little less than two large Folio pages in the *Greek Chrysostome* betwixt these two passages: The one *p.* 795. the other *p.* 797. and the distance well nigh as great in the words, there being little common between them. 3. The former that saith, *he enacted it from himself not from the Law*, is expressly designed to shew the *connexion* between *v.* 19. 20. *I judge*, and *v.* 21. where there is mention of *Moses*'s Law; but the latter most manifestly respects the words *I judge*, as they stand by themselves, τί ἐστι κρίνω ἐγὼ, *What is I judge?* saith that Father, immediately answering, ἀντὶ τοῦ μετ' ἐξουσίας λέγω τοῦτο εἶναι, *it is set, instead of, I say with power that this is.*

* Anſ. p. 45. † P. 72. l. 15.

10. What follows in Reply to the * 12. *Paragraph* is a strange *resolvedness* not to see what is most evident. In the † *Tr. of Sch.* I mention *James his giving the sentence, from Act.* 15. 19. and add [*upon which the Rescript is grounded, v.* 22.] evidently meaning that the *Rescript* which is set down *v.* 22. *&c.* is (as to any man that reads it, will appear) *grounded on* James's *sentence*, not thinking it needfull to set down the words at length, and so shew, how one is grounded in the other (the thing being most evident in it self) but leaving this to every man's *own eyes*, by comparing his sentence, *v.* 19. and that *Rescript*, v. 22. *&c.* for as one was. *That we trouble not them that from among the Gentiles are turned to God, but that we write unto them that they abstain from pollutions of Idols, &c.* So in the other, *It pleased the Apostles and Elders to send chosen men, and write by them, and this was the sum* of that Letter, that it *seemed good to the holy Ghost and to us to lay upon you no farther burthen, but to abstain.* — This which was thus evident, he will not see, but first in the *Disarmer* saith, it is onely *then*, i. e. *after St.* Peter *and St.* Paul, Barnabas *and* James *had spoken, it seemed good* ------ and when I had endeavoured to remove that which seemed to me his misunderstanding, still he insists on his way, and resolves that *if there were nothing in v.* 22. *signifying that the Rescript was founded on St.* James *his sentence, for which it was brought, then it is plain he neither misunderstands nor mistakes me*, and then turns *Preacher* (I cannot say *Saint*) divides his Text, and runs on *refuting* my refutation most pleasantly. But this which he now insists on, is so strange a *cavil*, that I confess I could not before imagine it. If it were his wit then, and now but his memory, I must ask his pardon, that I did not think so ill of him before, as to suspect him of so very slight and groundless a cavil. But I rather incline to believe this, his present refuge, and so not his *choice*, but *necessity*. However it is, I have answered it already, *viz.* that all I designed to say, was that the *Rescript* mentioned, *v.* 22. *&c.* was grounded on the express words of St. *James, I judge*, &c. and so needed no proof that it did so; and so *v.* 22. was a bare reference to the place where the *Rescript* was to be found, and compared with *James his decree*, and this any man might have seen at first, if industrious mistaking were not the best way to *lengthen* seeming (and excuse the want of solid) answers.

11. When he reflects on his concluding in favour of *Peter's authority from his speaking first, and charges me for not representing him in his own language, saying, in reason one should rather think*, &c. *nor thus much upon his bare speaking first, but that after such debate*, &c. I answer, that his Books are too long for me to transcribe every word of them into mine (as I did the *Cath. Gent.* that was shorter) unless there were more weight in every word than I find there is in his *Oratorious* harangues, and he cannot pretend that this now insisted on, is more than so; however I was to presume that he that would reade my refutation, would first consider his *plea*, and then he was sure to lose nothing by my summary repetitions. Now for the [*after such debate*] which he complains to have been omitted, he will find it was not neglected in my *answer*, which gave the clear account of *Peter's solemnly pronounced Oration*, not onely or so much to interpose his judgment after such debate, as to give account of his action in *preaching to Cornelius* a Gentile, for which he had been accused, as was also *Paul* and *Barnabas* for more, for which reason these three begin to speak; the *much disputing* (which he calls debate precedent, *v.* 7. being in all probability the *Judaizers accusing* these Apostles for what they had done, which therefore they justifie by their Commission from heaven to doe it. And when *S. W.* now saith, *That his preaching to the Gentiles was a thing already known to the Congregations*, &c. and that that *former knowledge was enough to satisfie such persons*, he must remember what persons they were that were to be satisfied, even those that disputed, and those were the *Judaizers that came down from* Judæa *to* Antioch, v. 1. and *arose and said it was needfull to circumcise them*, v. 5. i. e. *the converted Gentiles, and to command them to keep the Law of* Moses, which because *Peter* had not done, it is plain they yet remained *unsatisfied*, and expresst their dissatisfaction by their disputing and contending with him now in the *Council*, v. 7. and to these is St. *Peter*'s speech addrest, testifying it, as known by the rest of the *Synod*, that what he had done, he had done by God's direction and signal approbation, and then turning himself to the dissatisfied party, *Now therefore why tempt ye God?* which declares it to be still an Apology, *i. e.* a justification of his carriage, against the disputers or contenders for the *circumcising of Proselytes.*

12. He will now, I hope, see some reason, why his speaking first, should be thought to depend at this time upon the *matter of his speech*, the justifying himself against the *Judaizers* complaints, and dogmatizing, which was the occasion of the Synod, *v.* 1. and not from his *greater authority*; And what if St. *Chrysostome* on *Act.* 1. 15. say, *he spake then as the first of the Quire, and as intrusted with the flock of God* (both which Titles I acknowledge to belong to him) the circumstances of that being as distant from this action, as the places are, *Acts* the *first*, from *Acts* the *fifteenth*, which though they be, as he saith, *in the very Treatise I build upon*, viz. in that *Father's Comments* on the *Acts*, yet are they

as

as distant as almost two hundred pages could make them, and as *Jerusalem*'s having and not having a Bishop, on which one difference, he knows, all this whole question dependeth.

SECT. XII.

St. Paul's *independence. Distinctions without rendring the reason of them. Commission required for Supremacy as well as for power. How far Tradition is from proving St.* Peter's *Supremacy. Independence in the power after it was given.* S. W's *Objections answered from* Philip *the Deacon.* Μηδὲν λοιμῶ. Ἰούνιος. *St.* Chrysostome's *Panegyrick of St.* Peter, *and equally of St.* Paul. Πολλὴν *denotes no Universality. The Brother of the Lord none of the* XII. *St.* Chrysostome's *Testimony of* Peter *being Master of the world.* Πρῶτος τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀνέστη. Πάντας ἐγκωμιάζει. S. W's *unanswerable Testimony evacuated.*

1. HIS twelfth Section concerns the pretended dependence of St. *Paul* on St. *Peter*, and having granted to the force of *Gal.* 1. that the *conferring the honour of Apostle on St.* Paul, *was not dependent on St.* Peter, he not onely denies absolutely *that the dignity given was not inferiour, subordinate, and in that sense dependent on St.* Peter, but reproaches me for saying he ought in reason to offer some proof for this, and then very good game is pretended to be yielded the Reader on this head, by comparing this to a dispute, *Whether Logick be an art or a science*, &c. But when this chase is at an end, I may demand either of him, or (by direction of his appeal) of the boys in the Schools also, whether when a distinction is given in answer to an argument, it be so unheard of an absurdity, to demand some either reason or proof of the distinction, when till that is rendred, the meaning of the Respondent is not fully understood. For sure all sort of words put in form of a distinction, are not presently intelligible sense, and two things that seem to be equally grounded, cannot really be distinguished, till the ground of their difference be pointed at, and either exemplified in some instance, or otherwise rendred probable. As in our present case, 'tis not easie to conceive, how the honour given can be dependent on St. *Peter*, when it was not conferred by him, or as he will phrase it, when the conferring it was not dependent on him.

2. In stead of making demand of such proof, it had been obvious enough to have insisted, that honour cannot depend on any, from whom it was not in some sense derived, and therefore there could be no ground of that distinction; and a groundless distinction is as fit to be hist out of the Schools as a *non-pluss* Opponent. But that way of triumphing, and hissing being left to boys, I thought one reasonable man treating with another, might have expected that usage, which belongs to reason, yet did I not with such confidence depend on it from *S. W.* but that I provided for the worst and unkindest returns, and accordingly this and a second being but prelusory, I added a third Rejoinder, proving from that Text before us, the thing which he so absolutely denied. Herein then did the utmost of my illogical absurdity consist; that I expected proof, *i. e.* reason from *S. W.* and that I made three Replies, when one would have served the turn, but as long as three are not less than one, and the demanding a proof of his Answer acknowledged not the force of it, I am still secure, my cause hath not suffered by this managery.

3. Having said this, I might pass over the two first, and proceed to the defence of my third answer, but that, in reply to my second. 1. he reproves my caution, in requiring that *it appear as clearly that the same Christ that gave* Paul *this power, hath subjected it to St.* Peter; 2. he undertakes to make it appear, and that as clearly as that Christ is God, *viz.* by the Testimony of the *Catholick Church infallible, because ever built on the testification of a world of immediate Fathers and Pastours, who equally ascertain'd---- that* Simon *the first signified an efficacious primacy in the Church, as it did that the words, I and my Father are one, signifie an unity in divine nature.*] To the *first* I reply, that I discern not, wherein the *caution* was unseasonable; for it being most evident, and by *S. W.* yielded, that *Paul* had this *mission immediately* from *heaven*, after *Christ*'s ascension, What pretense can there be, that what was *given* him from *heaven immediately*, should *after its being given, depend* on any thing on earth, unless the *same power* that *gave* it, thus *subjected* it? and why should he that pretends this, be believed, unless he *as clearly* evidence the required *subjection*, as the *Commissions* immediate coming from heaven is evidenced? Suppose two men upon earth should each produce a *Commission* from a *King* for the raising a Regiment, or the like, and both proceed according to their *Commission*, can there be any pretense that one of these should claim *dominion* over the other, unless he have the *like Commission* for *Commanding* the other, that he had for raising his Regiment?

4. To the second, I shall make no doubt to stand to the first part of his issue, that if the *testimony* of the *Catholick Church* be proved to be as clear, that [first *Simon*] signifies an *efficacious Primacy* (which yet is as new a phrase to me, as *singular Supremacy* was to *S. W.* I wish he would bring as good authority for the one, as I did for the other; meanwhile I shall suppose he means by it *Supremacy* of *Jurisdiction*, or else still he saith nothing,) as that the text, *I and my Father are one*, and the like, signifies *Christ* to be *God*; he hath then overcome in this point. Herein then I shall spare him the pains of letting out his *Anabaptist-teazer* upon me (as he threatens, in case I deny what he yet confesses I grant) for so he make good his pretense of *Catholick attestation*, I demand no more to my utmost conviction: Onely it must be remembred, 1. That particular is not *Universal*; and 2. That *Universal* includes all times, as well as places; and 3. That the one thing that *S. W.* pretends to, the testification of his Fathers, and from thence concludes the *testification* of all ages foregoing. 1. Is not a world (as yet he here calls them) but onely a small piece of it, at the utmost but the *Roman world*, and yet not that neither, as hath largely been shewed; and 2. It is no sufficient proof,

but extremely *infirm* and *fallacious*, to pretend the *like teſtimony* of the *Apoſtles*, and the *Churches* by them planted, for *Peter's Supremacy*, as not onely may be, but was in the firſt *Council of Nice* actually produced (as I have elſewhere ſhewed) for the concluding the equality and unity of the *divine* nature in the *Father* and *Chriſt*. When it is remembred how much hath been ſaid in anſwer to his *grounds*, in confirmation of all my preſent *replies* to his argument from *tradition*, I ſhall need add no more in this matter. And hereby appears what reaſon I had to ſay, *'tis certain it appears not, that St.* Paul's *power given him by Chriſt, was ſubjected to St.* Peter; for there being but two ways imaginable by which it might appear, *Scripture*, and *Tradition* truly *Catholick*, the *atteſtation* of *S. W's immediate Fathers* and *Paſtours*, if it were, as it is not, granted him, is neither of theſe, and he hath no other *medium* but this, by which to pretend to them.

5. At length he comes to my *third anſwer*, prefacing it thus, *he would ſeem at length for faſhion ſake, as it were, to touch the point.*] The interpretation whereof is this, that when *three anſwers* were given, the two former but *preluſory*, the *third* directly *to the point* (the refuting his *diſtinction*, and ſo his *anſwer*, which was compriſed in that) the *third* of theſe, on which the whole weight was laid, ſhall yet be repreſented to the reader, as that which came in onely for faſhion ſake, and not ſo much neither, but onely *ſeemingly*, and this *ſeemingneſs* not to handle but onely to *touch the point*; and if I ſhould ask him for proof for any part of this, he is the *anſwerer*, and ſo is *ſecured* to ſay this, whether you will or no, and ſo any thing elſe at the ſame rate, and the *freſh-men* are at hand, and will *hiſs* you out of the *Schools*, if you queſtion, or ask *proof* of it. After this *prologue*; 'tis obvious to conjecture what uſage the *teſtimony* it ſelf ſhall meet with; What it is, I muſt firſt ſet down, *Gal.* 1. 17. St. *Paul* ſpeaks not of the *conferring* of the power upon him (that was in the foregoing verſes) but what he did *after the receiving it: I conferred not*, ſaith he, *with fleſh and bloud, neither went I up to Jeruſalem to them that were Apoſtles before me, but*— and all that I concluded from hence was, that this place belonging expreſly to the *power after it was given*, yet then he *depended* not on *Peter*, no way *wanting him*, nor his *voice*, ſaith *Chryſoſtome*, *but being of equal dignity with him, to ſay no more.*

6. On this he hath many arts of divertiſement to entertain his *Reader*, as 1. Obſerving that *I am no larger in citing the words, and making invincible arguments upon them.* To this I *anſwer*, that I thought the naming the place was ſufficient, to infer what I inferred, St. *Paul's* not *depending on Peter* in his *power after it was given*, and then the *leſs* I ſaid, with the intelligent reader it would be more effectual.

7. Secondly he obſerves, that *there are two propoſitions*, 1. *That the place*, Gal. 1. 17. *belongs expreſly to the power after it was given, the other, yet then he depended not on him, and the ſecond left indifferent whether proved from the text or by my own affirmation.*] I anſwer, that I acknowledge theſe are my *two propoſitions*, and that the firſt (but that is not the ſecond) hath no proof brought for it, but my *own affirmation*, the matter being viſible to any eye, that the 17th *verſe* is after the 15th, and ſo the *donation* of the *power* being mentioned, *v.* 15. that which is related. *v.* 17. is *after it is given.* The *ſecond propoſition* then was it, for the proof of which I produced that text, *v.* 17. and ſo there was no *truth*, or weight in that obſervation.

8. Thirdly he obſerves, that *in that verſe there is no news of power, much leſs expreſly belonging to power.*] I anſwer, that the *Apoſtolical power* is *power*, and the *preaching* the *Goſpel* was an *exerciſe* of that *power*, *after* it was *given*, and that verſe declares his *non-dependence* on *Peter*, or any other *Apoſtle*, in that, ſhewing that as ſoon as he had his *miſſion* from *Chriſt*, he was ſo far from ſo much as *conſulting* or *receiving* any directions from *Peter*, or doing any thing that might own any appearance of *dependence* on him, that he fell preſently to his work, the exerciſe of this power, without ever ſo much as taking notice of any other *Apoſtle*, ſaluting, or *viſiting* them.

9. Fourthly, ſaith he, *how doth it appear that the power given was not dependent on St.* Peter *as an inferiour degree to a Superiour?*] I anſwer; that depending onely on *Chriſt's* commiſſion (as it appears to have done, by his *exerciſing* it without any the leaſt addreſs to any elſe) it cannot depend on any other, and if it depend not on any other, then it *depends not as an inferiour to a ſuperiour.* We ſee the difference between *Supreme independent*, and *Subordinate dependent governours*, 1 Pet. 11. 13, 14. that the latter are *ſent*; i. e. *Commiſſionated by* the former; and *Paul's* not being ſent by St. *Peter*, but by *Chriſt*, is one great prejudice againſt the *ſubordination*; and his *acting* without any the leaſt reſpect to him, upon his own bottom, *i. e.* by the *Commiſſion* received onely from *Chriſt*, is another. 2. It appears by the teſtimony of St. *Chryſoſtome*, that both ſaith, *he wanted him in nothing*, and therefore could depend on him in nothing (becauſe he that depends, wants him that he depends on) and alſo that he was of equal dignity with him. Thus much for his ſet of Obſervations, by which his Reader was to be amuſed; with what weight of reaſon, he now ſees.

10. Meanwhile this confeſſion he yields to the force of this text, that *having commiſſion immediately from Chriſt, he had authority to preach to other places without demanding firſt the other Apoſtles order, and approbation*, yet not vouchſafing to ſhew us the reconcileableneſs hereof with his *depending on* Peter *in his power, when it was given:* Is not *authority* veſted in a perſon by *Chriſt* immediately, and that free to be *exerciſed* without demanding order or ſo much as approbation from (the text adds, without ſo much as conferring with, or viſiting) any other, an *independent authority?* Is not it, in the *Romaniſts* Logick, an argument of the *Prelates* acknowledgment of the *Pope's power* over him, that he fetcheth his *Pall* from him, or at leaſt ſeeks his *approbation?* And if he have no [leſs] obligation to *that*, ſhall he yet be *dependent* on him? He grants again, that if *our Saviour command a thing, he may be obeyed without or againſt his Superiours command or prohibition.* And what he ſaith he *may*, I ſuppoſe truth yields he *muſt*. And ſhall it not thence follow, that in that command, that perſon hath power and authority to doe that action, independent from the *Superiour?* What then ſhall be ſaid in caſe the *commiſſion* be given by *Chriſt* not onely for one action, but for an intire office? Is he not then in that office free to act *Univerſally* without, or contrary to any other's *command?* and if he be, is he

in

in that whole office (not onely in *conferring* of it, but *after it is given*) *dependent* on any but on *Christ*?

11. But in oppoſition to all this, he next obſerves, that *our Saviour could and did give immediate commands and commiſſions to perſons of ſeveral ranks, as to the Apoſtles and Diſciples to preach to the whole world, and to* Philip *the Deacon to go to convert the Eunuch*, Act. 8. 26, 29. To this I anſwer, that it is one thing to ſpeak of *ſeveral ranks* inſtituted or ordained by *Chriſt*, another to ſpeak of *ſeveral* perſons of the *ſame rank*; had *Peter* been ordained by *Chriſt* an *Apoſtle*, and *Paul* a *Diſciple* onely, one of the *ſeventy*, I ſhould never have concluded his *equality* to *Peter* from his having, or exerciſing his *commiſſion* without him. But I take it for granted, that *Paul* was inſtituted by *Chriſt* to be an *Apoſtle*, as well as *Peter*, and from thence, and from the exerciſe of this, *i. e. Apoſtolical* power, without *dependence* from any, it is, that I conclude his *equality*. If then all that he ſaith of *Apoſtles*, and *Diſciples*, and *Philip* the *Deacon*, were granted, yet unleſs it be ſuppoſed that that one rank of *Apoſtles* contains in it *ſeveral ranks*, he will have gained nothing by his inſtances; for it is manifeſt that *Paul* was no other than an Apoſtle by *Chriſt's immediate commiſſion*. I ſhall make no queſtion, but *Chriſt* may doe that, which I ſee every *Biſhop* doe, give powers of *ſeveral ranks* to ſeveral perſons, and ſo ſend *Apoſtles* (*twelve* onely of them) with *one* ſort of *power*, and *Diſciples* to a greater number (that of *ſeventy*) with another *inferiour* ſort of power (whether onely *temporary*, on preſent purpoſes, as harbingers to *go before his face*, Luk. 10. 1. or perpetual, and ſuch wherein they were to be *ſucceeded* by the *Presbyters* in the *Church*, I ſhall not now diſpute.) But what is all this to thoſe that are *commiſſionated* by *Chriſt* with the *ſame power*, elevated to the *ſame*, *i. e.* to the *Apoſtolical* rank? And of this onely it is, he knows, that we now treat. He muſt therefore remember, that I infer not St. *Paul's equality* to St. *Peter*, from his receiving *immediately* a *commiſſion* from *Chriſt*, and acting by it; but from its being an *Apoſtolical commiſſion*, which he thus received, and exerciſed. And to this the *inſtituting of Diſciples* is no way parallel.

12. Much leſs the *command* whether of the *Angel* or *Spirit* (be it of *Chriſt* himſelf,) *Act.* 8. to go to convert the *Eunuch*; for 1. *Philip* was of a rank much lower than the *Apoſtles*, and not commiſſionated to this immediately by *Chriſt*, but by the *Apoſtles* in *Council*, *Act.* 6. and 2. This of the *Spirit* was but the directing him to *one act* of his office, the *office* being formerly given him by the *Apoſtles*, and impowering him for *that*, as for all other the like acts; and what proportion can this bear with St. *Paul's Apoſtolical power*? Let the Reader now judge, where the *non-ſenſe* lies, and whoſe are the *ſly tricks*, which he thinks fit to complain of in this matter.

13. He now comes to the view of St. *Chryſoſtome's* words forecited, and, after his wonted manner, takes them aſunder, and in one *paragraph* handles the μηδὲν Πέτρε δεόμενον, μηδὲ τ ἐκείνε φωνῆς, which he renders, *not needing* Peter *nor his voice.*] Of this he tells us *the explication is already given in the paragraph foregoing*, when yet he knows he had neither mentioned it, nor ſaid a word of it; and how little what he there ſaid, is applicable to the evacuating the force of it, I leave any man to conſider. All he now adds is, that *whether by voice he mean commiſſion to preach, or inſtruction of doctrine, both which he yields he had from Chriſt immediately, yet he ſees not what follows hence neceſſarily for equality of power.*] To this I anſwer, that the teſtimony being μηδὲν δεόμενον, *he needed* Peter *in nothing*, it muſt follow, *that in nothing he depended on him*, and conſequently not in power, and ſo was not ſubordinate to him, but αὐτοκέφαλον, acting merely by that power, which he had from Chriſt, without any relation to St. *Peter*, and ſo that St. *Peter*, that is pretended to be the Univerſal, was not yet St. *Paul's* Paſtour, which yet more undeniably appears by the other branch of the Teſtimony, ἀλλ' ἰσότιμον ὄν αὐτῷ, *but was of equal dignity with him.*

14. But to this part of that Father's words he at length proceeds, and on the ſame grounds of ſincerity, by which he uſeth to divide parts of the ſame Teſtimony, he now will join to this what St. *Chryſoſtome* there adds, πλέον δὲ οὐδὲν ἐρῶ τέως, *for I will ſay no more*, from which addition he makes no ſcruple to conclude, *that in that place he ſpeaks not of power at all*, upon this one *medium*, *becauſe neither St. Chryſoſtome* nor D. *H.* himſelf hold that St. *Paul* had greater power than St. *Peter*, and then without more adoe the *Doctour hath quite diſanulled his own beſt Teſtimony.*] But I am in no-wiſe convinced of that; for that *more*, which the Father's addition of [*I will ſay no more*] intimates, I never imagined to belong to more power, but to ſome circumſtances of advantage on St. *Paul's* ſide, his being called from heaven, and the like. It is not [he had equal, I will not ſay more power] but [he was equally dignified with him, for I will ſay nothing more] *i. e.* I will not, as I might, extend that compariſon to thoſe other circumſtances; and that is very reconcileable with the ἰσοτιμία ſignifying equality of power, for why may not the power be equal, though the other privileges be equal alſo, nay, perhaps though more may be ſaid of one than the other in matters not belonging to power? ſo nothing is there in that *caprich* of his.

15. Next then he refers to his former performances, having, he ſaith, already ſhewed that ἰσοτιμία ſignifies *equal honour for the ſame efficacy of preaching, and in this place both it and the not needing St.* Peter's *voice, relate onely*, ſaith he, *to the ſufficiency of knowledge, making St.* Peter's *inſtructions needleſs, as appears by the words a little after, not as if St.* Paul *were to learn any thing of St.* Peter: and to this he interprets St. *Chryſoſtome's* [*I will ſay no more*] *many holding that St.* Paul *was higher in learning, and a greater Divine.*] To this I anſwer.

1. That as he formerly attempted to take off the force of the ἰσοτιμία, and interpret it onely of the efficacy of his preaching, ſo I vindicated it to ſignifie equality of dignity, which was not ſuppoſable in him that was inferiour in power.

2. That with no better reaſon he hath here endeavoured to reduce it to ſufficiency of knowledge, which if it would ſatisfie that part of the phraſe which mentions his not needing *Peter's* voice, yet it cannot that other, which ſaith, he needed him in nothing.

3. The following mention of his learning nothing of him, eſpecially following at ſuch a diſtance, as it doth in that Father, hath no influence on the ἰσοτιμία *equality of honour*, or *dignity*, and if it may

interpret the οὐδὲν πλέον *I will say no more*, yet ſtill their equal dignity is nevertheleſs the importance of the former, for though he will not compare their learning (that is all that can be concluded from the expreſſion; his ſaying nothing more, is his not extending the compariſon to other things, and equality may be the matter of compariſon, as well as preheminence) yet it is viſible he doth compare their τιμὴ *honour* or *dignity*, and ſaith they were equal in that, which yet they could not be, if one had greater power than the other.

16. And what if St. *Ambroſe* (or the Authour of the Comments on the Epiſtles under his name, ſay, "there was no neceſſity that he being elected by God, ſhould goe to thoſe that were Apoſtles "before him, *ut aliquid fortè diſceret*, that he might perhaps learn ſomewhat from them, becauſe "God revealed to him by his Son how he ſhould teach? What avails this to the Superiority of *Peter*'s power? Doth the independence in point of learning, infer dependence in point of power? and why may not St. *Chryſoſtome* (that is not *D. H.*) be heeded as well as St. *Ambroſe*? and he underſtands it of equality of dignity: Or why may not both of them deſerve to be conſidered, the words fitly bearing both? and then St. *Paul* had no dependence on *Peter* either for power or learning, and that alſo St. *Chryſoſtome* alone ſaid, when he ſaid μηδὲν ἧττον αὐτοῦ, that he *wanted him in nothing*, which could have no truth, if being independent in point of learning, he were in power inferiour, and ſo dependent on him.

17. But he will have one endeavour more (conſcious of the inſufficiency of the former) before he leave this matter, he will oppoſe St. *Chryſoſtome* to St. *Chryſoſtome*; and firſt, he will be *mercifull*, then proceed to the method of ſevere demonſtrating from ſome paſſages of his. His mercy and great indulgence is ſhewed in *not inſiſting* on the Titles of honour *given St.* Peter *by St.* Chryſoſtome *in the Panegyrick on* Peter *and* Paul, *the leader or captain of the Apoſtles, the beginning of the right faith, the great* ἱεροφάντης *of the Church*, which he renders *pronouncer of ſacred things in the Church, the Coryphæus or head of the Apoſtles, intruſted with the ſheepfold* (adding his reaſon for this laſt, becauſe the word ποίμνη *being a collective denotes an Univerſality.*] To theſe named but not preſt Titles, I make this equal return, that the very Title of that oration on *Peter* and *Paul*, is an anſwer to all that is deducible from all theſe ſtyles, none of them aſcending higher than that of
* *Tom.* 5. p. 991. l. 40. κορυφαῖοι *head of the Apoſtles*, and this is given to them in common in the Title, * εἰς τοὺς κορυφαίους τῶν Ἀποστόλων, Πέτρον καὶ Παῦλον, *On* Peter *and* Paul *the heads of the Apoſtles*, from whence I conclude, that whatſoever was attributed to *Peter* in that Title, in that St. *Paul* was equal to him, and that confirms, not impugns that Father's affirmation of the ἰσοτιμία *equality of honour*, as I interpreted it. So
† P. 992. l. 8. in the *Panegyrick* they goe conjoyned, † τὼ κορυφαίω, *the heads*, with this addition equal to what before we had from him, Τί γὰρ Πέτρου μεῖζον, τί δὲ Παύλου ἴσον; *what is greater than* Peter, *but what equal to* Paul? which can no otherwiſe have truth in it, but that as in ſome reſpects thoſe two were *equally* above all others, ſo in ſome other reſpects *Paul* was ſuperiour to *Peter* (leaving no third caſe, eſpecially that of power, wherein *Peter* exceeded *Paul*.) So again, when he gives *Peter* one title of honour, καθηγητὴς *the leader of the Apoſtles*, he gives *Paul* another, abundantly provided to equal it, ὁ γνωριστὴς τῆς οἰκουμένης καὶ τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων συμμέτοχος, *the inſtructer of the world, and co-partner of the ſupernal powers.* So when he ſtyles *Peter the beginner of Orthodoxy, the great Hierophantes of the Church*, &c. he ſubjoins *Paul* the great Preacher of truth, the glory of the world, the man in heaven, and angel on earth, the glory of the Church, *&c.* throughout that Panegyrick, joining them together in terms of equal power and
* L. 26. dignity, * the bleſſed twain intruſted with the ſouls of the whole world, † the yoked Oxen of the
† L. 33. Church, ‖ the pillars of the Church, and great luminaries of the world, κρείττους ἀλλήλων, *more excellent*
‖ P. 993. l. 24. *mutually the one than the other, better than all the Creation together*: This may ſerve for a return of gratitude, for his mercy, in not preſſing theſe ſo many advantages, or, if he will not interpret it ſo, as an account to the Reader, why it was not his intereſt to preſs them, and what he hath gained by mentioning, without preſſing them, let him now judge.

18. As for that other paſſage formerly mentioned of the flock intruſted to *Peter*, from whence he is willing to conclude an Univerſality, I ſhall leave him to judge of the force of it, when, *Act.* 20. the Biſhops of *Aſia* are ſaid to be by the *Holy Ghoſt* made *Biſhops of the flock*; or when *Chriſt* ſaith he hath other ſheep which are not of this fold, which will competently infer, that there are particular ποίμναι *ſheepfolds*, and that every collective is not an *Univerſal*; if it were, the honeſt deſpiſeable *Biſhop* of *Rocheſter*, even now brought forth by *S. W.* muſt commence *Univerſal Paſtour*, for no doubt he is a *Paſtour*, and hath a *ſheepfold* belonging to him, and that *ſheepfold* is a collective, but I ſtill hope denotes not an *Univerſality*.

19. But let us leave theſe, which he will not, and proceed to thoſe, which he will preſs; The firſt he cites out of the 87th Homilie on St. *John*, Πῶς οὖν — *If this be ſo, how then comes* James *to have the Epiſcopal ſeat of* Jeruſalem? ὅτι τοῦτον — *becauſe he ordained him* (*St.* Peter) *not Maſter of that ſeat but Maſter of the whole world.*] To this I anſwer 1. that *James* the *Biſhop of Jeruſalem* is not *Paul the Apoſtle of the Gentiles*, of whom onely he knows we now ſpeak, and whoſe ἰσοτιμία *equality of dignity* with *Peter* I aſſert, as I never did of St. *James* abſolutely, but onely that in his own *See* he had the *Superiority* as *Biſhop* there. I well know that the *Brother of the Lord* was none of the primary *A-*
* *Hiron. Comm. Iſai.* *poſtles*, but onely ἐν δευτερείῳ in a *ſecond rank*, called the * *thirteenth Apoſtle*, and † κατ' μίμησιν τῶν δώδεκα, *an Apoſtle by way of imitation of the twelve*; and ſo I cannot wonder, that *Peter* was thought *Superiour*
† *Euſeb. l.* 1. *c.* 1. to him, being one of the three, who (he knows that I acknowledge) advanced him to the *Biſhoprick* of *Jeruſalem*. With what leaſt degree of propriety, then, this teſtimony was ſet in his front, let him now judge. 2. That it is not imaginable he ſhould think it of any force againſt me, that of St. *Peter* it is ſaid by that *Father*, that he was ordained by *Chriſt a Maſter of the world*, when I know that *Chriſt* did in like manner ordain all the *Apoſtles*, of whom St. *Peter* was the prime. Have I not ex-
‖ *Of Sch. p.* 70. preſſly acknowledged, that ‖ the *commiſſion was given by Chriſt to all the Apoſtles unlimitedly*, and extending equally to the whole world? Did I not juſt now out of this *Father*, produce it, as one of St. *Paul*'s titles, that he was γνωριστὴς οἰκουμένης, *inſtructer of the world*? I might have tranſlated it the

whole

whole world, as well as *S. W.* doth, for ſure οἰκουμένη *the world* is of the ſame latitude in *both* places, and ſo are the titles, *inſtructer* and teacher and *Maſter*, both which I ſhall allow to ſignifie, at leaſt to infer, Juriſdiction or *Government*, and the precept of μαθητεύσατε *diſcipling all nations*, *Matt.* 28. 19. and the *whole world*, *Mar.* 16. 15. being given to all the *Apoſtles*, it cannot be true of every of them, that he is by *Chriſt* inſtituted a διδάσκαλος a *Maſter* or *teacher* of the *whole world* in the full latitude. And then (without deſcending to any nicer examination of the place, which he ſeems to have expected) what hath *S. W.* gained by his *firſt teſtimony?*

20. His *ſecond teſtimony* is from the *comment on Act.* 1. where ſaith he, *about the election of a new Apoſtle he hath theſe words*, εἰκότως ὁ πρῶτος τῷ πράγματι αὐθεντεῖ, ἅτε καὶ αὐτὸς πάντας ἐγχειρισθείς, *with good reaſon doth the firſt* (*St.* Peter) *undertake the buſineſs with authority, as having them all delivered into his hand.*] In this teſtimony I propoſe theſe few things to his calmer conſideration; 1. that it no way concerns the point in hand, St. *Paul's equality with St. Peter*; St. *Paul* was not an *Apoſtle*, *Act.* 1. and though *Peter* had ſome kind of *Primacy* among the *twelve*, yet St. *Paul* might be, and was made *equal* to him; 2. That if all were granted that the words, in his letting and rendring, infer, the gains would not be great to him; For conſidering what the πράγμα *buſineſs* or affair in hand was, the *chuſing of an Apoſtle* in *Judas's place* (and in that by *lot*, and after two were firſt named by the *whole company*, v. 23.) and that all that was to be done by them, was to *pray*, and then *caſt lots*, what can be pretended for St. *Peter's Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, or *power* over the *Apoſtles*, from this teſtimony, that ſaith, he *undertook this buſineſs with authority?* He might certainly have *authority* enough to propoſe, and carry on this buſineſs of the *election* by *lot*, without having the *rule* of the *Apoſtles* and all the world beſide. As for ἐγχειρισθεὶς πάντας, *his having them all delivered into his hands*, that is far from concluding him *chief governour* of all that were preſent; *all the reſt of the Apoſtles*, as *S. W.* ſaith, or any more than the *Univerſal commiſſion to all the Apoſtles*, together with *Chriſt's having* given him a *ſpecial* care of *promoting* the good of *Chriſtians*; and this is no interpretation of mine, but that which the *Father's* expreſs words confirm, rendring this as the reaſon of what he had ſaid, πρὸς ὃν αὐτὸν εἶπεν ὁ Χριστὸς— *for Chriſt had ſaid to him, and thou when thou art converted ſtrengthen thy brethren*, which was *Chriſt's* warning to him, to repair the fault of his *denying* him by future diligence in his ſervice; and then no doubt every other *Apoſtle* had the care of all committed and intruſted to him by *Chriſt* alſo, though *Peter* on this occaſion had a ſpecial warning to incite his *zeal*, and ſo became moſt forward in advancing this work.

21. But then 3. *S. W.* hath not done well to reade ὁ πρῶτος rendring it *the firſt* (St. *Peter*) when the *Greek* (which he profeſſeth to uſe) reads πρῶτος, without ὁ. And 4. when he renders [*the firſt* (St. *Peter*) *doth undertake the buſineſs with authority*] the *Greek* πρῶτος τῷ πράγματι αὐθεντεῖ, doth not neceſſarily import any more, than that, *he firſt undertook it of himſelf*, no man elſe putting him upon it, and that indeed is proper to the πρῶτος Σίμων, the *Primacy*, that is allowed *Peter*, according to that of the ſame authour * a little before, that as *being firſt in dignity* ἀεὶ πρώτης ἀξιοῖ τὸν λόγον *he always ſpeaks firſt*. * *in v.* 15.

22. But then 5. after all this, the *Copies*, which the learned *Editour* made uſe of, to reform the former corrupt *Greek* edition, have not any of theſe words πρῶτος τῷ πράγματι αὐθεντεῖ but onely thus much, as by the *margin* appears, εἰκότως, ὡς ἅτε αὐτὸς ἐγχειρισθείς, *with good reaſon, ſeeing he was intruſted, for Chriſt ſaid unto him, and thou being converted ſtrengthen thy brethren*; which as it is an evidence of the great *truſt Chriſt* repoſed in St. *Peter*, and of his *dignity*, if *S. W.* pleaſe, and *forwardneſs* before the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, ſo it is no intimation of his *authority* and *juriſdiction* over them. On this teſtimony then he had ſmall reaſon to rely, and perhaps he did not, expreſſing his confidence in it not ſimply, but in conjunction with, or as he ſaith *after peruſal of the following Teſtimony.*

23. To that then let us haſten *(than which*, ſaith he, *'tis impoſſible to find another more expreſs for this or any other point.*] And where and what is this? Why, in the ſame place and on the ſame occaſion, Τί ἦν ἐλέσθαι [τὸν Πέτρον] αὐτὸν ὃν ἐνλῶ, καὶ πάνυ, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ χαρίζεσθαι, ὃ ποιεῖ, *what then, was it not in* Peter's *power to elect him? Yes it was altogether in his power, but he does it not, leſt he might ſeem to doe it out of favour.* Of this teſtimony he lets himſelf looſe to boaſt, and heighten the *authority*, and concludingneſs of it, nor, ſaith he, *have we here any divers lections to diminiſh the authority of the words*—] In return to which I may be allowed to ask, why he made not uſe of this boaſt and ovation, after his former teſtimony? Was it becauſe he ſaw the *various lection* in the margin which quite evacuated the force of it? I ſhall ſuppoſe it ſo, and acknowledge it an act of *ſeaſonable* (though neceſſary) prudence in him: But then is it not ſtrange, that his eyes ſhould ſo fail, as to permit the fixing *this* character ſo unſeaſonably to *this*, where the not ſingle, but *double* γρ or *emendation* in the *margin* hath utterly deprived him of it?

24. For there being *two Manuſcripts*, which were eſpecially made uſe of in recovering this piece upon the *Acts*, one out of *New College Library in Oxford*, the other *Thuanus's*, there are two emendations in this place, the one reads no more than thus τὸν ὃν, ἵνα γένηται; αὐτὸν ἐλέσθαι ὃν ἐνλῶ, ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ, χαρίζεσθαι. *Why then doth he ſay, that he may be made?* (i. e. as appears by the *text*, v. 22. *That one muſt be made* or *ordained, a witneſs with us of the reſurrection*) to which he anſwers, *he might not chuſe him, that he might not ſeem to gratifie him.* And then 'tis evident, what is the ſole importance of the *Father's* words, *viz.* that *Matthias* was not to be *choſen* to be an *Apoſtle*, but *aſſumed* ſome other way, that it might not be thought a *gratifying* him, or that out of *favour* he was *preferred* before others; to which purpoſe it follows in the next page, † *This neither made thoſe that were choſen to be elevated (for they were called to dangers) nor thoſe that were not choſen, to grieve as diſhonoured*; and again, he *calls it a lot, ſhewing that all was of the grace and choice of God.* † *p.* 625. *l.* 7.

25. And if by its being in the ſingular number it be affixed to St. *Peter*, and ſo ſeem to conclude ſomewhat peculiar of him from the reſt of the Apoſtles; I anſwer, that though they be not named, yet are they not thereby excluded: and 2. that this may reaſonably be granted, that *Peter* being the ſpeaker and chief of the Quire, the prime Apoſtle, what was meant of the whole College, is ſpoken

in

in his perſon; Howſoever 3. the Father's reſolution being that he might not chuſe an Apoſtle, it were ſtrange if it ſhould be thence concluded, that he might, which alone is it that can pretend to ſupport *S. W*'s concluſion from hence, that *an act of the higheſt juriſdiction imaginable amongſt the Apoſtles*, viz. *the making a new Apoſtle, did here by that Father's Verdict belong to St.* Peter: How truly let him now judge.

26. The other various reading lies nearer to the words by him produced thus, τὸ ἦν ἐλέσθαι [τὸν Πέτρον] αὐτὸν ἐκ ἐνῆν, ἐνῆν μὲν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔθελεν, ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ χαρίζεσθαι· *What then? might not he* (Peter) *have choſen him? He might indeed, but he would not, that he might not ſeem to gratifie him*; which if it ſhould be preferred, it will yet infer no more in reaſon than the former did, that the choice was to be made by God, not by men, leſt an humane choice might ſeem to have ſomewhat of favour in it; Whereas this was not to be lookt on as an advantage, but office of burthen and danger; as ſoon after he ſaith, τότε ἡ ὁπτασία ἦν, ὃ τιμὴ, ἀλλὰ προνοία τῶν ἀρχομένων, *the advancement to the Apoſtleſhip was not a dignity, but a providence or procuration of them that were under them*; So that the oppoſition apparently is to be ſet not betwixt *Peter*'s chuſing, and the reſt of the Apoſtles chuſing, but betwixt humane and divine choice, there being place for favour, at leaſt for ſuſpicion of it in the former, not in the latter; and therefore without diſputing whether the Apoſtles might or had power to chuſe one into the void place or no, it is apparent they did not attempt it, but *Peter* making the propoſition of referring it to *Lot*, and ſo to God's choice, they onely naming two, on whom the Lots were to be caſt, it follows that they joyntly named two and prayed, and caſt lots, and ſo *Matthias* was choſen. And in this ſenſe, referring it to God's, not their own choice, this *Scholion* is a full and ſeaſonable interpretation of the γενέσθαι ἕνα, *that one ſhould be made*, as that is an indefinite word noting his being advanced to the Apoſtleſhip, but not ſpecifying the manner of it, whether by God or man, which therefore being an ambiguity, the note was to ſettle; that other Queſtion of *Peter*'s abſolute or ſole power, either over the *Apoſtles*, or without their concurrence in this Election, being no-way pertinent or reducible to this matter.

27. That this not onely may be, but is and muſt be the meaning of the place, I propoſe this argument to confirm: Should the oppoſition be ſet betwixt *Peter*'s doing it by his own ſole power, and doing it in conjunction with the Apoſtles, then where 'tis affirmed that he might but would not, or did not, it muſt be inferred that he did the other, *i. e.* that he with the Apoſtles choſe *Matthias*, which, ſaith *S. W.* is the "ordinary carriage of every prudent governour, leſt he ſhould be miſtaken "to doe it out of favour. Now it is certain this was not ſo, for neither he alone, nor he with the reſt, choſe *Matthias*, but it was done by lot, which devolves it not to their but God's choice. This therefore muſt be the meaning of the Father, if it be ſuppoſed to have any truth in it; Or if he ſhall imagine that it might refer to the chuſing of the two, which follows immediately, *v.* 23. firſt he muſt know that that is not the ἕνα γενέσθαι *one* being *made* or ordained, which is the particular to which this *Scholion* is affixt. 2. That that was not the choice, but onely preparative to it, and different from it, the choice being the falling of the lot on one of theſe; and that this was this Father's ſenſe of it, appears by this * farther declaration of it, ἐκ ἁπλῶς ὃ προτίθησι ἐκεῖνον— *he doth not ſimply propoſe one* ('tis it ſeems onely the Apoſtles propoſal, the choice being left to God) *but ſhewing that he that is honoured by men, is oft poſtpoſed by God, they pray all of them, ſaying, Thou Lord, thou, not we, and ſeaſonably they call him the knower of hearts, for from this the Election was to be made, thus they ſaid confidently that by any means one muſt be made, and they ſaid not, it is neceſſary to chuſe, but do thou point out the choſen or whom thou haſt choſen, knowing that all was predetermined by God*; and † again, ὅπου δ' ἑαυτὰς ἀξίους ἡγῶνται τοῦ διὰ ἑαυτῶν ἐκλέγεσθαί τινα, *they did not* yet *count themſelves worthy that any ſhould be choſen by them* (in a ſenſe parallel to what immediately attended *S. W*'s teſtimony, πνεύματος ἅμα καὶ οὐ πάρεστι, he had not yet received the Holy Ghoſt) but deſire to know it by ſome ſign, *i. e.* by lot, and by this, ſaith he, filling up the number, he that was not choſen, did not grieve; and according to this, his ἤνεγκον. applies it ſelf, and inſiſts, ‖ Let us, ſaith he, imitate theſe, If thou believeſt it is God's choice, be not troubled or angry, for if thou art, 'tis againſt God, 'tis he that hath choſen.— All manifeſting the one undeniable importance of *S. W*'s Teſtimony, that the Apoſtles might have choſen but did not, but referred the choice to *God*, who knew the hearts, and would not be partial; and though *Peter* be onely named in the place by him produced, he being the ſpeaker, and ſo ſpecified there, yet here they are put all together, not *Peter* alone, but *Peter* and the reſt of the Apoſtles, and the oppoſition laid as between man and God, not as between *Peter* and the reſt of the Apoſtles.

* P. 626. l. 9, &c.

† L. 16.

‖ L. 22.

28. And ſo much for *S. W*'s undertaking Teſtimony, which notwithſtanding I may ſtill challenge ſome part of his belief, that I did not know and wilfully conceal St. *Chryſoſtome*'s expreſs kindneſs to the Romaniſts intereſt, in this of the *Supreme Univerſal Paſtourſhip of St.* Peter. And ſo much for the twelfth Section.

SECT. XIII.

SECT. XIII.

St. Peter's *Primacy in* Cyprian's *ſenſe. No power over the whole Church. St* Cyprian's *paſſage in his Book* de Unitate Eccleſiæ, *examined.* Pamelius's *and* Eraſmus's *Editions. Unity of the Church in Ariſtocracy.* S. W's *aids to help the place in* Cyprian, *examined.* Primum elegit. Ἔφατο φησίν. *The teſtimony from* Anacletus's *Epiſtles, the agreement of it with that of* Cyprian de Unit. *Parity of honour in all the Apoſtles. St.* Jerom's *words of* Peter's *Primacy.*

1. HIS *thirteenth* Section is ſpent in a view of *two* teſtimonies, the one brought formerly by him out of S. *Cyprian*, the other by me out of the ſuppoſed Epiſtle of *Anacletus* taken into the *Romaniſts Canon Law.* The place in *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 71. lies thus, *Quem quamvis primum Dominus elegerit, & ſuper eum ædificaverit Eccleſiam ſuam, tamen cum ſecum Paulus diſceptavit, non vendicavit ſibi aliquid inſolenter aut arroganter, aſſumpſit, ut diceret ſe Primatum tenere, & obtemperari à novellis & poſteris ſibi potius oportere, nec deſpexit Paulum quod Eccleſiæ prius perſecutor fuiſſet, ſed conſilium veritatis admiſit*, i.e. *Though our Lord choſe* Peter *firſt, and upon him built his Church, yet when* Paul *contended with him, he did not inſolently challenge any thing to himſelf, or arrogantly aſſume, ſo as to ſay he had the Primacy, and ſo ſhould rather be obeyed by new and late Apoſtles, nor did he deſpiſe* Paul *becauſe he had formerly beed a perſecutour of the Church, but admitted the counſel of truth.* Whether this be not the literal rendring of the words, let the Reader judge.

2. Now when to this teſtimony I had formerly replied, that I never doubted of *Peter's primacy* in *this ſenſe*, as *Cyprian* ſpeaks of it (any more than of *Chriſt's building his Church* on him) yea had given him a *teſtimony* out of S. *Ambroſe* that avouched it, but onely I denyed that this *primacy gave him power over* St. *Paul*, *S. W's* rejoynder now is ſomewhat extraordinary, 1. That *as he remembers ſuch a teſtimony out of St.* Ambroſe, *ſo he remembers alſo that I would not let it ſignifie St.* Peter's *primacy in any ſenſe over the whole Church, but over the* Jews *onely.* 2. *That he thanks me for granting here that I gave a teſtimony from St.* Ambroſe *which expreſſedly avowed St.* Peter's *primacy in any ſenſe over the Church.* 3. That *within eight lines I recall this again, and make the place ſignifie a limited and contradiſtinct Primacy, ſaying that by the words of St.* Ambroſe *St.* Paul *had a primacy over the Gentiles, as* Peter *among the Jews*, and then my *memory*, and *cauſe* are both arraigned together.]

3. But there can be no need of any better *memory*, than *God* hath already given me, ſpeedily to diſinvolve this intricacy. The *primacy* I once gave St. *Peter*, I give him ſtill; but that is not a *Supreme Monarchick power over the whole Church*, but a *Primacy of Order* among the *Apoſtles*, and a *limited Primacy of Juriſdiction* and *power* over his *Province*. And then I may be allowed to ask, if not to wonder, who gave *S. W. authority*, from my acknowledging *Peter's primacy* in *Cyprian's ſenſe*, to require of me the acknowledgment of his *Primacy over the whole Church*, or the denyal of the like to St. *Paul* among the *Gentiles*? Was this St. *Cyprian's* ſenſe of St. *Peter's primacy*? I am ſure nothing like it, can be concluded from any words in the teſtimony before us, which ſay nothing of it, but that the *Lord choſe him firſt*, and *built his Church upon him*, and if that be to give him a *Primacy in the Church* thus founded, yet this is not a *primacy over the whole Church*; ſuch a *primacy* denotes *power*, and hath *obedience* relative to it, in the latter part of the *Teſtimony* (*Primatum tenere & obtemperari* —) and of ſuch, all that is here ſaid is, *Non vendicavit aut aſſumpſit, he did not challenge or aſſume* the having any ſuch *over Paul*, and ſo not *over the whole Church.* This is all that the words can avow, what violence ſoever he ſhall uſe to them to extort *favourable* (which if they be ſuch, will alſo prove *contradictory*) confeſſions.

4. Having therefore no need to make any farther returns in this matter, I ſhall gratifie *S. W.* with another place of this *Father*, which is thought by eminent *Romaniſts* to be moſt for his intereſt of any, in his Tract of *Simplicity of Prelates* againſt *Novatian* the *Schiſmatick*, to which title others add, *De unitate Eccleſiæ.* Here you ſhall have that *Father* ſpeaking of St. *Peter* in the *higheſt* of his dignity conferred on him by *Chriſt*, in *Thou art Peter* — and, *I will give thee the Keys*, and, *Feed my ſheep*, and concluding, if we may believe *Pamelius's* reading, that *Chriſt built his Church ſuper illum unum, upon him ſingle, and delivered his Sheep to him to be fed*, and *conſtituted one Chair*, and by *his authority diſpoſed the Original of the ſame Unity beginning from one*; and again, the *beginning proceeds from Unity, the Primacy is given Peter that the Church of Chriſt may be ſhewn to be one, and the Chair one.* All which if it were granted to be indeed that *Father's* words, yet ſtill how little it would tend to eſtabliſhing that holy *Apoſtles Dominion* (and *Primacy* in that ſenſe) *over* the *whole Church*, will appear by theſe expreſs paſſages intermixed with the former in the ſame *Romaniſts* reading, *Apoſtolis omnibus poſt reſurrectionem ſuam parem poteſtatem tribuit* — *he gave after his Reſurrection to all the Apoſtles equal power, ſaying, As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you, receive the Holy Ghoſt, whoſe ſins ye remit they ſhall be remitted.* And *hoc erant utique & cæteri Apoſtoli quod fuit Petrus, pari conſortio præditi, & honoris & poteſtatis, the reſt of the Apoſtles were the ſame that Peter was, indued with equal conſortſhip or copartnerſhip of honour and power*; and *Paſtores ſunt omnes, ſed Grex unus oſtenditur, qui ab Apoſtolis omnibus unanimi conſenſione paſcatur, they are all Paſtours, but the Flock is ſhew'd to be one, which is fed by all the Apoſtles with Unanimous conſent.* In which whole place as the *unity* of the *Church* againſt *Novatian* and all *Schiſmaticks*, is moſt vigorouſly aſſerted from the *founding of the Church on Peter*; as an Emblem, or Symbolical Declaration of *Chriſt's* command of *peace* and *unity* among all *Chriſtians*, ſo is this abundantly guarded (unleſs we will make the Holy *Father* contradict himſelf in the ſame period) from bringing in a *Monarchick* power into the *Church*, expreſly defined to be by *many equals*, and ſo *Ariſtocratical.*

5. But then if we ſhall take confidence to queſtion *Pamelius's* reading (for which his authorities are but weak, *Aldus's* Copy being the chief of his ſtrength, and no way fit to be preferr'd before the *Frobenian Edition* firſt prepared by *Eraſmus* * out of the *moſt ancient Manuſcripts*, and again more correctly publiſhed, and preſented to *Cardinal Puccius*) we ſhall then find a great part of this teſtimony vaniſhed, even all that belongs to the *Primacy* of *Peter*, *the one Chair*, the *building the Church on ſingle Peter*, and no more left, but what belongs to theſe *two heads*, the *Unity* of the *Church* (againſt *Novatian* pertinently), and the *equality* of the *Apoſtles power* and dignity, *i. e.* the *Ariſtocratical*, not *Monarchick Government* of

* *Ex vetuſtiſſimis exemplaribus. Eraſm. Præf.*

the *Church*; for thus in the *Froben Edition* we reade, after the words of Scripture which *Christ* ſpake to *Peter* at ſeveral times, *Quamvis Apoſtolis omnibus poſt reſurrectionem ſuam parem poteſtatem tribuat, & dicat, ſicut miſit me Pater—tamen ut unitatem manifeſtaret, unitatis ejuſdem originem ab uno incipientem ſua authoritate diſpoſuit. Hoc erant utique & cæteri Apoſtoli quod fuit Petrus, pari conſortio præditi & honoris & poteſtatis, ſed exordium ab unitate proficiſcitur, ut Eccleſia una monſtretur, Quam unam Eccleſiam in Cantico—Though after his Reſurrection he gave to all the Apoſtles, equal power, and ſays, As my Father ſent me—yet that he might manifeſt the unity, by his authority, he diſpoſeth the Original of that Unity beginning from one, The reſt of the Apoſtles were the very ſame that* Peter *was, indued with equal copartnerſhip of honour and power, but the beginning proceeds from unity, that the Church may be ſhewed to be one, which Church the ſpirit in Chriſt's perſon deſcribes in the Canticles, My Dove is one, &c. This Unity of the Church he that holds not, doth he believe he holds the Faith? He that refuſes and reſiſts the Church, doth he believe that he is in the Church?*

6. In this Period *Pamelius* inſerts theſe words, *Qui Cathedram Petri ſuper quam Eccleſia fundata eſt, deſerit*, that *Chriſt founded the Church on* St. Peter's *chair*, and making it all one *to deſert* St. Peter's *chair*, and the *Church* it ſelf; For which reading he pretends but one *Manuſcript*, and the reading of *Gratian Diſt. 43. cap. Qui Cathedram.* What authority that *one Manuſcript* may have, againſt the conſent of ſo many as have not theſe words, the impartial Reader, ſuch as *Eraſmus* was, will ſoon gueſs. As for the place in *Gratian*, though it be not *Diſt. 43.* the Reader will find it *Diſt. 93.* But with this *Note* in the *Corpus Juris*, ſet out by the *command* of *Gregory the thirteenth*, that ſo it is *read in the Roman impreſſion of Cyprian*, and that in the *Vatican there being eight entire Copies* of *Cyprian*, *there is alſo one* more, which *hath onely ſome Opuſcula, and among them this Tract*, and in that *Copy* and in *another in the Monaſtery at Bononia theſe words* are to be found, but it ſeems not in any of the *eight intire books*, and that is a competent prejudice againſt this inſertion; and yet ſuch is *Pamelius*'s courage in the *Pope's* cauſe, *non ſumus veriti*, ſaith he, *We feared not to inſert it into the Text.*

7. In the ſame place it follows upon the Theme of *Unity*, that of *all Men*, *the Biſhops that preſide in the Church eſpecially ought firmly to hold and defend the unity of the Church, that they may prove that Epiſcopacy it ſelf is one and undivided*, preſently affirming *Epiſcopatus unus eſt, cujus à ſingulis in ſolidum pars tenetur, that there is one Epiſcopacy, part of which is held by every Biſhop intirely*, which ſtill infers the *Ariſtocratick Government* of the *Church*, wherein its *unity* conſiſts, not that it is ruled by *one Biſhop*, but by *one Epiſcopacy*, by *one order* of *copartners*, *Apoſtles* and *Biſhops* their Succeſſours, and not by *one* perſon, St. *Peter*, or *his* Succeſſour at *Rome* over the Succeſſours of all other the *Apoſtles*. This may ſerve for a δεῖξις, what is to be thought of this *Father*'s ſenſe of St. *Peter's primacy*. And how poſſible it is, that other *Fathers* ſhould mean the ſame, who aſſert the ἰσοτιμία and ὁμοτιμία, *equality* and *identity* of *honour* betwixt the *Apoſtles*, I have lately ſhewed.

8. But the teſtimony of *Cyprian* having been once produced by *S. W.* it is not to be expected he ſhould ſo eaſily part with it, and therefore though it expreſly affirm of *Peter*, that he did not claim the *Primacy*, yet he will infer from the *circumſtances*, that it truely belonged to him; The *circumſtances* are in thoſe words, *Non vindicavit ſibi aliquid inſolenter—He did not challenge any thing arrogantly, or aſſumed inſolently.* Hence I thought it rather followed, that it had been *inſolence* and *arrogance* in him thus to have *aſſumed* or *claimed* the *Primacy*, and obedience from *Paul*; but he contends, that the words ſignifie onely *in an inſolent and proud manner, expreſs'd by our Engliſh phraſe ſtanding on his point, which*, ſaith he, *well conſiſts with the truth of what he callenges, and right of what he aſſumes.*] But to this I *anſwer*, that if it *onely conſiſts with it*, then it no way appears to *infer* it, and then *S. W.* that *. profeſſes to have brought this *teſtimony to prove that* Peter *being higher in dignity, expreſs'd his greater humility in ſuffering ſo mildly the reprehenſions of an inferiour*, was certainly ſtrangely miſtaken in producing it, for ſure it muſt doe much more than *conſiſt* with his *Primacy*, if it can *prove* his concluſion, which is founded in ſuppoſition of the *Primacy*, which will not be granted to that teſtimony, that doth not *prove* it.

* P. 292.

9. Many obſervations he is diligent to accumulate, no fewer than *ſeven*, and all ſcanty enough to help his underſtanding of the place to ſome leaſt probability; as 1. That *it had been no ſuch great commendation of humility to ſay that* St. Peter *did not uſurpingly challenge what was not his right, &c.*] But I *anſwer*, that the point which St. *Cyprian* had in hand to inforce by this *teſtimony*, was not the *great humility of* St. *Peter*, but the *concord* and *patience* of *admonitions*, which by ſtrict precept was exacted, and commanded to be among all *Chriſtians*, as appears by the words immediately following, *documentum ſcil. nobis—giving us a document of concord and patience*, that *we ſhould not pertinaciouſly love our own* (opinions or practices) *but prefer thoſe things that are ſometimes profitably and ſalubriouſly ſuggeſted to us by our Brethren and Colleagues, if they be true, and according to Law*; And again bringing St. *Paul*'s example in another place, taking care for *concord* and *peace*; which leaves no place for *S. W*'s deſcant, either of the *humility*, or the *great* commendation for it.

10. His *ſecond* obſervation is, that *unleſs his ſenſe be accepted, we have quite loſt the adverſative ſenſe, for what ſpecial commendation would it be to ſay King* James *was King of* England, *yet he did not challenge to be Emperour of* Germany?] I anſwer, the *adverſative ſenſe* evidently conſiſts in comparing him whom *Chriſt* had *choſen* firſt and *built his Church on*, with *Paul* that *came after him*, and *newly into the Church*, having formerly been a *perſecutour* of it; and this ſenſe is exactly maintained by my interpretation, and fully ſupports the *Father's* concluſion on it, for *patience and concord* among *Chriſtians*, for had St. *Peter* been, like other men, *impatient* and *contentious*, this had been ſufficient to have exaſperated the humour in him, that there were theſe grounds of *inequality* between him, and the other that took upon him to *reprehend* him.

11. His *third* is, that the *words are, he challenged not any thing inſolently to himſelf, It had been*, ſaith he, *an hard caſe, if he could have challenged nothing at all to himſelf with truth, when the line before 'twas granted that our Lord choſe him to be firſt, and built his Church on him, with truth therefore he might have challenged that which out of modeſty he ſtood not inſolently upon*] I anſwer, 1. That 'tis not his *modeſty* is commended (unleſs to *doe nothing arrogantly* be that *vertue*, as indeed in ſome ſenſe the *Poet* ſaith true, *virtus eſt vitium fugere*) but his *patience* of *reprehenſions*, and *peaceableneſs*, (as before I ſhewed) 2. that what is mentioned in the line before, his being *choſen firſt by Chriſt*, &c. he might with *truth have challenged to himſelf*, and therefore the [*nonſibi aliquid inſolenter*] muſt be underſtood not of his *challenging* ſo *much*,

but

but no more than that, which is clearly expreſs'd by his not *challenging an obedience from Paul as to his Primate*, which not belonging to him duely, upon that account of his being *choſen firſt*, or of any privilege, that peculiarly belonged to him (St. *Paul* truely ſaying, 2. *Cor.* 11. 5. μηδὲν ὑστερηκέναι τῶν ὑπερλίαν Ἀποστόλων, that *he was not a whit behind the very cheifeſt Apoſtles*) this he did not (becauſe with juſtice he could not) *aſſume* to himſelf, though it was moſt true, that he was *choſen firſt*, and St. *Paul* long after him, this περιοχὴ or *earlyer call* being no competent *medium* to infer a Dominion over all others, that (though not by *his* miniſtery) came *later* into the *Church*.

12. His 4th obſervation being in part founded in my *granting* him a *primacy in ſome ſenſe from this place*, is eeked out by his rendring *primum Dominus elegerit*, by, *our Lord choſe him to be firſt*] But I anſwer, *primum eligere*, is to *chuſe firſt*, and ſo it muſt be here rendred, being oppoſed *novellis & poſteris*, to *thoſe that were newly or after choſen*, and *called*. In proportion to which, St. *Peter's primacy* is onely a *primacy* of *order*, but not the *Primatus* which is after ſpoken of, which had *obedience* belonging to it, for certainly, as was ſaid, the *firſt choſen* are not Rulers, on that one account, over all that come *after* them into the *Church*.

13. His *fifth* is, that *the following words in the redditive part* [*and ought rather to be obeyed by later Apoſtles*] *muſt neceſſarily be true too*] I anſwer that the whole ſeeming force of *this* obſervation depends on the ſuppoſed ſolidity and efficacy of the *former*, which being already ſuperſeded, this falls immediately under the ſame fate, and comes to nothing; and now, all that can follow from thoſe words muſt be judged of, and receive its neceſſary *allay* from the *non arroganter aſſumpſit*] foregoing immediately, and is evidently but this, either that he did not *challenge any ſuch obedience*, or that to *have challenged it*, *had been arrogance* in him, and I hope neither of theſe will infer it *neceſſary that the obedience truely belonged to him*; If it will, I know nothing that may not hope to infer any thing.

14. His *ſixth* increaſe of evidence comes in from the ſubſequent words, of *his not objecting to St. Paul that he had been a perſecutour*, *ſince*, ſaith *S. W. he might with truth have ſaid ſo*, *but of his goodneſs would not*] I anſwer, that though *with truth Peter* might have ſaid this, *i. e.* have barely affirmed that *Paul* had been a *perſecutour*, yet to have *deſpiſed* him, or reſiſted his *reprehenſion* on this account (which alone is the thing to which the *Teſtimony* refers) would have had as little ground of *truth* or *juſtice*, as of *ſobriety*, or *Chriſtian temper* in it. For what though he had once been a *perſecutour*, it is ſure he was *now* ſo far from ſuch, that he was a *Prime Apoſtle*, no way *inferiour* (if he may be believed) to *the cheif of thoſe* that had never been perſecutours, but *Apoſtles* from the beginning; to which purpoſe the *Fathers* ſolidly interpret *Chriſt's* words of ἔσχατοι πρῶτοι, *the laſt ſhall be firſt*] of this *laſt* in order of *time*, but in many other reſpects *firſt Apoſtle*. And then granting the *paſt truth*, yet with what *fitneſs* can he imagine *St. Peter* (or how without *inſolence* or *arrogance*?) to have made this return to his admonition? I doubt not but he might as juſtly have exacted an *obedience*, which was no-way *due* to him, as have objected a crime that was ſo long agoe waſh'd off, and repaired by *abundant labouring* in the *Goſpel*; But to have made ſo impertinent a return to a moſt ſeaſonable and charitable reprehenſion, there could be no leaſt *Chriſtian* juſtice or wiſdome, by which no doubt *St. Peter's* actions were to be guided, and then it boots not to conſider what *truth* there was in it.

15. His *laſt* (and ſtill neceſſary) reſerve is from the laſt words, *his admitting the Counſel of Truth*, *an Encomium of St.* Peter's *candour*, *that when the thing objected was true*, *he maintained not his ſaying by authority*, *but made his height of dignity*, *there expreſs'd to be moſt eminent*, *ſtoop to the Sincere acceptation of Truth*] But firſt there cannot be a groſſer *begging* the thing in debate, than the affirming *St. Peter's height of dignity here expreſs'd*, *to be moſt eminent*, when all that is ſaid towards this, is that *Chriſt choſe him firſt* and *Paul* after. For abſtracting from that priority of *Time*, what ſyllable is here of any *dignity*, much leſs of *height of dignity*, much leſs of *eminent*, which yet is much lower than *moſt eminent height* of that ſuppoſed *dignity*? And what may not he aſſume by degrees, that at one hauſt ſwallows down all this, without the leaſt liberty given him by that *Father*? *Secondly*, if even all this had been ſaid (as there is not a ſyllable whiſper'd) of *St. Peter* here, yet I diſcern not what ſpecial *candour* it had been in him to *yield to Truth*, *or not to maintain his own ſaying* (ſuppoſing it, as *S. W.* muſt, *untrue*) *by Authority*? Had it been a moſt laudable carriage in a *Saint*, and a *Prime Apoſtle*, not to inſiſt on an *untruth* and bear it out by *his Authority*? Is it an *eminent* vertue not to be *eminently* and irrationally vitious, not to perſiſt in ill, when *charitatively* reprehended for it? What meaſures of *candour* and *moſt laudable* hath he met with, what new refined or rather polluted *Morals*, fit onely to complete his other *Novelties*, his *new* way of managing *Controverſies*, his *new* method of *rigorous* demonſtration (the *new Logick*, that muſt ſuitably aſſiſt his as *new Divinity*) Thus much for that *Teſtimony* of *St. Cyprian*, which being, as was noted, *S. W's firſt-born*, and *chief of his ſtrength*, was to have his *double portion* of care and providence to maintain it, but being deſtitute of Natural Forces, hath untimely miſcarried for all that.

16. His next induſtry is laid out on a more hopeleſs, unimproveable piece, out of the *ſuppoſititious Anacletus's Epiſtle*, which being entr'd into their *Canon-Law*, I had reaſon to think ought to be of force againſt them, but if it ſhould be thought to contain any thing to our diſadvantage, can be of no efficacy to thoſe that look on it (he knows) as ſpurious and *ſuppoſititious*, having no character of antiquity to which it pretends. ſo that it is moſt viſible before we ſet out, that if this *Bee* bring any *hony* with it, we may ſafely claim the benefit of it, the *ſting* being diſabled to make any impreſſion upon us.

17. This being premiſed, I ſhall now ſet down the whole paſſage from the * *Decrees*. *In novo Teſtamento poſt Chriſtum Dominum a Petro Sacerdotalis cœpit ordo, quia ipſi primo Pontificatus in Eccleſia Chriſti datus eſt, Domino dicente ad eum, Tu es Petrus, & ſuper hanc ——— & tibi dabo claves, Hic ergo ligandi & ſolvendi poteſtatem primus accepit à Domino, primuſque ad fidem Populum virtute ſuæ prædicationis adduxit. Ceteri verò Apoſtoli cum eodem pari conſortio honorem & poteſtatem acceperunt, ipſumque Principem eorum eſſe voluerunt, qui etiam jubente Domino in toto Orbe diſperſi, Evangelium prædicarunt. In the New Teſtament, after our Lord Chriſt, the Sacerdotal Order began from Peter, becauſe the Pontificate in the Church of Chriſt was firſt given to him, the Lord ſaying to him, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell ſhall not prevail againſt it, and I will give thee the Keys of Heaven. He therefore firſt received from the* * Diſt. 21. c. 2.

Lord the power of binding and loosing, and first brought the people to the Faith by the virtue of his Preaching. But the rest of the Apostles received honour and power with him in equal copartnership, and would have him their Prince, who also at Christ's *command being dispersed over the whole world preached the Gospel.*

18. Here one passage I acknowledge (as before I intimated) to be of an importance (at least if we believe the first appearance of it) *contrary* to our pretensions, when of the *Apostles* 'tis said *they would have Peter to be their Prince*] and of this I formerly said [*where he read this I know not.*] And this *S. W.* styles *talking ridiculously, because* Anacletus *being ordained by S.* Peter *is not imaginable to have read but heard it, and that could be from none but* Christ *and his Apostles.* But I must beseech him to believe, that as I cited not the *Testimony* from *Anacletus*, but from the *Canon-law*, as *from* Anacletus, *i.e.* from the *Epistle* then bearing his name, so by [*he read this*] I meant not *Anacletus* reading it (his *Authority*, if the writing were genuine, should have force with we, without a Voucher) but his reading it, whosoever he was that compiled that *Epistle* under *Anacletus*'s name; The rest I thought I could give a probable account
* *De unit. Eccl.* of, whence it was derived, borrowed and lightly changed from the passage of * St. *Cyprian*, which I even now so largely produced and established from the *Froben Edition*, the rather because of the affinity it bears with this, which now we are come to, especially the *parem potestatem*, *par Consortium honoris & potestatis* there, compared with the *cum eo pari consortio honorem & potestatem*] here.

19. For as in this there was a perfect Conspiration, and the conclusion from thence indubitable, that the rest of the *Apostles* were by *Christ* endued with a *copartnership of power, as well as honour with* Peter, and a plain *parity* and *equality* in both; so this was no way reconcileable with the *principality* and *dominion* of *Peter* over all those who were thus *equalled* with him, unless this *principality* were supposed to be afterwards introduced, by some other means than by that of *Christ's Institution.* Accordingly this is the distinct importance of those words, *ipsumque Principem eorum esse voluerunt*, noting that they that were by *Christ*, in the words immediately precedent, constituted in *equality of power and honour* with him, were after by their own free act pleased to *chuse* him to be their *Prince.* The truth and authority of which narration I had reason to question, upon those interests, that lie common to *S. W.* and me, it being as contrary to his, as to my pretensions, that this *Principality* should proceed from the *Apostles* own act, and neither *Scripture* nor other *ancient* Record yielding the least favour or probability to it. For if he were *after* elected by the *Apostles* to be their *Prince*, then it must needs be granted, that he holds not that dignity by *Christ's donation* in *Thou art Peter*, or, *I will give thee the Keys*, or, *Feed my Sheep*, which, he knows, are the onely tenure by which he pretends the derivation of the *Universal Pastourship*, from *Christ*, and from no other *Original*, to St. *Peter.*

20. These words therefore being set aside, and by consent of parties removed out of the *Testimony*, or else so softned by some commodious interpretation of the word *Principem* (as that at the *meetings* and common transactions of the *Apostles*, *Act.* 1. and the like, *Peter* was allowed the *first place*, and the office of *Speaker* among them) that they may have some appearance or probability of *Historical* truth in them, all the rest of the words are perfectly home to our pretensions, and so *ad homines* to the *Romanists* that allow them so *Primitive* an Authority, as that of *Anacletus*, must needs be constringent and convincing, that though the *Pontificate* in the *Christian Church* was *first given to St.* Peter in the *power of the Keys*, and so the *Sacerdotal* or *Episcopal Order began from him* (*Pontificate* and *Sacerdotal Order* signifying the same thing, not as *S. W.* dreams, the *same in order to the Christian Hierarchy, that Aaron was to the Levitical, for though Pontifex Maximus do*, yet *Pontificate, without that addition, simply taken, doth not signify that supreme dignity*) and accordingly he was the *first* that preached and converted to the Faith after *Christ*'s departure; yet the rest of the *Apostles* received from *Christ* the *same honour and power that he did*, and that *cum eo pari consortio, in an equal Copartnership with him*, which as it was all I endeavoured, so I cannot fail successfully to deduce hence, if plain words be but permitted to be intelligible by us.

21. For as for *S. W*'s exceptions, 1. to me, that I *never explicate nor apply the words.* 2. to the words themselves, that they infer not their *receiving parem honorem, equal honour and power*; they are soon assoiled; the *first* by assuring him, that to me the matter appeared so *manifest*, that it could neither want nor receive benefit by any assistence of mine to *explicate farther or apply it*: the *second*, that their *receiving honour and power pari consortio* in *equal* (so sure *par* signifies, as our *peer* or *Compeer*, *equality* not *likeness* onely, and so I suppose he yields, when he renders *parem honorem*, *equal honour*, though he allow not this *Testimony* to infer it) I say their receiving *power in equal copartnership* with him, can signify no less than their *receiving equal honour and power* with him: for 1. how can the *power* be *received in equal copartnership with him*, if they were *unequally*, one in an higher, the rest in an inferiour subordinate degree, *copartners* in it? 2. By what rules of *construction* can *pari consortio* be fully rendred by *likewise*, or *in like manner being his fellows*, when *consortium here* used, unavoidably signifies the *community* of the *sors* or κλῆρος, whatsoever that is, and the *parity* of that, is the *equality* therein; and that being by the *context* limited to *power* and *honour*, must be an *equality* of *power* and *honour.*

22. If it were possible there should be any difficulty herein, the *parallel* phrases of St. *Cyprian*, used in the self-same matter, would establish the rendring beyond controll, who assures us, that our *Saviour gave them* (in the very words, which he averts) *parem potestatem*, which he (by rendring so, whilst here he rejects it) allows to signify *equal power*, and again, that *the rest of the Apostles were endowed by him pari consortio honoris & potestatis, with an equal copartnership of honour and power*, which is not capable of his evasion.

23. After this, being, I hope, conscious of the vanity of this Artifice, he relents, and is willing to goe a little farther, and grants that *under the notion of Apostle each had a like consortship of honour and power, each being dignified with an unlimited Apostleship and Jurisdiction or power to preach*; but then, speaking of the *Apostolical College as a Community, and so requiring order of Government, we affirm*, saith he, *with St.* Jerom, *that* Peter *was supreme in that respect*] But 1. why may not *pari consortio*, be yet rendred an *equal* as well as a *like* Consortship, unless by *like* he mean a *like degree* of it, and that is an *equality*, and all that I demand? 2. How doth it *follow*, that if we speak of *Apostles, as of a College and Community*, that *Community requires Order of Government*, meaning by that (as he must, if he mean any thing to his purpose) *not onely a priority of place or order*, which we allow St. *Peter*, but such a *Supremacy*, as includes the *subjection* of all the rest to some one of themselves? Must there needs be a *Monarch*

over

over and above a *President* in every *College* or *Community?* and is there no such thing imaginable, or ever heard of, as an *Aristocratick Government*, wherein as one *presides*, so the *Gubernative power* is in all *equally?* These are rare pillars of support to an *Utopian*, 'tis pity they should so well fit the *Papal Greatness*. 3. Where doth St. *Jerom* say that St. *Peter was supreme in that respect*, i. e. *Supreme Ruler of the College of the Apostles*, (for if he say not that, his saying is of no weight) or with what confidence can he impose it on the *Reader*, without farther proof, than that *S. W.* saith that St. *Jerom* saith it? Is it a *principle* or common notion clear by its *own* light, that every thing is true, that *S. W.* affirms? or is it justly presumable, that the Reader knows that St. *Jerom* asserts *Supremacy over the Apostles*, when *S. W.* knows not, I must suppose, for else, being of such importance to him, he would vouchsafe to let us *know*, where he hath said it, or something else, from which he means to *infer* that *conclusion*.

24. To conclude this, I shall desire him to seek out the words, wherein St. *Jerom* avouches St. *Peter's supremacy of power over the rest of that College*, and if they be those, of * *inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut capite constituto Schismatis tollatur occasio*, To assign them such an understanding as may not *contradict*, or make nonsense of the words immediately *precedent*, and *subsequent*, and then to give the *Reader* account what advantages he hath gain'd by them. The words foregoing are there, *At dicis super* Petrum *fundatur Ecclesia, licèt id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat, & claves regni cœlorum accipiant, & ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur*. Here we see, as the *Church* was in one *Text* founded on *Peter*, so it was in another upon *all the Apostles*, all *receiving the Keys*, and the *strength of the Church established* or *solidated ex æquo equally upon them*. And in the words a little after, the comparison being made, betwixt *Peter* and *John*, though in respect of *Peter's Age* he be said to be preferred before the *rest*, which was not fit for *John* who was so young, yet he resolves that *John* being an *Apostle* and *Evangelist* and *Prophet*, Petrus *Apostolus tantum*, Peter *was onely an Apostle*; Which how could he say with truth, and thereby cast the advantage on *John's* side, if there had been so great an addition of weight to be cast into St. *Peter's* balance, as was that of his *supreme Jurisdiction* over *John* and the whole *College* of the *Apostles?* If by both these circumstances of that Context, St. *Peter's primacy* be interpreted, the indifferent Reader will soon discern, though *S. W.* shall not, what little support St. *Jerom* hath afforded to his pretensions.

* *Adverſ.* Jovinian. *l.* 1. *c.* 14.

25. One fetch more he hath, that in this passage the words [*cum eodem*] *appear by their placing to be better joined with acceperunt than with pari, and then the whole meaning shall be, acceperunt cum eodem, the rest of the Apostles received with him*, i. e. *at the same time he received it, in like consortship*, i. e. *of Apostleship, honour and power, which*, saith he, *was verified when he gave them their last mission, Going into all the world, preach the Gospel to every Creature*] 'Tis a little strange to see what *necessity*, and a good Invention combined, are able to produce; but more so, that any man should hope to satisfie others with such thin colours, and conceits as these, taken merely from the *placing* of *two* such words in the period, which may vary their *places* oft, and yet signify the *same* thing.

26. I know the words, [*cum eodem*] may be joined either with the immediate *Antecedent* [*cæteri Apostoli cum eodem*] *the rest of the Apostles with* Peter, or with the immediate *consequents* [*cum eodem pari consortio*] *in an equal consortship with him*, and either of these are *equally*, if not more, probable, than what *S. W.* hath pitch'd on. But I shall not contend on such deep points as these, let but [*pari consortio*] signify *equal consortship*, and I demand no more; for then, they that *receive at the same time with him honour and power in equal consortship*, will not easily be imagined so *unequal*, as are that one *Monarch*, and all his Subjects.

27. I shall onely add, that whereas, to put off his Invention the better, he interprets their *receiving power*] of the *Apostolical mission, Go preach the Gospel to every creature*, 'tis evident by the *Context*, that the *Authour* there speaks of two things severally, the *donation* of the *power of the Keys*, and the *preaching the Gospel*, and in reference to St. *Peter*, the former he calls *ligandi & solvendi potestatem, the power of binding and loosing*; the latter he thus expresseth, *Primus ad fidem populum virtute prædicationis suæ adduxit, he first brought the people to the Faith by virtue of his Preaching:* and then again in reference to the rest of the *Apostles*, he severally mentions each, 1. *their receiving honour and power*, 2. *their being dispersed and preaching the Gospel over all the world*, which renders it unquestionable, that the *honour and power*, which they *received* in *equal Consortship*, was the *power of binding and loosing*, *first given to* Peter, and so not, as he would persuade, *the mission to preach*, given at once to all, *Matth.* 28. Whereas the *power of the Keys* was *first* promised to *Peter*, and after conferr'd on all in *common*, *Matth.* 18. which utterly ruins this *artifice* of his.

28. As for the other passages of that *Epistle*, which *S. W.* is pleased to tender, as *evidences to shew him*, as he saith, *a plain Papist*, he cannot imagine them of any force against me, who utterly reject the *Epistles* under *Anacletus's* name, as *spurious*, and *supposititious*, and onely urge so much against the *Romanists*, as they have admitted into the *body of their Canon-law*; citing it from thence, not from the *Epistles*, and so am not concern'd in what follows in the *Epistles*, not in the *Decrees*. And so still my solidness and sincerity, which he is here pleased to arraign, are neither of them prejudiced by my carriage in this matter.

29. I might here proceed, and add more by examining his notion of *No-sense Dictionary Interpretations* (by which he is willing to defame the literal rendring of plain *Latine* by as plain *English*) *&c.* but *Declamations* are not *Argument*, and so this shall suffice for his 13*th* Section.

Sect. XIV.

S. W's. frailneſs of memory. His accuſing falſely, and himſelf confeſſing the contrary to his ſuggeſtion. His evaſions examined. Expreſſneſs of Teſtimonies. Of Peter *and* Paul *preaching promiſcuouſly at* Antioch. *All that I ſay, teſtified by* Baronius.

1. HIS *fourteenth* Section ſets out with a defence of *his ill memory*, and an accuſation of *mine*, and withall of my *anger, and paſſion* in telling him of it. But the Reader ſhall judge who is the guilty perſon. In his *Schiſ. Diſ.* p. 62. he began with a piece of wit, I had ſaid, *thus we know it was at* Antioch (St. *Paul formed a Church and left a Biſhop of Gentile,* St. Peter *of Jewiſh Chriſtians) and accordingly that Church in* Ignatius *is ſaid to be founded by both of them*, &c. And he replies, *His firſt teſtimony is his own knowledge, thus we know — but puts down no teſtimony at all to confirm the weaker one of his own We know*] And having ſaid this, and ſo formerly concluded that *ninth* Section, he begins the *tenth* with theſe words, *The next Teſtimony begins thus, Accordingly* (i. e. *to the Doctours own We know*) *in* Ignatius, *&c.*] This I then took to be a manifeſt refuting of himſelf, and ſo in my anſwer took notice of it, as of a *predominant fault* in this Authour, that he *bluſht not to deny what was ſo viſible* to his own eyes, himſelf ſetting down *two teſtimonies of that, of which he had ſo lately denied any.* In doing ſo, I ſaid his *memory was frail*, But that was not the fault of which I accuſed him, but that which in my opinion was much greater (and his moſt frequent, *railing, the blind to keep this from being deſcryed*) and indeed what greater injuſtice can a Writer be guilty of, than to ſay that confidently of his Adverſary, which is ſo far removed from all appearance of *truth*, that himſelf affirms the *contrary* within few lines? And can there be a more undeniable inſtance of this, than that which is now before us; the ſame *S. W.* ſaying, *My firſt Teſtimony is my own knowledge*] which beſide that he knows 'tis no *Teſtimony*, by calling it my *firſt*, he intimates there is ſome *ſecond* following, and yet adding in the very next words, that *I put down no Teſtimony at all to confirm my own, We know*] and yet after this, himſelf confeſſing, that I *add other Teſtimonies* in this very matter, his words being expreſly theſe, *The next Teſtimony begins thus* — The matter lying thus between us, let the Reader now bring in the verdict, 1. Whether it was his *ill memory* that I accuſed as his *predominant fault*, or ſomewhat elſe, which requires a *good*, and is worſe than an *ill memory*; 2. whether he were not guilty of that, whereof I thus accuſed him; 3. whether it were contrary to *Chriſtian meekneſs*, or *patience*, or a *ſymptome* of any *paſſion*, to ſay he was guilty of that, which was ſo viſible.

2. Now to this, what reply doth he now make? Why he ſets down the words that paſs'd between us, and in paſſing, 1. he notes that I uſed the *phraſe We know in the plural* [*We*] *as*, ſaith he, *became my authority*; 2. he asks, *What railing words I found which ſhould make me complain ſo hainouſly*, 3. that if *I mean ſuch things as I produced for teſtimonies, he ſet down indeed in the next Section not onely two but ten of them, but if I mean ſuch things as he expreſs'd himſelf to deny there*, i. e. *ſuch as did confirm my own We know, he ſtill avows that there is not one word among all the following teſtimonies*, 4. that *I muſt not tell him what I fanſie to be deduced thence, but what the Teſtimonies themſelves expreſs, the deductions being mine, the words onely the Teſtimonies*; and then he returns to a *challenge* formerly made, and ſo traverſes the Stage, and goes out moſt pompouſly. But to theſe I *anſwer* in few words; to the *firſt*, that the word [*We*] is a note of *plurality*, as well as of *authority*, and ſignified there, that more than I *knew* that which I mention'd, even all that knew any thing of the ſtory of thoſe times in that place, *Antioch*, as hath formerly, and ſhall by and by more fully appear by his own *Baronius*. To the *ſecond*, that his *railing* was not the *fault*, which at that time I accuſed in him; He had been competently guilty of that in *other* places. At this time it was *another* fault of which I complained; but that there was any *hainouſneſs* in my *complaining*, I diſcern not, but ſuppoſe it was rather in the *crime* complained of. To the third, that it is undoubted that I who produced the *Teſtimonies*, and he which called them by that name [* *His firſt Teſtimony*, and, † *The next Teſtimony*] did both agree to mean ſuch as I *produc'd for Teſtimonies*; which whether they were produced or no, was the *onely queſtion*, not betwixt *him* and *me* ſo much, as betwixt *him* and *himſelf*, firſt *denying* I brought any, and then *reciting* and refuting my *Teſtimonies*, and now farther yielding that I *brought not onely two but ten of them.* As for the validity of them to confirm what they were brought to confirm, that was to be tried by his *Anſwers*, and my *Replies*, and then referred to the *Reader's* umpirage between us, and could not be thus early denied by *S. W.* before he had at all reflected on them, without the groſſeſt *begging the queſtion, i. e.* the greateſt fault that a *Controvertiſt* could be guilty of. So dexterous is *S. W.* in curing his own infirmities. To the *fourth*, that what a *Teſtimony* yields by firm unqueſtionable *deduction*, is truly and ſolidly proved by that *Teſtimony*, as well as what the words *expreſs*; and though the *deductions* be *mine*, yet if the things deduced be naturally derived from the Teſtimony, it is as certain that they were firſt in the *Teſtimony*, as that nothing can be truly brought from *Rome*, which was not there, or that nothing gives but what it firſt hath.

* *Schiſ. Diſ.* p. 62.
† P. 63.

3. I know the rules that the * Authour of the *Dialogues* is pleaſed to impoſe, 1. that *the Catholicks diſpute not with Proteſtants from Scripture unleſs they promiſe to prove their poſition evidently and manifeſtly*, 2. that *they never undertake to convince their Adverſary out of Scripture, but content themſelves that the words inſiſted on may well bear that ſenſe which is in favour of them*] and I acknowledge what he there adds, to have great *truth* in it [*that this is more eaſie to perform*] and in juſt proportion to theſe rules, I ſee he here exacts, that the *Teſtimonies* not onely infer, but *expreſs* my concluſion, *i. e.* aſſert it in the very *terms*, leaving no place for *deductions*, becauſe they are *mine*, not the *Teſtimonies*; But I then obſerved the onely reaſon of the *Dialogiſts* ſo great partiality, to be a preſumption, that the *Catholick* had *Oral Tradition* on his ſide, from whence he thought it unreaſonable *to recede upon any though never ſo expreſs words of Scripture, becauſe they*, ſaith he, *have an aſſured ground of their faith, beſide the Bible, and which relies not on it*] to which *S. W.* adds, that thoſe were the words but of *dead men*, and by being ſo, liable to be variouſly interpreted by *wit*. And though this be ſomewhat *ſevere* to the *poor Proteſtant*, and robs him either of the benefit of the *Scripture*, or of his own *reaſon*, and *Logick* in drawing any *inferences* from

* Ruſhw. *Dial.* 2. p. 128.
P. 129.

from it, yet I ſhould have hoped it could not thus much farther be extended, even to things ſo far removed from their *Catholick Mother's* Lectures to their Children, their *Oral Tradition*, as is the queſtion now before us, whether St. *Paul* at *Antioch* applied himſelf to the *Gentiles*, and formed them into a *Church*, and St. *Peter* in like manner to the *Jews*; for certainly no manner of *Tradition* being pretenſible to affirm contrary to me in this matter, *deductions* from ancient *Teſtimonies* (ſuperadded to the expreſs words of *Scripture*, both that *Paul* was *Apoſtle* of the *Uncircumciſion* and *Peter* of the *Circumciſion*, and that they both met at *Antioch*) may deſerve to be heard, though the expreſs words of the *Teſtimonies* be no more than theſe, that the *Church* at *Antioch* was founded by thoſe two *Apoſtles*; For how could they be founded by two diſtant *Architects*, as are the *Apoſtle* of the *Jews*, and the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, but by the *Apoſtle* of the *Jews* founding the *Church* of the *Jews*, and the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles* the *Church* of the *Gentiles* in that City?

4. In this caſe it is not enough to ſay, that the *Teſtimonies* do not *expreſs* this, for if from them alone, or from them compared with others, it may be regularly *deduced*, or if whatſoever evaſion *S. W.* can invent, ſhall be found abſolutely *groundleſs*, and *improbable*, and not onely ſo, but ſuperſeded alſo by *other* Teſtimonies, I then refer it to any Reader to judge, whether this be not a *ſolid* way of *confirming my own*, *We know*, *by Teſtimonies*, which is the utmoſt that *S. W. denies* me to have done, or could have confidence to *exact* from me.

5. After this *preluſory* προαιμιαλα, he proceeds to review his former Anſwer to the *Teſtimonies*, viz. that they *proved no more but the founding the Church of* Antioch *by* Peter *and* Paul, *which*, ſaith he, *might be done by their promiſcuous endeavours*, *without diſtinction.*] To which I having replied *two* things, 1. that *if that were true*, *it prejudged* Peter's *ſingular juriſdiction*, *and joined* Paul *ſocially with him*; 2. that *another Teſtimony behind*, *removed this May-be*, *ſhewing the diſtinction of the Jewiſh and Gentile cœtus at* Antioch; firſt he will quarrel my uſing the phraſe *ſingular Juriſdiction*, and then 2. changing this into *higher authority*, he is diſpleaſed, that I ſay it *prejudices that ſtill*, and that without any offer of reaſon, onely in ſcoff adds, that *ſtill either part of the contradiction equally fits my concluding faculty*; 3. from the example of *Paul* and *Titus*, he infers that the *preaching promiſcuouſly to the* Antiochians, *doth not infer the no higher authority of* Peter *than* Paul, and 4. that *if by being joined ſocially*, *I mean that* Paul *was equal in authority*, *then the promiſcuous preaching cannot conclude it*; But to theſe I *anſwer*, To the firſt, that *ſingular Juriſdiction* evidently ſignifies *Monarchical*, in oppoſition to *Ariſtocratical* Government, and ſo fully expreſſes *S. W*'s pretenſion againſt ours. To the *ſecond*, that if his anſwer be ſuch as coheres not with other parts of his hypotheſis, in maintaining of which he was equally concerned, I might juſtly take notice of it, and think it a competent exception againſt his Anſwer; and that it was not, his *ſcoff*, and *outcry* [*dull* Ariſtotle, *&c.*] are no degree of proof. To his *third*, that it muſt be remembred, I ſpake of *two Apoſtles*, one of the *Jewiſh*, the other of the *Gentile Chriſtians*, and thoſe two ſent each immediately by *Chriſt*, and then ſuppoſing that they preached *promiſcuouſly*, how could I fail in concluding regularly, that they *joined ſocially*, and if ſo, then one *acted* not (and then *was* not) in *ſubordination* to the other, and then what elſe his *higher authority* is ſet to ſignify, I need not conſider. As for this inſtance of *Paul* and *Titus*, that cannot be pertinent, the one being viſibly impowered and *commiſſionated* by the *other*, and 2. not preaching *promiſcuouſly* neither, that I find, but one ſucceeding to the *Province*, when the other *left* it. To the *fourth*, that that is the ſame with the *third*, and requires no diſtinct anſwer, they that are συνωωξειδ *joint* or *fellow-labourers* in a work or office, 'tis viſible that one doth not *rule*, or *lead* the other.

6. *Next* he proceeds to my *Teſtimony*, which I ſaid *would remove the Might-be*, *and ſhew that their preaching at* Antioch *was not promiſcuous*; My Teſtimony was from *Act.* XV. 23. where by the *inſcription of the Reſcript of the Council*, the *diſtinction of the Gentile and Jewiſh cœtus at* Antioch *was diſcernible*, and that being ſo, I thought no man could doubt, but the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles* ſhould *preſide* in one, and the *Apoſtle* of the *Circumciſion* in the other, and that I hope is contrary to the *promiſcuous preaching* to them, which ſuppoſes them *preached* to, and *ruled* together by both as the ſame *cœtus*. Againſt this he hath nothing to object, but wonders what *unſeen wires* there are, *that connect theſe together*, *the Reſcript was directed to the Gentiles not the Jews*, Ergo, *St.* Peter *and St.* Paul *did not preach promiſcuouſly*. He now ſees the *wires*, and if it had been for his turn, he hath ſagacity enough to have deſcried them before, without extraordinary *Revelations*.

7. One ſeeming objection he offers againſt this, that the *Reſcript was ſent to them in the name of Saint* Peter *as well as St.* Paul, *and therefore if it intimate either*, *it is their promiſcuous Juriſdiction over the Gentiles*] To this I *anſwer*, that as my argument was taken onely from conſideration of them *to* whom the *decree* was ſent, and pretended to prove from thence the *diſtinction* of the *cœtus*, ſo the conſideration of the perſons *from* whom it came, though it pretend not to prove, yet it no way *prejudiceth* my concluſion, whether to the *diſtinction* of the *cœtus*, or the *no promiſcuous preaching* of thoſe *Apoſtles*, which I infer from thence. For though ſeveral *Apoſtles preſide* ſeverally in *ſeveral cœtus*, yet a *Council* of them united hath power over *all*, as an *Univerſal Council* hath an *Univerſal Juriſdiction*.

8. As for the *ſecond* Teſtimony which he ſaith he hath ſhew'd *Sect.* 7. to be from *Pelagius*, I have there I hope given it a *ſatisfactory* anſwer, to which I refer him *Sect.* VII. of this *Chapter*. And for the concluſion thence deduced, when it is rightly ſet, thus [*the Jewiſh and Gentile cœtus at* Antioch *ſeorſim habebantur*, *and they of the Jews were not mingled with them of the Gentiles*, *therefore they were ſeverally preached to*, *and ruled*, *and not promiſcuouſly*] I ſhall now refer to the Reader to judge, whether it be inferred by due *connexion of terms* or no, and in giving his verdict, let him, if he pleaſe, conſult the *Romaniſts Oracle Baronius*, *Ann.* 45. *n.* 13, 14. and then queſtion if he can, whether, *Euodius* being created by *Paul Biſhop* of *Antioch*, and *Ignatius* by *Peter*, *not one after another*, *but both together*, and *both of them thus preſiding* in *the ſeveral cœtus*'s, as *long as the diviſion laſted betwixt Jews and Gentiles*, (of all which that great *Cardinal* aſſures him) there can be any farther *queſtion* betwixt *S. W.* and me in this matter, but what that *Cardinal* ſhall be concerned in, as deeply as I. And ſo much, or ſo little rather, was proportionable to the *merits* and weight of his 14*th Section*.

SECT.

SECT. XV.

Peter's *withdrawing from all Communion with the Gentile Christians*, Gal. 2. ὑπέστειλε καὶ ἀφώριζεν. *Gentile diet. Of the* Samaritans, *whether* Jews *or Heathens. Abstinence from their conversation as from Heathens.* S. W's *mistakes concerning them. Of no Communion with Gentiles. By what Law 'twas interdicted the* Jews. *(Two sorts of Proselytes.) Decrees of the* Sanhedrim *against it.* Παρίνομον, *though not against Original Laws of God. The Original of Excommunications among the* Jews *under captivity founded in the Ordinances of not mixing with the Heathen.* Ἀμιξία κοινῶν. 2 *Mac.* XIV. 38. ἡδὺ παρίνομοι, χθὲς ἐπιμιξίας. Μὴ μιαίνων, Jo. XVIII. *Legates to the* Romans *and* Spartans. *Making Proselytes.* Nidui. Peter's *not daring to preach to* Cornelius. S. W's *objections answered. St.* Peter's *action*, Gal. 2. 21. *freed from Schism.* Justin's *opinion of the* Jewish *Christians that refused the communion of the Gentile Christians.* S. W's *interpretation of* ἀθέμιτον, *and confession of their casuists.*

1. HIS *fifteenth* is very long, and vehement in proposing, and pursuing, as the utmost *absurdity*, this passage of mine, in the *Tract* of *Schism*, (and my defence of it in the *Reply*) that *Peter and all the Jewish Proselytes*, Gal. II. 21. *withdrew from all communion and society with the Gentile Christians*, largely heaping up passages of *Scripture* (it is not amiss to observe that such *wordish Testimonies* are sometimes considered by *S. W.*) to prove that the *Jews* frequently *conversed* with *Gentiles*. For the clearing of this whole matter (at first incidentally touched, and now not to be inlarged into a Volume, especially unless it had more influence on the main *Controversie*) I shall briefly recite what hath hitherto pass'd in this business, and vindicate that, against his *contrary* pretensions, and having pointed out the ground of his mistake, leave him to salve the *antinomyes*, which his own fancy hath suggested, to his great disquiet and perturbation.

2. When the *Catholick Gentleman* replyed that the *Text*, *Gal.* 2. 21. *expressed no more than that he withdrew from eating with them*, i. e. *keeping the Gentile diet.* I answered, 1. that by *the same reason that they would not eat with the Gentiles, lest they should offend the Jewish Law, they must be supposed to abstain from all other Communion with them, because it was equally against the Jewish Law, to converse with a Gentile*, citing that of *Joh.* 4. of the *Jews having no dealing with Samaritans*, and concluding that (by parity of reason) *Peter abstain'd from all those other ways of converse and communion with the Gentiles, which the Jews thought as unlawfull as eating with them*, adding, that it was plain by *Acts* X. 12. that *preaching to a Gentile was as unlawfull, according to Jewish Principles, as eating unclean meat, or Gentile diet, and that till* Peter *received his Vision of the Sheet, he deem'd it unlawfull*, and tells them of it, as of a known thing, *vers.* 28. that it was ἀθέμιτον, *unlawfull for a Jew* κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσέρχεσθαι, *to keep company, or come in to one of another Nation*, which comprehends *all* other *communion*, as well as that of the *Gentile diet.*] This I thought might have removed, if not prevented *S. W's* fierce displeasure. But it falls out much otherwise.

3. And *first* I am accused of *falsifying Scripture*, and the *Page* 307. wherein this *Section* begins, referred to in the *Index* for that discovery. And what is the *falsification*? Why, saith he, the *citing the place expresly for the word All, and affirming it was read there.*] But there is no truth in this, I never affirmed that the word *all* was read in *that place*, but on the contrary, in the *citation*, that word was in a Letter different from that whereby a *citation* is signified, which absolutely precluded this Jealousie. I said indeed that *Peter and all the Jewish Proselytes withdrew from all communion and society with the Gentile Christians*, but I said not that these are all the *expres's words of Scripture*, but that we reade the thing, *Gal.* II. 12. and so still I suppose we do in those words, ὑπέστειλε καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, *he withdrew and separated himself, fearing those of the circumcision*; For if the *with-drawing* be, as he would have it, interpreted onely in relation to *eating with them*, immediately foregoing, then that infers, that they thus *withdrew*, and did not so much as συνεσθίειν, *eat with them*; which if we may interpret by μηδὲ συνεσθίειν, *with such an one no not to eat*, 1 *Cor.* V. 11. that alone will amount to the *withdrawing* from *all communion*, noted there by the μὴ συναναμίγνυσθαι, *v.* 9. and 11. *not to be mingled, or keep company* with them, this of *eating* with others, being one of the *lowest* degrees of familiarity, which when it was either *interdicted*, or voluntarily abstain'd from, it cannot reasonably be believed, that other *nearer* degrees of approach were allowed, or used. But if the ὑπέστειλε, *withdrawing*, should not be thus largely interpretable, as to yield this, Yet the ἀφώριζεν which is added to that, and put *indefinitely* without any restriction, is the word frequently used for separating from *all* other *communion*; and that it must be so understood here, appears by the *motive*, which incited him to it, the *fear of the Jews*, viz. those which came from *Jerusalem*, and still adhered to the *Mosaical Law*, the *fear*, saith *St. Chrysostome*, *of scandalizing them and causing them to forsake Christianity*, which motive equally extended to *all* other *communion* with *Gentiles* (and not onely in the *Gentile diet*) they counting all such *unlawfull*, as hath been shewed. Nay 'tis observable that the *Gentile diet* being but of the nature of things *strangled*, and *bloud*, and εἰδωλόθυτα, from which the *Council at Jerusalem* had allowed the *Gentiles* to *abstain*, 'tis not imaginable that *St. Paul* should so strenuously oppose the *withdrawing* from *that* in *Peter*, and his *Jewish Christians*, nor consequently, that this was all that they *withdrew* from. I shall conclude this with the expression of their own * *Baronius*, who useth a phrase of that *indefinite* extent, which contains little less than mine, and if not fully as much, yet much more than his of the *Gentile diet onely*, *that*, saith he, *he began Judaicos servare ritus, segregans se à Gentilibus, to keep the Jewish rites, separating himself from the Gentiles*, whether *persons*, or *rites*, let him determine; for if it be *rites* onely, that is more than the *Gentile diet*, which is but *one rite* at most, but if it be from their *persons*, that is *withdrawing* from *all communion with them*, unless he can be supposed to *communicate* with them, from whom he so *separates*, as not so much as to *eat* with them.

* *An.* 51. n. 45.

4. His next Impression is against my producing that *Text* of the *Jews having no dealing with the Samaritans. The question*, saith he, *is of the Gentiles, the Samaritans were not perfectly such, nor yet perfectly*

perfectly aliens from Moſes's *Law, but obſtinate ſchiſmaticks and hereticks, whoſe converſation by conſequence they deem'd more contagious than of pure Heathens.*] But I muſt firſt demand of this *ſevere Controvertiſt*, what he means by a *Jew* and a *Gentile*, that, he ſaith, the *Samaritans were not perfectly Gentiles*. Our Proteſtant *Dictionaries* have always by the word *Jew* underſtood one of the *Poſterity* of *Jacob*, and by *Gentiles* all other of what *Nation* ſoever, yea though they had undertaken the *Jewiſh Religion* either in whole or in part, for ſuch were *Gentile Proſelytes*, not *Jews*, I hope, but *Gentiles* ſtill, though *Proſelytes* of the *Jews*. Thus then it is beyond all queſtion, that the Generality of the *Samaritans* were *perfectly Gentiles*, being of the Race of thoſe that were tranſplanted thither from *Aſſyria*, 2 *King.* XVII. 24. (called thence * *Cuthæi*, *Cuthites*, from *Cuthah*, a chief place there, from whence a part of this *Colony* came) and *inſtead of the Children of Iſrael*, ſaith the *Text*, *poſſeſſed Samaria*, and *dwelt in the Cities thereof*. It is indeed *Joſephus*'s obſervation of them, that when the *Jews* are *proſperous*, and any thing to be gotten by it, ὅταν ἢ φέρειν αὐτοὺς λαμπρὰν εἰδῶσιν ἐν τύχῃ, *when they ſee any ſplendid condition by fortune befalling the Jews*, † ἐξαίφνης ἐπιπηδῶσιν αὐτῶν τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, *they preſently leap into their Kindred*, fetching their *Genealogies* from the Sons of *Joſeph*, *Ephraim* and *Manaſſes*; and ſo in *Alexander*'s time, * ἔγνωσαν αὐτοὺς Ἰουδαίους ὁμολογεῖν, *they profeſs'd themſelves Jews*; but † he tells us alſo, ἐν μὲν δὲ συμφοραῖς ὄντας Ἰουδαίους ἀρνεῖσθαι σφᾶς, ὁμολογοῦντες τῷ ἀληθεῖ, *When the Jews are under afflictions, they then renounce all Relations of Kindred to them, and in ſo doing confeſs the truth*, and therefore though to get off the *ſeventh* years tribute, they tell * *Alexander* they were *Hebrews*, yet when he asked them whether they were *Jews*, they *confeſs'd they were not*. And accordingly our *Saviour*, that confines the Preaching of the *Twelve*, *Mat.* X. to the *Houſe of Iſrael*, forbids expreſly both the *Gentiles* in general, and in ſpecial the *Cities of the Samaritans*, *verſ* 5. How then could *S. W.* imagine I had miſtaken in calling theſe *Gentiles*, or that himſelf ſpake intelligible ſenſe, in ſaying they were *not perfectly* ſuch. Did he think them of a *mix'd* Race, begotten of one *Gentile*, another *Jewiſh* Parent? how could that be? when the *Jews*, which, according to the *Teſtimony*, οὐ συγχέων), *had no dealings*, cannot be imagined to have uſed the freedom of *marriages* with them. 'Tis true indeed *Manaſſes brother* to *Jaddus* the *High-prieſt married Sanballet's daughter* a little before *Alexander*'s time, and ſome others of them were engaged in the like; but ſtill theſe were look'd on as moſt *unlawfull*, and as the *cauſe* of their *Captivities*, ſaith *Joſephus*, in the forecited place; and nothing is more obvious to reflect on, in this matter, than the ſolemn humiliation in *Ezra*'s time for this great ſin of *marrying*, and not *ſeparating themſelves from the People of the Land*, Ezr. IX.

* Κυθαῖοι, ἐξ ὧν καὶ οἱ Σαμαρεῖς εἰσι. Joſeph. ἀρχαιολ. βιβ. ια. κεφ. ζ.
† Ἀρχαιολ. βιβ. ια. κεφ. η. P. 344.
* *Ibid.*
† *Ibid.*
* *Ibid.*

5. Neither may I think that in *theſe* words he had reſpect to their *Religion*. 1. Becauſe he mentions that in the *next* words, [*nor yet perfectly Aliens from Moſes's Law*] and ſecondly becauſe their Religion is perfectly deſcribed, 2 *King.* XIX. to be the retaining their own *Idol Gods*, *Succoth Benoth*, and *Nergal* and *Aſhima*, and onely taking in the Worſhip of the *God of the Land* (as of a *Topical* Deity) fit for the *loweſt of the People*, to be the *Prieſts* of; and, ſaith that Authour, *to this Day, they fear not the Lord, neither doe they after their Ordinances, &c. v.* 34. and *v.* 41. *they ſerved their Graven Images, both their children and their childrens children, unto this day*; And although after this I ſuppoſe they might be refined, yet ſtill our *Saviour* tells them expreſly, *they worſhip they know not what*, *Jo.* IV. 22. which differs little from the character which St. *Paul* gives the *Athenians*, *Act.* XVII. 23. in relation to their *Altar* to the *unknown God*, *that God whom ye ignorantly worſhip*, &c. and accordingly *Epiphanius* in his *Catalogue* of *Hereticks*, ſets down the *Samaritans* in the ſame rank with the *Stoicks*, *Platonicks*, *Pythagoreans*, *Epicureans*, as the *ſeventh* hereſie ἀπὸ τῶ Ἑλληνισμῶ *from Greciſm* or *Gentiliſm*, as that is oppoſed to Ἰουδαισμὸς, *Judaiſm*, which, after the *four ſects* of *Samaritans*, he proceeds to: Thirdly, becauſe the account which *Joſephus* gives of this whole matter about the times of *Alexander*, and ſo not long before *Chriſt*, well agrees with this. * When *Manaſſes* had marryed *Sanballet* the *Governour* of *Samaria* his daughter, and † the *Elders* of *Jeruſalem* made an *inſurrection* againſt him, looking on it as a *foundation of impiety*, and *tranſgreſſing their Law*, that others would imitate, he expreſſeth it by τοῖς πρὸς τοὺ ἀλλοφύλους αὐτοῖς κοινωνίας ἀρχὼ τῶτο ἔσεσθαι, *that it would be the beginning of a Communion with Aliens*, i. e. with *Gentiles*, which makes it evident that the *Samaritans* were looked on as *Gentiles*. And accordingly they required *Manaſſes* either to *leave his Wife*, or not to *approach* the *Altar*, and his Brother *drove* him from the *Altar*. Hereupon *Manaſſes* goes to his *Father-in-law*, tells him, *he loves* his Wife well, but will not loſe the *Prieſthood* for her; *Sanballet* tells him he ſhall be ſo far from *loſing* his *Prieſthood*, that he will give him the *High-prieſthood*, hereupon he builds a *Temple* on *Mount-Gerizim*, like to that at *Jeruſalem*, and there ſets up *Manaſſes High-prieſt*, and all the *Jews* that were ingaged in the like *Marriages*, ἀφίσατο, *apoſtatized to Manaſſes*, and accordingly when *Alexander* came to *Sichem* the *Metropolis* of *Samaria*, where theſe *Jews* dwelt, he tells us, it was inhabited by thoſe who had *Apoſtatized* from *the Jewiſh Nation*, (κατῳκισμένον ὑπὸ τῶ Ἰουδαίων, ἐθνῶς) the *breaking* off from the *Jews*, in two ſo eminent parts of their *Religion* (that of *ſeparating* themſelves from *ſtrange women*, and Worſhipping in no other *Temple* than that of *Jeruſalem*) beſide the invaſion of the *High Prieſthood*, and aſſociating with him, that did ſo, was even in theſe Jews a pitch above *Schiſm*, *Apoſtaſie* from the *Jewiſh Religion*, whilſt the *generality* of that people were *Heathens* ſtill, and ſo look'd upon by the *Jews* at that time, elſe it would not have been ſuch an intolerable crime for the *Jews* to have *marryed* with them. *Fourthly*, becauſe, ſuppoſing ſome of them *Proſelytes* to the *Jewiſh* Religion in ſome things not in all, yet they that are ſuch, are *Gentile Worſhippers*, and ſo as was ſaid, not *Jews*, but as *perfectly Gentiles* ſtill, as thoſe with whom they were not allowed *free converſe*.

* Joſephus, Αρχ. βιβ. ια. κεφ. ζ.
† κεφ. η.

6. What then could he mean by that phraſe [not *perfectly ſuch?*] Or what confidence hath he in his next ſubtilty, that *they being Hereticks and Schiſmaticks, their Converſation was by conſequence more contagious than pure Heathens?* When yet 1. their *Schiſm* in *Worſhipping in Mount Gerizim* is interpreted by * *Epiphanius* to be *Idolatry*, διὰ τὸ ἀποκεκρύφθαι, &c. *becauſe the Idols of the four Nations were hid in that Mountain*, to which he applies the words of *Scripture*, which he ſaith *could not lie, that they remain'd to that day doing the Law, and worſhipping their own Idols*; and 2. 'tis certain, that though the *Fathers* make uſe of them as an inſtance of *Schiſmaticks*, meaning, I ſuppoſe, *Manaſſes* and thoſe *Jews* amongſt them, that inhabited *Sichem*, and judging by the *material act*, ſetting *High-prieſt* againſt *High-Prieſt*, *Altar* againſt *Altar*, *Mount Gerizim* againſt *Jeruſalem*;

* *Lib.* I. αἱρ. θ.

Jeruſalem; yet the *Generality* of *Samaritans* were not *Jews*, and the few that were, were more than *Schiſmatical Jews*, for though any ſtranger upon accepting the *whole Law*, became a *Proſelyte*, and ſo was part of the *Jewiſh Community*, yet the *Samaritans* failing in a *material article of* belief, were never admitted into the *ſociety* of that *Church*, and the *Jewiſh* Inhabitants that had, were now plainly *Apoſtatized* from it, and though the *Pentateuch* were accepted among them, and tranſlated, yet the *Prophets*, and reſt of *Scripture*, were ſtill rejected. And therefore it will be no rarity to him that ſhall look into the *Jewiſh* Learning, to meet with *Anathema's* againſt him that ſhall *eat the bread of the Cuthæans*, aſſociate thus familiarly with them, particularly in the תולדות ישו, where is a large deſcription of their *Excommunication*, with CCC. *Prieſts*, CCC *Trumpets*, and CCC *Books of the Law*, with ſeveral other circumſtances. And it is the obſervation of a † *learned* and ſober *Jew*, that the *Jews* left off the uſe of the *Samaritan* character, which was the *old Hebrew*, and took up the *Rabbinical* (lightly changed from the *ancient Aſſyrian* form) in its ſtead, that there might not be כלטה, &c. *agreement* or *communion* in the *kind of writing*, betwixt them and the *Samaritan*.

† *R. Tanchum.*

7. And yet thirdly, if it were granted, that they were *onely Schiſmaticks and hereticks*, and not *Heathens*, yet nothing is more known than that the *Jews* were moſt frequently *contaminated* by the *Heathens*, being *mingled among* them *and learning their works*, *Pſal.* 106. *v.* 35. drawn away by the bait of *Luſt*, &c. into the utmoſt abominations of *Idol-worſhip*, and were therefore moſt carefully guarded from that danger both by the Laws of *God*, and by ſome more, of the *Sanedrim's* impoſition, when yet of the many *Sects* and *Hereſies*, that were among themſelves (the *Phariſees* name expreſly ſignifying *Schiſm* and *ſeparation*, from the * *vulgar*, or *unlearned* and the *Saducees* being groſly *heretical*, in denying the *Reſurrection*, and *Angels* and *Spirits*) 'tis evident, that there were no ſuch prohibitions of *commerce* with them.

* קרושה יתירה, &c. *This is ſuperabundant ſanctity, that a man ſeparate himſelf from the vulgar* (*the people which know not the Law is accurſed*, Jo. 7. 49.) *nor touch them, nor eat nor drink with them*; *Maimon. Yad. tract. Tumath. Ocelim. cap. ult.* See him again *tr. Ab. Hattum. cap.* 13. § 8. *the Phariſees*, ſaith he, *are wont to goe at the ſides of the ways, that they be not polluted with the touch of the* עמי הארץ *Plebeians.*

8. I ſhall conclude this, as it relates peculiarly to the *Samaritans*, by demanding, whether indeed he believ'd himſelf, and thought it appliable to this matter, when he made this obſervation, diſtinguiſhing betwixt *Samaritans and Heathens*, , and yielding the *Jewiſh* reſtraint to be *greater* from the *Samaritans*, than from the *Heathens*? If ſo, how comes he to find as full proofs for the *Apoſtles*, preaching to the *Samaritans*, as to the *Gentiles*, in the proceſs of his refutation? for that is evidently to *equal* them in this matter, and ſo St. *Cyprian*, Ep. 76. looking on them as *Schiſmaticks*, and obſerving our *Lord's* prohibition of going to them, *oſtendit*, ſaith he, *Schiſmaticos Gentilibus adæquari*, *he ſhews that Schiſmaticks are equalled to Gentiles*, and ſo certainly πγκεᾶσθω in one place, is all one with κολλᾶσθω in the other, and ſignifies all manner of *Converſe*, I ſaid not *all traffick* (for that the *Jews* allowed, to *buy* of them, &c.) but *all communion and ſociety*, *mutual kindneſſes*, and eſpecially *communion in ſacris*. And ſo ſtill what I concluded from their *no dealing with the Samaritans*, and took liberty to apply to the *Gentiles*, was not with any reaſon to have provoked ſo much either of *contempt* or *indignation* in our *Controvertiſt*. The advantage, at this time, lay viſibly on the *Samaritans ſide*; for when *Peter* and *John* and *Philip*, *Act.* VIII. converſed freely with the *Samaritans*, in *communicating* the *Goſpel* to them, 'tis not without a particular *licence*, and *Viſion* from *God*, that *Peter* preacheth to a *Gentile*, *Act.* X. and yet is called in queſtion for that, and not the former, by the *converted Jews*. Thus happy is *S. W.* in all his quaint obſervations, and anſwers, and deſigned fruſtrations to the expreſs words of *Scripture*.

9. Next, he comes to my proofs, that concerned the *Gentiles*, and though they were moſt *expreſs*, that *preaching to a Gentile* (which was the *looſeſt degree of Communion*) was according to the *Jewiſh Principles as unlawfull as eating any unclean meat*, (which I inferr'd from *Peter's Viſion*, *Act.* X. 12. where one was repreſented by the other) and that *Peter himſelf profeſſes*, v. 28. *that it was unlawfull for a* Jew *to keep company*, *or come to one of another Nation*, κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσερχεσθαι, which includes *all Communion* and not onely that of the *Gentile diet*; yet this muſt be *paradigmatized*, and, his Reader here be adviſed to *learn a pattern of the Proteſtant manner of writing*, *which* is, ſaith he, *to lay the whole force of their proof upon any harſh ſounding Text*, *and ſomething difficult to explicate*, *though they know there are a thouſand other Texts expreſly againſt their pretenſe from that one.*] But to this I anſwer, 1. that this is a much better indication, I ſay not of *all Romaniſts*, but of *S. W.* my preſent adverſaries temper, who, if any thing be proved by *deduction* from *Scripture*, and not from *expreſs* words, conjures his *Catholick* Client, not to heed it at all, but to exact *expreſs* words, and at another time, when the words are moſt *expreſs*, then to call it an *harſh ſounding Text*, *and ſomething difficult to be explicated*, when yet there is not the leaſt appearance of *difficulty* in it, ſave onely that it is unreconcileably contrary to his pretenſions: Whether this be not fitter for the impartial Readers obſervation, than what he here ſuggeſts to them, let who will judge.

10. *Secondly*, when he ſaith, *I know in my Conſcience there are a thouſand Texts expreſly againſt my pretenſe from this one*, I that have read over the places, which he heaps up afterwards, can yet truely ſay, I believe in *my Conſcience*, there is not one either recited, or omitted by him, *contrary to that which I pretend from this one*. Nay 3. if need were, I could produce divers others, which, though not ſo *expreſly*, yet by neceſſary *deduction* muſt conclude the very ſame which I conclude from this *one*. And 4. the *Fathers* of the *Church*, (I ſhall give him a taſte by and by) have, as largely as I, made this deduction from thence, *viz.* that in thoſe times whereof we ſpeak, the *Jews* accounted *all communion* with the *heathen*, and not onely that in the *Gentile diet*, utterly *unlawfull*, and might not by their *Law* converſe *familiarly* with them.

11. I ſuppoſe, I ſee from whence *S. W's* miſtake (for I do not eſteem this a *willfull* errour) proceeds, and therefore I now add expreſly (what before was ſufficiently intimated) the mention of *the times*, *whereof we ſpeak*, i. e. to which the paſſages in the *Goſpels* and *Acts* and *Epiſtles* were limited, which being briefly noted, I ſhall farther trouble him, but with theſe two *vulgar* obſervations. *Firſt*, that many

many of other *Nations* through all times embraced the Religion of the *Jews*, either in *whole* or in *part*; they that embraced it *wholly*, and in token of it, were *baptized* and *circumcised*, were called their גרי צדק, *Proselytes of righteousness*, and גרי ברית, *Proselytes of the Covenant*, and of such an one * *Justin Martyr* (from *Ex.* XII. 48.) tells us, προσήλυτος περιτμόμενος ὅταν ὡς αὐτόχθων, *The circumcised Proselyte is as one that was born in the Land*, and with such an one (called προσελθὼν προσήλυτος, *Ex.* XII. 49.) they might as familiarly converse as with their *Native* brethren. Of these therefore I spake not, nor, I suppose, can be imagined to have spoken. * *Dial. cum Tryph.* i. p. 273.

12. But others there were which accepted but *part* of the *Jewish Law*, that which was not *Originally Jewish*, the *seven precepts of the Sons of Adam* and *Noah*, and such an one had some degree of admission among them, so far as to be called גר שער a *Proselyte* or *stranger of the Gates*, *Deut.* XIV. 29. גר חושב, a *stranger inhabiting* among them; by the *Chaldee*, *Deut.* XIV. 21. תותב ערל *an uncircumcised inhabitant*. But of these it is observable, that when the *Jews* were *carryed into Captivity*, and when afterward they lived under the *Roman Yoke*, and so were not able to keep their *Proselytes* within their *prescribed rules*, having no *coercive* Jurisdiction over them, their Wise-men or *Rulers conciliarly* determined, that the *Native Jews* should abstain from familiar *converse* and *communion* with them, in *like* manner, though not with the same *detestation*, and *degree* of *aversion*, as from all other *Gentiles*.

13. Hence is that known *distinction* in the *Temple*, betwixt the *Inner* and the *Outer Court*, the latter call'd the *Court of the Gentiles*, divided by a low *wall* from the other, (to which St. *Paul* refers, in his μεσότοιχον φραγμοῦ, *half wall of partition*, *Ep.* II. 14.) on which, saith *Josephus*, was inscribed μὴ δεῖν ἀλλόφυλον ἐντὸς ἰέναι, *that no Alien might enter the Inner Court*. That this was any *Original Law* given by *God* to *Moses*, I do not pretend, but a *latter* Law of the *Rulers* of this people, under *captivity*, &c. So *Maimonides*, *Holach*, *Isuribia*, *Ch.* IV. הגוים, &c. *the Gentiles*, saith he, *are not obliged by the Laws of the woman in uncleanness*, *of a Flux*, *or Childbirth*, וחכמים גזרו על כל הגוים, &c. *but the Wise-men have decreed all Gentiles male as well as female*, *to be as if they had a constant Flux of bloud*, &c. i. e. though by force of the *Law* of *God* by *Moses* they were not, yet by the *latter* Laws of their *Sanhedrim* they were to obstain precisely from *familiar* converse with *Gentiles*. To the same purpose the *Misna*, *tit. nidda*, c. IV. and this *Decree* seems to be made in the times of the *Hasmonæi*, for in *Gemara Babylon.* upon the title *Aboda Zara*, † *cap.* 2. 'tis said, that they *decreed every Heathen woman should be esteemed menstruous*, i. e. *unclean*, and not to be *touched* by a *Jew*. But though this were no *Original Law* of *God*, yet that derogates not from the *obligingness* of it to the *Jews*, our Saviour telling us, that what the *Scribes* and *Pharisees* (these *Wise-men* of theirs) *sitting in Moses's Chair*, *command*, *obedience* is due to them therein, *Mat.* XXIII. 2. And so these *Laws* of their *Wise-men*, by force of *God's Law* for *obeying* their *Rulers*, *Deut.* 17. 11. obtained so full authority, that according to *Jewish Principles*, abstracted from *Christian* liberty, it was not *lawfull* to disobey them; and therefore as * *St. Chrysostome*, speaking of the *Samaritan woman*, saith, that she looked on *Christ's speaking* to her, as τὸ μὴ κατὰ νόμον γινόμενον, *that which was not according to Law*, and again, Νόμος οὐκ ἐπιτρέπουτος, *that the Law permitted it not*, adding presently, τοιαύτας παρατηρήσεις, *such observances*, shewing that by *Law* before, he meant these *Ordinances* of the *Jews own* making, so, the same Father, speaking of *Cornelius* the *Proselyte*, to whom *Peter's* Vision appertained, hath first these words, † Ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὐδὲ ἀκροβυστος, οὐδὲν κοινὸν εἶχε πρὸς Ἰουδαίους, *he was uncircumcised*, *he had no thing common* (*no communion*) with the *Jews*; then, that had not *Peter* received that *Vision*, * *they would have accused him* ὡς παραβάτης, *as a transgressour of their Law*, and † after, ὁ Θεὸς τοῦτο ἐκέλευσε παρανόμου εἶναι κολλᾶσθαι, &c. *God*, saith *Peter*, *hath commanded that it be a transgression of the Law*, *to be joyned in close converse*, *or go in to an Alien*; and again, οὐ μόνον οὐ κολλᾶσθαι ἀλλ' οὐδὲ παρελθεῖν ἔξον φησι, he saith, *'Tis unlawfull not onely to cleave to*, or be joyned in close converse, *but even to go in to him*. * *Tom.* 2. p. 680. *lib.* 32. † *Tom.* 4. p. 738. *lib.* 6. * *Ib.* l. 7. † P. 742. l. 26.

14. To clear this yet farther, it is to be remembred, that the *Excommunications*, so famously known among the *Jews*, and from thence translated by *Christ* to *Christianity*, did not yet stand by *Moses's Law*, nor were they *Originally* in use among them, or as long as they continued in their own Nation; * *Elias Ben Moseh* a *Carean* or *Scripturian Jew* (and so none of their *Traditionals*) out of *Rabbi Benjamin Ben Moseh* sets down the institution of it, with relation to the *time of the Captivity*, בי מי שנרשע, &c. *If any be defiled by greater sins*, *for which in time of Captivity*, *we cannot exercise Judgments*, *he must by penance reconcile himself*, *and undertake to mend*; *but if he do not*, *we put him under Cherem*, *and separate him from us*, *according to that of Ezra* 10. 8. *he shall be separated from the Congregation of the Captivity*, or of those that have been *carryed* away: And so that *Elias Ben Moseh* himself adds, *it was*, saith he, *convenient and necessary* בומן תגלות *in the time of the Captivity*, *that if any obeyed not the words of the Law*, *or the Wise-men*, *he should be put under Cherem* and *Nidui*, and separated from the *Congregation of Israel*, *by the Decree of the Wise-men*, &c. *and the whole Congregation received the Decree of the Wise-men*, *to be in force* וומן הזה, at that, or any such *time* (as that of the *Captivity*, when they had not power of life and death over their people) *to all ages*. Thus † *Josephus* having described their *Excommunication* by ἐκβάλλεσι τῆς τάγματος, *casting them out of the Camp* or *Congregation*, adds, τοῖς δὲ ὅρκοις καὶ τοῖς ἔθεσιν ἐνδεδεμένος, *he that is bound by those Oaths* (or *Anathema's*) *and Customes* or *rites*, &c. *i. e.* by those degrees of *Excommunication customarily* brought in among them in those latter times; which therefore we reade of in *Ezra*, and after him frequently in the *Apocrypha*, and the *Gospels*, but not before the time of the *Captivity*. * *Tract. de Sabbatho.* † *Captiv.* l. 2. *Cap.* 12.

15. Now that what is thus *evident* of their *Excommunications* or *Censures* upon their own Members in case of offence, is founded on supposition of their *Ordinances* against *mixing* or *familiarly* conversing with *Heathens*, the very form in the *Gospel* makes evident, where, of the Offender it is said, upon his *obstinacy*, *Let him be to thee as an Heathen or Publican*, which could have no applyableness to that matter, if their *Law* did not prescribe the same *separation* from each of those, which their *Censures* inflicted as a *punishment* on obstinate *Offenders*.

16. Of *Publicans* it is frequently express'd in the *Gospels*, that the *Jews* censured our *Saviour* for conversing with them; *Why eateth your Master with Publicans*, &c. which cannot with any probability belong to the *Gentile diet*, for the *Publicans* being *Jews* by birth, as *Matthew* and *Zacheus*, though by the necessity of their employment they had to doe with the *Romans*, who employ'd them to gather *toll*, yet had no such necessity to forsake at home the rites of their *Religion*; And yet this very *mixing* with *Heathens* made them *detestable*, and as unfit for a *Jew* to converse

with, as the *Heathens* were, which ſtill ſets it beyond diſpute, that the *Heathens* were not to be *mix'd* with.

17. The like *analogy* between their dealing with *Offenders* and with *Heathens* we find in the *Books* of the *Maccabees*; for as in that which is call'd the *third* Book in our *Greek Bibles*, the puniſhment of *Excommunication* inflicted on the ὑποχωρήντας, *Apoſtates*, is deſcribed by τὸ σωμαι ασεχθῆς καὶ ἐυχρησίας ἐτέρου, *they deprived them of common converſation and receiving benefit by them*, ſo 2 *Maccab.* XIV. 38. 'tis ſaid of *Razis* an eminent *Jew*, ὧ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις τὸ ἀμιξίας κεῖσιν, εἰσηνηγμένος Ἰουδαισμὸς, which I ſee to be variouſly interpreted, but I think can ſignify no other, than that *in former times* (thoſe of *Antiochus Epiphanes*, called χρόνοι ὁπλιμξίας, v. 3. *the times of mingling themſelves*, becauſe ſo many *Jews* offended againſt the *Law* in *mingling* with the *Gentiles*) *he brought in the Ordinance of Judaiſm, of not mixing*, or, which is all one, *of not mixing of Judaiſm*, as that ſignifies the *Judaical Law* of *not mixing with the Gentiles*, whereby (it is there ſaid that) *he ventur'd his body and life for Judaiſm, i.e.* to preſerve that *Law inviolate* among the *Jews* of not *mixing* with *Heathens*.

18. So when 1 *Mac.* 1. 11. in *Antiochus*'s days we are told, there *went out of* Iſrael *ſome which perſwaded many, ſaying, Let us go and covenant Covenants with the Nations round about us, for* ἀφ' ἧς ἐχωρίσθημεν ἀπ' αὐτῶν, *from the time we have been ſeparated from them, many evils have found us*; this is an evidence, that there was a *ſpace* foregoing, wherein the *Jews* had been *ſeparated* from the *Gentiles*; and that it was not imputable to any thing elſe, but to their *Laws* that required it, appears from the *character* ſet on thoſe men that invited others to *violate* it, they are υἱοὶ παράνομοι, *tranſgreſſing wicked men*, acting contrary to their *Laws*, which could not be, had not the *Laws* of the *Jews* at *that* time been utterly againſt this *covenanting* with the *Heathens*, *i.e.* this free unreſtrained *converſe* with them, which fully explains to us the meaning of the χείνῳ ὁπλιμξίας, and ἀμιξία, the *former* in theſe times of *Antiochus*, as was ſaid, the *latter*, before them, and after again, when *Razis*, and ſuch as he, that were *zealous* for *Judaiſm*, reſiſted the torrent, and reduced them.

19. That this was the meaning of the *Jews* not going into the *Prætorium*, *Joh.* 18. 28. that they might not be under the ſame roof with the *Roman* Souldiers, μὴ μιανθῶσιν, *leſt they ſhould be defiled*, is an ordinary *obſervation*, but this ſtill to be underſtood in relation to thoſe times, and the decree of their *Rulers*, not as any *Original Law* of *God*; which having thus largely ſhewed, it already appears, how little I am in *S. W*'s *hundred*, yea *thouſand Texts*, which he deems ſo contrary to my pretenſions, when my pretenſions of the ἀμιξία, commencing from the time of the *Captivity*, and by force of their power to make *Laws*, as they ſhould ſee fit for their preſent occaſions, and not from any expreſs *Law* of *God* by *Moſes*, or from the beginning of *Judaiſm*, have evidently prevented all the proofs, which he hath brought from the practice of the *Jews* in more ancient times, from *Leviticus*, from *Joſhua*, from *David*, *Solomon*, *Elias*, *Elizeus*, and the like; for to all theſe the anſwer is, that the *Jews Ordinance* of ἀμιξία came in after theſe times, being no part of *Moſes*'s *Law*, but of a much later date under the *Captivity*. As for the *Embaſſy* and *League* with the *Romans*, (which indeed belong to the times I ſpake of) 1 *Mac.* 8. and ſo with the *Spartans*, *cap.* 12. theſe cannot prejudice our preſent *hypotheſis*, which pretends not any neceſſity, that the diſtreſſed *Jews* ſhould profeſs *hoſtility*, and defiance to all other Kingdoms in the world, but willingly yields, that they might, by the conſent of their *Governours*, make *peace* (as well as wage *war*) συμμαχίαν καὶ εἰρήνην, ſaith the Text, a *League of peace* and *amity*, and in order to that, ſend *Legates*, and thoſe *Legates* converſe with *Romans*, and negotiate the affair for which they were ſent, which being all that *S. W.* pretends, is moſt willingly granted him.

20. What he adds of their *converſing with the Gentiles in Captivity, and that we do not hear of any expreſſion of abominating their civil ſociety with them, or that they broke* Moſes's *Law by ſo doing, or any one put to death on that ſcore*] is ſoon anſwered, 1. That I pretend not the *No-communion* to ſtand by *Moſes's Law*. 2. That when they were carried out of their *own Country*, the *Capital* power (and ſo the *putting to death* he ſpeaks of) was taken out of their hands, and to repair that defect, their *Excommunications* brought in. 3. That though *S. W.* have not heard of them, there were *Decrees* made by their *Æchmalotarchæ*, their *Governours* in time of the *Captivity*, reſtraining them from *familiar* converſe with the *Gentiles*, among whom they were forced to live.

21. But may it not ſtill be of force againſt us, what he addeth of the *lawfulneſs of making Proſelytes*, and from our *Saviour's* words, that the *Phariſees compaſs Sea and Land to make one Proſelyte, which*, ſaith he, *could not be without converſation and preaching*] I anſwer, I think it is not of any force againſt what hath been thus far eſtabliſhed: *The compaſſing Sea and Land* being a *Proverbial* ſpeech, to expreſs great diligence, the ſame that the *Merchant* uſes to fetch home his *Jewels* and wealth, and ſo the plain meaning of that place being this, that when a *Gentile* deſired to undertake the Religion of the *Jews*, the *Phariſees* were extremely *zealous* to gain him to their *whole Law*, to be a *Proſelyte* of the *Covenant*, to be *circumciſed*, and receive *all* their *Ordinances*, and not onely ſo, but to raiſe him yet farther to *their Sect*, which was the moſt exact in *Traditional* obſervations of any: In order to either of which, there is no doubt, they were thus far allowed, by their χρίσις ἀμιξίας, *Ordinance of ſeparation*, to converſe with him, as to *reveal* their Doctrine, tell him all the *Precepts* of the *Law*, and inforce it on him by their moſt powerfull arguments, as a *Catechiſt* in the *Church* may and ought to reveal to the *Catechumenus* the terms of the *Chriſtian Covenant*, and prepare him for *Baptiſm*: though as till the one be *baptized*, he is not capable of the *Communion* of the πιστοὶ or *faithfull*, ſo the other, till he were *circumciſed*, though he were a *Proſelyte* of the *Gate*, or in *part*, yet the *Jews*, even thoſe that took pains to *convert* him, were to keep their *diſtance* from him, not to *communicate* with him *in ſacris*, in the ſame *Court* of the *Temple*, but the *Proſelyte* to keep to the *Atrium Gentilium*, as was ſaid. An image of which we have alſo in their *cenſures* againſt *Natives*, there being divers degrees of their *Excommunication*, and the *Nidui* ſeparating but for four *paces*, and the like; which was as much ſhort of the *Cherem* or *Anathema*, as the uſage of the *Proſelytes* of the *Gates* differed from that of thoſe *Gentiles*, which were not *Proſelytes*, or *Candidates* of any degree of it.

22. And if it be now demanded, why then it ſhould not be lawfull for *Peter* by their *Ordinances to go in to* Cornelius, who was a *Proſelyte* of the *Gates*, the anſwer is, that *Cornelius*'s deſign was not to gain *Circumciſion*, but to be taught *Chriſtianity*, and *baptized*, *&c.* without being *circumciſed*, which required

quired that *near* converſe and *communion* from *Peter*, expreſs'd by συναναστρεφεσθαι, *&c.* which the *Jewiſh Laws* allowed not, any more than *eating* with the *Gentiles*, and therefore *Peter* deemed it not lawfull by their *Laws* to take that liberty, till the Viſion from Heaven gave him *Authority* for it.

23. In the top of the 312. Page, reciting my *tenet* of the *Jews at* Antioch, he ſaith it is, *that they had no communion at all, no not even civil converſation with the Gentiles their fellow Chriſtians*] but he cannot believe theſe are the expreſſions of my *tenet*, or any words of mine; I ſaid *they withdrew from all communion*, and not onely from the *Gentile diet*; but any man elſe would have underſtood the *All communion*, either by the *oppoſition* to that one ſort, of *Gentile diet*, or at leaſt by the whole diſcourſe, which was *withholding* or abſtaining from *ſociety in ſacris* (as *communion* in the *Eccleſiaſtical* ſtyle particularly ſignifies) And in this laſt caſe I pray, doth not *S. W. withdraw from all communion* with the *Doctour*, to whom yet he profeſſeth himſelf ready to *perform much civility?* I never doubted but a *Jew* of the *ſtricteſt* ſtrain might have ſome kind of *civil converſation* with *Gentiles*, might *buy* of them, and the like, the Interdict lying onely againſt interchangeable *courteſies*, and *familiar* converſe: And for the *Judaizers* at *Antioch*, if they be yielded to have withheld themſelves from the *Gentile Cœtus*, and performed their Offices *ſeorſim*, *apart*, this is all that my pretenſions aſpired to; for then *Paul* and *Peter* had their *diſtinct Cœtus*, and the *Gentiles* were no part of *Peter's Province*, which is the *principal* concluſion to be made good, againſt *S. W.* and the *abſtaining* was not onely from the *Gentile diet*, which was the *leſs principal*.

24. But if all theſe objections have been found light, yet may not his next impreſſion be more fortunate? *viz.* that *this being ſo long after* Peter's *Viſion, and the declaration of it, and the ſatisfaction of thoſe that had been ſcandalized at it*, Act. XI. 18. *put caſe it had been forbidden by* Moſes's *Law, yet what likelihood was there, that the apprehenſion of that unlawfulneſs ſhould ſtill continue?*] I anſwer, 1. many things come to paſs that are not *likely*; 2. many things are *likely* in themſelves, and the circumſtances belonging to them, which to him who diſcerns not thoſe *circumſtances*, have another appearance. 3. That ſome mens *prejudices*, and favour to their own *Hypotheſis*, may confirm them in their old, and render them obſtinate to any contrary *apprehenſions*, how convincingly ſoever propoſed to them. An inſtance of which we have now before us, that when he himſelf confeſſes that *Peter withdrew from eating with the Gentile Chriſtians, for fear of the Jews that came from Jeruſalem*, he can yet think it improbable that *Peter's Viſion ſhould not e'er this have given all men ſatisfaction*, when yet the very *Viſion* it ſelf was in thoſe words, *ariſe* Peter, *kill and eat*, and *call not that common which God hath cleanſed*, though that were the very *Gentile diet*, which now he ſuppoſeth him to *abſtain* from, on this one motive of the *Jewiſh Chriſtians diſſatisfaction*. 'Tis true, when he declared his *Viſion*, *Act.* XI. the *Jews* then preſent were convinced by it, ſo far as to acknowledge that *God had to the Gentiles granted repentance to life*; yet 'tis as plain *after* this, (and the occaſion of the *great Council* at *Jeruſalem*, *Act.* 15.) that *there came certain men from Judæa, which taught the brethren, and ſaid, except ye be circumciſed, ye cannot be ſaved*, which is expreſly contrary to theſe *uncircumciſed Gentiles* (ſuch as *Cornelius* was) *having repentance unto life*. And 'tis no leſs manifeſt, that when *Paul* came to *Jeruſalem*, and declared his ſucceſſes among the *Gentiles*, and gave ample ſatisfaction to *James the Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, and the *Text* adds, *when they heard it, they glorified God*, v. 20. yet in the ſame verſe, that *good Biſhop* tells him, *Thou ſeeſt how many thouſand Jews there are that believe, and are zealous of the Law*, who, it ſeems were ſcandalized at *Paul*, that he taught the *Jews* that were among the *Gentiles*, not to *circumciſe their children, and ſo to forſake* Moſes's *Law*, and not onely ſo, but μηδὲ τοις ἔθεσι περιπατεῖν, *not to walk in the Cuſtoms* or *Ordinances*, which evidently belongs to the point in hand, and makes it ſtill more than probable, that the *Jewiſh Chriſtians* of *Jeruſalem*, the very men ſpoken of, *Gal.* 2. 12. were not ſatisfied of the *lawfulneſs* of *forſaking* either *Moſes's Law*, or the *Judaical Ordinances* (of which this of the ἀκροβυστία was one) thus long after *Peter's* Viſion, and the declaration of it. How much labour it coſt St. *Paul*, both in his preaching, and his *Epiſtles*, to infuſe the truer and more *Chriſtian* apprehenſions, and what perſecutions it brought him, is too much known to them that have read the *New Teſtament*, (without the *Folio-Annotations* he ſcoffs at) to be ignorant of.

25. But unleſs I can give him a *reaſon*, why thoſe at *Antioch* ſhould be *more unreaſonable* than thoſe, *Act.* XI. at *Jeruſalem*, I am ſtill a loſt man after all this. But I ſhall hope that others will think it poſſible, that ſome tempers are more hardly *ſatisfied* with *reaſon*, than others, and if I ſhall pitch on *S. W.* himſelf, as an inſtance of it, I ſhall not fear to be refuted by any impartial *Umpirage*.

26. Once more, the *Church of Jeruſalem*, ſaith he, *before this, heard of the preaching to the Gentiles, and* Act. *XI.* 22. *ſent* Barnabas *to Antioch for the ſame end*] But I conceive there is a wide difference betwixt the *Church at Jeruſalem*, as that ſignifies the *Biſhop James*, and ſuch as he was (the ſame I ſay of *Philip preaching in Samaria*, which he after mentions, and why not *Chriſt* to the *woman*, and *Paul* to the *Heathen* world?) and the *many thouſand Judaizers*, ſuch as that *good Biſhop* tells St. *Paul* of, after this, for that theſe ſtill remain'd *unſatisfied*, muſt be as certain as the *Authority* of that Book can make any thing.

27. Another little probability he would glean from the diſtance between the time of St. *Peter's Viſion*, and that referr'd to *Act.* XI. ſufficient, ſaith he, *to let the Jews in the ſame City know, that the Gentiles might be convers'd with*] But he is diſcernible to be drawn low, that catches at ſuch colours as theſe, all force of which is ſo eaſily avoided, and retorted againſt himſelf, for the longer this was after St. *Peter's Viſion*, the more time had the *Judaizers* to ſow their *Tares*, as well as the force of his *Viſion* to prevail; which the longer it was paſt, the more apt it was to be *forgotten* by them, that had not the inclination to be convinced with it.

28. But now this batch of *objections* is over, there is a *freſh maſs* behind, for, ſaith he, *if nothing elſe could bridle Dr.* H. *from ſuch extravagancy of inſincerity and weakneſs, yet I wonder much his own words could not curb him*] and then without more adoe is enter'd into the *Index* the *Doctour's contradicting himſelf and common ſenſe both at once*, p. 314, 315. But whence came all this ruefull *Tragedy*, and *wonderment*, *of extravagancy*, *of inſincerity*, &c. that thus tranſported *S. W?* why, it ſeems, I ſaid, *that we reade of St.* Peter *and the Jewiſh Proſelytes, that they withdrew from all communion and ſociety with the Gentile Chriſtians.*] But is this to *contradict my ſelf and common ſenſe?* I more wonder where I ever ſaid or dream'd the *contrary* to this. Is not this the ſaying that I have been arraign'd for, all this while? and if I have elſewhere *contradicted* it, why might not that have atoned *S. W's* rigid diſpleaſure, and ſav'd

me ſo many pages in *defending it*? But the trick is yet behind, *For*, ſaith he, *if they withdrew from all communion, and ſociety, I ſuppoſe they had, and uſed formerly, both communion and ſociety with them, elſe how could they be ſaid to withdraw from it*] I anſwer, that if by *both communion and ſociety*] he mean onely *ſome ſociety*, I grant his Concluſion; but if he mean *all* ſort of *communion* and *ſociety*, I deny his conſequence, and render my reaſon for it, becauſe they that hold but *one* part of *external* ſociety with others, if now they ſhall *withdraw* from *that*, may fitly be ſaid to *withdraw* from all, becauſe in this caſe there is none left, from which they have not *withdrawn*: Thus in the inſtance before us, the *Jewiſh Chriſtians* at *Antioch* uſed ſome *ſociety* before, *viz.* that of *eating*, *with the Gentile Chriſtians*, v. 12. but kept their *Cœtus apart* (as not onely I, and his ſuppoſed *Pelagius*, but, as hath been ſhew'd him, his own *Baronius* may advertiſe him) but now *Peter*, and, I ſuppoſe, his *Jewiſh Cœtus* there, *withdrew* even from *this*, and ſo conſequently from *all communion and ſociety with them*. *S.W.* will eaſily underſtand this by a parallel; the *Romaniſts* and the *Proteſtants* in *London* keep their *Aſſemblies apart*, but are content without all ſcruple to *eat* together; ſuppoſe now ſome rigid *Romaniſt*, ſuch as profeſſes himſelf bound to make all that
* *Sch. diſp.* p. 18. a *Proteſtant* ſaith *Non-ſenſical*, and yet * will *ſhew as much civility, be as ready to ſerve one of them as he would any Gentleman in* England, ſuppoſe, I ſay, this man ſhould advance, as he may, when his *zeal* is turgent, or the *Pope* commands, ſo much higher, as to abhor the very *eating* with a *Proteſtant*, might not I then ſay, he *withdraws from all communion* with *Proteſtants*, without ſuppoſing that he *had*, and *uſed all formerly*? He ſees then, our *Phænomena* ſtill ſalved, and no ſuch *ſelf-contradiction*, as he and his *Index* informed the Reader of.

29. His *laſt* and eagerſt rebuke, is, that I *make St.* Peter *and his Proſelytes Schiſmaticks*] and a loud clamour is rais'd on that Theme. And when I thought I had prevented that, as far as St. *Peter* was concerned in it, by telling him the reſolution of St. *Chryſoſtome* and the *Greek Commentatours*, that, what he did at that time, was but an οἰκονομία or *act* of *prudent managery* deſigned by *agreement* betwixt him and St. *Paul*, to reduce the *Judaizers* from their errours, this anſwer he ſees, yet forbids me to *make any uſe of it, ſince the breaking of all communion with another Church is the extern act of Schiſm, and ſo not juſtifiable* (by the *Doctour's* Confeſſion elſewhere) *by any cauſe or motives.*] But to this the *anſwer* is brief, 1. that he did not ſo *ſincerely*, as he would ſeem, and is obliged, who complains of *inſincerity* in others, to change my words, and for [*withdrawing from all communion*] to inſert [*breaking all communion*] to which my *hypotheſis* is no-way liable.

30. I ſuppoſe *two diſtinct Cœtus* at *Antioch*, as he very well knows, one of *Jews*, the other of *Gentiles*, and no more a *Schiſm* in this, than in *two diſtinct Churches* of *different* Nations now-a-days, which have no *dependance* or *ſubordination* the one to the other, but each enjoy their own *Ceremonies* and *Communion* apart, yet as members of the *Catholick Church* of *Chriſt*. And if this be no *Schiſm*, as ſure there is not the leaſt appearance of any, then how is St. *Peter* become a *Schiſmatick*, or what *communion* doth he *break* by my *hypotheſis*? Is it becauſe I ſay he *withdraws from all communion*? I have formerly ſhew'd, that in this there was nothing *new*, or over and above the *diſtinct Cœtus*, (wherein there was no *Schiſm*) ſave onely the leaving to *eat* (which I ſuppoſe alſo includes *free converſing*) *with the Gentiles*: And 1. that is but a *civil* thing, and ſo no matter of *Schiſm*. And 2. *S.W.* that acknowledges he *withdrew from the Gentile diet*, if there be *Schiſm* in that, is himſelf moſt guilty of that which he chargeth on me, *i. e.* of *making Saint* Peter *a Schiſmatick*. And indeed 3. the *Text* of *Scripture* cannot be denied to ſay expreſly, that he *withdrew from eating with the Gentiles*, and therefore if that be to *break communion*, and to *break communion* be to be a *Schiſmatick*, 'tis the *Scripture* not I, nor *S.W.* that makes St. *Peter* a *Schiſmatick*. Wherein then doth my *Hypotheſis* involve St. *Peter* in the leaſt ſhare of guilt, which ſuppoſes no more than this, that the *Cœtus* being kept *apart*, from the firſt planting of the *Goſpel* betwixt the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Chriſtians* at *Antioch*, onely the *Apoſtle* of the one, and, I ſuppoſe his *Cœtus* alſo, freely *eating* and converſing with the other, upon the *coming* of the *Judaizers* from *Jeruſalem*, they intermitted at that time, or retrenched themſelves the uſe of that *liberty*, *withdrew from eating with the Gentiles*, becauſe they knew this would be matter of *ſcandal*, and avert the *Judaizers*, who counted it *unlawfull* to have any *familiar converſe* with *Gentiles*.

31. The utmoſt that is imaginable to be objected to St. *Peter* in this point, muſt be made up of theſe *two new hypotheſes*. 1. That the *Judaizers from Jeruſalem*, that would have no *communion* with the *Gentiles*, were *Schiſmaticks*; and 2. that they which for *fear* of *ſcandalizing* them, *withdrew from eating* with the *Gentiles*, complied with *Schiſmaticks*. But herein whatſoever mine opinion is, *S.W.* cannot charge me, 1. becauſe I have not yet ſaid any thing of it; 2. becauſe his *hypotheſis* yielding that he *withdrew* from *eating* with *Gentiles*, is as liable to this as mine; and 3. becauſe I ſuppoſe the reverence to the *Judaical Law* ſprang from ſuch an *Original*, that it rendred it more *pardonable* at that time, to *adhere* to it, and on that account to abſtain (as upon obligation of *Conſcience*) from the *ſociety* of *Gentiles*, than it can be now for any *Chriſtian* member of the *Catholick Church* to *abſtain* from *Communion*
* *Dial. cum Tryphon.* p. 265. with any other. Thus I am ſure *Juſtin Martyr* determines it for *Circumciſion* it ſelf, and the * τὰ διαταχθέντα, the *Judaical Ordinances*, that he *that believes Jeſus to be the Meſſias, and obeys him, and yet βιάλῃ τοῦτα φυλάσσειν, will obſerve and retain theſe, ſhall be ſaved, unleſs he be vehement in perſuading others, and ſay they cannot be ſaved unleſs they obſerve them*; which if it be not for the advantage of theſe *Judaizers*, ſuppoſing them ſuch as thoſe that are mentioned, *Act.* XV. 1. (and perhaps as little for the *bitter*, unreconcileable, *cenſorious Romaniſt* now-a-days) yet I ſhall yield ſo much to *S.W's judgment*, that now after the *Council*, it is not certain that *theſe* are ſuch. And then it is not amiſs to remember, that in the *firſt* times, it was unqueſtionably lawfull for an *Apoſtle* to *comply* with the *Jews*, that were *zealous* of their *Law*, and to uſe, or not to uſe their *obſervances*, ſuch as that of not *eating with Gentiles*.

32. This is frequently exemplified in that very St. *Paul*, who *became as a Jew to the Jews*, 1 *Cor.* IX. 20. *purified himſelf at Jeruſalem*, *Act.* XXI. *circumciſed Timothy*, *Act.* XVI. performed the Ceremonies of the *Nazarites* Vow at *Cenchrea*, *Act.* XVIII. and yet at other times freely made uſe of his *Chriſtian Liberty*, and all to the ſame end, that he *might gain the more*, which was ſurely an act of the greateſt *Charity*, and ſo of utmoſt diſtance from *Schiſm*.

33. If this be not rejected, he will ſoon ſee through his own anſwer, which he offers to St. *Peter's* words, of the ἀθέμιτον κολλᾶσθαι ἢ ἐφοδιάζεσθαι, *unlawfulneſs of being joined or going in to an Alien*, though a

Proſelyte

Proselyte of the *Gates*; and how far his haste, or want of observation missed him, in not seeing a middle betwixt the *Law* of *Moses*, and the *Traditions* of the *Scribes* such as *Christ rebuked*, when yet to the *Decrees* of their *Sanedrim*, which are a *third* thing, different from *both* these, *God* himself by *Moses* in *Deuteronomy* had commanded *obedience*, and so had *Christ* also; and accordingly St. *Chrysostome* saith of this very Ordinance before us, ὁ Θεὸς ἐνεδείξατο, *God had commanded it*, though not by *Moses*, to be παρὰ νόμον, *against Law*, to be *joined with them*.

34. But 'tis worth observing, what *passion*, or prejudice, or resolution to adhere to his own notions, in opposition to expres words of *Scripture*, can doe. He had resolved it *lawfull* by the *Jewish Law* at that time, to *converse* and associate with *Gentiles*; and when St. *Peter* assures him, as of a *known* thing, that it was ἀθέμιτον, which no *Author*, or *Dictionary* in the world could incline him to interpret of any thing, but simply *unlawfull*, he will yet, rather than leave his hold, construe it *not unlawfull*, but *what their Teachers and Doctours, who governed their Conscience, bore them in hand was unlawfull*, exemplifying this by those things, *which the Romanist Doctours and Casuists judge to be unlawfull, which are not found forbidden by* Christ's *Law*; Which may serve to perfect our information in that, which *Les Provinciales*, or the *mystery of Jesuitism* hath told us of, but withall confin'd to that *one* Order, that their *Doctours* and *Casuists* have not set up *Christ's Law* for the umpire of their *Controversies*, but their own *probable*, oft most *improbable opinions*; and that as the *Jesuits* have been *popular Confessours*, carefull to send no man away *melancholy*, and so have made many more things *lawfull*, than *Christ* left, so others have chosen to deviate on the other side, and, if their *Advocate S. W.* may be believed, have *judged those things unlawfull, which* Christ's *Law hath not forbidden*; which if it be true, must conclude that they are dangerous *Dogmatizers*, but gives no least satisfaction to the *Argument*, or aid to *S. W*'s pretensions.

35. Thus much, (and it is a little strange that thus much should by our *Controvertist's* dexterous industries be rendred *necessary*) for that small *proposition* of St. *Peter*, and his *Jewish Proselytes*, *Gal.* 2. *withdrawing from all communion and society with the Gentile Christians*. If nothing else be gained by it, this piece of observation may, that *S. W.* was made on purpose to *multiply*, and perpetuate *controversies*.

SECT. XVI.

Of the first Bishops of Antioch. *The Expedient for reconciling the seeming difference among Authours, about* Euodius *and* Ignatius. *A pretended falsification of the Writer of the Constitutions, cleared.* Baronius's *accordance with me in every part of it, and in my conclusion of the disparate Cœtus from it. No promiscuous ruling of Bishops. What authority belongs to the Constitutions. Proving of Testimonies.*

1. HIS *sixteenth* Section sets out with a very fierce and bloudy resolution to make D. *H.* the *most wilfull self-condemned falsifyer*, and agreeably the three pages, 319, 320, 321. are referred to in the *Index* to discover a *voluntary and shamefull falsification left undefended*. But with what truth this (and the four sage *Observations* of this Section laid out on this feat) is suggested, the Reader will easily be informed.

2. In the *Tract of Schism* I had spoken of the *disparate*, and not *subordinate Churches* of *Jewish* and *Gentile Christians* at *Antioch*, and added, *that according to this condition of disparate*, &c. *it is, that the Writer of the Apostolical Constitutions, tells us, that* Euodius *and* Ignatius *at the same time sate Bishops of* Antioch, *one succeeding St.* Peter, *the other St.* Paul, *one in the Jewish, the other in the Gentile Congregation*, and so continued a while, till both the *Churches* joined, and united together, under *Ignatius*, who therefore as by *Origen* and *Eusebius* he is called the *second*, so by St. *Jerom* is called the *third Bishop* of *Antioch*, and yet by *Athanasius* said to be constituted *Bishop after the Apostles*, and by *Chrysostome*, that the *Apostles hands were laid on him*, whilst yet *Theodoret* affirms him to *have received the Archisacerdotal Honour from the hands of St.* Peter.] That in these relations there was some seeming difficulty and unreconcileableness, I thought was visible to all, (and therefore no great *mastery* in *S. W.* now to discover that) yet had I no reason to suspect the *Truth* of any one of these relations, and therefore deem'd it necessary to pitch on such an *Expedient*, as might reconcile all these; and that was briefly this, that as these *two Apostles*, *Peter* and *Paul*, had their different *Cœtus* at *Antioch*, the one among the *Jewish*, the other among the *Gentile Christians*, so they severally constituted *Bishops* at their parting thence, *Peter*, *Euodius*, and *Paul*, *Ignatius*, who continuing together for some time, and at length *Euodius* dying, and the partition between the *Jewish* and *Gentile Christians* being now removed there, St. *Peter* committed the *Jewish* portion also, and so the entire flock of that *great City*, to the *Bishop* of the *Gentile* part, *Ignatius*.

3. That those *ancient* Writers should mistake, or really *contradict* one another, in a thing of so recent memory, so easily refutable out of the *Records* of so famous a *City*, without any probable motive to seduce, or bait to tempt them out of their way, I thought no man would be so vain as to imagine, and therefore expected not to be reproach'd for offering an easie, obvious *clue* to extricate this intanglement, and to vindicate the truth of every of the relations; and supposing onely what my *hypothesis* offers, of the *disparate Cœtus*, the way was most *facile* and open, and no difficulty to conceive *Euodius* and *Ignatius Bishops* there at the *same* time, one on the *Jewish*, the other on the *Gentile* part, and so either or both of these μετὰ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους, *after the Apostles*, in the *plural*, one succeeding one, the other the other *Apostle*, and as obvious withall to discern *Ignatius* constituted by *Peter* in one *Authour*, who had formerly been ordained by *Paul* in another, and is therefore said to be *ordained by both* in a *third*, and in one respect to be the *second Bishop* there, as immediately succeeding *Paul*, and yet in another the *third*, as succeeding *Euodius* who succeeded *Peter*.

4. This being, as I had thought, perspicuously, though (as became a πάρεργον) succinctly set down in the *Tract* of *Schism*, all that the *Catholick Gentleman* returned, was his fastidious *scoff*, [*Upon this wisely laid ground*, saith he, *he would persuade us, followed the division of the Bishopricks at* Antioch, *&c.*]

And

And ſo having in him no more to reply to, but that which ought to be his own ſhame, his deriding of that which was ſo neceſſary to the underſtanding the *Records* of the *Church*, and which he did not, could not attempt to refute, or render improbable, (acknowledging, at leaſt not denying the *diviſion* of the *Biſhopricks*, but rejecting this moſt obvious and expedite, without rendring any other account or reaſon for it) I yet in the *Reply* pointed at the force of the fore-mention'd *Teſtimonies*, (which ſignified not ſo much ſeverally, as jointly, and received their greateſt force from that whereof he accuſes them, their ſeeming *contradiction*) and added ſome more to confirm the ſame, 1. ſhewing from *Suidas* that *Peter ordained Euodius*, and 2. ſetting down the place in the *Conſtitutions*, but citing no more from it, than that *Ignatius was ordained* by *Paul*. 3. From the unprinted *Acts of Ignatius*, and the compilement of *Metaphraſtes*, evidencing that *Ignatius* ſucceeded *Euodius*, and *Euodius Peter*. 4. From *Pope Felix* III. agreeing with *Theodoret*, that *Ignatius* was *ordained by Peter*, and *laſtly* from *Johannes Malela*, (known by the name of *Antiochenus*, and therefore probably acquainted with the *Annals*, and particular tranſactions of that *City*, and his name and authority no prodigy among Scholars, though, which was not my fault, *S. W.* have not formerly heard of him) that it was a *time*, when *Peter paſs'd* by *Antioch* in his way to *Rome*, that the *Biſhop Euodius happened to die*, and *Ignatius* was ſettled in his *Throne* by him. Which as it was eaſily interpretable, and intelligible, according to the *hypotheſis* of the *diſparate Cœtus*, at length united, and governed together by *Ignatius*, (for then *Ignatius* having ſate together with *Euodius* for ſome time, being ordained by *Paul*, as *Euodius* by *Peter*, might afterward ſucceed *Euodius* by St. *Peter*'s appointment, and be *Biſhop*, and in the latter ſtyle, *Patriarch* over *all* the *Chriſtians* at *Antioch*, *Jews*, and *Gentiles* alſo, and then St. *Chryſoſtome*'s words would be exactly true, that the *hands of the Apoſtles*, in the *plural*, St. *Peter*'s as well as St. *Paul*'s, *had been laid on him*, not at the ſame but at *divers* times,) ſo it could not be underſtood, but by this way, without expreſs *contradicting* thoſe that make *Ignatius Paul*'s, and *Euodius Peter*'s *immediate Succeſſour*, and thoſe again that ſay *Paul* laid his hands on *Ignatius*, which he did not at that time, being not then upon the place, when *Peter ordain'd* him.

5. This being thus clear, and no place left for any appearance to the *contrary*, but from *S. W*'s excellent quality of ſowing of *teeth* in every field, from whence contentions and contradictions are obliged to ſpring up among thoſe, that, till he came, had lived very *amicably* together, I ſhall not think fit to recount particularly the *arts*, by which he hath, as he hopes, engaged them in *eternal feuds*; he that will not accept of the one way of reconciling diſtant *Relations*, need no more gifts, but that one of *imperſuaſible* obſtinacy, to perfect ſuch an enterprize to his own ſatisfaction, and that is all I ſhall need to add, to what hath been already ſaid, in return to all his queint *obſervations* on this *Section*. Onely the *voluntary* and *ſhamefull falſification*, which was to be inferr'd by this *medium*, the *cloud* which his *obſervations* ſhould caſt before the Reader's eyes (of which he will perſuade him, firſt that it is a *falſification*, and then, that it *remains undefended*) muſt, to avoid his noiſes, be now briefly accounted for.

6. That it was not before *defended*, to be no *falſification*, the reaſon is plain, becauſe having in the *Reply* to the *Catholick Gentleman* ſaid that, which I verily thought had *prevented*, and ſo would competently cure all miſunderſtandings in that buſineſs of *Euodius* and *Ignatius*, in the anſwer to *Sch. Diſar.* I choſe rather to refer to what was there ſaid, than to enter into a particular ſurvey of all, or any of his exceptions, which were by that *Reply*, that he pretended not to have yet ſeen, ſufficiently *foreſtall'd*. And had it been his intereſt either to *ſee* himſelf, or to leave his *Reader* the free uſe of his *Eyes*, I am ſtill of opinion, that *ſhorteſt* would have been my *fulleſt* way of *Return* to him.

7. But now that his *clamours* are repeated, and may in time ring ſo long in his own ears, till he believe they have ſome ſolidity of *Truth* under them, I ſhall no longer defer to ſecure him from the *ſnares*, he is willing to be caught in, and aſſure him, that as I ſet down no *place* in the *Tract* of *Sch.* ſo I ſet down no *words* from the *Writer* of the *Conſtitutions*, (what he would conclude from the *tranſlation letter* is vain, the ſame every-where belonging, as to *proper names*, ſo to words that have the ſpecial influence on the matter in hand, ſuch as the word [*ſame*] in that place) I onely recited a *ſenſe*, which I knew was deducible from thence, *viz.* that both *Euodius* and *Ignatius ſate Biſhops of* Antioch *at the ſame time*, *one ſucceeding St.* Peter, *the other St. Paul*, which being interpreted of the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Cœtus*, (for elſe there muſt be *two Biſhops* in the ſame City, which in no other caſe but this, is own'd by ancient *Records*) would infer *two diſparate* and not *ſubordinate Churches* at *Antioch*, for ſome time; which being my concluſion, was, I thought, and muſt ſtill think, competently concluded thence, though neither the *premiſſes* nor the *Concluſion* were *in terminis* to be found in (as I did not cite them *from*) thoſe *Conſtitutions*.

8. I ſhall labour to enlighten him by a *parallel*; ſuppoſe I ſhould now addreſs my ſpeech to a *Catechumenus*, and ſay, with one of his *Romiſh Mothers*, that *Moſes* tells us ſix thouſand years ſince, that the *Omnipotent Creatour* formed a world of Creatures, *Angels* and *Men*, &c. and ſhould cite neither Book, Chapter nor Verſe, (as I ſuppoſe his *Oral Traditours* do not) and ſuppoſe *S. W.* ſhould over-hear this *Lecture*, would he preſently draw up his action againſt me for a *voluntary*, *notorious falſification*, and aſſure the *Catechumenus* that I *conceal'd the place*, becauſe I knew there was no ſuch word there, and then make all this manifeſt by referring the *Reader* to *Gen.* 1. 1. where the words are onely theſe, *In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth*, no mention of *ſix thouſand years*, of *Omnipotent*, of *World*, of *Angels*, &c. Would not this be ſome ſurprize to him that had not been very familiarly acquainted with the practices of common *Barreters*, or the diſputes of ſuch *Controvertiſts* as *S. W?* and yet this is the very proportion of his preſent dealing.

* *Reply*, p. 63. 9. The words in the *Conſtitutions*, to which I related (without citing them then) I * after cited in part (before the birth of his *Sch. Diſ.*) from l. VII. c. 47. Ἰγνάτιος ὑπὸ Παύλου, *at Antioch* Euodius *was ordain'd by* Peter, *and* Ignatius *by* Paul] Is there then 1. any difficulty from hence to conclude, that the *Ordination* of each of theſe was to the office of *Biſhop*? I ſuppoſe he will make a ſhift to acknowledge that; and if ſo, then 2. either they were *Biſhops* there at the ſame time with *Peter*, and *Paul*, (and then there were at once *four Biſhops* of that *City*, and that is *four Heads*) or elſe they *ſucceeded* them, which therefore will not be his intereſt to deny. And if they *ſucceeded* them, then 3. they came to thoſe Sees, when thoſe *Apoſtles* departed thence; if ſo, then 4. either *Paul* ſtaid there ſo long after *Peter*, that

Euodius

Euodius was dead, before his departing, (which is againſt all *Annals*) or elſe *Ignatius* who ſucceeded *Paul*, and *Euodius* who ſucceeded *Peter*, muſt ſit at the ſame time *Biſhops* at *Antioch*; and if they did ſo, then 5. there were two *diſparate Cœtus* at *Antioch*, which was the thing I was to demonſtrate hence, and ſo neither *premiſſes*, nor *Concluſion* have failed me, nor have I need of the leaſt *falſification* to aſſiſt the words, which *S. W.* himſelf reads in the *Conſtitutions*, to infer the utmoſt I pretend, or need to draw from them.

10. And herein I have yet ſome confidence to give this very *S.W.* full ſatisfaction, having a *medium* of *conviction* at hand, which his moſt obſtinate ἀναπολογία cannot *reſiſt*, or queſtion the force of, the *Teſtimony* of his own * *Baronius* in theſe words, *Hoc eodem anno Euodio Epiſcopo Antiocheno ex hac vita ſublato, ſubrogatur qui aliquando Collega fuit, Ignatius. In the year of Chriſt* 71. (a *competent* ſpace after *Paul's* leaving *Antioch*) Euodius *Biſhop of* Antioch *dying*, Ignatius *is ſurrogated in his ſtead, who had ſome time ſate his Collegue.* In which relation, though I cannot conſent to the exactneſs of his *Chronology*, which placeth this two years after *Peter's death*, when the *Ancients* agree in the contrary, that *Peter's hands* were impoſed on *Ignatius*, yet the variation is but of a few years from *Malela's* account, who ſets it at the time, of *Peter's going to Rome*, which was ſoon attended with his *Martyrdom*. Meanwhile the *Cardinal* is clear for *Ignatius* having ſometime ſate Collegue with *Euodius*, (which is all I pretend from him) referring us, for the difference among Writers, whether *Euodius* or *Ignatius* ſucceeded *Peter*, to what he had formerly ſaid in that point. What that was, I have alſo formerly more than intimated, but ſhall (to overcome *S. W's* reſolved *Scepticiſm*) again recite from that † *Cardinal*, *Legimus apud Clementis Conſtitutiones, quibus interdum uſi ſunt viri ſanctiſſimi, nec non eruditiſſimi, Antiochenæ Eccleſiæ à Petro Euodium, à Paulo verò Ignatium creatos eſſe Epiſcopos, nec ſane unum poſt alium, ut de cæteris ibi dicitur, ſed ſimul. We reade in* Clement's *Conſtitutions which moſt holy and learned men have ſometimes uſed, that* Euodius *was by* Peter, *and* Ignatius *by* Paul *created Biſhop of the Church at* Antioch, *and not one of them after the other, as of the reſt it is there ſaid, but together.* What can be more manifeſt to every particle of that I pretended from theſe *Conſtitutions?* I had ſaid, that Writer tells us, that *Euodius* and *Ignatius* at the ſame time ſate *Biſhops* at *Antioch*, and he agreeing with me in all, particularly by the [*ſimul* (and *Collega*) *nec unus poſt alium, at the ſame time* (*his Collegue*) *and not one after another*] hath ſomewhat exceeded me, in ſaying expreſly *Legimus, We reade*, and citing l. 7. c. 46. (I ſuppoſe the *Printer* ſhould have ſet 47.) in the *margent*, when yet, alas, none of theſe *ſyllables* are to be read there.

* *An.* 71. n. XL.

† *An.* 45. n. XIV.

11. And then what a *voluntary, ſhamefull, undefenſible falſificatour* muſt this great *Cardinal* be recorded to be in the back ſide of *S. W's Diptycks* (and that were a *crime* much above the pitch of *calumniating a Proteſtant*, even rendring him κατήγορον τῶν ἀδελφῶν, *an accuſer of his* own *Brethren*, or rather *Fathers*, ſhould he be guilty of it) or elſe what a *partial indefenſible* Judge is our *S. W.* which can ſolemnly charge that on me, for a *wilfull* and *ſhamefull forgery*, which another might have ſaid (and yet alſo have profeſs'd to *ſpeak truth* as demurely as I ever did) without his leaſt diſpleaſure?

12. And as that *Cardinal* hath fully own'd my premiſſes in this particu'ar, ſo doth he my *Concluſion* derived thence alſo, telling us that their *ſitting together* was at that *time* when a *diſſention aroſe between the Jewiſh and Gentile Chriſtians, during* which ſpace, *this remedy was uſed, ut uterque ſederet*, that *two Biſhops ſhould be in the ſame City, one preſiding over the Jews, the other over the Gentile Chriſtians.* What reparations he will make this great *Cardinal*, whom he hath thus branded and wounded through the *Doctour's ſides*, I now leave him to conſider at his beſt leiſure; and having no kind of concernment in the reſt of the *Exaggerations* of this Section, farther than I have already given evident grounds of anſwering them, by ſhewing the way of reconciling all ſeeming *contradictions*, I haſten to take my leave of it, onely minding him of theſe few things by way of *ſtricture*, 1. That there is a wide difference betwixt *two Preachers* aſſigning themſelves, two *halfs of a City* for *the convenience of their Auditours*, which he here fanſies, and *two Biſhops preſiding* in the ſame City, which our Teſtimonies expreſs, the former always frequent, and every day exemplified in greater Towns and Cities, the latter never allowed, or heard of among *Catholicks*, but in this one caſe of the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Cœtus* in the ſame City, (and ſo there is no place for his old trick repair'd to afreſh, of *promiſcuous preaching*, and *prudent managery*, for *two Biſhops* in the ſame City ruled not *promiſcuouſly*, though two *Presbyters* might preach ſo) 2. That my *Argument* being at this time founded in the ſeeming *contradictions* of the *Ancients*, 'twere ſtrange if that very thing ſhould be a valid objection againſt me, who have ſhew'd the one way of reconciling them all, particularly of according *Theodoret* and *Malela*, with the Writer of the *Conſtitutions*, on which he moſt inſiſts.) 3. That though we think the *Conſtitutions* were not written, as they ſeem to pretend, by the *Apoſtles*, yet we acknowledge them an *ancient* piece, and in matter of hiſtory (ſo eaſie to be compared with the *Records* of each City, and to be refuted and ſhamed, and ſo their *diſguiſe* to be utterly loſt, ſhould they thus *falſifie*) we allow them with *Baronius* that conſideration, which, he ſaith, *holy* and *learned men* have yielded them. 4. That it is a method, I think, not *exemplified*, which he is pleaſed to impoſe on me, * firſt to prove the *neceſſity of each Teſtimonies being true, before I found any Argument* in *reconciling them*; whereas I had always been taught, that he that produces *Teſtimonies*, preſumes, and is not to *prove* their *Truth*, for if that be otherwiſe done, he hath no need of, or benefit by the *teſtimonies*; If he clear their conſonancy one with another, and their propriety ſingly, or in conſort, to induce his *concluſion*, no more can be required of him. 5. That the one thing, which in order to *reconciling* the difference was obſervable from *Malela*, he is not pleaſed to take notice of, the circumſtance of *time*, when *Peter* ordain'd *Ignatius*, viz. at his *paſſing by Antioch to Rome*, which muſt needs be after the time of *Paul's* leaving him his Succeſſour there, or his ſuppoſed *ſitting*, or *Collegueſhip* with *Euodius*, which *Baronius* as well as the Authour of the *Conſtitutions* yields us, and ſo an account of both *Apoſtles impoſing their hands* on him (at ſeveral times,) which *Chryſoſtome* had told us, which being adverted, removes all the *feigned* difference with the *Conſtitutions*, which he ſo triumphs in. *Laſtly*, that when he complains * I have *produced never a teſtimony, which ſaith* Euodius *was conſtituted by* Paul *over the Gentiles*] he diſcovers, that he knows not at all, or elſe adverts not to the *common* Terms of the *Debate*, for I pretend not, that either *Euodius* was not at all over the *Gentiles*, or *Conſtituted by St. Paul*, but (directly the *contrary* to both theſe) by *Peter* over the *Jews*, and that I have ſufficiently teſtified; and ſo I leave him to Philoſophize of *Stocks* and *Scyons*, which are his well choſen, more *ſafe*, and more *innocent* divertiſement.

* *P.* 325.

* *P.* 328. l. 13.

SECT. XVII.

Deduction from Teſtimonies without expreſs terms. Peter *and* Paul *Founders, and Biſhops of* Rome. *But one Biſhop in a City, ſave in this caſe of* Jewiſh *and* Gentile *Cœtus. Of the firſt Biſhops of* Rome. Epiphanius's *words of them. St.* Jerom's, Baronius's. Gentium Eccleſia *in* Proſper. *Nothing but expreſs words allowed by S.* W. Generalis Eccleſia *explicative of* Gentium. S. W's *dealings. Short work with his* XVIII. *Section.*

1. IN his *ſeventeenth* Section he takes a view of his great and ſucceſsfull performances in *Sch. Diſ.* againſt the *ſix* Teſtimonies, brought by me, ſaith he, *to prove that St.* Peter *was over* Jews *onely at* Rome, *and St.* Paul *over Gentiles.* And aſſuring himſelf, that he had brought an unanſwerable charge againſt me, that *none of them had a word to my purpoſe*, &c. he hath now nothing to doe, but to diſplay his Banner, and to triumph in his paſt feats, *ſince, nothing is returned to his Exceptions in my Anſwer, but by reference to my Reply to the Cath. Gent. nothing found* there, but in *Sect. 7. par. 6.* (for which I confeſs to him that the Printer had miſtakingly ſet *c. 9.*) and, ſaith he, *nothing there*, but *the enumerating thoſe teſtimonies again*, and my *Concluſion*, that *ſure there can be no need of farther proofs, or teſtimonies from antiquity in this matter.* On which temptation, his *wit*, getting the advantage and reins of his Judgment, lets flie upon the word [*ſure*] firſt in great ſeverity 'tis a *bold-faced word*, then, being in better humour, *'tis a ſure Card*, and that exemplifyed by the *Ace of Trumps*, and ſtreight, 'tis transformed, and appears again in a more *ſanctified* ſhape, *the ſure nail* ſpoken of by *Salomon.*

2. To all this I anſwer, 1. That I have no kind of Reply to his *wit*-part; my faculties, he oft tells me, lye the *dryer* way; However, he hath had the comfort to hear it repeated, let that ſuffice him. 2. That thoſe *ſix teſtimonies* were not ſo much brought to *prove* any new *Theſis*, as to exemplifie in *Rome* alſo, what was before ſufficiently proved in general, and exemplified in *Antioch*, and therefore if there had been ſome defect in the *Evidence*, that might be repair'd by the *analogy* held between *Rome* and the former paſſages. 3. That the *Diſarmer*, having barely repeated thoſe *ſix* teſtimonies, and then told the Reader they *came not home to the evidencing of the buſineſs of excluſive juriſdictions, becauſe they had no reſtrictive terms*, ſuch as *onely, ſolely, alone, to none elſe*, I did till now really think, that no farther *Reply* was neceſſary, there being no ſuch *Law* impoſed on *Teſtimony-evidences* or probations, that the Authorities cited ſhould have the concluſion in *terminis*, it being ſufficient, if by deduction it were duely inferred from them; And I cannot but wonder, that he that ſo much prefers the *Oral Tradition* of the *Catholick Mothers*, before any kind of *Scripture*, upon this chief reaſon of the *Apologiſt*, becauſe the *Mothers* deliver their Propoſition in words many ways varied, and ſo write the inerrable ſenſe in their childrens *hearts*, cannot allow any Teſtimony, but what *expreſſes* the words, wherein the *Concluſion* is propoſed; Are there no ſuch things as *equivalence* or *deduction*? If I have deduced any thing from *Teſtimonies*, which either ſeverally, or joyntly they are not able to afford, I ſhall be content to undergoe *S. W*'s ſevereſt diſpleaſures, but I may ſtill hope, this is not my guilt at this time.

3. The immediate *Concluſion* that I was then to infer, was the diſtinction of the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Cœtus at Rome*, ſeverally governed by *Peter and Paul*, and *Biſhops* after them aſſign'd by *each*; And this is regularly deducible in *all* the parts, by *all*, though not in *each*, by every of the *Teſtimonies.* Thoſe of them that Record *Peter* and *Paul* to have been both *Founders* of the *Church of Rome*, in the latitude, being added to what was before proved, (and now vindicated) will be acknowledged to have ſome force in them; for ſuppoſing 1. what no man can, and *S.W.* doth not doubt, that *Rome* was made up of *Jews* and *Gentiles.* 2. The teſtimony of *Scripture* being plain, that one of theſe was *Apoſtle of the Jews*, and the other of the *Gentiles*; and 3. that before this, they had *joyn'd hands of fellowſhip, the one to go to the Jews, the other to the Gentiles*; this will be a good foundation of this proof, and *Irenæus*, and *Epiphanius*, and *Euſebius*, and *Gaius*, and *Dionyſius*, and *Proſper*, and the very *Seal* of the *Popes*, teſtifie this; the *five* former *in terminis*, and the laſt by *intimation*; for why ſhould St. *Paul*'s image be joyn'd with St. *Peter*'s in their *Seal* (yea and allowed the *nobler* place,) but that he had the honour of founding the *Church* among them, and was either in that, or ſome other reſpect, the more *honourable* perſon of the two?

4. But then thoſe that make theſe two *Apoſtles* and *Founders*, to be alſo *two Biſhops* in this *Church*, (which is the expreſs affirmation of *Epiphanius*) ſay enough to *perfect* the Evidence. For how can one City admit of *two Biſhops* (each of which is a *ſingular Governour* in his *Cœtus*, be it leſs or greater, and acts not in *parity*, or *promiſcuouſly* with any other, which is *S.W*'s αἰτον ψευδος, *principal miſtake*) ſave onely in reſpect of theſe *diſparate Cœtus*, which do as it were divide the *City* into *two* Cities, the one *Rome* into
* *Ti.* 4. p. 5. *lin.* the *Jewiſh*, and *Gentile* Inhabitants thereof? It is * St. *Chryſoſtome*'s queſtion, belonging to thoſe *firſt* times (not to that place, but to *Philippi*, of St. *Paul*'s Plantation) τί τοῦτο; μιᾶς πόλεως πολλοὶ Ἐπίσκοποι ἦσαν; *What is this? Were there many Biſhops of one City?* and he anſwers it, οὐδαμῶς, *No by no means:* and ſo, from his ſenſe, the *Scholiaſts* on the *Epiſtle* to *Titus*, c. 1. 5. reſolve it the *Apoſtles* appoint-
† *Theophyl.* in *Ep.* pag. 643. ment, † ἐκέλευε πόλιν ἔχειν ἴδιον ποιμένα, *that every City ſhould have their proper Paſtour* or *Biſhop*, and that ἄλλος ἄλλο μέρος τῆς οἰκουμένης διανέμηται, *in the diſtribution of the world, one had one part of it, another another*; and never any news of *two Biſhops* in one City, but when the *City* was thus *divided* into *two Cœtus*; nor this, but when there was this reaſon for it, the inveterate partition between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, which being ſuch as could have no place in any other circumſtances, cannot reaſonably be extended to any other; And this was the very reaſon, why I placed ſo much weight in *Epiphanius*'s words, that they were not onely *Apoſtles* but *Biſhops* at *Rome*, for that abſolutely precluded the evaſion of *promiſcuous* preaching, on which now he wholly depends, but can do ſo no longer, when he ſees, 'twas not onely in *preaching*, but *ruling*, as *Biſhops*, on which my Argument proceeded, and ſuch, with all but *Presbyterians*, are *ſingle* perſons in every *Cœtus.*

5. Then as theſe *Biſhops* had their ſeveral *Deacons*, *St. Paul Linus*, and *St. Peter Cletus* and *Clemens*, of which *Ignatius* their Contemporary aſſures us, ſo when theſe are found to ſucceed them in the *Biſhops* Chair, and ancient Writers affirm, ſome, that *Linus* was the *firſt Biſhop*, after the *Apoſtles*, ſome that

Cletus,

Cletus, ſome that *Clemens*, and we have no reaſon to prejudge the *Truth* of any of their affirmations, I leave the impartial Reader to judge between *S. W.* and me, whether there be any ſo fit an Expedient to compoſe this difference, as that which bears proportion with what was formerly ſaid of *Euodius*, and *Ignatius* at *Antioch*, (confirmed then by the ſuffrage of their own *Baronius*) that *Linus* the *Deacon* of *Paul* ſucceeded him, and *Cletus* was ordained by *Peter*, and on his death *Clement St. Peter*'s other *Deacon*; and then, whether there can be any ground of queſtioning, but that theſe were in their ſeveral *Cœtus*, *Linus* in the *Gentile*, *Cletus* and *Clemens* in the *Jewiſh* part, and conſequently whether there be any the minuteſt part of my Concluſion, which is not inferred from my *Teſtimonies*.

6. To this laſt particular, the *novelty* whereof renders it moſt queſtionable, I deſire the words of *Epiphanius*, ſet down in the fourth Section of this *Chapter*, may be accommodated, where Succeſſion of *Biſhops* at *Rome* is thus deſcribed, *Peter* and *Paul*, *Linus* and *Cletus*, *Clemens*, &c. And then as there can be no queſtion, but the two firſt, *Peter* and *Paul* ſate together, becauſe died together, and ſucceeded not one the other, ſo it will be very obvious to marſhall the other three with reſpect to this pattern, the two former *Linus* and *Cletus* ſitting together, *Cletus* or *Anacletus* ſucceeding *Peter*, whoſe *Deacon* he was, and *Linus* ſucceeding *Paul*, having been his *Deacon*, and *Clemens* ſucceeding *Cletus*, andout-living *Linus*, under whom alſo both parts, *Jews* and *Gentiles*, at length were joyned, and then *Evariſtus*, &c. in a continued *ſeries* of ſucceſſion one after another.

7. Thus when St. * *Jerom* places *Clemens quartum poſt Petrum Romanum Epiſcopum*, the *fourth Biſhop after Peter*, allowing *Linus* the *ſecond* and *Cletus* the *third* place, he adds, *Plerique Latinorum ſecundum poſt Petrum Apoſtolum putant fuiſſe Clementem*, that *the Latines do moſt of them think that* Clement *was the ſecond after Peter*, which two opinions cannot rationally be *reconciled*, without the way I point at, nor yet with any reaſon the truth of either of them queſtioned; not *Jerom*'s, who, it ſeems, had ſo much for his, as with him out-weighed the affirmation of the *greateſt part of the Latines*; not the *Latines* who were certainly the moſt competent teſtifyers in this matter ſo lately acted among them, eſpecially when the ſame *St. Jerom* * elſewhere affirms, that *Clement an Apoſtolical perſon*, *poſt Petrum Romanam rexit Eccleſiam*, *governed the Roman Church after Peter*, (meaning, I ſuppoſe, *immediately* after his death) and ſo many others alſo; which makes me remember one paſſage in *Baronius*, who though he never conquered the Difficulty of the *Succeſſion* of theſe firſt *Biſhops* of *Rome*, yet ſeems to have miſs'd it very narrowly, for having, as was ſhewed from him in the laſt Section, clear'd it at *Antioch*, that after *Peter* and *Paul*, *Euodius* and *Ignatius* ſate *Biſhops* together, till the *coaleſcence* of the *two Cœtus*, and then *Ignatius* yielded all to *Euodius*, adds in a *Parentheſis*, *ut Clemens Lino*, as *Clemens had done to Linus*; which if he did, then before that, *Linus* and *Clemens* ſate *together*, which is all that can be incumbent on me to prove in this matter, and cannot now be denyed me, without contradicting his own *Baronius*, a ſecond time, in ſo ſhort a compaſs; Thus much in general to his ſuggeſtions againſt the evidence of my *Teſtimonies*.

* *De ſcrip. Eccl. in Clem. c. 15.*

* *In Iſ. 52. ult. to. 4. p. 170.*

8. But out of the whole *quarry* he ſingles out his choſen particular, that of *Proſper*, which he reſolves to *gorge* himſelf upon. And when I had tranſlated *Gentium Eccleſiam* there, the *Church of the Nations*, and *S. W.* had reſolved it muſt be the *Church of the Gentiles*, and on my ſide it was urged, that *Jeruſalem*, and *John's Jewiſh Converts* were contained in that *phraſe*, and ſo it could not be the *Gentiles*, in oppoſition to the *Jews*, but *Nations* that comprehended both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, 'tis a little remarkable how *S. W.* hath behaved himſelf; 1. He ſaith, *the grounds of my aſſurance are found onely in my own ſayings, and no where in any teſtimony.* 2. *That if I can ſhew him any word in any teſtimony yet produced, which expreſſes that* James *preach'd to Jews onely in Jeruſalem, or* John *to Jews onely in Epheſus, he will pardon me the anſwering this whole Book*, and then follows *ſcoffing*, and *railing*, and nothing elſe for many lines together to the end of the *Paragraph*.

9. To all which, becauſe no other anſwer can be due, I annex onely my Obſervations, 1. That what is not in *expreſs* terms affirmed in a *Teſtimony*, is not, by *S. W*'s *Logick*, and methods of waging Controverſies, to be *found* in it; and then the *creation of the World* is not to be found in *Gen.* 1. 1. becauſe there is not the term [*World*] but onely the *Heaven* and the *Earth*, and then the *Controvertiſt* muſt make no uſe of his *reaſon* to deduce the moſt unavoidable conſequences, but onely of his *Eyes* to judge of Words and Syllables, (the reaſon, I muſt ſuppoſe, that a * while ſince he told me, *I ſhould have ſaid his miſreadings, when I ſaid his miſunderſtandings*, it being unimaginable, it ſeems, for him to underſtand any thing, but what he *reads*, i. e. to *deduce* or conclude any thing from words, but the *words* themſelves) This is beſt exemplified in the matter now before us; I proved that *Gentes* muſt in this place ſignifie *Nations*, *Jewiſh* and other, and not *Gentiles excluſively to Jews*, becauſe *Jeruſalem* is expreſly named in the *Teſtimony*, and *Jews* intimated in another paſſage of it, and thence I ſaid, theſe *Nations* are *ſure of Jews as well as Gentiles*; and yet ſaith he, *there are no grounds of my aſſurance in any Teſtimony*] Is not *Jeruſalem* in this *Teſtimony*, a *ground* to conclude, that *Gentes* compriſe *Judæa*, of which that was the *Metropolis*, and ſo cannot be rendred *Gentiles*, in oppoſition to them; or can any thing be concluded from another, if this be not? And yet it falls out, that the Context in that Writer makes it yet more undenyable, if it be poſſible: for if the Reader conſult the † place, he ſhall find theſe words immediately ſubſequent, *Huic generali Eccleſiæ communicans Chriſtianus eſt Catholicus*, *with this General Church he that communicates is a Catholick*, by which 'tis evident, that *Gentium Eccleſia*, is *Generalis Eccleſia*, the *General* or *Univerſal Church*, which it cannot be, unleſs it contain the *Jewiſh* as well as the *Gentile Chriſtians*, and ſo be rendred the *Church* of the *Nations* indefinitely, *i. e.* of *all Nations*.

* P. 320.

† *Proſper de pro. & præd. Dim. Temp. c. 5. p. 159.*

10. My *ſecond* Obſervation is, that when the matter is ſo evident, as that nothing can be more, till *Jeruſalem* be removed out of *Judæa*, or *James* ceaſe to be *Biſhop* of the *Jews*, yet *S. W.* can *ſcoff*, and *vapour*, and make his *challenge*, fixing on that, on which I do not at all fix my *Argument*, or Interpretation, and yet tell the Reader with full confidence, *that on it alone I build it*. Can the bounds of *ſincerity* or ingenuity be more tranſgreſs'd, than by thus doing? Or can any thing be more manifeſt, than that de doeth thus? I infer the neceſſity of my Interpretation of *Gentes*, ſo as it might contain *Jews*, from two mentions in the paſſage, one of *James* at *Jeruſalem*, the other of *John* at *Epheſus*, becauſe *Jeruſalem* was in *Judæa*, and *John's* Converts at *Epheſus* were *Jews*. He aſſures the Reader I build upon *two other things alone*, viz. *That St.* James *preach'd to Jews onely in Jeruſalem, and St.* John *to Jews onely in Epheſus*. How ſeaſonable it was in this ſame period to tell the Reader, that it will not onely be *laborious* and *ſhame-*

full, but *impossible satisfactorily to answer his Book*, and then to accuse of *vanity* and open *cowardice*, will be judged by those that have heard how necessary Ingredients *diversion* and *calumny* and seeming *invitation* are in an *S. W. Controvertist.*

11. My *last* Observation is, that against a matter thus evident, and undeniable, he will propose five *Objections*, *i. e.* so many *Arguments* against that which is most manifest to *common sense*, and then assure the Reader, that this process of mine is *made up of such Gotham-absurdities* and *weak impertinences in a Doctour of Divinity*, *that 'tis most wearisome to him to stand laying them open.* What the Arguments are, I leave the Reader to survey in his * *two* Pages; and if he can but tell *three*, I shall adventure on his abilities to answer them. And the like I say, of the business of the *Pope's Seals*, on which his whole *eighteenth Section* is spent, which is so evidently set down, and fully vindicated in the † *Answer* to *Sch. Dis.* shewing of what it was a *proof*, and with what it was set in *agreement* and *consonancy* onely, and now again in this *Sect. n.* 3. and the severals by me supposed, and by him denied, so largely vindicated in the former part of this *Discourse*, that I must not increase the bulk of that which is too big already, more particularly to reflect on it. And so for once I shut up these *two Sections* together, onely minding him, that my whole process (of which the ἰσοτιμία of *Peter* and *Paul* is one part, and perfectly *exclusive of subordination*) hath prevented all that here he objects to it.

* P. 132, 133.

† *Ch.* III. *Sect.* n. 1, 2.

SECT. XVIII.

S. W's *challenge. Transforming of words. Difficulty of understanding what is most plain. My weariness of Controversie with what truth pretended. Express words unduly exacted.* S. W's *instances of more Bishops in one City. Onely in a Schism at* Antioch. *Pope* Damasus's *acknowledging* Paulinus, *when all the East were for* Flavianus. S. W's *charges cleared. The no efficacy of a May-be in matter of Fact.*

1. HIS *nineteenth* Section reflects on the famous *challenge* once made by *S. W.* about the word *Onely*, and there is but little that falls in upon that occasion, which hath not been punctually spoken to already; yet that he may not think one of his most eminent *prizes* utterly neglected, I shall give some account of it.

2. And *first*, the *occasion* of it offers it self to consideration, which was onely this; In the *Tract* of *Sch.* having spoken of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, and found in ancient Records, that they were both of them *Bishops of* Antioch, and both of *Rome*, and shewed how this was to be understood, by the distinction of *Cœtus* of *Jewish* and *Gentile Christians*, in both those *Cities*, I said [*And all this very agreeable to the Story of Scripture, which as (according to the brevity of the Relations there made) it onely sets down St.* Peter *to be the Apostle of the Circumcision (and of his being so at* Rome *we make no question) so it affirms of St.* Paul, *that he preach'd at* Rome *in his own hired house, receiving them which came to him,* Act. 28. 30. *which will most fitly be applied to the Gentiles of that City, the Jews having solemnly departed from him,* v. 29.] In this passage, before we advance farther toward the triumphant *Challenge*, I must appeal to all mankind (excepting onely *S. W.*) 1. Whether I am not the most competent testifier of the meaning of my *own* words; and 2. whether any more obvious sense of this passage (as far as the word [*onely*] is concerned) can be imagined, than this, that the *Scripture* making very *brief narrations* of St. *Peter's* story, sets down *no more* of it in relation to our present matter, than that he was the *Apostle of the Circumcision*, not telling us particularly of his preaching to the *Jewish Cœtus* at *Rome*, &c.

3. That this was my meaning, and nothing but this, I am sure I know, as much as any man can the *thoughts* of his *own* heart, and 'tis impossible he should have any tolerable colour of probability to excuse his questioning it; and whether any other meaning could fit the circumstances so readily as this, let any that understands *English*, judge between us. Yet did *S. W.* (such is his *acumen* or candour) miss what was thus obvious, and instead of it, produced *two* other meanings of the word [*onely*] 1. That *Peter is onely set down as Apostle of the Circumcision, exclusively to* James *and* John.] 2. *That he was Apostle of the Circumcision onely.* For the former of these, 1. It cannot without violence be drawn out of the words [*It onely sets down St.* Peter *to be Apostle of the Circumcision*] not [*it sets St.* Peter *onely*] 2. the sense by him imposed, is expressly contradictory to *Scripture*, to my *own* words, that *James* and *John* were *assigned* the *Jews* for their *Province*, (the one in *Judæa*, the other in *Asia*) as well as St. *Peter*, and to the *Interest* of my whole Process in this very Controversie. And not onely so, but when he was told of this in *Answ.* to *Sch. Disar.* he still adheres, and 1. avers that he *enumerated as many Interpretations of the word* [*onely*] *as were obvious*, 2. *that this which* I repeated to him *was impossible for* S. W. *to imagine*, 3. he offers *proofs*, that it *could* not be *thought to mean thus*, 4. he makes a shift to mistake also the words of my *Answer*, wherein I explicate them, and because I say the [*onely*] was set in *opposition to the Scriptures making more particular Relation of St.* Peter's *preaching to the Jewish Cœtus at* Rome, he will understand me to say, that the *Scripture did make some particular Relation of this matter*, when 'tis evident the *more particular Relations* signify *more particular*, than that forementioned being *Apostle of the Circumcision*, and nothing else. 5. He challenges my *Conscience*, that I *cannot be ignorant*, *that I contradict my self frequently and purposely*, and so hath left no round in the *Climax* of most uncharitable, temptationless Contumely, to which he hath not ascended, rather than he will open his eyes to the cleerest light, or be induced to acknowledge what is most visible to any that shall but have the patience to examine it.

4. As for the *second imposed sense*, that *he was Apostle of the Circumcision onely*] that was as far removed from my meaning or words, which were [*It onely sets down St.* Peter *to be the Apostle of the Circumcision,*] and he feigns them to have been [*of the Circumcision onely.*] What can be distorting and deforming of plain words, if this be not? Yet did this *No-occasion* serve his turn to renew his *Challenge*, which he confesses he had made *twice* before (and so might the better have spared the *third* time, till he saw the success of the former) and being told how *unseasonably* it was founded, he now replies no word to that, but triumphs in my *acceptance* of it, *upon so tempting an hope as to be at an end of Controversie*,

verſie, and 1. he *dares ſay that I repent I ever medled with it*, 2. *I ſee my ſelf anſwered, and unable to reply*, and then 3. with great exaggeration of words he perſuades the *Reader*, that I am now bound to *ſhew in my Teſtimonies* ſome *one expreſs reſtrictive* word, or *excluſive particle*, as *onely*, *ſolely*, *alone*, *or ſuch like*, and becauſe I do not ſo, but infer my Concluſion from *three* Teſtimonies, his *Reader and he know what to think of me, that hazard my Reader's ſalvation on my own bare unauthorized ſayings, and unwarrantable imaginations.*

5. To all this I ſhall give him my brief Replies. 1. That though I ſhould be glad to be at an *end of Controverſie*, when *contumely* and *diſtortion* of words, and *cauſeleſs cavils* are the onely weapons of managing it againſt me, and on that account ſhould not be ſorry to be at an end of *this* preſent Rejoinder, yet none of theſe inconvenient Attendants of my writing the *Tr.* of *Sch.* give me any inclination to repent the writing of it, nor have they diſcouraged me from proceeding to add to a *Tract* of *Fundamentals*, a *third* of *Hereſie*, on all theſe moſt comprehenſive heads (as before in that of *Infallibility*) to vindicate our diſtreſſed *Church*, and approve the temper of it to all *lovers* of *Antiquity*, and leave inexcuſable thoſe, that will *paſſionately* and imperſuaſibly adhere to the *Novelty* of *Oral Traditions* of their *preſent Church*, and caſt out all that adhere to *Vincentius's rule* of maintaining *Catholick Communion*. And indeed though I ſhould be very ſorry to have the leaſt *controverſie* with any but the *paſſionate* and *unreconcileable*, and ſhall endeavour to preſerve *charity* even to them, that have none for others, yet I confeſs not to diſcern the profit of waging *Controverſies* with ſuch, ſave onely to preſerve others from being deceived by their ſubtilties, or out-faced by their Confidences, or overcome by their noiſes, in *charity* to whom, I ſhall not be wearied with the length of ſuch tasks as theſe, till I have ſome grounds of hope that they may be ſpared with *ſafety*.

6. *Secondly*, when he ſaith *I ſee my ſelf anſwered and unable to reply*,] he muſt needs be able to aſſure himſelf, that he ſpake with no leaſt ſemblance of *truth* or *modeſty*. For when could I be conceived to *ſee* this? before, or ſince the publiſhing of the *Diſpatcher*? If before, then 'tis evident that the two onely Anſwers which had been given me by the *Catholick Gent.* and the *Diſarmer*, as they were *ſeen*, ſo they were actually *replied* to by me; with what *Truth* then (laying his *modeſty* aſide) could I be ſaid to *ſee my ſelf unable to reply* to *theſe Anſwers*? If ſince, then 1. that ſight could not ſuggeſt to me thoſe words of the *tempting hope to be at an end of Controverſies*, to which he affixes his *confident* aſſertion, that *I repent I ever medled*, &c. for this were for me to *divine* what he would write, and for him to have *ſearched* my *heart*, and found there this piece of *augury*. And 2. it doth now as much appear, that I have been able to *reply*, as that he hath written what I *reply* to; for as to the ſatisfactorineſs of either, that muſt be no more *boaſted* of by him, than it is *preſumed* by me, but equally left to the Reader's umpirage, and cannot be otherwiſe, without the groſſeſt *begging* at once the *whole queſtion*.

7. *Thirdly*, it is his great miſtake, if not worſe, to perſuade himſelf, or think fit to perſuade others, that I am now *bound* to *ſhew in my Teſtimonies*, ſome *one expreſs word* or *particle*, as *ſolely*, *onely*, or *alone*, or *the like*, not contenting himſelf with any thing elſe. What I undertook, is not to be judged by the terms of his *challenge*, but by my *return* to it, and that * was, to *offer to his review the Teſtimony from St.* Paul *and from* Epiphanius, the *firſt affirming the agreement, betwixt thoſe two Apoſtles, one to execute his office among the Gentiles, the other among the Jews*, and the *ſecond, that in* Rome *they were both Biſhops*, and from thence by force of a *third* (that the *Cœtus of the Jewiſh and Gentile Chriſtians were kept apart and not mingled*) to infer this *Concluſion*, that St. *Peter's Juriſdiction* at *Rome* was *reſtrained* to the *Jews onely*, and *excluſively to the Gentiles*. This then, and evidently no more, was the ſum of my undertaking, to *infer* my *Concluſion* from thoſe ſeverals compared together, not to ſhew thoſe expreſs words or *ſyllables*, which now he calls for; And if I have not fail'd in my deduction, (which formerly hath, and muſt by and by, it ſeems, be again debated) there can be no more incumbent on me by my engagement. The reaſonableneſs of this, hath oft been inſiſted on, and need no farther be confirmed; elſe I might ask him, whether to prove that *Rehoboam* was *King over* Judah *onely*, *excluſively to* Iſrael, it were not ſufficient to cite 1 *King.* XII. 16, 17. where yet there is none of thoſe expreſs terms to be found, *onely*, *alone*, *or ſolely*, *or the like*? Or again, whether the *Nicene Fathers* might not conclude the *conſubſtantiality* from the *Scripture* without finding that *word* or *ſyllables* expreſs'd there; in brief, whether it be not as warrantable to *conclude* from *premiſſes*, as to *tranſcribe words*, and if, as the † *Apologiſt* ſaid, the ſame *meaning be explicable by hundreds of different expreſſions*, what *Law* can interdict me from the uſe of *Ninety nine*, and confine me to ſome *one* of thoſe *hundred*, that my Adverſary ſees is not in my *Teſtimonies*, and therefore chuſes it out for me. And to ſay 'tis but a *moſt facile thing* that he *demands*, and ask *what can be eaſier than to ſhew onely, ſolely, alone, or the like, expreſſed in a Teſtimony*, when the *Teſtimonies* being already produced, his *eyes* may have aſſured him, there is none ſuch there, is indeed a rare way to inhance the glories of his *Victories*, but withall to make no difference betwixt *facile* and *impoſſible*, it being moſt *impoſſible* that any *ſyllable* ſhould by any *Limbeck* be extracted out of a *Teſtimony*, which is not in it, unleſs what is wanting in the *letter*, may be allowed to be made up by *deduction* or *equivalence*, which being denied by this *rigorous* Controvertiſt, it remains, that no man muſt prove by *Teſtimony* what he hath not *tranſcribed* from it, a Decree to be added to *Draco's* Laws, at *S. W's* review and new *Edition* of them; which being accepted by the reſt of *Mankind*, he will then hope, though till then he cannot, to maintain his *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* (which yet is as little expreſs'd in the words from which he intends to deduce them) and triumph in *Controverſie*.

* *Anſw.* p. 50.

† P. 81.

8. But 1. *the Teſtimonies*, he ſaith, *have been anſwered over and over*; and I ſay, they have now, after all his *Anſwers*, been *defended* to infer what I conclude from them. 2. He complains that there is an *Ellipſis in the firſt of them*; and I anſwer, that no obligation lay on me to uſe no *Text* of *Scripture*, that had an *Ellipſis* in it; mean while I ſupplied the *Ellipſis* ſo, as he cannot, I am ſure *doth* not, complain of any fault in that; 3. he ſaith the whole force of the *ſecond* lies in the word *Biſhops*, and wonders why I ſay *Peter* and *Paul were the ſame perſons both Apoſtles and Biſhops*; I *anſwer*, I ſaid the *ſame perſons were both*, that he might not think the words imported no more, than that *one* was the *Apoſtle of* Rome, the other the *Biſhop*, as were *Paul* and *Timothy* at *Epheſus*, and ſo one *under* another, but *both Apoſtles* there, and *both Biſhops* of *that City*, which could not be, unleſs there were ſeveral *diſparate*, *co-ordinate*, not *ſubordinate Cœtus* there; nor ſo neither, unleſs on this account, that one conſiſted of *Jewiſh*, the other of

Gentile Christians, which being kept severally, one from the other, under their several *Bishops*, it was consequent, that he that was *Bishop* of the one *Cœtus*, was *Bishop* of that onely, and so *exclusively* to the *other*. 4. He saith again, that the *third Testimony was borrowed from the Arch-heretick* Pelagius, and I have already told him, 1. That this is affirmed without a *Constat*, and may as reasonably be *denied*; and however, 2. that this is no part of *Pelagius's heresie*, but a plain matter of *fact*, far removed from any of his *Interests*, wherein therefore he may be as *competent* a *Testifier*, as any other; and lastly, that their own *Baronius* hath been now produced to testify it as well as he. 5. He saith, the *Testimony* from *Pelagius hath not a word of exclusion of the Jewish Cœtus at Rome*, much less that the *Apostles were exclusively over these two Cœtus*; I answer, that because it hath not, therefore I make use of *Epiphanius*'s affirmation, that there were *two Bishops* there, as my proof of this, and demand, why I may not as reasonably make that *conclusion* as applicable to *Rome*, as their own *Baronius* upon the same *medium* concludes it of *Antioch*, if not of *Rome* also? 6. That I *have no reason to think that all the Jews of the dispersion were so zealous, since* Act. 13. 42. *both Jews and Gentiles were together, when St.* Paul *preached at* Antioch *of* Pisidia, *and most expresly*, Act. 14. 1.] I *answer*, 1. that by affirming it was thus at *Rome*, I am no way obliged to affirm it was thus *every-where else*; nor do I prove it was thus at *Rome*, by any such *medium*, but by the Analogy between the *two Bishops* at *Rome*, with the like at *Antioch*, acknowledged to have been on this occasion, and by the *agreement* between these two *Apostles*, one to go to *Jews*, the other to *Gentiles*, dated after these instances of his, yet before their going to *Rome*; yet 2. his instances have little of pertinency in them, the *Gentiles*, *Act.* XIII. 42. being evidently *Proselytes* of the *Jews*, who might, no doubt, if but *Proselytes* of their *Gates*, come into their *Synagogue* with some such *distinction* as there was betwixt the *two Courts* of the *Temple*, the one for the *Jews*, the other for the *Gentiles*, and there is nothing in the *Jewish zeal*, by my *hypothesis*, contrary to that. The same is evident of the *Greeks*, *Ch.* XIV. 1. that were *Proselytes* of the *Jews* also; Nor indeed 3. doth the instance of *Jews* and *Gentile Proselytes unconverted*, as these were, at all belong to this matter, the difference I speak of, being founded in their receiving the *Gospel*, for then the question arose, whether the *Gentile Believers* should be *bound* to be *circumcised* or no, *Act.* XV. 1. and then the difficulty of *conversing* freely with the *uncircumcised* (which caused the different *Cœtus* we speak of) for which there was no occasion before the *Conversion* to the *Faith*, the *Jews* knowing well enough, and observing their appointed distances with the *Gentiles*, whether *Proselytes* or not.

9. At length he will consider of proofs taken from the *two Bishops in one City*, and will give me an instance sufficient to *destroy my universal position*: And what is that? Why *Meletius and* Paulinus, Paulinus *and* Flavianus, Flavianus *and* Evagrius, *who successively two together Bishops of* Antioch.] But I wonder he went so far from home as *Antioch*, for such a rarity as this; he might as well have given us two or three *Bishops* of *Rome*, sitting together in the time of *Schism*. For, that thus it was at *Antioch*, I shall need no *scruing deductions*, (as he calls them) his own *Baronius* shall decide it betwixt us, * *Cum scissa est Schismate Ecclesia* Antiochena, *When the Church of* Antioch *was cut asunder by a Schism*, speaking of this of *Paulinus* and *Meletius*. Nay it was kindly done of *S. W.* that he named us but *two Bishops* at that time at *Antioch*, it being certain, that there were † three, *Euzojus* the *Arian*, *Meletius* that had been *elected* by the *Arians*, and followed by those that had been *baptized* by *Arians*; and *Paulinus*, that had never been thus polluted, yet was too *hastily ordained* by *Lucifer Calaritanus*, without the *consent* of those which were to be satisfied in it. That this *Schismatical Division* continued 85 years, he * elsewhere tells him out of *Theodoret*, *lib.* 3. c. 5. though he doth more than once, upon good reasons, deny that Schism to last so many years as *Theodoret* assigns to it. I need add no more of what is thus obvious to every eye.

* *An.* 372. n. XLVII.

† *Id. An.* 362. n. CLXXX.

* *Ib.* n. CCXIV.

10. But as long as the *Cœtus* of *Jewish* and *Gentile Christians* under *Peter* and *Paul*, *Linus* and *Clemens* are not thus stigmatized by *S. W.* (as I presume they are not) I shall hope that this example of his will not be thought pertinent, or parallel to the present case, or prejudicial to my conclusion, till I shall give him some reason to think it my opinion, that in case of *Schism*, there were never *two Bishops* in *one City*. As yet I have found no need of such refuges, and I assure my self I shall not, and therefore may be allowed to conclude, that my Conclusion from the *two Bishops* at *once*, stands unshaken, and that *S. W.* hath no other instances, but what are of this kind, else sure he would not have opposed my Conclusion on such grounds as these, especially considering how little it is for the present *Romanists* interest to have it remembred, that when *Pope Damasus*, and his *Western Bishops* acknowledged *Paulinus*, and wrote ὡς Ἐπισκόπῳ Ἀντιοχείας συνήθεις Ἱστολὰς ἂς συνοδικὰς καλῶν, *Customary, which they called Synodical Letters to him as to the Bishop of* Antioch, and as for *Diodorus* and *Acacius*, which had *ordained* Flavianus, ἀκοινωνήτους εἶχον, *they refused communion with them*, as * *Sozomen* tells us, yet *all* the *East*, saith † *Baronius*, and the *Council of* Constantinople (which I suppose, by τοὺς Δυτικοὺς, the *Western partition*, *Can.* 5. meant those of *Paulinus*'s part) were for *Flavianus*, *Meletius's successour*, against *Paulinus*, asserting him to be the true *Bishop*, and the *Pope* was fain to bear this, and not to send out his *Bulls* of *Excommunication* against the followers of *Flavianus*. I might add much more, but this shall serve at this time (*extra Orbitam*) for *S. W*'s seasonable instance of the *more Bishops in one City*, *viz.* in time of notorious *Schism*, which if the Reader will not take for a parallel to *Peter* and *Paul* their being *both Bishops of* Rome, our Controvertist must be very unfortunate, having no more variety to furnish him with.

* *Lib.* VII. c. 2.

† *An.* 381. n. XCVII.

11. 'Tis now his turn to *deride*, instead of answering, my proof of my Conclusion, when I say, that if there were *two such Cœtus*, then they that were of one *Cœtus* under one *Bishop*, were not of the *other Cœtus*, under the *other Bishop*. *'Tis evident*, saith he, *by the light of nature, that one is not another, and needed no proofs*.] I reply, that if it needed no proofs, then I may be afforded my *Conclusion* without them, and I shall as willingly hold the *Truth* of it, by the force of the *light of nature*, as of the *Testimonies*; but still hope, that *two* proofs more than needed, will not topple over into none at all, or provoke *S. W.* so far, as to resist the *light of nature*, rather than yield any thing to me. Yet to see, this *candid Controvertist* having granted what I say to the *light of nature*, first *refutes* as solemnly my *proofs* of this, as of any thing that he most denies; and 2. tells me of one of my *Testimonies*, that 'tis *the onely prop of my cause in this point*: which was some surprize to me, when he had so lately mentioned my *double proof*, and the *light of nature tells me also*, that one is but one, and so not the *onely prop*, when there is *another* by it. And 3. for my *other proof*, *viz.* because no *Bishop* was to meddle in *another's Province*, he saith,

ſaith, *till the Teſtimony of* Pelagius *be made authentick, it toucheth him not, for till then it is not proved theſe two Apoſtles had two diſtinct Provinces,*] whereas it is manifeſt that *diſtinct Provinces* are relative to *diſtinct Biſhops*, and *Epiphanius*, that had teſtified *Peter* and *Paul* to be *both Biſhops of* Rome, muſt needs authentickly teſtify them to be *diſtinct Biſhops*, though he doth no more expreſly uſe the word *diſtinct*, than he doth the *reſtrictive*, or *excluſive*, *onely*, which even now I was challenged about.

12. This being done, he reflects on what I added to prevent his one poſſible anſwer, of *Peter*'s being not *co-ordinate*, but *Primate* in reſpect of *Paul*, to which I oppoſed what before I had ſhewed of *Paul's independency* from him, and *primacy among the Gentiles*. This he ſaith *is to the queſtion*, and replies, by referring to his former *Anſwers*, *Sect.* 7. and ſo do I to my preſent returns to *that*, and the reſt of his former *Sections*, where it is viſible how far it was from the leaſt *falſification* in me, when I pretended to have ſhewed from *Scripture* and *Antiquity*, that St. *Paul* had the *Primacy* among the *Gentiles*, as *Peter* among the *Jews*. This he here ſtyles a *flat falſification*, and improves it in his *Index* into *falſifications of St.* Ambroſe, (in the plural) *reiterated and ſhamefully applied to mine own advantage, whereas it is expreſly for him.*] To this I muſt make ſome reply, 1. That there was no neceſſity, that what I ſay was ſhewed from *Scripture* and *Antiquity*, ſhould be founded in St. *Ambroſe* onely; yet can I not doubt, but out of the words recited from that *one Father*, my Concluſion will be inferred, when the former part, that of *Paul's primacy in founding the Churches of the Gentiles*, is the expreſs words of the *Teſtimony*, and might competently conclude *Peter's primacy* to the *founding the Church* indefinitely, not to belong to *all*, but onely the *Jewiſh Church*, to whom the *Goſpel* was firſt to be preached; or if it did not, yet the addition of *plena authoritas* Petro *data in Judaiſmi prædicatione*, *&* Pauli *perfecta authoritas in prædicatione Gentium, the full authority given* Peter *in preaching to the Jews, and* Paul's *perfect authority in preaching to the Gentiles*, muſt neceſſarily enforce it, and ſo conclude *S. W.* all this while to have drawn his *own* character, cauſeleſly accuſing me of his own *crimes*.

13. Once more, when to his one inſtance of *Peter's preaching* to *Cornelius* a *Gentile*, I anſwered, that this was not at *Rome*, but long before the *agreement* between the *Apoſtles*, and though it *may be*, *he converted ſome other ſuch*, yet this was nothing to the *matter of Juriſdiction*, and withall but a *whimpering may-be*, in his language, he replies, 1. *That this is my oft affected miſtake, that he is to argue and prove, who undertook to anſwer.* 2. *That my words confute almoſt all my third Chapter, which concerning juriſdiction, runs almoſt upon nothing elſe, but preaching and converſion*, 3. That *juriſdiction is nothing to our queſtion, unleſs I firſt evidence its equality with the pretended higheſt*] To theſe I anſwer, 1. That I expect not *S. W.* ſhould be ſuch a worker of wonders, as to *prove* all that he hath the *confidence* to ſay, and therefore ſhall here promiſe him once for all, not to exact it of him: Onely he having out of his great liberality inſtanced in *Cornelius*, and received anſwer that that was nothing *contrary* to me, I thought the bare *poſſibility*, that there might be ſome *other* ſuch inſtance, would have no force in it, the reaſon being evident, becauſe this which was produced, was ſhewn to have none. And although the ſhewing that the *contrary may-be*, is oppoſed, and ſo ſufficiently *reſponſive* to the pretending it *muſt be*, ſpeaking of *demonſtrative evidences*, yet there is not the like reaſon in matters of *fact*, depending wholly on proofs from *Teſtimonies*, in which caſe what doth not appear ſo much as by intimation, cannot reaſonably be *ſuppoſed* to be; If it may, the dream of *Adam*'s firſt Wife *Lilis*, nay, the whole *hypotheſis* of the *Pre-adamites*, will not be ſo wildly and utterly irrational and indefenſible, as we take it to be, there being no repugnance in the *terms* (and ſo a *whimpering may-be*) that there ſhould have been a race of men before *Adam* and *Eve*, which yet are the *firſt* we reade of, and from thence *believe* the *firſt* of mankind created by *God*. However the other anſwer, to which this was added, will not, I hope, be enervated by this *addition*, and then that will ſerve to repell his *firſt* cavil.

14. *Secondly* then for *preaching* and *converſion*, that that is not *juriſdiction*, but differs from it, as it is evident in it ſelf, ſo it is not contrary to my *third Chapter*, where though in the way to *ruling and juriſdicti-* I inſiſt on the *preaching-aſſignations* and *Provinces* of the *Apoſtles*, yet it is evident my argument againſt the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* is founded, not in St. *Paul*'s or *Jame*'s or *John*'s *preaching* or *converting* alone, but in their * *forming their Converts into a Church, leaving them to be governed by Biſhops of their own aſſignations*, which cannot have place in ſuch a ſingular caſe, as was *Cornelius*'s being ſent to *Peter* by *Chriſt* to be taught the way of the *Goſpel* by him. * *Of Sch.* p. 76. l. 9.

15. *Laſtly*, If by *S. W*'s allowance, *Juriſdiction* may be then to our *queſtion*, *when it is ſhewed in* Paul *to be equal to the pretended higheſt*, I ſhall then be competently ſecured to have aſſumed nothing *irregularly* at this time; The very laſt thing that we paſs'd, and have again here vindicated, being the *Independency* of *Paul* from *Peter*, and his *perfect authority* and *primacy* among the *Gentiles*, concludes the deſired equality.

SECT. XIX.

Aſſuming by probabilities without Teſtimonies. Obſervations on S. W*'s probabilities. The Jews ſolemn departing from St.* Paul, *Act.* XXVIII. Ἐπίδοντι, V. 24. S. W*'s miſtakes.*

1. THE *twentieth Section* is at ſo great leiſure as to go three ſides out of his way, before he returns to *anſwer* my *Teſtimonies* (his buſineſs in hand) pretending to give ſome probable account of the *two Biſhops* in *one City*, which he calls *conſidering what was likely to happen out of the nature of the thing it ſelf, joined with the prudence of the Apoſtles*;] And the ſum of it is, that what ſeemed moſt to *S. W*'s *intereſt*, that and nothing elſe could be *prudent* for the *Apoſtles* to doe, and being the *Diſciple* of the *Apologiſt*, who † pronounces of his *connatural* way of *Oral Tradition*, that *if God had not already taken it, certainly he ſhould have done it*, we are beholden to him, that he hath not with as *reſolute and pious a confidence* pronounced in like manner of the *Spirit-confirmed Twelve*, as he ſtyles them; But having oft obſerved the no-probability of arguments *merely probable* againſt *Teſtimonies* of *fact*, and withall reflecting on *S. W*'s performances formerly, where we have not found ſo much as a *probability* in thoſe *grounds* of his, that aſſumed to be moſt *demonſtrative*, and ſo concluding from one of theſe *in theſi*, what the other makes vehemently *credible* in *hypotheſi*, that what is by *likelihood* aſſumed *without*, or *againſt Teſtimonies*, is moſt † *P.* 13.

imper-

impertinently *weak* and unſignificant, I might leave it to the Reader, on his ſurvey, to judge, whether *S. W*'s cauſe deſtituted *him*, or he *his* cauſe, and not offer any *Antidote* to ſo *feeble* a Poiſon as here his *Topical* faculties have mixed.

2. But to pay our *Controvertiſt* all manner of imaginable reſpect, I ſhall very briefly attend him here alſo, and obſerve, 1. That when from *all hiſtories* his *own* † *Baronius* tells us, that the *Apoſtles diviſerunt ſibi ad quas ſinguli proficiſcerentur Orbis Terræ Provincias, divided to themſelves the Provinces of the World, to which they ſhould goe*, and adds, *hæc eadem omnia ſpiritus ſancti ſpeciali inſtinctu eſſe peracta, that by the ſpecial inſtinct of the ſpirit* (whether by an *Angel*, as he after ſaith, or by ſome other *divine way*) *all this was done*, yet *S. W.* can diſcern no ſuch matter probable, but denying their *Prophetical foreſight what place or time for the future would be always moſt convenient*, leaves them, for their *when and where*, to *govern themſelves by that high prudence rain'd down on them* (whether in the ſhowre of *ſound* as of *wind*, or of *tongues* as of *fire*, he hath not determined) *at Pentecoſt*. 2. That ſpeaking of the *Twelve*, and ſaying that *moſt linger'd in* Judæa, *&c. among the reſt* he will *particularize in two*, and thoſe are St. *Peter* and St. *Paul*, yet I diſcern not, either the *great probability* that St. *Paul* ſhould with any other but *S. W.* go for one of the *Twelve*, or that he ſhould be an *inſtance* of *lingring in Judæa*, till *occaſional circumſtances, together with the inſpiration of the Holy Ghoſt* ('tis well that may now be taken in, to join with *occaſional Circumſtances*) *diſpers'd them*, or that the direction of St. *Peter* and St. *Paul* to *Rome* ſhould be the *firſt* thing taken notice of, after the *diſperſion* of the *Twelve*. 3. That he takes pains to prove that the *Apoſtles* did not *hazard at* Rome, *the yet weak and ſlenderly moved Souls by ſeeming to neglect them, and ſending them away one to another*, whereas my ſuppoſition is, that the *Jews* rejected St. *Paul* (not St. *Paul* the *Jews*) at his *firſt coming*, and *departed* from him, and then he *turned to the Gentiles*, and by ſo doing, did more aſcertain the *Jews* not to apply themſelves to him, and then how could he *turn them from him?* or how could any dream of his *ſeeming neglects*, or *ſending them to another?* What then 4. follows in his caſe put, of the *multitudes of Gentiles under St.* Peter *ſhifting ſides, and running to St.* Paul, and the *Jewiſh from St.* Paul *to* Peter, is a rare fabrick of *Chimera*'s, to be added to the foot of his *fifth* fore-going *Section*, and exemplify the faculties of a *new-faſhion'd probable Doctour*, what they may advance to, when in a good cauſe they are improved carefully. *Laſtly*, that when he hath managed his liberty (of ſuppoſing what he will) to his own hearts deſire, he reſolves that *Peter* and *Paul continued at* Rome their *diſtinctive way till their death*, either of them immediate *Biſhops over ſeveral particular Flocks*, which notwithſtanding, one may be *ſuperiour*, he ſaith, *in authority to the other, as an Archbiſhop or Primate to a Biſhop*] To which if I return my bare reference to the *Teſtimonies* for their ἰσοτιμία (and St. *Paul*'s being *no-way inferiour to the chiefeſt Apoſtles*) which have now been vindicated againſt all his *exceptions*, and even the *equality of all* the *Apoſtles* ſhew'd to be the *Doctrine* of a competent number of *Fathers*, yea and *later Romaniſts* alſo, I ſhall then ſuppoſe *S. W*'s *probabilities* will have no great efficacy of *conviction* on any, and ſo I leave them.

† *An.* 44. n. XX.

3. Being thus ſtock'd and furniſh'd with a fair proviſion of (to him ſeeming) *probabilities*, he advances to the aſſault of *another Teſtimony*, fixing his ἔλεγχος to that paſſage in the *Tract* of *Schiſm*, when I ſaid of *Paul's preaching in his hired houſe*, Act. *XXVIII.* 30. *that the Jews had ſolemnly departed from him*, v. 29. And on review of what had paſs'd in the *Diſar.* and my *Anſwer* to him, he attaches me for putting the word *ſolemnly*, which I acknowledge is not found in the *Text*, *in the ſame letter with departed, which is found there, immediately citing*, v. 29.] I anſwer, that neither one nor other were put in the *letter*, which is the mark of a *citation*, and ſo, by his favour, I am demonſtrably cleared from that which was before my *charge*, and conſequently ſecure from all other in this matter, it being free for me not to *cite* the word from the *Text*, which was there, as long as I cited nothing from it which was not there. As for the *citation* of v. 29. that I ſhall hope was no *enormity*, or *unſincerity*, it being lawfull to cite *ſenſes* as well as *words*, the Doctrine of the *Trinity* from *Joh.* XIV. 26. where yet the *word* is not to be met with, and that this ſenſe was to be afforded by that Verſe, as it ſtood in conjunction with the *former* Verſes, and was interpreted by them, I thought I had ſufficiently manifeſted, for as v. 29. the *Jews departing* is expreſs'd, ſo before, v. 25. it is with this addition, *they departed after St.* Paul *had ſpoken one word, well ſpake the Holy Ghoſt by* Iſaias — *ſaying, Go unto this people and ſay, Hearing ye ſhall hear and not underſtand, for the heart of this people is waxed groß, &c.* From hence I infer, That *departing*, which was interpreted by St. *Paul*, to be an act of the greateſt *obſtinacy*, and *obduration*, I might juſtly ſtyle a departing *ſolemnly*, But ſuch was the *Jews departing*, mentioned, *v.* 29. *Therefore* —

4. And I hope this account will be ſufficient to his weighty queſtion that here follows, *what this is to the pretence that their ſolemn departure was found*, v. 29.] for if their *departure* were *found* there, and that *departure* otherwiſe appear to be *ſolemn*, then their *ſolemn departure* is found there, though the word [*ſolemn*] was not.

5. But, ſaith he, he *denied not the ſolemnity of reprehenſion expreſs'd to the unbelieving Jews in other Verſes*] I anſwer that I am ſo far from ſaying he *did*, that I never applied the *ſolemneſs* to *Paul's reprehenſion* of the *Jews*, but onely to the *Jews departing* from *Paul*, which might have been diſtinguiſhed, if he had pleaſed.

6. But, ſaith he, *reade the place, and we find not a word of reſolution in them to come no more*] I anſwer, that if *Paul* were a competent Judge with him, this would without ſo much difficulty be *found*: For doth not *cloſing their eyes, leſt they ſhould ſee, hear, underſtand, be converted, and healed*, ſignify this reſolution of *coming no more*, to that *end*, to which he preached, their *Converſion?* And did not St. *Paul diſcern this* in them, when he pronounced it of them? If by coming again, he mean coming to *catch*, or *cavil*, or *calumniate* (as ſome men come to *anſwer* Books) or even to *ſtone* him, I have no neceſſity of *denying* that, whenſoever *S. W.* ſhall turn *Augur*, and affirm it.

7. Once more, Dr. *H. ſhould have ſhewed*, ſaith he, *that St.* Paul *reſolved not to preach to them whereſoever he found them in other places.*] I anſwer, that by *other places* I muſt ſuppoſe he means (if any thing to the preſent purpoſe) *other places* in *Rome*, whereof we now ſpeak; and then 1. I have little need to prove that *Paul* made any ſuch *reſolution*, for if they *came not to him* to hear, but *cloſed their eyes againſt* this light, they are ſecured from being his *Converts*, without any intervenient *reſolution* of his not to ſpeak to them; for how could *Paul* in his *hired houſe*, preach to them that came

not

not to him? Yet 2. the *Text* is plain enough, when he proclaims to them, *v.* 28. *Be it known unto you that the ſalvation of God is ſent to the Gentiles, and that they will hear it.* For let it now be conſidered on theſe premiſſes, *who* they are of whom St. *Paul's Cœtus* at *Rome* is by *S. W.* ſuppoſeable to be congregated? Can it be *Jews* and *Gentiles promiſcuouſly*, or any other but *Gentiles* onely? When the *Jews cloſe their eyes*, &c. and *depart*, and when the *Goſpel* is by him *preached to the Gentiles*, and they do *hear* it: Remembring ſtill, that in other places the *Jewiſh* would not conſort with *Gentile Chriſtians*, and that as *Peter* was the *Apoſtle* of the *Jews* in other places, and *Paul* of the *Gentiles*, ſo they were both *Biſhops* at *Rome*, and continued *their diſtinctive way untill their death*, by *S. W*'s own * *confeſſion.* * P. 358.

8. But, ſaith he, *ſome of the Jews believed*, v. 24. *there is therefore no ground of any ſolemnity of departure in order to them*, and therefore the words cited from St. *Chryſoſtome* in my *Anſwer*, are *not appliable to them.*] I might anſwer, that when it is ſaid of ſome, *v.* 24. that ἐπείθοντο τοῖς λεγομένοις, *they believed*, or *were perſwaded* by the *things*, *which were ſpoken*, there is no neceſſity this ſhould be interpreted of their *receiving* the *Chriſtian Faith*, there being many things ſuppoſeable to be ſaid to them by him, concerning his *appeal to Cæſar*, and the *reaſon* of his *bonds*, the *common hope* of all *Jews*, and laſtly concerning *Jeſus out of the Law, and the Prophets.* But granting, as I have done, that their *believing* was *receiving* the *Faith* of *Chriſt*, yet 'tis no news to hear of ſome that with *joy receive*, and *preſently* are *ſcandalized*, and *leave* it again; and the ſame we have reaſon to conceive of thoſe, which, though they were *perſwaded*, and yielded *belief* to what he *ſaid*, yet upon *debate* with the others, diſagreement ariſing, they all *forſook Paul* and *departed*, they, of whom it was ſaid, ἐπείθοντο λεγομένοις, *they were perſwaded by what he ſaid*, as well as others. This is manifeſt by the words of the *ſacred* Text, (not of St. *Chryſoſtome*) ἀσύμφωνοι ὄντες ἀπελύοντο, *they being not agreed departed*; who are theſe that were not agreed? Certainly *both parties*, the πεισθόμενοι and ἀπιστοῦντες, *they that were perſwaded* or *believed, and the disbelieving*: and therefore of *both* theſe it is evident, that *they departed*, and ſo to all in common St. *Paul* addreſſes himſelf in the words of the *Prophet*, and, if it be marked, the *cloſing the eyes*, and that meant by the ſtyle, *ſeeing they ſee not*, i. e. *the obſtinacy*, is as applyable to them that were *perſwaded*, and yet *departed*, either for *fear* of offending, or diſſenting from their fellows, as to any other; nay with more propriety to theſe, than others, for theſe peculiarly *ſeeing ſee not*, i. e. do not ſo far make uſe of their *ſight* (though they *ſee*) as to be *converted* and *healed* by it; and ſo ſtill St. *Chryſoſtome*'s words may comprize them *all* at the time of their *departing* (for it ſeems none adhered to, or continued with him, and the *Gentiles* hearing is expreſly oppoſed to *not* hearing μὴ πιστεύοντες ἀνεχώρουν, *not believing they departed*, for elſe how can that interpret ἀσύμφωνοι, *thoſe that agreed not*, which comprehends all? and ſo the other words of his, πρὸς ἐκείνους ταῦτα εἰρῆσθαι ἀπιστήσαντας, *thoſe words of Scripture were ſaid to them* when they *believed not*, being ſaid to them *all* in common.

9. But he hath yet more to object on this point, that it *was poſſible for them to return after ſuch a diſmiſſion, or for* Paul *to apply himſelf again to them, that the Text ſaith nothing to the contrary*, that he *had formerly cited the Apoſtles ſhaking off the duſt of their feet*, *Act.* XIII. 51. *departing more ſolemnly, and yet they after preached many times to the Jews*, and on this occaſion my *accuteneſs* is arraigned for taking it, as if he *expected the ſhaking off the duſt of their ſhooes at* Rome *alſo*] To all this I *anſwer*, and firſt to the *rebuke*, which how ſeaſonable it was, let him now judge. I ſpake of the *Jews ſolemnly departing from* Paul, v. 29. And the † *Diſarmers* anſwer is of *Paul's departing from the Jews more ſolemnly* (where, I beſeech him, was the *pertinency* of that *anſwer*? (To this I ‖ replied, *And what if he did not ſhake off the duſt of his ſhooes againſt them? That was the ceremony of his departing from them, and that, when he meant to leave their City, but I ſpeak of the ſolemnity of their departing from him.* This, if he pleaſe to reflect, was my *anſwer*, and I hope as ſeaſonable and *pertinent*, as his had been the contrary. And if I conſidered his *impertinencies* ſo much, as to *hope above hope*, that there was ſome *latent* force in them, and therefore took care alſo to ſuperſede whatſoever was but thus remotely *poſſible*, and ſo gave him my reaſon why St. *Paul* did not here at *Rome ſhake off the duſt of his feet againſt them*, I wonder who was injured by, or had reaſon to complain of it. Let him firſt reply ſolidly to my *whole Anſwer* (of which he hath not touched a *third* part) and I ſhall give him free leave to *add* as much more as he ſhall think fit. † P. 74. ‖ *Anſw.* p. 52.

10. *Secondly*, when he talks ſtill of the poſſibility of their *returning after ſuch a diſmiſſion*, I mind him again, that this was their *ſolemn departure* from St. *Paul*, and that is not *Paul's diſmiſſion* of them. 3. For *Paul's applying himſelf to them again*, though the *Text* ſaith nothing to the *contrary*, yet it ſaith, *Be it known to you the ſalvation of God is ſent to the Gentiles, and they will hear it*: and this a competent prejudice to his *applying* himſelf to the *Jews again*, for either that muſt be done to them with the *Gentiles promiſcuouſly*, or not at all; And that the *Jews* and *Gentiles* at *Rome* did not converſe thus freely and *promiſcuouſly*, though the *Text* of the *Acts* declare not, the ſtory being here at an end, yet we have indications enow elſewhere; For if *Rom.* 14. the *partition* were not taken down between the *believing Jews* and *Gentiles* in *this* very City, but that they *deſpiſed* and *judged* one the other, and ſo needed the *Apoſtle's balſame* to cure this *ſciſſure*, then how much more is it to be preſumed of the *unbelieving Jews*, who are the proper Auditours to whom *S. W.* can ſuppoſe him *again* to *apply* himſelf?

11. *Laſtly*, how fitly was his inſtance from *Act.* 13. 51. here again produced, to prove *Paul* might apply himſelf *again* to thoſe from whom he had *ſolemnly departed* (it ſhould have been from them who had thus *departed from him*) when it no-way appears, that he applied himſelf *again* to the ſame *Jews* either in *Antioch* of *Piſidia*, or *Iconium*, from whom he had *departed*; To others, after that, he did preach, or elſe he could not to the *Jews* here, but ſtill that is not to thoſe who *departed ſolemnly* from him, nor from whom he thus *departed*: and indeed the *ſolemnity* of this *departure* of his, being ſignificative of the *deſtruction*, that they were ſuddenly to look for, and attended with his *turning* to the *Gentiles*, there was ſmall ground of this *phanſied* returning after ſuch a *ceremonious*, and *pompous farewell.*

12. He concludes this *Section* with reflecting on a *conceſſion* of mine, in relation to the *Jews*, that are ſaid to have *believed* (or *been perſwaded*) v. 24. Of them I ſaid, *that if they continued in that Faith, which now they received, and were not ſcandalized and averted*, on mention of his *reſolution* to *depart* to the *Gentiles*, (for many *Jews* that received the *Faith*, would no longer aſſociate with *Paul*, when he did ſo) then, *upon any evidence produced for this, I ſhould make no doubt to acknowledge, that they though Jews became*

part of Paul's *Cœtus*, inſtancing in *Clemens* a *Roman*, yet *Deacon* to St. *Peter*. Now 1. here is diſcern'd a very *illogical* fault, that I *anſwer with Ifs*, and *expect he ſhould produce evidence againſt them.*] But I reply, this could not be ſaid without at leaſt a *double* deceit impoſed either on the *Reader* or *himſelf*; for 1. I do not *anſwer with Ifs*, but ſuppoſing the utmoſt of his *Ifs*, (*i. e.* of his *unproved* ſuppoſitions, that ſome of theſe not onely *received* the *Faith*, but *continued* in it) I give this *diſtinct anſwer*, that I am noway prejudiced by acknowledging this, and more, even that they were *part of* Paul's *Gentile Cœtus*. 2. 'Tis not onely *falſe* that I do, but *irrational* that I ſhould expect of him to *produce evidence againſt the Ifs*; for my words are [*upon any evidence produced for this*] and that is not *againſt* them. But then 3. though I uſe thoſe words, *upon any evidence I ſhall make no doubt to acknowledge it*] yet was I not ſo rigorous, as to *expect* ſuch evidence, but in the next words ſhew him, how ſafe I am in the *acknowledgment* of the utmoſt, that is ſuppoſeable, not onely evidenced in this matter.

13. But neither will this ſecure me from his *purſuits*, For, he *would ask me, if this be ſo, how many Jews St.* Paul *might convert and govern*, and again, *what the Jewiſh Converts under St.* Paul *ſhould doe, in caſe they hap to take a toy againſt the Gentiles for eating a piece of Pork*] And I anſwer, that in the converſe of the *Engliſh Proverb*, a *Fool* may ſometimes anſwer as many queſtions as a *Wiſe-man* can ask, and that in very few words; To his *firſt*, that St. *Paul* might *convert* and *govern* as many *Jews* as would receive the *Faith* from him, and not be *ſcandalized* or averted again by his *preaching* to the *Gentiles* in the ſame *Cœtus*. And they that would not doe thus, muſt of neceſſity either remain *Unbelievers*, or aſſociate with the *deeper* ſort of the *Jewiſh Converts*, ſtill addicted to the *Judaical* obſervances under St. *Peter*.

14. And by proportion with this, his *ſecond queſtion* receives its ſatisfaction alſo, that they that *diſlike* what they have once embraced, be it the Doctrine of *Chriſtian Liberty*, or of *unreſtrain'd communion* with *Gentiles*, muſt either live out of *communion*, or ſeek it ſomewhere elſe, among thoſe that are as *ſcrupulous* as themſelves. And ſo much for the quaint *interrogatories*, and his *twentieth Section*.

SECT. XX.

A charge of falſification in citing Ignatius, *cleared. Of* Accordances. S. W's *witty chaſe examined. St.* John *not ſuppoſeable to be under St.* Peter's *ſucceſſour. Seeing*] Gal. 2. 7. *for acknowledging, Sending, a giving of Juriſdiction. Excluſiveneſs. Phanſie. What degree of neceſſity there is to reconcile the Fathers different affirmations.* Epiphanius's *conjecture of* Clement's *refuſing to be Biſhop. How grounded.* Ἀναχωρῶ, ἄπειμι.

1. HIS 21. Section ſets out with a view of a citation from *Ignatius*, where he is reſolved to ſpring ſome *unſincerity*, and though by the aid of *five Obſervations* of *S. W.* (able to work any *metamorphoſis*, when they are ſet on it) he have here advanced it but into *artifice* and *deſign*, and *ſlily abuſing my Reader*, yet when he is gathering the *Index*, he hath his *magnifying* Glaſs ready at his eye, and
* 358. 358. ſtreight converts this *vermin* into a *Swine*, for there we find theſe * two pages (ſpent on theſe his *five* obſervations) noted for the diſcovery of *egregious and moſt wilfull falſifications of Fathers, and other Authours*; with what affinity to Truth, will be ſoon judged.

† P. 78. 2. My words in the † *Tract* of *Sch.* are theſe, *Accordingly in* Ignatius, *Ep. ad Trall.* we reade of *Linus* and *Clemens, that one was St.* Paul's, *the other St.* Peter's *Deacon*; To this, which thus begins a *Paragraph*, I adjoin (as I think will not be news to any that hath lookt on the *feweſt* Books) many words of my *own*, without any *full point* between, to the end of the *Paragraph*, but with no leaſt colour of appearance, that I cite one word more than theſe, which I have now ſet down out of *Ignatius*. And it may be remembred, that when *S.W.* in the perſon of my *Diſarmer* came to view *this* citation, though in great *zeal* to *truth* and *honeſty*, he required to have this teſtimony *ſifted over and over, whether it were an evidence, that St.* Peter *was onely over the Jews, and St.* Paul *over the Gentiles*, yet he appeared
P. 75. not to ſuſpect any *falſification* in the *Teſtimony*, but called the following words, which now he will have part of the *Teſtimony*, my *Expoſition*, and ſaid, *that all that any way made to my purpoſe, was ſubjoin'd out of mine own head*: But I need not ſo fallible a *witneſs* (nor ſhould uſe it againſt any other but himſelf) as either the *negative*, or *affirmative* of *S. W.* The thing is in it ſelf, by the *no-citation-letter*, by the ſtyle, by all that can be required to make good ſuch an evidence, moſt manifeſt, that I cited no more from *Ignatius*, than that *Linus was St.* Paul's, Clemens *St.* Peter's *Deacon at* Rome. And if thoſe words be to be found there (as *S. W.* acknowledges, and cites them from thence) 'twill ſoon be diſcerned who is the *egregious* and *moſt wilfull falſifier*.

3. Muſt I yet anſwer this Obſervatour's Arguments, by which his Reader was to be induced to think that *poſſible*, which was moſt extremely removed from all *Truth*? For once I will, acknowledging their weight as great, as any thing elſe that exacts reply in *this Section*. His *firſt* is, that *there is nothing but a ſimple Comma after the word Deacon, where I ſay the Teſtimony ends, nor any thing like a full point of a Teſtimony, till the words* [*the Jewiſh Chriſtians there.*] I anſwer, there is no *Law*, that a *Teſtimony* ſhould end with a *full point*, or that he, that ſaith he reads ſuch words in an *Authour*, is precluded and obliged to add no word more in that *period*, (I think I may add, that never any man in the world ſaid or thought this, till an itch of *calumniating* and heaping loads of the meaneſt crimes on his Adverſary, ſuggeſted it to *S.W.*) And ſhould this *Legiſlatour* now be hearkened to, the whole *Paragraph* (which is near a Page) muſt be the words of *this Teſtimony*, for, as was ſaid, there is never a *full point* till the *end* of it: what he calls *like a full point*, I ſhall not examine, nothing being *that*, which is but *like* it.

4. *Secondly*, ſaith he, *there is no other diſtinctive note imaginable to let him know which are the teſtimonies, which my own words.*] I anſwer, 1. his [*no other diſtinctive note*] implies that a *full point* is a *diſtinctive note* of a *teſtimony*, which is far removed from truth, for there may be a *full point* in the *midſt* of a *Teſtimony*, and there may be a *Teſtimony* without a *full point* at the *end* of it. May not I cite *In the beginning was the word*, and paſſing to ſomewhat elſe, leave that concluded (as it is in the *Text*) with a *comma* onely? Or, where there is a *full point* in the *Text*, may not I doe the ſame, annex other words in the ſame peri-

od,

od, without coming under *S. W*'s ſcourge of *Scorpions* for *egregious falſification?* 2. What *other diſtinctive note* can he demand, than that the *Letter* is *changed*, after the *Teſtimony*, for above a line together, and then is no more uſed, ſave in *proper names*, and words of ſome ſpecial *energy* toward the matter in hand, (to both which that *letter* is accommodated through that *whole* Book) till the end of the Paragraph. The *third* obſervation is but the ſpreading of this, and ſo is anſwered already in this *ſecond*.

5. His *4th* is, that the *word* [*Deacons*] *is nothing to our Controverſie, but the words ſubjoyned are mainly important to the point.*] I anſwer 1. that I might equitably be allowed to uſe *one* word (for *Deacon*, by him mark'd is no more) which was *nothing to our Controverſie*, when *S. W.* uſes ſo many *thouſands*, which are as little; witneſs all his *railings*, *evil ſurmiſings*, *calumnies*, *cavils*, which make up the far greateſt part of his book, the *fleſh* to fill up the vacuities of that *Sceleton*, the *live-colours* to his *Monogramm*: But I would not be like him in the tithe of one line, and therefore 2. I ſay the word *Deacon* is no ſuch περίλογον, or *redundant* as he would have it taken for. For if the *Deacon* be, among other notations of this name, an inſeparable *relative* to a *Biſhop*, (as the *moſt ancient Records* in *Epiphanius* import, and teſtifie, ſaying, ἄνευ διακόνου ἐπίσκοπον ἀδύνατον εἶναι, *that a Biſhop muſt not, cannot be without a Deacon*) then *Ignatius*'s affirming that *Linus* was *Paul's Deacon at Rome*, and *Clement Peter*'s, is an intimation pregnant enough, that theſe two, *Paul* and *Peter* were (at the ſame time, for they ſucceeded not one another) *Biſhops* of *Rome*, and then that is a *ſecond* to *Epiphanius* (before produced for it) and ſo *eſtabliſhes* a *truth*, which is acknowledged to have ſome relation to our *Controverſie*. Nay, 3. it being evident from parallel inſtances of thoſe times, that thoſe *Apoſtles* and firſt *Biſhops* left their *Deacons* to ſucceed them in the *Epiſcopal* Chair, *Timotheus* (who is by *Ignatius* there named to be one of *Paul's Deacons*) at *Epheſus*, and the like, their being the *Deacons* of thoſe two *Apoſtle-Biſhops*, was fit to introduce that which followed in that *Paragraph*, of their ſucceeding them in their *Biſhops* Sees, which being by all men granted, that they did, (though with ſome difference in the manner) an *arrogance* it might be in *S. W*'s eſteem (but ſay he what he will, his conſcience will tell him it neither was, nor could be a *falſification*) to undertake to accord the difference of *Authours* in this point, which without foreſeeing his ſeverity, or craving his leave I adventur'd on, and ſhall not doubt to vindicate the probability of it, againſt all that hath, or can be pretended againſt it, and this never the leſs for the *Diſ- * P. 77.
armer*'s ſaying, *No man could ever underſtand the buſineſs aright, though*, as again he ſaith, *they found evaſions to ſalve the difficulty*. And then that alſo was pertinent (though it pretended not to be *demonſtrative*) to the point in hand; for how could *Linus* and *Clemens* be at *once Biſhops* of *Rome*, but as *Baronius* found *Euodius* and *Ignatius* to be at *Antioch*, at the *ſame time*, one over the *Gentile*, the other over the *Jewiſh Cœtus*?

6. His *laſt* reaſon is, becauſe *that of* Linus *being conſtituted Biſhop of the Gentiles*, Clement *of the Jewiſh Chriſtians there*,] *is no-where elſe pretended to be ſhewn, and ſo it could not be imagined, but that thoſe words were part of this teſtimony.*] I *anſwer*, 1. that if this were an *argument*, then *S. W*'s book would be little other than *Teſtimony* (which yet hath little of that deſpiſed ware in it) there being ſo little in it ſo much as pretended to be ſhewed by any other way of *probation*, than that of his *own* dictating. But then 2. it now appears, that as there is no queſtion among any, but that *Linus* and *Clemens* were *Biſhops* of *Rome*, ſo there are very pregnant grounds of affixing one to the *Gentile*, the other to the *Jewiſh Cœtus*, both from the analogy with *Antioch*, in *Baronius*'s acknowledgment, and from the conſtant practice of the *Church* (ſave onely in this one caſe of *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Chriſtians*, whilſt the *partition* remained) to have but one *Biſhop* in a *City*.

7. He now ſees, what little need I had of any the leaſt artifice in ſo plain a buſineſs, how little of *refuges* or *evaſions*, eſpecially of that which he names laſt, *that I meant it not for a proof*, but *as a branch of accordance*, for 'tis impoſſible again, he ſhould believe himſelf, that I gave that anſwer to the charge of having *falſified Ignatius*, when the *Diſarmer*, to which my Anſwer was addreſt, charged onely the *inſufficiency* of *Ignatius's words without my additions, to prove the Concluſion*, (and to that onely my *anſwer* was accommodated, *viz.* that the *concluſion was proved before, by Scripture, and this from* Ignatius *was onely a branch of accordance with it*) and not that which is now the *uglier* charge, that of *falſification*.

8. The reſt of this *Section* is ſpent in *Comedy*, purſuit of his pleaſant *game*, as he ſtyles it: But I am old enough not to be ſo *playſome*, and ſhall reſerve my ſelf to wait on him, where he is more *ſerious*; It may ſuffice to tell him, that there is as proper a place in a *Controverſie* for *accordances*, as for *proofs*, the difference being this, not that the former are apt to *prove nothing* (as he would perſwade us) but that ſuch *teſtimonies*, as, being taken *alone* by themſelves, are not ſo *explicite*, as to bear the whole *weight*, and convince gainſayers, yet being annex'd to *plainer* proofs premiſed, they may both *receive*, and *add* ſtrength to them, receive, by our interpreting what is leſs clear, from *analogy* with that which is more *perſpicuous*, and then *add* that weight, which conſent of more teſtifiers is acknowledged to bring with it.

9. When then 1. the *Scripture* tells us, that *Paul* was *intruſted with the Goſpel of the Gentiles*, *Peter* of the *Circumciſion*, *Gal.* 2. 7. that they *gave one another the right hand of fellowſhip, one to goe to the Gentiles, the other to the Circumciſion*, c. 2. 9. from whence I thought it concluſible, that the *Gentiles* were St. *Paul*'s, and ſo no part of St. *Peter's Province*; 2. When in *antiquity* ſo many other paſſages *accorded* perfectly with mine underſtanding of thoſe words, the *diſtribution* of all the *Apoſtles* into their ſeveral κλήσεις, particularly *Peter*'s preaching to *Jews* in *Judæa* and *Samaria*, and thoſe of the *diſperſion*, to whom and none elſe his *Epiſtles* were addreſt; then *James*'s being made *Biſhop* of one portion of *Jews*, not by him *onely*, but by *Peter*, and *James* and *John*, and ſo the *Juriſdiction* over thoſe belonging *immediately* to *him*, and no more to St. *Peter*, *ultimately*, than to *James* and *John*; then *Paul's Commiſſion* to the *Apoſtleſhip* of the *Gentiles*, given him *immediately* by *Chriſt*, and ſo exerciſed alſo without any *relation* to, or *dependence* on *Peter*, his *authority perfect*, and his *primacy* aſſerted among the *Gentiles*, and (when in Cities conſiſting of *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Converts*, the *Cœtus* were kept *apart*) *Paul* preſiding as *Biſhop* in the *Gentile Cœtus*, as *Peter* in the *Jewiſh*, and each leaving his ſeveral *Biſhop* Succeſſour in his *Cœtus* (and this by the learned *Romaniſt* confeſt at *Antioch*, and in one part proved by *Teſtimonies*, in the other part rendred undeniably probable at *Rome* alſo) theſe, I ſay, and many other the like, which I muſt not here repeat, being *branches of accordance*

dance and *agreement* with words of the *Scripture* firſt laid, and authorizing my way of underſtanding them, and application of them to our preſent *hypotheſis*, and each of them now largely approved to doe ſo, againſt all his *little exceptions* to them, how can they fail to eſtabliſh that, which alone I infer from them, that the placing an *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* in one man, the *preſent Biſhop of Rome*, cannot be founded in any the like *Monarchick* power veſted in, or exerciſed by the perſon of St. *Peter*? And then what place there was for *S. W's game* or *chaſe*, on this head of difference between *proofs* and
* P. 306. l. 3. *accordances*, and how far that was from a *flat falſification* of *Scripture*, which he * accuſes as ſuch, becauſe the word *onely* was not found in it, but ſupplied from other *Teſtimonies*, let him now judge.

10. So likewiſe in the very *firſt ſtep* of his *chaſe*, when having cited from the *fifth Par.* theſe words of mine, *And firſt it is evident from Scripture, St.* Peter *was the Apoſtle of the Circumciſion*, &c.] and then made his obſervation [*Here we ſee the point to be evidenced, and from Scripture*] he can yet find no other place of *Scripture* in that *Paragr.* but ἴδιον τόπον, *his own place*, and *lot of Apoſtleſhip*] What ſtrange blind hunting is this, when the very words which he firſt recited, were fetched from *Scripture* (and *therefore* I ſaid expreſly, 'tis evident by *Scripture*) *viz.* that *Peter was the Apoſtle of the Circumciſion*, for doth not St. *Paul* affirm this, *Gal.* 2. 7. that the *Goſpel of the Circumciſion was committed to Peter*, and what is that, but his being *Apoſtle* of them? What he hath objected againſt [*this being St.* Peter's *Province excluſively to the Gentiles*] hath now been cleared, *Sect.* 2. and being not here inſiſted on, needs not our farther reflexions; all that I now obſerve is, that he that had the *game* in his *hand*, kept it there cloſe, on purpoſe that his fellow Hunters might never be permitted to come in *view* of it: He names the *Scripture-evidence* from the *firſt* words, and then aſſures the *Reader* there is none in the whole *Paragr.* and yet this is one of his *juſtifiable arts* of *making his adverſary ridiculous*.

11. So in his view of the *ſixth Par.* where he is reſolved *nothing of proof* is to be found, but that *James at Jeruſalem was conſidered as a Biſhop*, this is moſt manifeſtly *falſe*; for 1. *Peter's preaching* in the *Acts*, being wholly ſpent in *Judæa* and *Samaria*, and his *Epiſtles* addreſt to the *Jews* in *diſperſion*, and both theſe exactly agreeable to his *Apoſtleſhip* of the *Circumciſion*, were a farther Confirmation of it. 2. The *intruſting all* Judæa *to the Brother of the Lord*, not by *Peter alone*, but by *James* and *John*, together with *Peter* (which is there alſo inſiſted on) 1. is ſomewhat more than the *bare conſidering* James *as Biſhop* there, and 2. 'tis a proof that this *Apoſtle* of the *Circumciſion* was not alone in that *power*, or poſſeſt of the *Supremacy* among the *Jews* in any other manner, than was common to two other *Apoſtles* (and that is prejudice enough to the *Supremacy* being veſted in *him* onely) and 3. as this concludes that *ſixth Par.* ſo it proceeds not (as he ſaith the reſt of that *Paragr.* doth) with *accordingly*, that word being but once uſed in the matter of *James*, and then belonging onely to his *giving the ſentence*, after which is ſeverally ſet down the *argument* which I now mention.

12. No more colour of truth is there in his ſuggeſtion concerning the *ſeventh Par.* of which his words are [*the next* (i. e. *the ſeventh Par.*) *proceeds with, accordingly*] Let the Reader ask his own eyes, if it be ſo: It begins, *So again for the uncircumciſion or Gentile Chriſtians*] and is of a new matter, not of St. *Peter's*, or St. *James's* (on which the two former were ſpent) but of St. *Paul's Province*, which, that it was the *Gentiles*, is there proved from *Peter's* own acknowledgment, *Gal.* 2. 7. from his title, *Rom.* 11. 13. from his *no-dependence* on St. *Peter*, which he conteſts, *Gal.* 1. 12--17. And theſe I hope are all proofs, and the word [*accordingly*] but once uſed, and that after all theſe in the *laſt period* of the *Par.*

13. After ſo groſs a failure, he becomes ſomewhat more carefull, and omitting the diviſion by *Paragraphs*, he falls to *Pages* and *Lines*, and whereſoever he meets with the word [*accordingly*] he caſts it down, and becauſe that is not the note of a *proof*, he concludes there is none, (an *Univerſal negative* from a *particular*) and by this Rule 'tis reſolved, that the teſtimony from the *Conſtitutions* of the *two Biſhops* at *Antioch*, no-way reconcileable but by the *hypotheſes* of the *two Cœtus*, muſt go for *no proof* alſo, becauſe forſooth it happened to be introduced (not by [*accordingly*] or [*agreeably*] (the words in which all his *chaſe* was concerned) but by [*according to this condition of diſparate, not ſubordinate Churches at* Antioch.]

14. So again, what I brought, onely to prove that the *Church of Rome* was founded by *Paul* as well as *Peter*, and therefore affirm'd, that *I meant it not as proof that St.* Paul *betook himſelf to the Gentiles, St.* Peter *to the Jews*, but that this being formerly proved, the *concluſion* inferred from theſe, was *agreeable to that*; here is matter of *Joy* and *Triumph* to the *ſporters*, on this account, eſpecially, becauſe one, the *Seals of the Popes is called an irrefragable evidence*] And ſo it is of that which it pretended to prove (*viz.* that the *Church* was *founded* by both thoſe *Apoſtles*, and not onely by *Peter*) though not of ſomewhat elſe, which needed not its aid, and was not pretended to be inferr'd from it; The like might be ſaid of *ſome* of the reſt.

15. Then for the 12*th* and 13*th*, the former being but the *deducing* the *concluſion* from the foregoing *premiſſes*, and the latter the *tranſition* to the view of St. *John's Province*, the *chaſers* muſt *ſmile*, if they cannot *laugh*, that *theſe are no proofs*, i. e. that the *concluſion* was not the *premiſſes*, nor the *propoſal* of matter to be ſpoken of, a *Teſtimony*.

16. The 14*th* and 15*th*, he acknowledges are *employed in ſhewing St.* John *over the Jews alſo, and* Timothy *over the Gentiles*, but yet theſe muſt fall under his rebuke, that *they ſhew not that St.* Peter *was over the Jews onely, nor* Timothy *over the Gentiles onely*.] Becauſe this is of ſomewhat more weight than ordinary, I muſt more diſtinctly ſatisfie it, that the thing that I brought the mention of *John's* Province to prove, was not that St. *Peter* was over the *Jews onely*, but that he was ſo far from *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, that even all the *Jews* were not *under* him, and I have ſuggeſted to him ſince ſome reaſons to lay a little more weight on this, than there was laid, becauſe it is evident *John* out-lived *Peter*, and then it is not imaginable that he ſhould be ſubject to *Clemens St.* Peter's *Succeſſour* at *Rome*, for then a *Biſhop* ſhall not onely be ſuperiour in *dignity* to an *Apoſtle* (contrary to the order ſet down, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *firſt Apoſtles, ſecondarily Prophets, thirdly* διδάσκαλοι, *Teachers*, the title of *Paſtours* or *Biſhops* in the *Church*, *Eph.* 4. 11.) but he muſt be the *Apoſtle's Supreme Ordinary* and *Governour*, which I intreat *S. W.* to conſider, whether he will affirm or no. However that be, it now appears, how far I

was

was from being obliged to infer from this *medium* of *John's* being over the *Jews*, that *Peter* was over the *Jews* onely; No, I conclude, he was not over all the *Jews*, and that I hope equally refutes his *Universal Pastourship*.

17. As for *Timothy*, if he were over the *Gentiles*, and not under *Peter*, but *Paul*, who without any contribution of *power* from *Peter*, placed him there, it will then follow, *Peter* had no *jurisdiction* at all in the *Lydian Asia*; and then what need I prove that *Timothy* was over *Gentiles onely?* which yet will follow regularly enough from the *Jews* being the *Province* of *John*, if that were pertinent to be insisted on.

18. The force of the remaining *Paragraphs*, to prove what they pretend to (though it is likely they prove not what they pretend not) hath been vindicated in the *Answer*: and shall hereafter be defended, if he hath ought to object against them; and his *mirth*, as far as concerns them, is a *triumph* before the *fight*, as it hath been all along, before the *Victory*. And so there is a *Conclusion* of this Scene.

19. What follows in reflexion on some words of mine, *viz.* that *the Uncircumcision were not St.* Peter's, *but St.* Paul's *Province peculiarly, by St.* Peter's *own confession*, Gal. 2. 7.] takes him up to the end of the *Section*. And the first suggestion is, that *this is not found acknowledged in that* 7th *verse, which saith but this, they saw that the Gospel of the Uncircumcision was committed to me, as the Gospel of the Circumcision was unto* Peter. And *seven* severe Observations he makes against that, most of which being the same which he had formerly objected, have already received their *Answer*, yet to all that can in the least-wise seem to exact it, I shall afford my reflexions.

20. And 1. to that which is most peculiar to *this* verse, *viz.* that *there is no news of confession and acknowledgment, unless I contend that* [*they saw*] *signifie they confess'd, and so make seeing, and saying to be all one.*] I answer, that for *seeing* to be taken for *knowing*, (and ἰδόντες here is interpreted by γνόντες *v.* 9.) and *knowing* for *acknowledging*, is no such prodigy to be observed. When *David* saith, *I see that all things come to an end, but thy commandment is exceeding broad*, this I take to be his *acknowledgment* or *confession* of that Truth; and what more ordinary in *vulgar Dialect*, than this, *I see 'tis as you say*, i. e. *I acknowledge it to be so*. And this sense is evidenced to belong to this place, 1. by the reason rendred *v.* 8. *God's effectual working with* Paul *in his preaching to the Gentiles*, whereby as by a motive of *conviction* they came to *see* this, *i. e.* to *acknowledge* it. 2. By the effect, v. 9. *giving the right hand of fellowship that he should goe to the Heathen*, Peter, &c. *to the Circumcision*, which *giving of hands* being the note of an *agreement*, that *agreement* must imply an *acknowledgment* of the former, to which it is *consequent*.

21. But, saith he, *there is nothing in the verse expressing jurisdiction*] I *answer*, *Christ's intrusting the Gospel of the Uncircumcision* to him, is giving him *Apostolical Commission*, as he saith, *I will send thee far hence* to the *Gentiles*, *Act.* XXII. 21. in the notion that the *Father's sending Christ*, and *Christ's sending the Apostles*, *Joh.* XX and the *Holy Ghost sending out* Paul, *Act.* XIII. 4. is giving them a *Commission* not onely to *preach*, but to *receive disciples*, to *baptize*, to form into a *Church*, to rule and *preside* among them; and though bare *preaching* were not *Jurisdiction*, yet these other parts of the same *Apostolical Commission* were, and all these comprehended in the phrase here of being *intrusted with the Gospel*, and *Rom.* XI. 13. being the *Apostle of the Gentiles*.

22. Again, saith he, *there is nothing there express'd of any exclusive power of preaching to Jews onely*] I *answer*, all that I produced it to conclude, was, that the *Gentile Christians were not St.* Peter's *Province, but peculiarly St.* Paul's, and if this be not express'd *in terminis*, 1. I did not say it was, 2. 'tis sufficient if it be *deducible* hence, and so still I suppose it is; for a *distribution* of *Provinces* being now supposed, the *Province* allotted one, must be peculiarly his, and that so his, as not to be the *Province* of another, who hath not that but another *Province* assigned him, in the *distribution*. An *Apostle* intrusted with a *Province*, is *Bishop* of it, and being so, no other *Apostle* is *Bishop* of the same (for that were to affix *two Bishops* to *one Province*) unless it were supposeable that one of them were *subordinate* to the other, which as it is refuted by the evidences brought for the ἰσοτιμία of *these two*, yea of *all* the *Apostles*, so it is here competently prejudiced by the *parity* of *intrusting*, and opposition of the *Provinces* so intrusted. *Paul* is *intrusted* with one, as *Peter* and *James* and *John* with the other; 1. *Peter* no otherwise than *James* and *John*, and sure they were not all three St. *Paul's superiours*; and 2. *Peter* no otherwise with the one, than *Paul* with the other, and sure they were not *mutually superiours*, or by turns the one to the other. 3. Their several *Cœtus* of *Jews* and *Gentiles* were not *subordinate*, but *disparate*, and then why should their *Apostles* or *Bishops* be *subordinate?* 4. The consequents, *v.* 9. & 11. make it yet more evident, *They part*, and sever their *Provinces* by *agreement*, v. 9. one to *betake* himself to one party, the *other* to the other, contrary to *promiscuous* preaching, which is *S. W's* pretense, and no otherwise reconcileable with *subordination*, than those *Cœtus* were *subordinate*, the one to the other. *Lastly*, when they meet together at *Antioch*, Paul *withstands him to the face*, which would not have become an *inferiour Saint* to his *superiour Pastour*; so that if this had been my onely proof (as he falsely suggests, for I immediately subjoyned *Paul's title of Apostle of the Gentiles*, Rom. XI. 13. and his assignation to it from *Christ*, and his *No-commission* from, or *dependence* on *St.* Peter, *Gal.* 1. 12--17.) yet he now sees, it had been worth his heeding, though there had been never an *accordance* to fortifie it; and that it was not thus largely deduced in the *Tr.* of *Sch.* (which is his *last* charge) the designed *brevity* of that Tract might have given an account for me.

23. Whilst he shuts up this *Scene*, some pleasure it is to him to observe that I write *phansie*, (for which he hath *fancy* with *f.* and *c.*) and indeed so I do when I think of it; and if the *f.* be the *peccant* letter in his opinion, I justifie it by analogy with the *Latin phantasia*, whence it is deduced with no greater change of sense, than is ordinary in other words, and if the *ph.* then not onely by that, but by *phœnomena*, *phasme*, *phœnix*, and a multitude of the like, and it seems his *chase* had yielded him no solid satisfaction, that he so soon let loose again after this *Butterflie*.

24. But there is a greater matter behind, for I required him that liked not my *fancy of Linus and Clement*, (ſitting together at *Rome*, one over the *Gentile*, the other over the *Jewiſh* part,) to direct his Reader to ſome other ſolid way to reconcile the *repugnances* in *ſtory*, and *S. W.* thinks not this *neceſſary*, not *that the repugnant ſides ſhould both be true*; and with all minds me that he *directed me expreſly to ſome other ways how the Fathers went about to reconcile that Controverſie, which I neither confute, nor acknowledge he did.*] My *reply* is, 1. that in that degree that the *Fathers* endeavoured to *reconcile* this difficulty, in the ſame I may be allowed to think it of *importance* to be *reconciled*, but that is not to place it in the ſame rank with *Articles* of the *Creed*, i. e. to affirm it *neceſſary*. 2. that to vindicate the *Truth* of *ancient* Writers (in matters of *fact* within their *cogniſance*) on whoſe *authority* we depend for conveying of our *Faith* to us, if it be not *neceſſary*, 'tis yet very *expedient* to the *Chriſtian Church*; and to profeſs that ſome of them have erred from the *Truth* in *relating* of things, which they had means to know (which we muſt doe, if we find them ſaying things *contrary* one to another, unleſs thoſe contrarieties are *reconcileable*) becomes him beſt, that for his whole *Faith* depends on his *preſent Oral Traditours*. To us that do not ſo, the *neceſſity* that *repugnant ſides* ſhould be *true*, ſeems as great, as thoſe *Fathers*, whom we duely *venerate*, and vouch their *Teſtimonies*, as *authentick* proofs of thoſe matters of *fact* eſpecially, which were within their, but are out of our *reach*, ſhould not have the lye given them by us, at this diſtance, who when we conſent with them uniformly, are *approveable*, but not when we aſſume to affirm in *diſſent* from them.

25. *Laſtly*, it is too like himſelf, that he complains *I acknowledge not the directions he gave*, and the ſome *other ways* he mention'd of *reconciling this controverſie*; for if the *Reader* look on *n.* 9. he ſhall find I did, and that in the very ſtyle by which he notifies them, *evaſions to ſalve the difficulty*. I might indeed have added thus much more, that he ſaith, the *difficulty was ſo ventilated, and the opinions ſo various among the ancient Fathers, even Ignatius, Tertullian, Jerom*, &c. but ſtill this was not to *direct* to *ways of reconciling* the controverſie, (ſave to ſuch as he called *evaſions*) but to ſhew it even then, in that very age (*Ignatius* being contemporary) and ſo ſoon after as *Tertullian* lived, to be *unreconcileable*; which is as if he ſhould ſay that the *ſeries of Kings of* England *or Biſhops of* Rome was not to be diſcovered in the *ſame* Age, nor two *hundred* nor three *hundred* years after; The truth is, he tells us among the *evaſions*, that * *Epiphanius recurs to this ſolution, that* Clemens *was ordained by* Peter, *and refuſed the office till the Death of* Linus *and* Cletus. And I have formerly anſwered this, 1. that *Epiphanius* mentions it onely as a *conjecture* (with an εἰ γέ πως ἐπερέχει, διανοοῦμαι δ', ὡς δείζομεν, *If it ſo were, for I conceive, I define not*) 2. that he gives us the *ground* of his *conjecture*, becauſe in ſome *records* he finds, that *Clemens counſelling ſome, ſaith thus, in one of his Epiſtles*, ἀναχωρῶ, ἄπειμι, *I retire, I am gone*, which we that have that *Epiſtle*, his *firſt* to the *Corinthians*, are enabled to underſtand better, than he could, that had it not, and ſo find, that theſe words are by him delivered in his *own* perſon, but by way of *counſel* indeed put into the mouths of thoſe, for whoſe ſakes the *diviſions*, and tumults at *Corinth* were made, that they ſhould rather *go aſide*, than let thoſe *ſtirs* continue in the *Church* becauſe of them, which as it was a *Counſel* peculiar to the then preſent circumſtances of *Corinth*, ſo it cannot be imagined to have had any place at *Rome* in *Clement*'s caſe, unleſs, as * *Baronius* thinks it poſſible, upon the making up the *partition* between the *Jews* and *Gentiles*, *Clement* (the *Biſhop* of the *Jewiſh* part) *retired* and gave up all to *Linus*, and then that is to ſtate it, juſt as I ſtate it, of the *two Cœtus*. And ſo he hath a ſatisfactory account, why being told by him, there were *evaſions* to be met with, I was bold to demand of him ſomewhat above the rate of *evaſions*, a *ſolid* courſe of reconciling this difficulty, which in reverence to the *Fathers* I think may be had, and ſhall not be diſcouraged by *S. W*'s *Contempts* from thinking it is found, leaving him to be as rude with others as I give him free leave to be with me, whilſt he deems their *repugnances unreconcileable*.

* *Hær.* 27.

* *An.* 45. n. XIV.

SECT. XXI.

John's *Province. Of the immediateneſs of his governing. Prejudices from thence to St.* Peter's *ſupremacy.* John's *dignity of place.* Baronius's *teſtimony of it, and the* accubitus. *No priority inferr'd from thence for* John. *Anſwer to* S. W's *exceptions.*

1. THE *two* and *twentieth Section* concerns the *Province* of St. *John*, the *Lydian Aſia* (the *Jewiſh* part of it, the *Gentile* being under St. *Paul*) Of which I having ſaid, that *it is manifeſt St.* Peter *had never to doe, either mediately or immediately in the planting or governing it*, he * accuſed me, that I *ſay it is manifeſt, but bring nothing to prove it.*] To this I *replied*, that I did bring my *proofs*, though *not in that, wherein this was ſaid*, yet in the *next* Sect. And *that this was an art of his*, formerly uſed, to ſay I affirmed without *proofs*, and then after ſet down my *proofs*, and confute them. If this were not in every circumſtance truly replied by me, let any man now judge.

* *Sch. Diſa.* p. 78.

2. Yet this hath no force with him, for having now minded the *Reader*, that my *Theſis was abſolute, that* Peter *had nothing to doe either mediately or immediately*, and aſſuring him that the *teſtimonies* enſuing no-way reſiſted *Peter's governing them mediately*, he thinks he hath abſolutely juſtified himſelf, and to that end he ſets down *four* of the *Teſtimonies* (whereas, there were five in that very next Sect.) and finding no more in them, but that St. *John appointed Biſhops in* Aſia, and perſwading himſelf that one is a *flat* and *wilfull falſification*, he makes his *Obſervations*, and goes off very triumphantly.

3. But to all this I anſwer, 1. that if it were convincingly proved, that theſe *four teſtimonies* did not come home to the point of *Peter*'s not *governing mediately* (which yet was not ſo much as attempted in *Sch. Diſar.* nor any notice taken of thoſe *five Teſtimonies*, Sect. 14.) yet will it not follow thence, that I *brought nothing to prove my own It is manifeſt*] For 1. if I did not ſufficiently prove it, yet if I brought *four teſtimonies* to *prove* it, it cannot be ſaid with *Truth I brought nothing*, that being acknowledged to be *ſomething*, which is accuſed to be *inſufficient*. 2. Whether thoſe *teſtimonies* did *prove* what they pretended was another *queſtion* after diſcuſs'd, when he examined them ſeverally, which

which therefore was not here to be ſaid, without begging the *Queſtion*; and 3. they might, and did infallibly *prove* ſome part of my *poſition*, and ſo were *ſomething* to *prove my poſition*, for if they were nothing, they could *prove nothing*; and 4. if what was not *proved* by theſe, were reſerved to *other* iſſues, what leaſt fault could he object to my whole proceſs? And that this was ſo, ſhall now thus appear.

4. *Firſt* in the entrance on this inſtance of St. *John*, I touch'd the ſeveral *lots* of the *Apoſtles*, the *Provinces* by joynt conſent aſſigned them, *Act.* 1. according to which *one* of the *Teſtimonies* in *Euſebius* proceeded, κλῆρον ἕνα τινα κληρώσων, *obtaining ſome one part*, or *lot* there, and then if thoſe were diſtributed with *plenitude* of *Authority* to each, and without *ſubordination* to St. *Peter*, then was *mediate* as well as *immediate juriſdiction* in *St.* John's *Province* prejudged on that account; and whether this were ſolidly inferr'd or no, muſt depend on the proofs for that, and the ἰσοτιμία of the *Apoſtles* formerly inſiſted on, and not again to be repeated at every turn.

5. *Secondly*, to the naming of *John*, was added the *Circumſtance* of *Chriſt's favour*, and *dignity* of *place* before all others, *even before* Peter *himſelf in Chriſt's life-time*, and then, though that *dignity* of *place* (though it had been conſtant) do not inſer *ſuperiority* of *power* (which I pretend not for St. *John*) yet it will be a prejudice to the veſting *ſuperiour* power in *Peter*: for then *Chriſt* muſt give *John* the *precedence*, or πρωτοκλισία, before his *lawfull Paſtour*, afford him the *upper* place at this time, who had ſo much the *lower power*, or elſe *Peter* was not advanced to this *ſupremacy* of *power*, till after this, *i. e.* till after *Chriſt's death*, and then this *ſupremacy* was not beſtowed on him, in *thou art Peter, and I will give thee the Keys*, as is pretended. That he which was *ſubjected* to another as to his *ſupreme*, ſhould yet have the *higher* place, given him by him, who had thus *ſubjected* him, I cannot believe affirmable by any ſober man; and yet thus it was in *Chriſt's laſt Supper*, if St. *Peter* had then the *ſupreme Paſtourſhip*.

6. If what I have formerly ſaid of this, be not ſufficient to prevent *S. W*'s replies on that point, in the latter part of this *Section*, I ſhall now once for all refer him to the plain words of his own *Baronius*, as ſolicitous an aſſertour of St. *Peter*'s power, as any man, * *Ratione accubitus Johannis, qui in ea Cœna primum locum poſt Chriſtum obtinuit*, &c. *In reſpect of John's lying at meat, who at the Supper obtain'd the firſt place after Chriſt, aroſe the occaſion of the contention among the Apoſtles*, Luk. XXII. *who of them ſhould be the greateſt, when the reſt ſaw that in lying at that Supper John was preferred before all.* † Adding a ſpecial obſervation of his own, that the *Apoſtles never contended thus, or took it ill that* Peter *was preferred before them, but could not well bear that* John *or* James *ſhould be eſteem'd firſt by Chriſt.* And for all this he had laid the foundation ‖ out of *Fulvius Urſinus*'s Obſervations of the *Romans accubitus*, that they did not onely place thoſe that were *dear* to them in their *boſome*, next *below* them, but that the *Rex Sacrorum*, who had the *ſupreme place* of *dignity* among the *Pontifices*, uſed to take the *uppermoſt* place in the *Pontifical Suppers*, none lying *above* him; which he there applies to *Chriſt*, and expreſly adds, that as there were *five Apoſtles in each of the other two Tables*, ſo *there were but three, where Chriſt was, Chriſt and* John, *and* Peter, which indiſputably gives this *precedence* to *John* at *this* time. This makes it leſs needfull here to repeat, what hath been formerly inſiſted on, that if *Chriſt* had declared St. *Peter* to be the *chief*, the *contention* who *ſhould be the chief*, had e'er this been ſuperſeded, and converted into this other, *who ſhould be next after St.* Peter.

* *An. Ch.* 34 n. 41. † n. 42. ‖ n. 40.

7. *Thirdly*, it was immediately added in the *Tract* of *Schiſm*, that *John was one of thoſe that by agreement went to the Circumciſion*, was aſſigned the *Jews* for his *Province*, as well as *Peter*; and then, if by that *agreement Paul* had a *full authority* and *primacy* among the *Gentiles*, and ſo *Peter* were confined to the *Jews*, it will by parity of reaſon follow, that the other two, *James* and *John* had their *full authorities* alſo among their *Jewiſh Converts*, (and ſo *James* was a *Metropolitane* at *Jeruſalem*, *John* a *Primate* at *Epheſus*) and there is not the leaſt colour producible, that what we find related of his *converting* and *governing* the *Jews* in the *Lydian Aſia*, and is thus expreſs'd by the fifth *Teſtimony*, (which *S. W.* here takes no notice of) that αὐτὸς δι' ἑαυτοῦ, *he by himſelf with ſeven Biſhops with him, undertook the care of the chief Metropolis* of it, ſtood thus by *power mediately derived* from St. *Peter*, or that he did not rule there as abſolutely, as *Peter* himſelf did either at *Antioch*, or at *Rome*, it being formerly evidenced, and now farther vindicated, that this *John* and his *Brother James* together with St. *Peter* were equal in the πρωτίμιοις or *priority* of *honour* beſtowed on them by *Chriſt* (and as ſuch, joyntly beſtowed the *Biſhoprick* of *Jeruſalem* on *James* the *Lord's Brother*) and ſo not *Peter ſupreme*, or *Prince* of them.

8. *Fourthly*, having by the *Teſtimonies* proved that *John* was the *Converter* and *Governour* of that part of the *Church*, and that *Peter* had nothing to doe there *immediately*, I demanded, *What can be ſaid by any Romaniſt in any degree probably for St.* Peter's *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, i.e. for any *mediate juriſdiction* there? Was there any the leaſt remainder of *Record*, that he ever *exerciſed* or pretended any *Juriſdiction* over them? Which though it were but a *Negative Argument*, yet being a *challenge* ſo eaſily refuted, if any ſuch thing appeared, and if it did not, it being onely *gratis dictum*, by the *Romaniſt*, it might be of ſome competent force in that *Tract* of *Schiſm*, which was not enquiring what was barely *poſſible* on either ſide, but what was in any degree *probable*, and if by this inſtance of *John*, and the other of St. *Paul* and *James*, it ſhould be found, that there were nothing to be offer'd in any degree *probable*, that *Peter* had, and *exerciſed* any kind of *Juriſdiction* in ſo great a part of the *Church*, ſubject to them, I left it to the Reader to judge, whether we were to be caſt as *Schiſmaticks* on that one account of *Peter*'s ſuppoſed *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*.

9. To all which I have now farther added a ſpecial conſideration founded on St. *John's ſurviving Peter*, and long after his *Death*, under *Nero*, and his own return from *baniſhment*, in *Trajan*'s time, ruling the *Church* at *Epheſus* perſonally; At which time I particularly demand whether the then *Biſhop* of *Rome Clement*, or his *ſucceſſour Evariſtus* had the *Paſtoral* charge over *John*, the greatly dignified, and now *onely ſurviving Apoſtle*? I know *S. W's Hypotheſis* binds him to ſay he had, but perhaps being reduced to theſe terms, *modeſty* may have ſome force with him, and not permit him to

ſubject

ſubject a *prime Apoſtle*, to one that was of a degree inferiour both to *Prophets* and *Evangeliſts*; and yet both thoſe *inferiour* to *Apoſtles* in St. *Paul*'s marſhalling them.

10. And after all theſe, why might not the words recited from *Proſper*, have had ſome force, that *Johannes apud Epheſum Eccleſiam ſacravit*, when his doing ſo at *Epheſus* is affirmed in the ſame manner as *Peter*'s and *Paul*'s doing the like at *Rome*, and nothing diſcernible that *Peter* ſhould have more to doe at *Epheſus*, than *John* at *Rome*. But I did not mean to infer any more from that (or from the other ſet in the margent before it) than what it is immediately brought to prove, *viz.* that *John* had the *converting* and *governing of all the Converted Jews in the Lydian Aſia*, of which *Epheſus* was the *prime Metropolis*, and that it could not well miſs to prove.

11. Yet to ſee, inſtead of doing any thing, 'tis diſcovered by my quick-ſighted Accuſer to be a *flat and wilfull falſification*, and in the *Index*, with the addition of *egregious and moſt wilfull*. And what can it be imagin'd, ſhould bring this *cenſure* on it ſo unexpectedly, when the words are certainly to be found in that *Father*, in that part of the *Book of Promiſes* and *Predictions*, called *Dimid. Temp.* c. 5. Why, ſaith he, *he maim'd the Teſtimony, and left out the malignant word* Gentium, *becauſe it utterly defied his party*, &c.] *I anſwer*, The truth is, that in the ſame Period, where *Proſper* mentions *John*, he mentions alſo *Peter*, *Paul*, *Andrew* and *the reſt*, with the ſeveral places where they *preſided*, and I having at this time nothing to doe but with St. *John*, took out of the *Teſtimony* (formerly cited in another part) all, and no more than concerned him. And having now formerly proved, that *Gentium* ſignified *Nations* in the *Latitude*, as they comprehend *Jews* and *Heathens* both, and not particularly *Gentiles*, it is manifeſt, that I could not with any ſenſe affix this *Gentium Eccleſiam*, *Church* of more *Nations* than one, (and as little could I the *Church* of the *Gentiles*, in his notion) to that part of the *Teſtimony* which concerned onely St. *John*, whoſe *Province* is there confin'd to *Epheſus* the *chief Metropolis* of the *Proconſular Aſia*, and was there the *Apoſtle* of the *Jews*, the *Gentile Chriſtians* of the ſame place being viſibly St. *Paul*'s *Province*. I may juſtly ask, Why was it not as much a *wilfull falſification*, to ſet down *ſacravit*, *he*, inſtead of *ſacraverunt*, *they conſecrated?* Which yet by Good luck *S. W.* marked not, elſe, judging by *parity* of *Reaſon*, here had been a *double egregious falſification*; Mean-while, 'tis manifeſt the words I cited were there, (though there were more words there alſo) and I gave no *gloſs* or *Interpretation*, or ſo much as *Engliſh* of them (which *S. W.* doth for me) but onely ſet the *Latin* in the *Margent*, *Johannes apud Epheſum Eccleſiam ſacravit*, and thoſe words being there, 'tis impoſſible it ſhould be *falſe* to ſay they were there; And then, whilſt I am thus ſecure, if ſtill it be interdicted by this Enacter of *Laws*, and that under *penalty* of *falſification*, to cite any words out of an *Authour*, without tranſcribing the *whole* Period, when onely a few words of it belong to his purpoſe, or if all men be obliged to ſet down together what is found together, without conſidering whether by ſo doing they ſhall write *Senſe* or *Non-ſenſe*, I ſhall have an Argument on *S. W*'s ſide for diſlike of *wordiſh Teſtimonies*, which I believe he himſelf did not foreſee, not onely the unavoidable length and impertinence, but the frequent *Barbariſms* alſo, and want of *ſenſe*, and common Conſtruction in ſuch *Citations*.

12. What now follows in reflexion on *Timothy*'s being under St. *Paul* over the *Gentiles* in *Aſia*, is in part the *accuſing* of me, in part the *excuſing* himſelf. I am accuſed in theſe words, *The Teſtimonies for* Timothy, &c. *are of the ſame ſtrain, or worſe, which by their reference to the immediately foregoing of* John, *muſt ſignifie that they are flat and wilfull falſifications, or worſe than ſo.*] And indeed what *worſe* thing a *Citation* can be guilty of, I cannot eaſily imagine, or what ſemblance of any thing amiſs was imputable to theſe. But I have long ſince learnt μὴ ξενίζεσθαι, not to *wonder* at ſuch *charges*, if they are become part of his *ſtyle*, elegant forms of *tranſition*, and the like, this is a very ſufficient account of them, he having not ſo much as attempted to give us any.

13. For *himſelf* he pleads thus, he had, ſaith he, *accuſed* the *Doctour of unpardonable blindneſs, and he is ſuddenly ſtruck blind himſelf, and caught that diſeaſe, onely by ſeeing Dr.* Hammond's *blindneſs.*] But 1. I could not be guilty of any *blindneſs* in interpreting the *whole entire Nation intruſted to Timothy*, of the *Gentiles onely*, when 'twas manifeſt the *Jewiſh* part of that very Nation were under St. *John*, elſe there muſt be *two Metropolitanes* of the ſame *Cœtus* in *Epheſus*, and over the *Lydian Aſia*; 2. 'tis viſible to any man that looks on the words in the * *Tr.* of *Sch.* or on † *Chryſoſtome*, whence they were cited (which he that *Cavils* at them, is obliged to doe) that they are ſpoken of *Timothy*, and to miſtake him for *Paul*, is no ſpecial act of *Quick-ſightedneſs*, or *ſeeing* another's *blindneſs*, that had committed no ſuch miſtake. But I thought not this an affected overſight, and ſo inſiſted not on it, but onely offered it to his view, who accuſed me, without the leaſt cauſe, of *unpardonable blindneſs*. And upon the ſame account I now mind him, that the *Fifth Teſtimony* concerning *John* returned from his *Baniſhment* by *Nerva's Decree* (thereby ſecured from being miſtakeable for any other) is * now by my *Diſpatcher* ſet down as a *Teſtimony* for *Timothy*: But this alſo he might *catch* as well as the former, by ſeeing the *Doctour's blindneſs*. An earneſt deſire of finding faults where they are not to be had, will work more unexpected effects than this.

* P. 82.

† *Hom.* 5. on 1 *Tim.* V. 19.

* P. 367. *l.* 23.

14. His *ſecond blindneſs*, he ſaith, *was by not ſeeing that which was not at all in the Book of Sch. but left out by my ſelf.*] I anſwer, it was in *Chryſoſtome*, whence it was cited, which he, that ſaid *I deſtroyed all by that Teſtimony*, was in reaſon to have conſulted, and asked its leave before he made ſuch a *bloudy* concluſion from it: And that I take to be a greater fault than *blindneſs*, to *catch* at words, when the Contexture in the *Authours* renders them ſecure from his *Cavils*, and yet ſtill to inſiſt after *admonition*, and never to *ſee* what is moſt *viſible*.

15. His *Four Obſervations*, that next follow concerning the *Romaniſt's Tenet*, that neither St. *Peter* nor the *Pope* were *over the whole Church immediately, but onely mediately*, I willingly acknowledge, and have already ſhewn, how my Proofs proceeded not againſt the firſt *onely*, but *both* of them. As for his *Fifth*, concerning the *limitations* of the *Provinces* of the *Apoſtles*, not as *Apoſtles*, but as *Biſhops*, I ſo far conſent with him alſo, and he knows I do ſo, that the *Apoſtolical Office*, as committed to them by *Chriſt*, was to the *Twelve*, *unlimited*, (though to *Paul* ſpecified, that it ſhould be to the *Gentiles*) and the *limitation* came from their own *aſſignations* (yet that alſo by *direction of the ſpirit*)

ſpirit) when they *diſperſed* themſelves to their ſeveral κλῆροι, and by mutual *agreement*, *Gal.* II. and then where they *preached* and were *received*, and *formed* a *Church*, there they were *Biſhops*, as over a *Province*, as long as they ſtay'd, and after their departure, left it to ſome *Succeſſour*, and ſo theſe are not (as he pretends) *quite different things*, but one regularly *conſequent* to, and *founded* in the other. And then by all this let it be judged, whether I have avoided the whole *queſtion*, or whether *S. W.* calumniates not, when he ſaith I have.

16. Of the buſineſs of *John's Accubitus* I have ſaid enough at the beginning of this *Section*, ſhewing from their own *Baronius*, that *John* had the *firſt place* at the *laſt Supper* given him by *Chriſt*, and particularly before *Peter*, and that this was look'd on by the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, as an indication * *omnibus prælatum eſſe Johannem, that John was preferred before all.* But how juſtly *S. W.* from this, or all I formerly ſaid, can infer any thing proportionable to *Birthright* or *Inheritance*, which before he inferred, or to ſo much as a *dry Primacy*, which he now † cites from me, let the *Reader* judge. All that I ſaid was, that he had the *favour of Chriſt. and dignity of place in Chriſt's life-time, even before* Peter *himſelf*, the former being cleared by the title of *Beloved Diſciple* peculiar to him, and by the latter evidently meaning no more than this πρωτοκλισία in this *laſt Supper*, which *Baronius* affirms with me. * *An.* 34. *n.* XLI. † *Sch. Diſp. p.* 371. 1.

17. But it ſeems I ſaid in my *Anſwer*, that *Chriſt's favour to him is infallibly inferr'd from the title of Beloved Diſciple*; and then forſooth, this is matter of delight to *S. W.* that the *Doctour is more certain in his Inferences, than his Church is of her Faith*; *ſince he is confident of his infallibility in thoſe, but in this he onely affirms, that it is not ſtrongly probable his Church will err*] To this worthy and witty *Reply* I anſwer, that my * words by him cited are no more uſed of our *Church*, than of any other *particular Church* (I inſtance now in his of *Rome*) and when I ſaid, that *a particular Church, that is at the preſent in the right in all matters of Faith, and hath all uſefull aſſiſtances to keep it ſo, is yet fallible, and may teach falſe*, i.e. *it is naturally poſſible, though not ſtrongly probable, as long as it is diſpoſed to make uſe of theſe aſſiſtances*, I ſaid no whit more than the *Apoſtles* warning to the *Primitive Romans* will juſtifie, *Rom.* XI. 20. 21, 22. to which I refer him. And when in continuance of the Jeer the *Proteſtant* is bid *recur for his infallible rule of Faith, to Dr.* Hammond's *Inferences*, I ſhall wiſh *S. W.* no more harm, than that the *Rule* of all his *Faith*, (I mean the *Roman Additionals*) were but as *infallible*, as is the *Inference* now before us, that *Chriſt's favour to John* is inferr'd from the *title of Beloved Diſciple*, I ſhould not then diſpute the *Truth*, or *irrefragable certainty* of them. * *Repl. p.* 16.

18. This is all he replies to that of *Chriſt's favour* to *John*; but to that of his *leaning on Chriſt's Breaſt*, he hath many things to object. 1. Says he, *We reade not he did ſo more than once.*] I anſwer, that though his *Negative ab authoritate* be not *concluding*, yet I ſhall not reſiſt the force of it, having never ſaid, or intimated that he did. 2. He *cannot imagine, that Chriſt taught his Diſciples that complementalneſs as to ſit conſtantly in their ranks at meat*] And I am of his mind, and never made uſe of ſuch an Imagination. 3. He obſerves from *Luk.* XXII. 26, 27. that *Chriſt forbad that carriage by his own example*,] And I think ſo too, and conſequently that the moſt *Apoſtolical* and *Chriſtian*, and *becoming* exerciſe of *Greatneſs* for any *Succeſſour* of *St. Peter*, is that which beſt accords to that *Text*, the *humility*, and *miniſtring*, which are there ſpecified, and the *indifferency* that *S. W.* infers thence. 4. He ſaith that *I allow St.* Peter *nothing but a dry complementary precedence, to walk, ſtand or ſpeak firſt, and now give* John *precedency of place at Table, ſo that to make my Doctrine conſonant, it muſt* (if he may be believed) *be conceived, that St.* John *had a Primacy in ſitting, St.* Peter *in ſtanding or walking, and then why not* Judas *in dipping at the ſame time in the Diſh with our Saviour*, at which it is expected the *Gentile Reader* ſhould laugh, leſt *S. W.* be diſcouraged and ſpoiled for a *Wit*. But I pray, who inferred any *Primacy* in St. *John* from this πρωτοκλισία? If the *Romaniſts* infer more than a *bare Primacy* to St. *Peter*, even an *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, from *Topicks*, as unconcluding, as his *ſpeaking* or being named, or *called firſt*, let them look to it, I plead nothing for St. *John*, which may any way juſtifie them, nor ever imagin'd any kind of *precedence*, ſo much as of *place* conſtantly to belong, or ever to have been pretended the right of that moſt *humble*, and moſt *favoured Diſciple*.

19. But the ſharpeſt Impreſſion is yet behind, *viz.* that I *did not punctually recite, and anſwer his Arguments againſt* Lazarus *being next* Abraham, *when he is ſaid to be in his Boſome*, he having *tender'd*, as he aſſures us, two *ſuch*; 1. That by my way of *interpreting* Abraham's *Boſome*, Lazarus *muſt be above all the Patriarchs and Prophets but* Abraham; 2. That *none muſt be in* Abraham's *Boſome but he*. I anſwer, that I conceived I had given ſuch a return, as prevented all ſeeming force of them, *viz.* that what is ſaid of *Lazarus* in *Abraham's Boſome*, is a *Parable*, for then it is no farther to be extended, than to that which was the *deſign* of the *Parable*, and according to that I do acknowledge, that ſuch as are repreſented by *Lazarus*, (not any *particular* perſon, but) *all* that are ſo *qualified*, as, in the *Parable*, *Lazarus* was, (under which reſemblance I doubt not but the holieſt of the *Patriarchs* and *Prophets* may be comprehended) ſhall be placed in Heaven next the *Father* of the *Faithfull*. And this he might have ſeen before, if he had pleaſed, and ſpared the reſemblance of *David George, who called himſelf Chriſt*, which will better fit thoſe that fanſie the *Pope Univerſal Paſtour*, and then pretend *Chriſt's Commiſſion* for it, than me, for but ſaying *I believed Chriſt, that* Lazarus *in the Parable* (or they that were meant by him) *was capable of the place of precedence in Heaven next* Abraham; which may as well be conceived, as that the *poor in ſpirit ſhall* be in a ſpecial manner preferred in the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*, for all ſuch are compriſed under the *Embleme* of *Lazarus*, and all they that are ſo (and not onely ſome one) are next *Abraham*: And that I ſuppoſe was the *Father's* meaning that firſt ſaid, that all the *former faithfull were in* Abraham's *Boſome*, i. e. *next Abraham*, which may as truly be affirmed of a *multitude* altogether, as of one perſon, without deſcending to the marſhalling every or any particular in that *multitude*; and ſo ſtill there is no need that *each ſhould be higheſt*, as *S. W's* fancy hath made neceſſary.

SECT. XXII.

Of Christ's Epistle to the VII *Churches. His Cavils answered.* Peter's *no Jurisdiction exercised among them. Their Customes distinct from* Romes. *Ποιμαίνειν belongs to every Bishop. Christ's Sheep. The Falsification of Falsifications examined through all his Exceptions.*

1. HIS last *Section* of his Part falls upon my demand, *What could be said in any degree probable for* Peter's *Universal Pastourship over the Lydian* Asia, *whose seven Metropoles are so early famous, being honoured with Christ's Epistle* (not to the *Revelations*, as he recites it, but) *to them in the Revelation*] And 1. I am rebuked that the latter words of their *early fame*, and *Christ's Letter*, are not *acknowledged* to have been by me designed to *prove* that St. *Peter had nothing to doe with them*, when, saith he, *these were the onely positive words in the Period, the rest interrogatory*, and also he *could not guess what they did there else*. 2. That I say I *meant onely that these seven were considerable parts of the Universal Church*, as if, saith he, *Christ wrote to them, not that they stood in need, but because they were Big ones.* 3. That I say *there is no pretence that St.* Peter *should be said ποιμαίνειν to feed or govern, or so much as to have medled with the administration of them*, answering, that he *makes account that our Saviour said thrice to* Peter, *Feed my sheep, as also that the word Sheep excluded none, but included those of* Asia *also, these being Christ's sheep as well as the rest.*] To these I answer.

2. To the *first*, that had any measure of reason or justice taken place, 'twere sufficient to *assure* him, this was not designed to *prove the main Conclusion*, that it was a mere *circumstance*, and as such, annexed, being wholly *extrinsecal* to the *argumentative part*; To which 2. the professions though of an Adversary, yet of him that *alone* could be supposed to *know* his own mind, might have added some weight, toward the silencing this suggestion, and keeping it from appearing upon the stage the *second* time, especially when his reasons for re-inforcing it now, are so far from proving ought; For 1. why might not a *proof* be proposed in an *interrogatory* form? Did he never hear of one, which the *Oracle* affirmed to be at least as wise a man, as *S. W.* (I am sure much *wiser*, and more *skilfull* in the Art of *disputing* than either he or his *Adversary*) who seldom used any form of arguing but the *interrogatory*? 2. If his faculties were applyed to the discerning of *Truth* with the fortieth part of eagerness, which is used in inventing *Cavils*, he had wit enough to have imagin'd, that *other* use, to which the *early fame* of those *Churches* might be and was designed, their being such *considerable parts of the Church*, that if *Peter* had had the *Supreme government* of them, as 'tis visible *John* had the *immediate*, it must be strange, that one being so famously spoken of by *Histories*, the other should never be the most *casually*, or darkly mention'd in them. And the same Argument may be thus farther improved, that those that have most studiously endeavoured to inhance the *Popes* power by the title of his succeeding St. *Peter*, have not yet been able to instance in any act of *Jurisdiction* exercised by him, whether in *Scripture* or *Ecclesiastick Writers*, but such as either was *common* to him with all the rest of the *Apostles*, or belonged to those parts which are acknowledged his *particular province*, under his *immediate* not *mediate Jurisdiction*.

3. To his *second* 'tis sufficient to reply, 1. that [*big*] is not equivalent to [*considerable*] many other excellencies may render them *considerable*, whom that one of *bigness* doth not; and these conspired in these *Churches*, till *heresies* creeping in among them, made their *wants* of the *Supreme Pastours* care *considerable* also; and therefore secondly, by saying that these were *considerable Churches*, I could not in any tolerable Construction be deem'd to conclude, that *Christ* had no reference to their *wants*, in writing to them.

4. To the *last*, that my saying [there is no pretence, *&c.*] related not to what *S. W.* or other *Romanists* did or could (though never so *unjustly*) pretend, but to what was, according to humane measures, meet they should pretend, or for which they had any Authority from *ancient Records* producible, to *justify* their pretences. My words related merely to matter of *Fact*, demanding, was he *Supreme Pastour of them, had he any, did he ever exercise or pretend any Jurisdiction over them*, (I ask not whether *S. W. pretend* it for him 1600 years after his death, but) whether in *times*, or *Authours* worth heeding for *matters of fact*, any footsteps of this remain, any exercise of such his *immediate Jurisdiction* in *Asia* be *testified*? Or changing the style from *Interrogatory* to *positive* (in complyance with him that cannot understand arguing in any other form) the force of what I said is this, There is no *colour of pretence* from stories of credit among men, that St. *Peter* ever medled *mediately*, (it being granted by *S. W.* that he did not *immediately*) with the *administration* of these *Churches*; nay (lest he say all this is *Negative* not *Positive* still) the *Customes* that were observed among these Asian *Churches*, so distinct from those at *Rome*, that when the *Popes* assumed a *power* any where, they were not permitted, are a competent proof, that that Asian *Province* received their *Laws* from St. *John*, without any respect to St. *Peter's*, and the *Romish Chairs mediate Jurisdiction*. The difference about the keeping of *Easter*, which was so long contested in the *Church*, one *Tradition* holding from St. *John*, the other from St. *Peter*, and the managing of this in this our *Island* between *Augustine* the *Monk* insisting on *Peter's* way, and the *Britains* adhering to theirs derived from St. *John*, are sufficient witnesses of this. As for the onely pretence that *S. W.* now offers, from *Christ's* bidding him *feed his sheep*, let it be judged, whether every *Apostle* were not intrusted with as large a *Jurisdiction* as these words can pretend for him, whether we consider the force of *ποιμαίνειν to feed* and *rule*, or the *indefiniteness* of the Phrase, *My Sheep*, which are *S. W's Topicks*; For the first, 'tis well known that the power of *feeding* and *ruling*, and so of being ποιμὴν *Pastor*, belonged not onely to every *Apostle*, but every *Bishop* in the *Church*, who is therefore styled *Pastour in Scripture*, and in the *Ancients*. And for the *latter*, the *indefinite* Phrase *Christ's Sheep*, 1. that can by no rules of *Logick* be made equivalent to *universal*, or if it could, yet the *Apostolical commission* (which extends as far as that of the ποιμαίνειν or *Pastoral*) is to *every Creature*, and so certainly *universal*. 2. I shall demand of any that knows the nature of words most *Critically*, whether when St. *Paul* commanded the *Bishops* at *Ephesus*, *Act.* XX. ποιμαίνειν τὴν ποίμνιον *to feed the Flock over which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers*, he might not have used this very Phrase which *Christ* used to St. *Peter*, *Feed Christ's Lambs or Sheep* ----and yet have been certainly resolved to have meant no more, than he now meant, in those other words, which were terminated in their *immediate Province*? This therefore being so insufficient it was but needfull that he should promise that the *particularity of this to* Peter *shall be seen hereafter*, else it might pose a

Master

Maſter, and Exacter of *Demonſtrations*, to complete this *Enthymeme* into a *Syllogiſm*, *Chriſt bad* Peter *feed his Sheep*, Ergo, Peter *had the Supreme, mediate Juriſdiction over the Aſian Churches*, and muſt be reſolved to have had ſo, though he never find, that he *medled* with them, ſo much as to *commit* them to another's charge; and though the conſequence of it be, that not *Peter* himſelf, which was a *prime Apoſtle*, but even thoſe that were inferiour to the meaneſt *Apoſtles*, muſt have a *ſupereminent power* over St. *John*; for ſuch were *Peter*'s Succeſſours at *Rome* that ſate there, when *John* reſided at *Epheſus*.

5. But though this be well over, there remains behind a moſt diſmal Crack of Thunder, with which the *Exit* to his *ſecond Act* is celebrated, *Dr.* Hammond's *Falſification of Falſifications thrice* propounded, *firſt* in the *title*, then in the *body* of the *Section*, and *thirdly* in the *Index*. And what is it that provoked this *Civil Gentleman*, that hath ſuch a mind to be *ſweet* and *gratious*, to this great ſeverity? Why, I had in the * *Tra. of Sch.* theſe words, *Doth not St.* Paul *give* Timothy *full inſtructions (and ſuch as no other Apoſtle could countermand or interpoſe in them) leaving no other Appeal or place of application for farther directions, ſave onely to himſelf, when he ſhall come to him*, 1 Tim. 3. 14, 15.] If this be the *Falſification* of *Falſifications*, i. e. the *greateſt* and moſt *notorious*, I am guilty of, it will be little for *S. W.*'s credit, which hath branded ſo many other paſſages under that title. * P. 83.

6. In theſe words it is evident by all that a matter of this *nature* is capable of, *i.e.* by the *letter*, wherein they were put, that they were not ſet as the very *words* of *Scripture*, but as a *ſenſe deducible* from thence. In which ſhould I have failed, and inferr'd more than the paſſage would bear, this were indeed a piece of ill *Logick*, reducible to that of an *illegal ſyllogiſm*, but could no more be the leaſt degree of *forgery* or *falſification* (which is the reciting *words* from a place, that are not there to be found) than they are guilty of, which appeal to any words of *Scripture*, and *miſinterpret* them. Certainly they muſt be new *Dictionaries*, not yet *authorized* in the world, by which every *miſunderſtanding* or undue deduction muſt be the *loweſt* (and that is far from the *higheſt*) degree of *Falſification*. But then ſecondly, I am not yet vouchſafed any degree of conviction from *S. W.* that here was any more deduced from thoſe verſes, than they are ready to yield without any importuning or ſoliciting them.

7. The words of the Verſes are theſe, *Theſe things I Write unto thee, hoping to come to thee ſhortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayſt know how to behave thy ſelf in the Houſe of God.* From theſe I inferr'd, 1. that St *Paul* gave *Timothy full* Inſtructions, and ſo he doth in this *Epiſtle*, and in this place *ſaith* he doth, elſe how could it have *Truth*, that he wrote it *that he might know how to behave himſelf in the Houſe of God*, *full Inſtructions* being nothing elſe, but ſuch as would *ſufficiently* furniſh him with knowledge for the diſcharge of his Office; 2. That he *left place of application for farther derections to himſelf, when he ſhould come to him*, and this is concluſible from theſe words, *Theſe things have I written, hoping to come to thee ſhortly*, which contains a reaſon why he writes no *more* copiouſly at *this* time, becauſe he *hopes ſhortly to* ſupply in perſon whatſoever in reſpect of *circumſtance*, or caſual emergence, may happen to be wanting in his preſent directions. 3. That he *leaves no other appeal or application for directions, ſave onely to himſelf*, when he *ſhall thus come to him*, and this is alſo as evident as a *Negative* can be, *no other is mentioned here*, that is certain, no other in all the *Epiſtle* nor any where elſe, which yet were neceſſary to the rendring his *directions full*, ſhow *Timothy*, *Primate* of *Epheſus*, were to behave himſelf in the *Church*, were there any *Superiour* beſides St. *Paul*, from whom he might receive *Orders*: For (beſide that *Exceptio firmat Regulam in non exceptis*, and therefore his *excepting* himſelf at his *coming*, *confirms* the *completeneſs* of the direction for all other caſes) the *Supreme Paſtourſhip* of *Peter*, had it truth in it, were of all things belonging to his behaviour in the *Church*, the moſt *neceſſary* to be told *Timothy*, that he might addreſs to him, and receive *Orders* from him, whenſoever occaſion required, as now in the *Roman* Impalement; nothing is more eminently required of a *new Biſhop*, nothing more ſolicitouſly taught him, than his *Obedience* to the *Pope*. Thus he ſees every part (ſave onely the *Parentheſis*) moſt readily reduced from thoſe Verſes; and then, what matters it, if the *words*, which were not cited thence, nor affirmed to be found there, are not found, ſo long as the *ſenſe* is, which alone was cited thence, as is moſt evident?

8. As for the *Parentheſis*, though that were therefore put ſo, that it might not appear to be any part of the *citation*, yet I ſhall ſtill (as then I did) challenge any man to make it appear in the leaſt wiſe probable, that *Peter* had any power *de jure*, or *de facto* exerciſed any, to interpoſe between *Paul* and *Timothy*, or countermand any thing that he had ordered? 'Tis not ſufficient for him now to ſay, as here he doth that I know *long agoe his anſwer*, that St. *Peter* could, for I asked not what he would ſay by way of *Confident Dictate*, but what could in *any degree probably be ſaid*, or how it ſhould be made to appear? Were not theſe words in the beginning of the *Par.* which had their influence on that that followed [*what can be ſaid in any degree probable*, &c.] *S. W.*'s bare affirmation being far from amounting to the feebleſt degree of *ſuch probability*.

9. Having thus cleared the matter of *fact* in both parts, 1. that there is no leaſt colour of his Charge of *Falſification*; 2. that all that I undertook to deduce from the two Verſes, is fairly deducible; I have no need of adding more, having already done more than he required, his great Out-cry of *Falſification of Falſifications* being ſilenced by the former, and himſelf now † confeſſing that he *charged me not for inferring thence, but for putting down thoſe words for pure Scripture*] which is without all ground or ſemblance of truth ſuggeſted by him, and in a plain *matter of fact*, (viſible by the *Letter* wherein the words are put) ſeldom exemplified among *Writers*, how be it among *Libellers*, and in *Chancery Bills*, and thoſe that are to make their advantages by the *Calumniari fortiter*, it may by *curious* Obſervers perhaps be met with. But for the very ſame trick to be plaid over ſo many times, as we have found inſtances of this in *S. W.* and an *Index* to be wholly made up of ſuch like Ware, which is a *Confeſſion* that there is no other conſiderable Ingredients in this *defence* of his, is as little for the credit of the Cauſe that could ſeem to a friend to want ſuch aids, as of him that was qualified to contribute them. † P. 376. l. 31.

10. It is now very admirable in a mere *matter of fact*, as this is, with what ſlight colours he hopes to delude the Reader into a perſwaſion, that *I did not intend to conclude thence, but that I put down the words for pure Scripture*, (when yet by affixing the place, 1 *Tim.* 3. 14, 15. I muſt neceſſarily *diſcover* the cheat to any man that could but reade, and could not be imagin'd to deſign to deceive any other) as 1. if I *intended to conclude, why*, ſaith he, *did I not put ſome expreſſion of that my intent?*] Which is as much as if he ſhould ſay, that the phraſe [*I conclude*] or [*Ergo*] were neceſſary to adorn or complete every

Period, where any *Concluſion* is made, or as if he that ſhould conclude *Iſaac* was *Abraham's Son*, and refer the Reader to *Mat.* 1. 2. where thoſe words were not found, were obliged to produce it thus, the *Holy Text ſaith* Abraham *begat* Iſaac, *Ergo*, or thence *I conclude* Iſaac *was* Abraham's *Son*; I deſire this new Regulatour of *Laws* of Diſcourſe, will firſt get his Patent ſealed, before he impoſe thus Magiſterially; In the mean to conclude me guilty of *Falſification of Falſifications*, becauſe I tranſcribed not this his Copy before I received it, is as much above the Language of the Boy, [*If you will not give me my Hat, you Lie*] as the greateſt is the moſt *trivial* Contumely, the ſtyle of *S. W.* above that of *Billings-gate.*

11. This ſame Reaſon is ſoon after a little diſguiſed, and brought on the Stage again, *becauſe*, ſaith he, *my words are poſitive and abſolute, not expreſt like an Inference or Concluſion.*] When 1. they were *interrogatory*, and that, as was lately ſaid, no unskilfull form of *concluding* from any premiſſes, be they places of *Scripture*, or any other.

12. His next reaſon is, *becauſe they are Relations of matters of fact*] And ſo was *Iſaac*'s being *Abraham's Son*, even now mention'd. His *laſt*, becauſe *they that conclude from Scripture, put the place firſt, and then deduce from it*] And ſo may they too, that *put* the place *laſt*, and no Rules have by any *Artiſts* been impoſed on ſuch indifferent, variable circumſtances, as theſe. And let him beſtow an hour in any *Authour* he pleaſe, that writes of matters of *fact*, from others *Teſtimonies*, and mark if he find not this exemplified. It is true they that write *Syllogiſms*, ſet down their *premiſſes* firſt, and then the *Concluſion*; But I never entred into Bond to *S. W.* to write nothing but *Mood* and *Figure*, and I think he hath given me neither *reaſon*, nor *example*, to alter my courſe.

13. But it ſeems I told him, that *to ſay I inferred the whole Concluſion from the word* [*come*] *was one of* S. W's *arts*, when yet, ſaith he, *I confeſs the ſame a little before in theſe expreſs terms, I thought it concluſible from St.* Paul's *words*] But a more moderate ſagacity than *S. W.* is maſter of, would have ſufficed to diſcern, that there is ſome difference betwixt the *Monoſyllable* [*Come*] and [*the words of St.* Paul] as thoſe ſignifie, in a large *plural*, no leſs than *two Verſes*; from the latter I affirm'd my ſenſe *concluſible*, and have ſhew'd him how it was ſo; and that is very reconcileable with the juſtice of my accuſing *S. W*'s arts in ſuggeſting I did it from the *former.*

14. Again he blames me for ſaying, *I thought my grounds were viſible, when*, ſaith he, *the jeſt is, that he never laid any ſuch pretended grounds at all in the Book of Sch. and ſo they could not be viſible.*] But I think *S. W.* hath laughed in the wrong place, and that the *jeſt* really was, that he thought, or was willing to perſwade others, that the mind had not *eyes*, as well as the *body*, or that nothing could be *viſible*, though never ſo obvious to be *deduced*, but what was *in terminis* at large exhibited. But how far they come home to the inferring my *Concluſion*, that hath been ſhew'd already alſo, and that *ex abundanti*, there being no need thereof to vindicate me from his charge of *Falſification.*

15. Next *I did my duty*, ſaith he, *either in ſhewing that thoſe words* [*No other Apoſtle could countermand, No Appeal*, &c.] *were expreſt in the Teſtimony, or concluded thence*] 'Twere ſtrange if no ſuch power of *Countermand*, or Appeal being extant, I might not ask, whether St. *Paul* left any, and by ſo asking expreſs my ſelf to ſuppoſe he left none, without ſhewing thoſe words in St. *Paul* [*I leave no Appeal*, &c.] As for deducing it thence, it is ſufficient, that it is *not found* there, if at the ſame time it can no more duly be pretended that ſomewhere elſe it is to be had, than 'tis found there; Againſt which it was, that I made the demand, and find it not yet anſwered by *S. W.* any otherwiſe than by his putting a bare empty claim for St. *Peter*, unleſs we reſume his forementioned, *Feed my Sheep*, which hath, when it was produced, had its due conſideration alſo.

16. But *the Doctour*, ſaith he, *counterfeits himſelf ignorant whom we hold for Head of the Apoſtles, ſaying, let him be nam'd, and his power ſpecified*] I anſwer, the Doctour pretended no more *ignorance*, than he truly lay under, for his * words are by *S. W.* maim'd, and cut ſhort; they were thus, *If any could*, i. e. *could by any authority given him by Chriſt countermand*, &c. *Let him be nam'd and the power ſpecified, and proved, by virtue whereof he ſhould thus act*; It was then the *proving* his right to any ſuch power, and not onely the *naming* or *ſpecifying*, which I demanded; and of that I am ſtill *ignorant*, as *S. W.* appears to be, by leaving out, when he ſet down the former, that part of the words, on which the whole weight lay, and to which the other were but *introductive*, and replying no word to them.

* *Anſ.* p. 57.

17. 'Tis true he after proceeds to thoſe words, ſo far as to *jeer* and poſſeſs himſelf of the *Anſwerer*'s privilege, *to prove nothing.*] But neither will that clear his dealing in this matter; For 1. had he joined the *proving his power* with the *naming* and *ſpecifying* it, there had then been no place for his charge of my *counterfeit ignorance*; And 2. though the *Anſwerer* is not always bound to *prove*, yet when the Argument is drawn from the *No proof* producible for a pretended *power*, the *Anſwerer* muſt either deny the premiſſes, or yield the *Concluſion*, and if he deny the premiſſes, he is in all reaſon to ſpecifie what this *proof* is, and on what grounds pretended, that ſo the *Diſputant* may invalidate his Plea, by ſhewing how weak that *proof* is. Thus may injurious Invaders be forced in *Chancery* to produce their *Deeds*, and not continue to hold either by ſullen *Violence*, or by Title, which is therefore concealed, becauſe it is ſo little the Pretender's Intereſt to ſee the Sun.

18. But again the *Doctour wrongs* S. W. *in ſaying he dares not, doth not affirm that St.* Peter *had power over the reſt of the Apoſtles*, I anſwer, that he miſinterprets my ſaying, I ſaid, *he dares not, I am ſure doth not affirm this*: But what is *this*? That muſt appear by the former words, which comprehended the power given by *Chriſt*, the *proof* as well as *pretenſe* of that *power*, by which he ſhould thus act; And this was it, that I ſaid *S. W.* did *not affirm*, i. e. did not *ſpecifie* and *prove* the giving any ſuch *power* from *Chriſt*, which ſure he did not in this place, where he never pretended to doe it, and I ſuppoſed he *durſt* not *affirm* it, becauſe though he may be valiant enough, I took him not to be any Worker of *miracles*; and to pretend ſome words of *Chriſt*, ſuch as *Feed my Sheep*, and the like, and to be able to infer no uſefull Concluſion from them, would be no act of ſolid *valour* or *daring*, and ſo no prejudice to *S. W.* to be deemed to want it. And if he be not of this mind, but ſtill makes his profeſſion, that he both *affirms* and *dares maintain it againſt* D. H. *and forty more learned than himſelf*, and is ſo *reſerved*, as not to indulge to ſo many *demands* (which if they had been his, had been open *defiances* and *challenges*) one word of *proof* of this *power* being given *Peter* by *Chriſt*, he is the very ſame *S. W.* that I ever took him

him for; and there is an end of his *Section* of *Sections*, which is to be known by the name of *Falsification* of *Falsifications*, as that with some truth signifies the *false* accusing another, which is most innocent, of what he is most guilty himself. And this concludes at length his *Second Part*.

CHAP. VII.

A Reply to his Third Part.

SECT. I.

His Pleas of possession and Oral Tradition. Of Testimony-proofs, Deductions, Distinctions. No proving a Negative by Testimonies. Of Pasce oves. *S. W's memory. The conference betwixt* Reinolds *and* Hart. *The power promised St.* Peter *with the Keys. How maintained by* S. W. *to be his incloſure. Of calumniating their Tenet.*

1. WE are now come to the last stage of our δολιχοδρόμιον, and find not much in his first Section which exacts any other Reply than of remitting the Reader to what hath been already said in the * *Ans. Schis. Disar.* and now in this Rejoynder, in the view of his grounds, which I made so largely and particularly then, that there might be less need afterwards of repeating. He shall there find an answer satisfactory to his Question, wherewith he sets out, and perceive my sense, how far the Papal Authority, as he maintains it, or the possession by him pretended, was removed from being so qualified, that nothing but perfect demonstration might safely be heard against it, and how little could be said for them from his own Topick of Oral Tradition, and withall how no force there was in that, as by him it is managed, to demonstrate any thing to come from the spring-head of Truth. * *p.* 59.

2. As for his Notion of Testimony-Evidences, that they "must be by words so directly expressing "the thing to be proved, that they need no additions or explications to bring them home to the mat-"ter, but are such as the alledger himself were he to express his thoughts in the present controversie "would make choice of to use.] I have oft prevented his present challenge, and told him I utterly dislike his Notion on this account, because there are multitudes of ways of testifying the same thing, and so of inferring a conclusion regularly, beside that of finding it in express words; and indeed whatsoever words the alledger shall have chosen to put his Conclusion in, he might with tolerable, perhaps with equal fitness have chosen many others; and still there is such a thing in the world, as rational deduction, which is of as full force with all rational men, who judge as well as see or hear, as the expressest words can be imagined to be; Nay, be the words never so express, yet he knows, there is place for distinctions, and those are not fetched from or found in *express words*, but from other Circumstances, which though not expressed in the τὸ ῥητὸν, may yet be collected from the τὸ λογικὸν or *rational importance* of the *Context*, &c. And whether it be thus rightly deduced or no (not whether it be to take place, though it be) is the onely question at any time among those that seek Truth, and not occasions of *cavilling*. And so he sees, express words are so far from being the onely means of solid probation, that others are oft such, when they are not; and when all is done, the eyes of the mind and not of the body must judge of these things, else wise and learned men would have no advantage of Fools and Idiots.

3. Here indeed he talks very devoutly of *hazarding souls*, and *schismatizing upon no better grounds*, as if there might be any good grounds to schismatize upon, or as if it were granted betwixt us that we *schismatize*, and the onely Question were of the goodness of our *grounds*, when he knows we give over all farther dispute, when once we shall be proved to have *schismatized*, being resolved that no cause or Grounds can justifie Schism in those that are truly the Separatours.

4. As for his kinds of *Testimonies*, some *manifesting that the thing must be*, *others probable*, *inferring that they may*; No man doubts but there is such a distinction and convenient place for both of them; of the former, against him that denies the necessity, of the latter, against him that denies the possibility of a questioned truth: But for producing of, and depending on such onely, as infer no more than possibilities, when there is need of more, whether we are found guilty of that, or whether our deducing from senses as well as from express words, render us guilty of it, these were too much to the matter for *S. W.* to make the subject of his enquiries; 'Tis more for his turn to amuse the Reader, than to speak to that which alone is pertinent, and this with him is another part of this Character of rigorous Discourse.

5. Next enters a Charge of *Prevarication from my promise*, That *in stead of bringing evidences of my own, I solve their pretended ones, and so sustain the part of the Defendant, when I was the Opponent.*] To this I gave before a double Answer:

1. That the *one possible way to testifie a Negative, was to take a view of the places the affirmers pretend, and shew they have no such force in them.*

2. *That an Opponent may be such*, i. e. *discharge his office by opposing affirmations* (as well as negations) *of other men*; and that he must doe, *by invalidating their testimonies*, on which they found or defend their *affirmations*. Now the latter of these, which evidently cleared me from all colour of the charge of prevaricating from my promise or office, was not usefull for him to take notice of; The former he recites, and 1. the [one possible way] are canting words, and 2. if one signifie onely, then there was never so strange a position heard of in the Schools, who have taught concluding in *Celarent* and *Ferio*, *without answering arguments in Barbara and Darii.*] To these I answer.

1. That the One possible, cannot reasonably signifie other than the *onely*, as *unus* and *unicus* are all one; if this be *the One possible*, then there is no other possible but this; and then, where's the canting, but in *S. W's* (not fancy, but) resolution to cavill at every thing?

2. For the Logick, and appeal to the Schools, how ordinary is it there to hear, that it is impoſſible *to prove a Negative by Teſtimonies?* By a Negative meaning as now we do, in matter of fact, that ſuch a thing was not done or ſaid by Chriſt, *&c.* And the reaſon is evident, becauſe if any man ſhould thus teſtifie negatively, his Teſtimony were inſufficient (and then that which hath no means but inſufficient to work it, is not poſſible to be done) for the utmoſt he can with Truth teſtifie, is, that he neither ſaw nor heard the thing done or ſaid, at this or that time, which notwithſtanding, the thing might at that time be ſaid without his hearing it, or elſe perhaps it was ſaid at ſome other time; And this is moſt clear in the preſent Queſtion of the Univerſal Paſtourſhip held by donation from Chriſt; for how can any man teſtifie Chriſt gave it not, no man being always preſent with Chriſt both on earth and in heaven, in either of which 'tis poſſible he ſhould give it. And indeed for any man to ſay, he gave it, and not to aſſign the time and words wherein he gave it, or ſome competent Teſtimony to eſtabliſh it, is perfect vanity, and as unworthy as impoſſible to be refuted, This then that was by *S. W*'s directions to be hiſt out of the Schools, is, in the matter before us, the onely method, that either Logick or Reaſon will allow us to make uſe of (I ſaid not to prove, but) to teſtifie our Negative, by invalidating their affirmative, and ſhewing that thoſe words wherein their ſtrength lies, conclude nothing in favour of them. As for his good friends, *Celarent* and *Ferio*, there may be other turns for them to ſhew their uſefulneſs, and in effect uſe hath already been made of them, when by the ἰσοτιμία of *Paul* and *him*, or of the *twelve* and *him*, the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* of one of them was diſproved, Thus, No one of two or twelve *equals* is *Univerſal Paſtour*, *Peter* is one of two or twelve *equals*, *Ergo*: But it was not of *proving*, but teſtifying of *Negatives*, i. e. *proving* them by that one way, *à teſtimonio*, that I ſpake; and he wanted not abilities to diſtinguiſh theſe, if he had pleaſed to have been ſerious, when he had no temptation to the Contrary.

6. But from hence he thinks fit to make his retreat to his old hold of *Tradition Oral*, and renouncing all other ways, but that, of *interpreting* the *Texts*, on which he grounds his Tenet, he finds the *Dr's diſcurſive* faculty *infinitely weak*, the *utmoſt my way can aſpire to, being but this*, that the *Concluſion follows not out of thoſe Teſtimonies, not that the thing is in it ſelf untrue, their Faith being not founded in ſuch texts as explicable by wit, but onely by Univerſal Tradition.*] I ſhall be ſo far from oppoſing him in any part of this his retreat, ſave onely in that one, of his Notion of *Tradition*, that I ſhall devolve *this* (as ſafely I might the whole) *Controverſie* to that Iſſue. For if by *Tradition* truely and properly ſo called, he ſhall ſhew that to be the meaning of his *Texts*, which he pretends from them, if the *Univerſal Church* of *Chriſt* of all *ages* have recieved from the *Apoſtles*, that either *Feed my ſheep*, or *thou art Peter*, &c. did ſignifie the inſtating the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip* on *Peter*, he ſhall never by my conſent be troubled with *explications of wit*, or any thing that *Grammatical* or *Critical quibbling*, as he calls it, can bring againſt him. But when by *Tradition* he ſhall mean no more, but the Language of the *preſent Roman Church*, and think by his *Explications of wit* to infer this to be the very voice of the *Apoſtles*, and that it is impoſſible for the moſt fallible *Romiſh Mothers* to teach their Children any thing but what is thus derived from the fountain of all *Truth*, he may think himſelf ſafe in this *Sanctuary*, but will be fetched out from the *horns* of *his Altar*, by ſhewing that this his laſt pretence and reſerve is the feebleſt of all the reſt. And that hath been ſo lately done, by examining the ſtrength thereof, in the Chapter of *Tradition*, that though he will repeat upon any, or no occaſion, I muſt not be ſo importunate, nor yet have I any thing elſe to doe toward the deſtroying his pretenſions, his *Confeſſions* being now very frank, that *all the Teſtimonies which he pretends from Scripture for his Tenet*, are *words left without life, and ſtark dead to his hands*, and then ſure they are no better in his own opinion, than thoſe *mute* ones of mine, which were to be hooted off the ſtage, for being ſuch. This I deſire he will remember, when he comes to fetch proofs from hence, and not now onely when he ſeems to deſpiſe them.

7. The *Next* part of his procedure is to accuſe me for *not inſiſting*, in the *Tr.* of *Schiſm*, on this text *Feed my ſheep*. And having in the *Reply* mentioned to the *Catholick Gentleman*, *three heads* of *Arguments to* prove, that that was no more than an *Exhortation* to *Peter* to perform his duty, and in the *Anſw. to Sch. Diſa.* told him the reaſon of my *not handling this, becauſe it had been ſo oft handled already and found to have no force in it*, and that his with me was like Dr. *Stapleton's dealing with Mr. Calvin*, when among the *Romaniſts Arguments* from *Scripture*, he having made no mention of *Lu.* XXII. 31. the *Dr.* tells him, *he had left it out, becauſe he knew ſuch clear words could not be eluded by any Cavilling*: to this I added what paſſed between Dr. *Reinolds* and Mr. *Hart*, when all the ſtrength, that Dr. *Stapleton* could infuſe into it, was found, and by the manager *yeilded* to be inſufficient, were it not that *other texts*, (ſaid he) affirmed the ſame, particularly that of *Lu.* XXII. 31. Which was ſoon diſcovered alſo to have no force in it; and all this under the hands of both theſe diſputers, teſtified to be the iſſue of that *Diſpute*. To all this what hath he to reply? Why, 1. *I am the inheritour of Mr.* Calvin's *faults, and therefore may well be uſed as he was.* 2. *I am his friend, and therefore am not, in what I ſay of Dr.* Stapleton *and him, to be believed unleſs I prove it better.* 3. For my *account of Feed my ſheep, 'tis onely ſome account telling him ſleightly three things*, whereas *S.W. demands, Is there no particularity in order to St.* Peter? *An hard caſe, that after Chriſt's ſaying*, Simon ------ *loveſt thou me more than theſe*; &c. *Nothing ſhould be ſpoken in order to* Peter *in particular.* 4. *He asks, whether I have reckoned all the places in Controvertiſts, where this and other texts have been anſwered*, and *where are my Tables of accounts*, &c. 5. For the *Conference* with *Hart*, he will not *credit the Relation*, and ſaith the *words of* Hart *are ſillily unlikely*, and that *ſo 'tis alſo*, that he *ſhould fly from Feed my ſheep, to* Lu. XXII. 31. And he asks in what *words I think he ſhould place his Argument*. To all theſe I muſt, as briefly as I can, make my *Reply*.

8. To the *firſt*, that when, and whatſoever he ſhall prove to be any of Mr. *Calvin's faults*, I will aſſume at the leaſt warning, either to defend Mr. *Calvin*, that it is *no fault*, or *my ſelf*, that I am not *guilty* of it; but at the preſent I have no need of either: The *fault* before us, though accuſed by Dr. *Stapleton*, being vindicated (would one think it?) by *S.W.* who, in the *laſt* branch of this *Reply*, juſt now ſet down, makes it a *ridiculous thing*, for Mr. *Hart*, to be thought to make uſe of *Lu.* XXII. 31. for a *proof* of *Peter's Supremacy*, asking where we will *pretend he placed the moſt force*, in *Simon*, in *Satan*, in *Sifting*, in *wheat*? And I am ſcoffed at for a *great wit*, to bring ſuch *unlikely trifles for my Excuſe*.

And

And yet now, to shew on which side the *wit* lay, 'tis *Calvin's fault* (and deserved the same *reprehension*, that *S. W.* laid on me, and that is severe enough) to think this very place *Lu.* 22. 31. *so unsignificant*, as not to take notice of it. Let that serve for his *first Answer*.

9. To his *second*, 'tis yet a little more *strange* that his *eyes* now, as before his *memory* should fail him, for I cited the very place in * Dr. *Stap.* Where he makes this return to Mr. *Calvin*; what *better proof* would he require of words, than citing them in the *Language*, and from the very *Chapter* where they are extant? Did he not see this? where then were his eyes? Did he see it? Where was his *Truth*? * *Princip. doctr. lib.* 6. *ca.* 8.

10. To the *third*, that I should have thought *three* heads of *Arguments*, so easie to be dilated on, were a competent tender of *probations*, without descending to write *Discourses* on each of these heads; however, that he that saith *nothing* to *them*, was not to be gratified with more, when being so *sleightly proposed*, they might have been the more *briefly answered*; But instead of that, asking a question nothing to the purpose (for there might be *somewhat* spoken to *Peter in particular*, without giving him the *supremacy*) and crying *an hard case*, and repeating the same question in other words, is all the return he is pleased to afford, and that in his opinion is enough, it seems, to outweigh *many heads* of *Arguments*.

11. To the fourth, that I have no *Tables of accounts* ready, nor mean to purchase his favour or his mirth at so dear a rate; That it was so often answered, that I could not imagine it would be deemed usefull I should descend to it, will be made good without appeal to an Auditour. The referring him to Dr. *Reynolds* his *Answer to Dr. Stapleton*, as his treasures were perfectly rifled by M. *Hart*, is sufficient for my discharge; for who need transcribe what is there so visible? and if it will not be believed, that conference is truly set down, yet it cannot be questioned, whether those Arguments be there produced, and there answered.

12. To the last, that I shall not attempt any violence on his faith, or perswade him that there was such a Man and Disputant as M. *Hart*, that we have the true Copy of his *dispute*, *i. e.* that all men that had to doe in that Edition, parted not with their wits as well as *honesties* at the undertaking; for so they must, had they forged a thing so gross and easie to be disproved, and so much to their own disadvantage, if it were disprovable; for I know all this signifies nothing with *S. W.* whose measures of egregious *falsifications* are such, that nothing can secure from them; I shall best satisfie the Reader, if I consider the weight of his reasons for this suggestion; and first, the sillines *of the words of* M. *Hart* (the very *rehearsal* of which, saith he, *is enough to disgrace the whole relation*) will not be so convincing an Argument of their *falseness*, if it be remembred on what Text it was that his words were spoken, even that of *Luk.* 22. Simon, Simon, *Satan hath desired to have thee*, &c. of which *S. W.* pronounceth *there is nothing found to prove the point of Supremacy*, and challenges any Protestant to pretend; from which of the words it should be deduced; and if there were nothing, why is it incredible, that he should be able to fetch nothing out of it? and if so, what could he doe more than he did, adhere to it, for D. *Stapleton's* sake, from whom he had it, and having some implicite faith and kindness for it, be content to take his leave of it, in this manner? And truly if *S. W.* could think fit to plead for his more improvable place, *Joh.* 21. as he did with [*An hard case, if thrice saying* Simon, *Son of* Jonas, *lovest thou me more than these? and thereupon, Feed my sheep, nothing should yet be spoken in order to St.* Peter *in particular.*] I know not why Mr. *Hart* should be despised for taking his leave in his manner of an *unimprovable*.

13. As for his second pretended *improbability that he should fly from Feed my sheep*] *to* Luk. 22. 31. the account is so visible, that nothing but his *interest* to have it concealed, could miss it. For that of *Feed my sheep*] he had driven as far as it would goe, and this other of *Lu.* XXII. was his onely *reserve*, and that of which even now we heard Dr. *Stapleton's* boast, *Nullo Cavillationis fuco tam manifesta verba eludi posse, that nothing could elude such manifest words*; and 'tis now much more strange that *S. W.* should thus despise, and in another's person reproach the *Dr's Authority* and *Judgment*, than that Mr. *Hart*, who profest to allow his *Conduct*, should be led by it. Meanwhile we have here an instance of *S. W's Justice to others*, as well as *Civility* to his *friends*, when Dr. *Stapleton's* words to Mr. *Calvin*, pretending that *Lu.* XXII. 31. is an *invincible place*, must be solemnly defended, and yet the no-appearance of force in that *Text* be an *Argument* sufficient to discredit the whole relation of that *conference*, of which this is one (though a most inconsiderable) part. Thus happy is *S. W.* in making good his charges whether of *injuriousness*, or of *falsifications*.

14. From hence we are led to a review of my *Calumniating the Catholicks tenet concerning the power of the Keys*, in calling it a *peculiarity and inclosure of St.* Peter. The thing I said in the *Tr. of Sch.* is visible in these words, *To him that pretends this donative (of the Keys*, Mat. XVI. 19.) *and consequent power, as a peculiarity and inclosure of St.* Peter's, *&c.*] I say not here that they say the *power* of the *Keys* is St. Peter's *inclosure*, but presume they say that this *Donative*, or what was given *Peter* in that *place*, Mat. XVI. *was given to him alone*, and so was his *peculiarity* and *inclosure*, for else how can they found his *Supremacy* here? And therefore to the *Disarmer's* objection of *Calumny*, I confronted his own words in several places, especially these, that the *promise of giving the Keys of Heaven, was given to St.* Peter *in particular*, and again, *that it was performed by a performance in particular*, (as that differs from the *performance* to *all* the *Apostles in general*) from whence, and his rebuking me that I omitted this *performance* in *particular*, I thought I might conclude, that what was promised and performed to *Peter in particular*, was in his opinion *something* which was not *comprehended* in that to all in *general*, and then that was in his opinion St. *Peter's peculiarity* or *inclosure*. Here it is manifest that both in the *first* draught, and in the *defence*, I speak not of the *power of the Keys* simply, but of that whatsoever it is, which was given *Peter particularly* in that place; and if so, how can I have calumniated them in supposing that they make it St. *Peter's inclosure*, which unless they do, they cannot imagine how to gain any thing by this place.

15. He now will perswade his Reader, that *I expresst no such thing*, nay that *I carried it so, as if they held that no Apostle had the Keys but St.* Peter, and he will give his reasons for this, 1. From the *position of my words*, which after [*I will give the Keys*] *subjoyn, But to him that hence pretends this Donative*, &c. Whence he concludes, *this Donative* was with me the *power of the Keys in general.*] I answer, by *this*

Donative

Donative, I meant that, whatſoever it was, which was there *promiſed St.* Peter, abſtracting from the *queſtion* what *power* it was; I acknowledge with him that ſomewhat was *promiſed St.* Peter in that place, but afterward ſhew, that what was there promiſed him, was, *Matt.* 26. 11. *promiſed all*; This is not to *calumniate* their *tenet*, but *refute* it.

16. His *ſecond* reaſon is, becauſe one of my Conſiderations *to ſuperſede their concluſion*, was the *Scriptures that expreſs onely that the Keys were given all the Apoſtles in Common, but nothing at all that they were given equally to all.*] I anſwer that it is true, that what was given *Peter* in one place, I ſhew was given all the *Apoſtles* in another, and from thence think it reaſonable to reſolve, that they pretend amiſs that there is any thing *peculiar* to St. *Peter* there, and this is equally true, be it a *power*, or *degree of power*; for if that *degree* be any thing, and yet nothing were given in the one, which is not given in the other, then no ſuch *degree* was there given; Let it then be ſhewed by any *Romaniſt*, that what was promiſed *Peter*, and all the *Eleven together*, in one place of *Matthew*, was promiſed *Peter*, in an *higher degree* in the other, and he ſhall then have made good his pretences; yet cannot conclude thence, that *I calumniated their tenet*, who, by ſaying that the *Donative* there, was not as they pretend, St. *Peter's incloſure*, affirm this, of *whatſoever* it is, that they ſhall either ſhew or pretend to be *his Donative*.

17. His third reaſon is, by *asking what means incloſure, and is it not a plain expreſſion, if applied to* Peter's *having the keys, that none had that power but* Peter?] I anſwer, *Incloſure* doth ſignifie, that none elſe had that *Power* ſo *incloſed*, if it were a *power*; none that *degree*, if it were but a *degree of power*. But I confined not the words to *one*, or *other*, but to that *whatever* it was, that was *promiſed St.* Peter in that place. And is not that *that particular power of the Keys* in the *Tr. of Sch*? Is not *this Donative* and
* *Sch. Diſpat.* *this power*, Mat. 16. 19. *that particular power*? With what conſcience then can he,* ſay, it is not; or
p. 392. *lin.* 2. accuſe of *Calumniating* ſo reſolvedly and imperſuaſibly, when himſelf is ſo palpably guilty of it, and none elſe in the leaſt degree of appearance?

18. His laſt attempt is to *deliver me from ſprights*, as he will ſtyle the contrary ſuggeſtions, which the *Cath. Gent.* and *S. W.* the other appearance of him, made of me, concerning my denial and conceſſion, that the *Keys were given eſpecially to St.* Peter.] When though I uſed other words *peculiarly* and *particularly*, yet I uſe not the word *eſpecially*. This notwithſtanding, he will now *prove* that both of the *Suggeſters* ſaid *true*; the firſt, becauſe *I ſay the Keys were given in common and equally to all*, the latter, *becauſe I ſaid the promiſe was made to* Peter *peculiarly and particularly*, and then the *light of nature is invoked* to *teſtifie* againſt me.] But the *light* of the *Sun*, which enables me to reade, tells me, that it was of the words I ſpake, and not of what may by *equivalence* be gathered from them. And ſo by his recital of my *words* I am acquitted, the word [*eſpecially*] being not found in any. Otherwiſe, if of the *ſenſe* he will now have me ſpeak, he knows long ſince, that I ſcruple not to deny any *eſpecial*, as that ſignifies *higher degree of power* to belong to St. *Peter*, though I acknowledge, that *particularly* (but that is not in an *eſpecial*, as that is *higher degree*,) the *power of the Keys* was promiſed him, as to every of them (when to all together) the ſame was promis'd after. All that I am to learn hence is, that he that will not in another allow *Deduction* from *Teſtimonies* (as elſewhere, ſo at the beginning of this *Section*) without *expreſs* words, when *ſenſe*, not *words*, is in *Controverſie*; can, when 'tis his own *Intereſt*, be well content with *equivalence* and *deductions*, when the queſtion is onely of the words. And let this ſerve for his *firſt Section*.

SECT. II.

S. W's *proof of St.* Peter's *ſupremacy from* Mat. 16. *The promiſe to him in particular acknowledged. Not any particular promiſe, in reſpect to the matter. Particularizing circumſtances do not encreaſe the power. What promiſed St.* Peter, *repeated to all.* Theophylact, Cyprian. *The performance of the promiſe of* Jo. 21. S. W's *arguments to draw ſupremacy from it, fruſtrated.* Paſce oves, *no commiſſion. Our Paraphraſe of that Text.*

1. HIS *ſecond Section* is reſolved to reſume and repeat what he had ſaid, to conclude St. *Peter's ſupremacy* from *Chriſt's promiſe* of the *Keys* to him *particularly*, Mat. 16. His proof, the Reader may
* *P.* 394, 395. reade* at large. The beſt abſtract I can Collect of it is, that it was given him after a *particular manner*, after a *particularizing way*, after a *manner not competent to the reſt*; *a particular bleſſing of* Peter, *ſprung from a particular act of his confeſſion of Chriſt's Divinity, his and his Father's particular names, God's revealing to him in particular*, then *Chriſt's ſaying to him, then his alluding to his particular name given him by Chriſt, thou art* Peter or a *Rock, and upon this Rock I will build my Church.* Then the *promiſe in the ſame tenour Copulatively. And I will give unto thee (ſtill with the ſame ſpecialty) the Keys*, &c. *and whatſoever thou*, &c. From all which he concludes, that the *Confeſſion, bleſſing, name, alluſion*, being not *common to the reſt, the promiſe-expreſſing words were ſpoken to him in a way not common to the reſt, and this being the promiſe of the Keys and their power, this was made to* Peter *after a manner not common*, i. e. *particular*, and *upon particular occaſions ſpringing from*, and *alluding to his particular perſon*, All this for the *promiſe*.]

2. And what ſhould one now doe, but ſtand ſtill and admire this rare *Machine*, this exquiſite piece of *Demonſtration*, which being ſo advantageouſly framed, as to make *particular* uſe of every ſyllable in the period, moſt irreſiſtibly concludes, that what *Chriſt* ſpake, *Mat.* XVI. was at that time ſpoken particularly to St. *Peter*, and to no other *Apoſtle*, but to him at that time. This is the utmoſt that his minuteſt diſſections, and repetitions of *particular* and *particulariſing manner*, and way, and variety of *circumſtances*, as yet appear to aſpire or pretend to; and it was all granted him before he began, *viz.* that in this place the power was promiſed to one particular perſon, and that St. *Peter*. Nay the *Original tract. of Sch.* had done him this ſervice, having purpoſely eſtabliſhed this, and ſhew'd the ſole uſe that properly belonged to the obſerving it, the veſting a plenitude of *Eccleſiaſtical power* in *ſingle* perſons, and not in *Communities*. And ſo *S. W.* (in a fit of *kindneſs* once) hath taken *exquiſite* care and pains to make good our *Prelatical* tenure againſt the *Presbyterians*, and *Conſiſtorians*, but hath brought

brought forth nothing elſe by all his ſqueezing, I ſhould wrong him to ſay that he doth yet ſo much as pretend, that either any other power, or any *higher degree* of the ſame *power* was here given St. *Peter*, than what at another time was given all the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, for I cannot wreſt any ſuch *poſitive* concluſion from his words, thus far recited (the word *ſpecialty* indeed once uſed, ſounds a little ſuſpiciouſly if compared with his notion of it * for the *ſpecial* or *chief*, but I that rejected it then, ſhall not be ſo unkind, as to bind him to it now, and therefore am onely to ſtand at the gaze, to expect, where, and by what arts any more will hereafter be concluded from it? * P. 8. *l.* 2.

3. Mean while, I ſhall yield him in an ample manner, that though all the *Circumſtances* which he ſuppoſes to *particulariſe*, are not ſo *particularly* reſtrainable to St. *Peter*, as to be incompetible to the other *Apoſtles*, (for I muſt in charity believe that ſome other of the *twelve* did acknowledge the *Divinity* of *Chriſt*, and had it revealed to them *by the Father*, and ſo were bleſſed, and deſigned as *ſtones*, or if he will have it ſo, rocks, on which *Chriſt* would *build his Church*, and ſo the *Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were* now in the *Divine Deſtination*, as after in the common promiſe, made over to all them) yet ſome *circumſtances* are thus *particular*, viz. his name, and the name of his *Father*, and the alluſion to the *Name Peter*, given him by *Chriſt*, and he hath moſt irrefragably proved, that theſe three are not common to the reſt, for he were hard hearted that would not yield, that *John*'s name was not *Simon*, that the other *Simon* was not *Barjona*, that though *Andrew* were *Barjona*, yet he was not *Simon*, that the *Appellative Peter* was beſtowed on none but him, and ſo the *ſingular* number all along is by theſe *Characteriſticks* confin'd to the *particular* perſon of *Peter*. All this I ſay is, in as large a manner as can be deſired, yielded to the force of a few of his Arguments, which he moſt mightily hath eſtabliſhed with a far greater variety. And when we are thus well agreed, is it not pity we ſhould ever differ in this matter? Yet thus we ſhall unavoidably do, whenſoever he ſhall from theſe premiſſes attempt to conclude either the *Supremacy* in plain terms (for how can any thing of that ſort be deduced hence, when whatever is here *promiſed* him, is *Ch.* XVIII. promiſed all of them, and all cannot be *Supremes*) or, with the ſame deſign, any *power* or *degree* of *power*, which is not common to the reſt. Which I here mention before its time (that when it cometh to paſs, it may be remembred) for as yet nothing of this nature is attempted to be proved, or concluded hence.

4. Nothing then being yet gained to *S. W*'s advantage from his managery of this *Text*, we muſt obſerve his next *Step*, and that concerns the *performance* of this *particular promiſe*. Here, e'er we proceed, may poſſibly lurk ſome deceit, for the phraſe *particular promiſe*] appeared not till now, but onely *promiſe made to him after a particular manner*, after a *particulariſing way*, and the like, and becauſe he hath * declared that *particular* is expreſly *the ſame with not common or competible to the reſt*; and yet I am ſure that the very promiſe he made to *Peter*, *Mat.* XVI. is explicitely made to all the reſt, *Mat.* XVIII. therefore I ſay 'tis poſſible ſome Viper, ſome fallacy may be hid under this deſpicable leaf, which muſt be diſcovered by his anſwer to this *Queſtion*, doth he by this *particular promiſe*] mean any *particularity of power*, or *degree* thereof, exceeding or differing from that which was, *Mat.* XVIII. promiſed to all the *twelve*, or doth he mean no more, than the particularity of the way or *manner* of promiſing the ſame degree of power, which before he ſpake of? If he ſay, he means any particularity of power, or degree of power, which was not after promiſed to the *twelve* together, what doth it here? when no ſuch thing was deduced, or ſo much as attempted to be deduced from that *Text*, *Mat.* XVI. in his laſt *Paragraph*, but onely the making it in a *particular manner* to St. *Peter*, i. e. to *Peter*, as a *particular perſon*, *Peter* by *name*, and with the *particulariſing circumſtances*, and when the very thing *power*, and *degree* of power (expreſt by the *Keys*) that is promiſed *Peter* here in the *ſingular*, is promiſed them all in the *plural*, *Ch.* XVIII. And then, this was not very well done of *S. W.* to endeavour to put a *Trope* upon the *Dr.* to ſneak in a *fallacious* phraſe [*particular promiſe*] which may refer to the *matter*, and not onely the *manner*, or to the *manner*, as that notes ſome ſpecial *degree of power*, peculiar to him, and not onely to the making the *promiſe* to him particularly; which if admitted in this his intended ſenſe, was the *begging* of the whole *Queſtion*, aſſuming, without tendring the leaſt proof of it. If this were the aim, it is well it was taken in time; for now that it is diſcovered, as the *Cheat*, it muſt be ſolemnly diſcarded out of the future reaſoning. * P. 394. *l.* 31.

5. But if he ſhall be fair conditioned, and profeſs to mean no more by this *particular promiſe*, but the promiſe of the *Keys* made, *Mat.* 16. *particularly* to *Peter* (as *Mat.* 18. it was generally to all the Diſciples) then all is well, and this impertinent caution was yet well meant, onely to keep *S. W.* honeſt; And then in God's Name let him manage his argument, and gain what he can by it on theſe terms.

6. What then is his next ſtep? why, that it is *worthy our Saviour to perform his promiſe after the manner and tenour he promiſed, and ſo to give it after a particular manner, and conſequently St.* Peter *had the Keys after a more particular manner than the other Apoſtles*; In proof of which he adds, that reaſon would think himſelf deluded (whether that be ſenſe or no, it matters not, as long as we know his meaning) *to have his expectation raiſed, by ſuch a particular manner of promiſing to ſomething extraordinary and more than common, and when he comes to the point, to have his hopes defeated by a common and merely equal performance.*] In this proof, the deceit hath diſcovered it ſelf, and appears bare-faced. For now it is evident, that the particularity of the promiſe, though it ſeemed not to relate to the matter at all, or the degree of the matter, but was held up demurely in the former phraſes, *after a particular manner*, &c. was intended by him to mean ſomething extraordinary and more than common, *i. e.* in reſpect of the matter, ſome power, or degree of power, above that which was given to all the Apoſtles. Here then though in a diſguiſe, is the very fallacy, that I took care to prevent, addreſt to us. The diſguiſe made uſe of, is a light change of phraſe from [*the promiſe given after a particular manner*] to [St. *Peter's having the power of the Keys after a more particular manner than the other Apoſtles.*] For though theſe two phraſes do differ little, yet in the ſenſe wherein he ought to take the former, and appears to take the latter, they are competently diſtant. His having the promiſe *performed after a particular manner*, in proportion with the uſe of the phraſe [*the promiſe made after a particular manner*] ought to ſignify no more, than that it was performed as it was made, to *Peter* particularly, *i. e.* to him as a ſingle perſon, not to him as a member of a community, as one of many (or if he did not thus

thus mean it, all muſt be unravelled again, for there was no more proved from the view of all the circumſtances of the Text, moſt particulariſing, as hath been ſhewed, and there was no more granted him, than he thus proved, *i.e.* no more than this.) But now, his having the *power of the Keys after a more particular manner than the other Apoſtles,*] that is evidently deſigned by him to mean, his having ſomething extraordinary, (and that is the matter of the power) ſome power or degree of power, which others have not, which as it is a fallacy too groſs to be put upon the Reader by any that meant him well, ſo it is utterly unconcluſible from the Text of *Mat.* 16. it being as if he ſhould argue thus, whatſoever was promiſed *Peter* by name, and with thoſe other Circumſtances, mentioned in that Text, muſt be an *higher degree of power*, than that which at any other time was promiſed to all the Apoſtles; but the *power of the Keys was promiſed* Peter *by name*, &c. *Ergo.* In which Syllogiſm the *major Propoſition* is utterly falſe. For how ſhould thoſe extrinſecal circumſtances of naming him, and his Father, *&c.* make the power promiſed him the greater, than it would, had not he been ſo deictically named? or why might not that which was given *Peter* by name, and in that particulariſing manner, have afterward been given to *John*, or to *James*, with all the like particulariſing Circumſtances, *Bleſſed art thou* John, *Son of Zebedee, fleſh and bloud hath not revealed the Divinity of the word to thee, &c.* Or why might not that very thing be given, without the particulariſing Circumſtances, which was given with it? The particulariſing circumſtances are ſtill circumſtances, and concern no more but the manner of introducing the promiſe, being merely extrinſecal to the matter of the promiſe. And though what I ſay of his naming *John*, be but a ſuppoſition, not pretended to be acted, and ſo is fitly confronted to the drawing his Concluſion from hence, which is not neceſſarily but precariouſly inferred, as long as it may be otherwiſe, and is but begg'd not evidenced hence, yet the latter is the very *res geſta*; for the thing that was promiſed St. *Peter* in one place, is promiſed to all the Apoſtles in another: the words wherein the power was promiſed, being no otherwiſe changed than from the ſingular to the plural, to him firſt, *whatſoever thou ſhalt bind*, and in the full extent of the power ſoon after to them, *whatſoever ye ſhall bind*, &c. and accordingly performed alſo, *Joh.* 20. 23. *whoſeſoever ſins ye remit, they are remitted*, &c. And that ſo the Fathers underſtood it, was manifeſted from them, εἰ καὶ πρὸς Πέτρον μόνον, &c. *though it were ſaid to* Peter *alone, I will give thee, yet the power hath been conferred on all the Apoſtles.* And ſo * *Cyprian*, and others the like; and ſo both *S. W*'s pretenſions, the words of Scripture interpretable whether by wit, (if that do not ſignifie the wit of the world, downright cheating by changing words or ſenſes) or by Tradition (meaning that which the ancient Fathers, not his preſent Mothers deliver to us) are both of our ſide, and then I hope we are competently ſafe on his own Grounds, ſuch as alone he can juſtifie to argue on.

* *Of Sch. p.* 89.

7. Thus we ſee the utmoſt force that the proportion betwixt Chriſt's promiſe and performance to him can infer; what Chriſt promiſed him, I doubt not, but it was fully performed, and the performance was as particular as the promiſe, the promiſe made to him as a ſingle Apoſtle, and the performance to him and every other ſingle Apoſtle; But ſtill no neceſſity imaginable, that when the promiſe was performed, he ſhould again be called by name, or the ſame form of addreſs be uſed, as was at the making the promiſe (for then it muſt begin again with *Bleſſed art thou* Simon Bar-jona, *&c.* which we find not any where elſe, nor is by *S. W.* pretended to be the form uſed in conveying the power to him] or indeed any other particularity whether of matter or manner, than that what was promiſed to him particularly, ſhould be particularly performed.

8. When therefore he ſaith, it is *worthy our Saviour not onely to perform his promiſe, but to perform it after the manner and tenour he promiſed*] if it ſignifie no more, than that the utmoſt degree of power, that was promiſed, was to be performed, then it is eaſily granted (and in that conſiſts the worth or divine fidelity of the promiſer.) And then it is ſtill incumbent on *S. W.* to prove, that any more or higher degree was promiſed *Peter*, than any other Apoſtle afterward, that being not yet proved in the leaſt; and if it ſhall in the proceſs be ſuppoſed or imagined to have been proved, then it is fallacious, and the begging of the Queſtion. But if it be expected from Chriſt to perform it in the very manner wherein it was promiſed, as that ſignifies onely the particulariſing circumſtances; then as there is, even according to *S. W*'s pretenſions, no colour of affirming that thus it was (for *Simon Son of Jonas, loveſt thou me more than theſe*, &c. are other, not the ſame particulariſing circumſtances with *Bleſſed art thou* Simon Bar-jona, *&c.*) ſo is there no leaſt Energy concluſible from the ſuppoſed continuing of thoſe, or the like forms, and ſo nothing that can be called *worthy* of Chriſt to doe: And it is certain, the promiſe made to the twelve together, *Mat.* 18. was not with this exact correſpondence of Circumſtances, ever performed to them, which yet muſt be as worthy of Chriſt to take care of, as in this other inſtance to *Peter* particularly.

9. By what hath been thus largely ſaid, appears not onely the vanity of his arguing, from *Mat.* 16. but alſo of his ſecond more dreadfull impreſſion from *Joh.* 21. on which he relies with moſt confidence. For the foundation, in reaſon, of his arguing thence, being laid on the foreſaid correſpondence betwixt the promiſe made and performed, we already diſcern the bottome of that, and therefore need not be amazed at, or dread it, let him manage it how he can.

10. And firſt, to ſhew that reaſon gives it, he argues *ad hominem*, to the *Proteſtant that acknowledges the ſelf-ſufficience of Scripture, that the promiſe being made to* St. *Peter after a particular manner, and regiſtred in Scripture, it is fitting that the performance ſhould be expreſt there likewiſe; But there is no other place of Scripture ſo apt to ſignifie a particular performance, as this of* Joh. XXI. 15, 16, 17. *Ergo.*] This is now ſoon anſwered by the premiſſes, that there is no neceſſity, or law of congruity, that *Chriſt* ſhould make good to *Peter* any other performance of his promiſe, than that whatever was promiſed him as a ſingle perſon, ſhould be in like manner performed to him; and this is done moſt exactly and punctually, when to every of the *Twelve Apoſtles* (of which number St. *Peter* was certainly one, he gave the ſame commiſſion, which himſelf had received from the *Father*; for what could be imagined to be meant by the *Keys promiſed Peter*, whether for power or degree of power, which was not comprehended in that *Commiſſion of God to Chriſt*? And this we Proteſtants find in another place of Scripture, *Joh.* XX[illegible] and ſo need not be beholding to his wit to help us maintain as much as we teach of the ſelf-ſufficiency [illegible] Scripture. He ſoon ſees then, how perfect nothing it is, that his imaginary reaſon gives him.

11. His next attempt is by *Scripture*, to ſhew how that favours him, and if it ſhould indeed chance

chance to do ſo, he would have great reaſon to applaud himſelf, that that of which he hath deſerved ſo little, ſhould make him ſuch unexpected returns; for it is but a very little while ſince, (even in the *laſt Section*) that he expreſt this way of proving from *Scripture*, by *Grammatical and Critical Quibbling*, thereby *making words left without life, and ſtark dead to our hands, move dexterouſly and ſmartly towards the end one drives at*, *i. e.* in plainer terms, extracting any thing that is for his turn, from any thing that is moſt diſtant from it; Of this kind we were long ſince told, what miracles the *wits* were able to doe, and we are now likely to perfect our obſervations, by ſeeing it *Experimented* before our eyes. Let us now draw near to a cloſer view of it.

12. And his *firſt Argument* is, that the *particular promiſe had preceded, apt in its own nature to breed ſome greater Expectation in St.* Peter; *theſe words are apt to ſatisfie that Expectation, they ſignified therefore a particular performance.*] It would be a long work to ſet out the Excellencies of his *firſt Argument*, three propoſitions, the number of thoſe in a *Syllogiſm*, and the laſt a formal *Concluſion*, as in a *Syllogiſm* alſo, yet no kind of *mood* or *figure* that it concludes in; and it will be a worthy exerciſe of *S. W*'s great diſcurſive faculty, to review, and reduce it to any ſuch. But not to ſtand on ſuch niceties with a *Civil Gentleman*, we will join iſſue with him in his firſt *propoſition*, which aſſumes that the *promiſe*, Matt. 16. *was in its own nature apt to breed ſome greater expectation in St.* Peter. Now what doth he mean by ſome *greater Expectation*? Sure nothing leſs than a *Supremacy* over all the *world*, and particularly over all his *fellow diſciples*; And what was there in the words of the promiſe *preceding, apt in its own nature* to breed this *Expectation*? To this, which wanted his utmoſt aid, he is ſo reſerved, as not to afford one word of proof, either now or before; and ſo 'tis denied, as ſoon as propoſed; and there is an end of that *Argument*. And is not this a ſtrange infirmity in a great *Diſputer*, to leave himſelf thus unarmed to the mercy of his adverſary, without any thing to ſecure, or inforce his firſt onſet?

13. Yet leſt it ſhould be too like him, barely to deny what he hath barely affirmed, I offer my reaſon for my denial. If the words, *Mat.* 16. *were of their own nature apt to raiſe in* Peter *an Expectation of Supremacy*, or of ſomewhat more than any other *Apoſtle ſhould partake of*, it muſt be, either by force of the *Subſtance*, or *Circumſtances* of the promiſe. The *Subſtantial* part was that of a *ſteward* in the *Church*, emblematically ſignified by the *Keys*, explicitly by the *power of binding and looſing*, and this intimates no ſuch thing as a *Supremacy* over the *whole Church*, but a *ruling* power in ſome *family*, *i. e. part of the Univerſal Church*, where his lot ſhould fall; and the very ſame being ſoon after, *Matt.* 18. promiſed to all the *twelve*, it is evident it was no *ſupremacy*, for then there muſt be *twelve ſupremes*. As for the circumſtances, it is firſt unreaſonable, that they ſhould have more force in them toward the interpreting the meaning of the promiſe than the ſubſtance it ſelf hath; 2. Theſe very circumſtances, all but that of his *name* and his *Father's name*, joyned together, are common to others, and ſo not particular to him, as hath been ſhewed by others *confeſſing the Divinity of Chriſt*, having it *revealed from God*, being *bleſſed* and deſigned for *ſtones* in the fabrick of the *Church*; And would it not ſeem ſtrange that the *Simon Barjona*, or *Son of Jonas*, which had alſo its viſible uſe, *Barjona* to diſtinguiſh this *Simon*, from *Simon the Zelote*, and *Simon* to diſtinguiſh this *Son of Jona*, from *Andrew*, which was his *Son* alſo, and ſo both being as neceſſary to addreſs the ſpeech diſcernibly to him in either place, as the name of *John*, or the *diſciple whom Jeſus loved*, was to diſtinguiſh him from all others, ſhould now commence the grand *foundation* of *Peter's ſupremacy*. This were as if he ſhould argue, *Our Saviour* bid *Peter follow him*, as he did alſo XI more, and by this, *conſtituted them diſciples in common*; but had he ſaid, *Simon Son of Jonas follow thou me*, or any thing *equivalent* thereto (as I ſuppoſe he did, ſufficient to make himſelf underſtood, and that is all that this other form imported) he had been engaged never to have taken any other into that form of honour or *Diſcipleſhip*, after him, *the words in their own nature had been apt to breed this expectation in St.* Peter, and it would be *worthy of Chriſt to ſatisfie his expectation*, &c. What can be more ridiculous than ſuch arguing? And yet this is the very *Quinteſſence of his firſt proof*.

14. His *ſecond* follows in full accordance, thus: *The thrice particularizing him by his name and relation*, Simon *Son of* Jonas, *denotes the ſpeaking the following words to him particularly. But the following words, Feed my ſheep, were apt and ſufficient to inſtate him in the office, and give him the authority of a Paſtour. It was therefore given him in a particular manner to be a Paſtour in thoſe words*; the *Major*, ſaith he, *is evident, the Minor is proved, for ſhould any Maſter of a Family bid one of his ſervants in the ſame words feed my ſheep, that ſervant would think himſelf ſufficiently authorized to perform that duty.*] Here again is a doughty *Syllogiſm*, *demonſtrative*, or *probable*, which you pleaſe, of the new mode, which *Ariſtotle* had no acquaintance with: When he ſhall have reduced it to *Vulgar* form, my returns may perhaps be more punctual: At the preſent 'tis ſufficient to tell him, that I grant his *Major Propoſition*, but then for the *Minor*, if it be *argumentative*, and by the aid of the *Major* be able to infer the concluſion (which is *Chriſt's giving him in a particular manner to be Paſtour*) it muſt be underſtood of more than it expreſſes, of more than being apt or ſufficient to inſtate in the authority of a *Paſtour*; for 1. every thing doth not actually doe that, which it were ſufficient to doe, eſpecially if it be before-hand already done, as in this caſe I ſuppoſe the office and authority of a *Paſtour* was inſtated in the former words, *Jo.* 20. 21, 22, 23. both on *Peter*, and all the reſt; and then there is no reaſon to think that in this place *Feed my lambs* or *ſheep*, was any more than an admonition to perform the office diligently, that had formerly been inſtated on him. And 2. the office of a *Paſtour* gains nothing to *S. W.* for all the other *Apoſtles* were *Paſtours* alſo; and 'tis of the *Supremacy*, not bare *Paſtourſhip*, that we now treat. And ſo much for this other poor creature, *S. W*'s ſecond argument, or (in his own dialect) *quibble*, whether *Grammatical*, or *Critical*, he hath no otherwiſe directed us, by its having no tincture of *Logick* in it.

15. His *third Argument* is, that the *word, doſt thou love me more than theſe, manifeſtly puts both a particularity and ſuperiority in St.* Peter, *above all the other Apoſtles in the interrogatory*, Ergo, *the inference thereupon, Feed my ſheep*] *in ordinary reaſon ſhould ſignifie after the ſame manner, and ſound*, if ſo, (i. e. Peter *aſſenting*) *if thou loveſt me more than theſe, feed my ſheep more than theſe, or have thou commiſſion to feed them more than theſe.*] Here the former *ſyllogiſtical* irregularities are prevented by putting it into an *Enthymeme*. But we have gained little by this, for 1. the *Antecedent* is very infirm, the queſtion *loveſt thou me more than theſe*, is far from inferring neceſſarily, or probably that *Peter* did love *Chriſt* more than *John*, or all the reſt of the *Apoſtles*, ſave onely in his own former confident profeſſion (to

which our *Saviour* moſt probably refers) when he ſaid, *though all men deny thee, yet will not I, and though I ſhould dye with thee, yet will I not deny thee*; but 'tis too well known, that he alone, of all the reſt, moſt remarkably failed, and denied *Chriſt*, for fear of the *crucifiers*, which fear is moſt contrary to perfect love. The *Antecedent* then hath no firmneſs of truth in it, no man being able to pronounce from this or any other place, that *Peter loved Chriſt* better than any other; nor indeed doth he now profeſs any more than belonged to the ſincerity of his love, *thou knoweſt all things, thou knoweſt that I love thee*, purpoſely leaving out the degree or compariſon with, or ſuperiority above others, and ſo not aſſenting (as *S. W.* feigns) to the ſuperiority of his love. This being thus evident, for the evincing the frailty of his antecedent, his argument is at an end, having already wholly loſt its foundation.

16. Yet is there another horrible flaw in the conſequent, for having ſaid with ſome tolerable probability, that the inference of *feed my ſheep*, ſhould ſignifie after the ſame manner, if thou loveſt me more than theſe, feed my ſheep more than theſe, (which might well have paſt in the notion of greater diligence, in diſcharge of his office, which indeed of abundant labouring, is properly conſequent to abundant loving) in ſteps a gloſs of *S. W*'s, *or* [*have thou commiſſion to feed them more than theſe.*] But I muſt ask, whence comes the word *commiſſion*? Should I now after the manner of *S. W.* ſet down the words in his own tranſlation, all the three verſes together, from which he hath now argued, 'tis certain I muſt either be very unlike him, or elſe, having ſo much better reaſons, cry out with him, *Falſification of Falſifications:* behold a Text produced to prove a *commiſſion*, and all that can by any torture be extracted from it, is an *Exhortation* to a diligent diſcharge of that office, to which he was before *Commiſſionated*: and it may as well be ſaid, that *Paul* ordained or *Commiſſionated the Biſhops of* Aſia, *Act.* 20. 28. by ſaying to them, *Take heed—to feed the Church of God*—who were clearly *Biſhops*, before *Paul* ſpake this to them, and becauſe they were ſo, he therefore ſpake thus to them, as that *Chriſt* in theſe words commiſſionated *Peter*, having before commiſſionated all of them moſt ſolemnly, *Joh.* 20. 21. and ſo *Peter* was one of that number, and was not now to be ordain'd again ſo ſoon after.

17. His fourth Argument is, that *Paſce, being expreſt imperatively, and ſpoken by a Lord to his ſervant, ought in all reaſon to ſignifie a command; ſince then every command of a lawfull Superiour gives a Commiſſion to doe that which he commands, and the words expreſſing this command are in a particular manner ſpoken to St.* peter, *it follows that St.* Peter *had by them a particular Commiſſion given him to feed Chriſt's flock*] I anſwer, by denying his *minor*, that part of it that pretends that every command of a lawfull Superiour gives a Commiſſion,] for it is evident *Lawfull Superiours may command to exerciſe their Commiſſion* after it is given. Is not this viſible in the field every day? The General gives his Commiſſions firſt for the raiſing of an Army, then in any particular Expedition, he gives out commands, an hundred perhaps in a day; and is there any colour of probability for each of theſe commands, that it ſhould be the giving a *Commiſſion*? If there be, it muſt be founded in the equivocalneſs of the word *Commiſſion*, ſo that not onely the conveying the power and authority, or office, ſhall be meant by it (which is the ordinary notion) but the giving out any Order, which is ſufficient to authorize him that doth it, which we are wont to expreſs by that other phraſe of giving *Orders*, not *Commiſſions*. However, we ſhall not contend with him about the uſe of a word, but if that be his meaning, we grant all that he can demand, that this, whether *command* or *exhortation of Chriſt to feed Chriſt's ſheep*, did authorize him to the utmoſt diligence in diſcharge of it, that the ſincerity or degree of his love to his crucified Maſter, and the ſenſe of his own former failings, could ſuggeſt to him; but ſtill this is nothing like a *Commiſſion* of *ſupreme Univerſal Paſtourſhip* conveyed to St. *Peter* in theſe words.

18. The laſt argument is taken from the *property of the word* Paſce, *as it is diſtinguiſhed from preach. This* ſaith he, *ſhews that there was a kind of Ordinary care commanded to St.* Peter, *whereas by the pure Apoſtleſhip, he and his fellows had but an extraordinary and voyager Authority.*] I anſwer, that whatſoever can be concluded from the moſt critical uſe of the word *Paſce*, or the oppoſition of it to preaching, I ſhall willingly yield, and yet be ſecure, that *S. W.* ſhall get nothing by it: For the *Apoſtolical power* being that, wherein they *ſucceeded Chriſt*, by tenour of thoſe words, *As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*, muſt be extended to more than bare preaching, for *God ſent Chriſt* to doe more than ſo, even to rule his Church, and ſo the *Apoſtles*, when ſent out to preach, and μαθητευσαι to *receive Diſciples*, were inveſted with power to rule all, whom they ſhould thus diſciple, and caſt out by cenſures whom they were impowered to admit by Baptiſm; and this is all that is meant by the word *Paſce*, whether *feed* or *rule*, which therefore became the title in the Church, of all thoſe that ruled in it, the Biſhops or Paſtours of the Church, who yet herein ſucceeded the Apoſtles (as the Fathers oft tell us) and not St. *Peter* onely; by which it appears, that the Apoſtles by their Commiſſion from Chriſt, were all Paſtours, and not onely S. *Peter*; and therefore we have great reaſon to queſtion his Concluſion for ſupremacy drawn from the notion of *paſce*, and not to admit any thing to have been conveyed in that, but the exerciſe of that which was before conveyed by *Chriſt's Commiſſion* to all the Apoſtles.

19. Something he adds to this Argument, the force of which lies as concealed as *Sampſon*'s ſtrength, of which, till by *ploughing with his heifer*, I ſhall have made ſome farther diſcovery, all that I can pertinently take notice of, is, that he takes it, I perceive for granted, that *ſheep and Lambs are all the faithfull.* But 1. all that thoſe words ſignifie, is the ſtronger and weaker Chriſtians indefinitely, and every indefinite is not an univerſal; it is ſufficient to the diſcharge of *Chriſt's command*, if he feed all of either ſort, which ſhall come to be his κλησὶς or *Province*; and 2. unleſs ſheep and lambs not onely ſignifie *all the Faithfull*, but all thoſe alſo that have brought them to the faith (and it would be hard that ſheep or lambs ſhould ſignifie Shepherds themſelves) he hath not obtained his deſign, even by this moſt reprovable interpretation.

20. And having thus acquitted himſelf, *i.e.* uſed five Arguments for the drawing *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, from this his prime Text, of which no one of them hath the leaſt appearance of force in it, it was but neceſſary he ſhould ſhut up,

1. With renouncing all appeal to Commentatours.

2. With an acknowledgment that he *pretends not to evidence*, and

3. A complaint that the *words he interprets are dead words*; for indeed, as he will hardly find a Commenter in the world of his mind (and then by the way, how is this Text explicated to his purpoſe

by

by Tradition, even that of his own way, of the preſent Romaniſts?) So his proofs have been as far from evidences as could well have been ſuſpected, and the words of the Text, as induſtrious as he hath been to animate them, and perſwade them to ſpeak to his ſenſe, ſtill moſt obſtinate and imperſwaſible, no carcaſe could have been more mute than they.

21. And becauſe he challenges his Adverſary after all this, to ſhew that *another can ſo connaturally agree to the ſame particularizing Circumſtances*, I ſhall very briefly offer him this *Paraphraſe* of this Text, *John* xxi. 15,16,17. On a certain day ſoon after Chriſt's Reſurrection, when Dinner was done, Chriſt addreſt himſelf in a moſt particular manner to *Simon Peter*, or *Simon the Son of Jonas*, and in relation to his confident aſſuring him (before his crucifixion) that he would not deny him, though all the reſt of the Apoſtles ſhould, and yet ſhamefully failing, and denying him thrice, through a great meaſure of that fear, which perfect love caſts out; he asked him that ſame Queſtion very particularly three times, whether he *loved him more than all the reſt of the Diſciples loved him?* To which he anſwered him twice with chearfulneſs, that he did indeed love him ſincerely, but upon the third propoſal of the queſtion minding him of his having denied him three times; *Peter was grieved*, yet anſwered as confidently as ever, by appealing to Chriſt as God, the ſearcher of his, as of all other hearts, and proteſted the ſincerity of his love to him, though without entring any compariſon with others his fellow Apoſtles, having diſcerned his errour in doing ſo formerly, when he fell more ſcandalouſly, as he aſſumed more confidently, than others. To every Anſwer of his (proteſting the ſincerity of his love) Chriſt replies by way of exhortation to him, that being now a little while ſince, with all the reſt of the Apoſtles, inſtated in the office of Paſtours of the Church, to take care of ſtrong and weak, to feed and rule both, he ſhould be carefull to exerciſe it diligently in each part, as opportunity offered it ſelf: That this is a more connatural way of interpreting this place than that which he hath offered, I will add no more to prove, but am content that the Reader judge.

SECT. III.

S. W's *gleaning of my ten ſolutions about St.* Peter *ſeverally conſidered. Plurality infers equality as well as particularity doth Supremacy. All power from Commiſſion. Superiority of Biſhops above Presbyters, though not of* Peter *above Apoſtles.* Paſce oves *no words of Commiſſion.* S. W's *Parallel how feeble and gainleſs.*

1. HAving thus largely anſwered every the minuteſt part of *S. W*'s laſt thoughts, his refined elaborate Argument, in behalf of the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, from *Joh.* 21. and alſo obeyed his challenge, in giving him my diſtant way of interpretation of that Text (the grounds whereof being viſible in the Context, there was no need of annexing them more particularly) and referring it to judgment, whether it be not far more connatural than his, there is now no poſſibility that I ſhould be obliged to make the like punctual return to his third Section, the deſigned method whereof is thus unreaſonable.

2. Having ſet down his reaſons for his interpretation, he ſaith, *I endeavour not to ſhew our advantages from Scripture againſt him, or any more connatural explication, but onely to enervate their deductions thence, by ſolutions and poſſibilities of another explication*, and hereupon he will he ſaith, *glean up theſe ſolutions from the places wherein I have ſcattered them to the number of eleven* (as he hath extended them in his falſe muſter, when in truth they are but ten) and by this Art he takes liberty to himſelf to call what words of mine he pleaſes, a ſolution, and no leſs than four of the ten are fetch'd out of the *Tr. of Sch.* two out of the *Reply* to the *Cath. Gent.* (and ſo a larger moiety, ſuch as could not be imagined by any other way but of divination to have been replyed to what he had ſaid in *Schiſ. Diſar.* and no one of the whole number to have had any relation to his preſent managery of this buſineſs in his *Sch. Diſp.*) Which being the product of his ſecond and better thoughts, if I have now ſuperſeded all force and even probability of them (as I muſt yet believe I have, till the Reader tells me I am miſtaken, or *S.W*'s reply attempt to give his Arguments more ſtrength than yet they have) and withall ſubjoyned my much more connatural way of explicating this Text, which is the utmoſt of his preſent demand; 'tis evident I cannot be thought concerned in Defence of thoſe Solutions, which though they may have been words of mine, and ſo defended in their due places, from all that he hath had to ſuggeſt againſt them, yet they are certainly no ſolutions of mine to his preſent Arguments, and therefore as they are not owned by me for ſuch, ſo neither are they any pertinent care of mine at this time.

3. Yet I ſhall not wholly deſpiſe this his Section, but as far as can be any way incumbent on me, afford it my reflexions. And firſt, when he is in ſuch an high rant againſt me, for ſaying the words, *Joh.* 20. 21. *As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*, &c. and *Mat.* 28. 19. are delivered *in common and equally to all and every of the Eleven Apoſtles, as is evident by the plural ſtyle, throughout the Commiſſion*, expreſſing his opinion of it in this pretty variety, *Bedlam-like non-ſenſe, affected foolery, paralogiſms, infinitely weak, monſtrous Logick, to be reſented in behalf of man's nature, total defacing of reaſon by paſſion and intereſt, putid non-ſenſe, and all this by Truth and Juſtice rendred lawfull, but by his concernments neceſſary*, and yet farther *the ridiculouſneſs of this arguing* for *equality* from *plurality* exemplified by *Paul's* and *Pancras* being *plural Churches*, all *individuals of every ſpecies, Conſtables and Kings, Captains and Generals*, &c. What was there that could provoke this *tranſportation*? For 1. If the Reader ſhall conſult* the place, he ſhall find the words confronted to thoſe that make the *Donative*, *Mat.* xvi. 19. St. *Peter's incloſure*, having no other *Argument* for that pretenſion, but becauſe they were ſpoken to him particularly, and then the *Romaniſts* being the *Opponent*, and I ſuſtaining the perſon of the *Anſwerer*, I ſhall appeal to any *Judgment*, whether the performing the promiſe to many in common, be not as forcible to infer equality, as the promiſing at one time to one, to infer his *Supremacy*; nay whether whatſoever be the pretence for the *former*, it be not wholly *ſuperſeded* by the *latter*. And if ſo, this is ſufficient to juſtifie my words in that place, which were expreſly deſigned to this end, as appears by theſe words. [*But to him that from hence pretends this Donative —— as a peculiarity —— of St.* Peter, *theſe conſiderations will be of force to ſuperſede his concluſion*——. And then, if there were any infirmity in the proof, yet being *ad hominem*, apportioned and fitted to his, and certainly of as much efficacy for the *equality*, as his for the *Supremacy*, it might have deſerved his *Candor*, inſtead of provoking his *Indignation*. Shall

* *Tr. of Sch. p.* 86.

it be *Logick* and *reaſon* in him, from our *Saviour*'s promiſing a *Power to* St. *Peter particularly* at one time, to infer the *Supremacy* of that power to be veſted in him, and ſhall it be *madneſs* and *non-ſenſe* in me, from *Chriſt*'s actual conferring the very ſame *power on all together*, to enervate and *Superſede* the force of that inference? On which ſide the *paſſion* and *Intereſt* moſt lies, is obvious to diſcern.

4. But then 2ly. there is yet more in it than ſo; I ſay the *community* and *equality* is evident by the plural *ſtyle*, throughout that whole commiſſion. And the force of my *Argument* lyes thus; If it be enquired what power or degree of power *Chriſt* gave to his *Apoſtles*, or particularly to St. *Peter*, it can no otherwiſe be ſolidly determined, than by reſort to *Chriſt*'s commiſſions, wherein that power is ſet down, it being viſible that ſuch commiſſions remain on *Record* in *Scripture*, and that from them all *Eccleſiaſtical* power hath by all *Chriſtians* been deduced; and even the *Romaniſts*, that impute moſt to tradition, do yet in this point of *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, fetch their proofs from theſe *Texts* of *Scripture*; and *S. W.* himſelf, that differs from other *Romaniſts*, doth herein agree with all others, onely with this difference, as theſe *Texts* are explicable by *Tradition*, and not by *wit*, and with all theſe I ſo far comply, that I offer no explication of any ſuch *Text*, but what *Tradition* truly ſtated, doth readily yield me.

5. If then for the reſolving our *Queſtion*, we reſort to thoſe *commiſſions*, the conſequence is, that what there we find expreſt, or rationally deducible, and *Traditionally* derived from thence, that we may reſolve to be the power deſigned by *Chriſt*, diſcarding likewiſe all that which is not thus deducible. If therefore what is there found, be given in common to all, and though once promiſed to *Peter* particularly, was ſoon after without any note of *inequality* or particularity promiſed to all the reſt, if in the performance of the promiſe, the actual donation of the *Keys* by commiſſion from *Chriſt*, expreſly ſet down from his mouth by the *Evangeliſt*, *Joh.* xx. there was yet no leaſt *circumſtance* of advantage to *Peter*, but throughout the whole *commiſſion* the ſtyle far removed from particularity, or any thing elſe, wherein *inequality* or *ſupremacy* could be founded, then is this an evidence as great as the matter is capable of, that the power thus conferred was conferred equally: For how ſhould *Peter* come to any pretence to *Supremacy*, but from *Chriſt*'s *commiſſion*? How can his *commiſſion* yield it him, if throughout the *commiſſion*, there is no leaſt mention, or intimation of *Supremacy*, but whatever is made over to one, is made over to all, and conſequently is not *Supremacy*, or if it were, it muſt conſtitute them all *Supremes*, which is impoſſible and *ſelf-deſtructive*.

6. If in this caſe it be thought a ſufficient objection to ſay that the *Supremacy* pretended for St. *Peter* is competible with, and not reſiſted by the *donation* of the *Keys* to all the *Apoſtles*, then 1. I anſwer that this would equally conclude for making *Peter* an *Arch-angel* or a *Secular Prince*, for *Chriſt* might alſo have done that, and reconciled it with the *gift* of the *Keys* to all. 2. that to make a difference betwixt this and that, and to render one more rational to be affirmed, than the other, it is abſolutely neceſſary, that in the *commiſſion*, by which 'tis held, ſomewhat be ſhewed for the one, which will not hold for the other, and if ſtill nothing be producible throughout the whole commiſſion, that belongs to *Peter* at all, ſave as he is one of the *twelve*, and ſo belongs to every one of them, as much as to him, then ſtill this onely imaginable ſuggeſtion, can be of no force for his *Supremacy*.

7. And now let him conſider, whether his *Inſtances* of *Paul*'s and *Pancras*, *King* and *Conſtable* will ſtand him in any ſtead. The two firſt are names of *Churches*, the two latter of *Magiſtrates*; but is there no note or intimation of *inequality* betwixt theſe diſcernible, as betwixt *Peter* and the reſt of the *Apoſtles* there is none? In the former pair the *inequality* is evident to the eye of any that compares them; in the latter to the *Ear*; but to which of thoſe ſenſes doth St. *Peter* appear ſo much *Superiour* to the reſt of the *Apoſtles*? The *King*'s *powers* are known by the Laws of the *Community*, to be far greater than thoſe of a *Conſtable*; but what laws of our *common Chriſtianity* inſtate the *Supremacy* on St. *Peter*? There is then as little of *Argument* as of *Gravity* in theſe inſtances.

8. Secondly, when I had ſaid *Each Apoſtle had the power as diſtinctly promiſed to him*, Mat. XVIII. *as* Peter *is pretended to have*, Mat. XVI. and againſt his accuſation of [*ſhameleſs and expreſs againſt Scripture*] oppoſed this *Syllogiſm*, that which was promiſed to all the *Apoſtles*, as to *twelve ſingle perſons*, *each ſingly* to have and exerciſe it, and not altogether in common, was as diſtinctly promiſed to *Each* ſingle perſon, as it was to St. *Peter*; but the power of binding, *&c.* was *Mat.* XVIII. ſo promiſed to all; *Ergo*. What hath he now to *Reply*? Why, 1. he converts my ſyllogiſm, which is a proof, into a bare interpretation of my words, and ſo avoids the anſwering it. 2. he tells me this agrees not with my other words, for that it is one thing to ſay each could uſe this power diſtinctly, another to ſay this power was promiſed diſtinctly to each. 3. he pretends, *that ſuch a meaning cannot ſtand with common ſenſe, unleſs I will own to Calumniate their tenet*, for how can it be put in oppoſition to them, without ſuppoſing their tenet to be, that no ſingle *Apoſtle* could bind or looſe, but all of them together in common onely.

9. To theſe I reply; to the firſt, by requiring him to take my *Syllogiſm*, as it is a proof of my former affirmation, and if he can, to avoid the force of it, if he cannot, to yield the *concluſion*, and that is all that I demand.

10. To the ſecond, that this very well agrees with my other words, and that ſuppoſing (as we ought) that *Chriſt*'s performance and promiſe were fully anſwerable the one to the other; it unavoidably follows, that if the power were given diſtinctly to each, (as it muſt, if each had it, and could exerciſe it diſtinctly, for they could not thus have it, unleſs it were thus given them) then it was promiſed diſtinctly to each. The one difference, that of its being by name promiſed to *Peter*, and not ſo by name to *Each* of the reſt, being of no force in this matter, and ſeparated from this debate in the * *Anſw.* to *Sch Diſar.*

* *p.* 66.

11. To the third, that my oppoſing of this to the *Romaniſt*, is founded in his pretence, that ſomewhat is *promiſed to Peter*, *Mat.* XVI. which is peculiar to him. This 'tis certain he pretends, and ſo this is no *calumniating his Tenet*, (whatſoever he again pretends in *Reply* to the *fourth Solution*) and *Chriſt*'s giving this very *ſame thing* to every other *ſingle Apoſtle*, ſo that each hath, and may exerciſe it by himſelf *diſtinctly*, and not onely to all in *common*, is (if made good, as now I hope it is) expreſly oppoſite to that.

12. Thirdly, when to all his deductions from the *particulariſing circumſtances*, I have anſwered, that they prove no more, than that the *power* was given *particulariſing* to him, not that others are excluded from the *ſame power*, and the *ſame degree of power*, he replies, *this is my own ſaying, without ſhewing that the words give occaſion to ſay it*] To this I anſwer, that in an *anſwerer* (ſuch am I, when I conſider his

Arguments

Arguments for the *Supremacy* from *Mat.* 16.) it is sufficient to consider all that he can offer for his pretensions, and shew that they have no other force in them, than to prove that which is already acknowledged, *viz.* that the *power* was *promised particularly to Peter*. Can he now pretend they have any more force in them? (viz. to settle somewhat on *Peter*, which belongs not to the *rest*?) Can the *naming* him, and his *Father*, and alluding to his new *style*, *Cephas*, infer this, or any other *Circumstance* yet produced by him? If they can, let it be shewed where this his strength lies; If it cannot, what needs he any farther *Answer*?

13. Fourthly, when from the special Energy of the words applied *particularly* to St. *Peter*, I concluded the *stewardship* in *Christ's house* to belong to *single persons*, not to *Assemblies*, 1. This saith he, *again is but my own saying*. 2ly. *Who sees not how much better and more probably it follows hence that St.* Peter *was Superiour to the Consistory of the Apostles, (they being present when those particularising words were spoken) then it will follow in succeeding times and distinct circumstances, that some one should be chief, and over the Assembly.* 3. Saith he, *since Dr.* H. *grants no higher degree of Authority in St.* Peter *than in the rest of the Apostles, he can conclude no more, but this, that the Presbyters are all equal in authority as the Apostles were.* To these I *answer*. To the *first*, that what he calls *onely my own saying*, was expressly proved by the *authority* of S. *Cyprian*, who saith that *our Saviour in those words to* Peter, *sets down the honour of a Bishop, and the way of ordering his Church, that from this promise of his, the ordination of Bishops and course of the Church, hath continued by all successions and vicissitudes, so that the Church is constituted upon Bishops, and every act of the Church is governed by them.* And the † like from others of the *Fathers*: By which it appears, that *S. W.* observes not the rules of men, makes no *scruple* in a matter of *fact*, to affirm quite contrary to his and the Reader's *eyes*, if he shall but consult the place.

* *Ep.* 27.

† *Tr. of Sch. p.* 90.

14. To the *second*, that no man can see what he seems to say is *seen by every man*, viz. *the greater probability of* Peter's *Supremacy over the Apostles*, than of *the succeeding Bishops over their Assemblies*. For the latter, there is visibly the *Ensign* and *power* of the *œconomus* over the *Family*, given to a *single* person, by which the *Fathers* assure us was meant the *power* of the *Bishops* over their *several Churches*, and then what matters it, though the *circumstances* of *persons* be distinct, when in this we are assured the *Order* of *Bishops* in the *Church* was constituted: But for the *former*, if there were (as there is not) any least appearance of *probability* to be founded in the *particularising* words, and the *Apostles* being present, yet the repeating the same promise to all so soon after, without any mark of *particularity*, must needs destroy that *appearance*.

15. To the *last*, that allowing *Peter* no *higher degree* of *Authority* than the *rest* of the *Apostles*, I can yet hence conclude more than the *equality of Presbyters*, viz. the *single power* of *Bishops*, as those are over both the *Presbyters* and their *Churches*, those *Bishops* in the *Fathers opinion* being the *Successours* of the *Apostles*, and their *power* formed διὰ τῶν Ἀποστόλων, *by the Apostles*, and given every of them *single* in the *promise* of the *Keys to Peter*, and so *Episcopacy* the πρωτεῖα τῶν Ἀποστόλων, the *Presidency of the Apostles*, in St. *Basil's* phrase; and when all this was already proved from hence, what may not he say, that again, against matter of *fact*, will affirm, that I can conclude no more than the *equality of Presbyters*? Is not the *Superiority* of *Bishops* over their *Churches*, somewhat more than the *equality* of *Presbyters*? And is not this proved from hence? If so, what *truth* in *S. W.*'s suggestions?

16. Fifthly, when he asks, whether *Peter had ever a particular commission given him correspondent to the particularising promise, but in Feed my sheep?*] The *Answer* is obvious, that *particularising* promise was sufficiently performed, by *sending him*, as *Christ* was *sent* by his *Father*, with *power* of *remitting* and *retaining sins*; and this, as perfectly correspondent to the *power* of the *Keys*, was given in a *Solemn* manner and by way of *Commission*, *Jo.* xx. to him, and all other the *Apostles*, and so there was no use of a more *particular commission*, the admonition to *Feed Christ's flock*, being founded in the former *donation* of it, and so not imaginable it self to be the *commission*.

17. Sixthly, when he scoffs at my *parallel* betwixt *Christ's praying the same prayer thrice, yet, not turning his prayer into a precept, and his saying* Pasce *thrice, yet not turning his Exhortation to a commission for supremacy, and pretends the word it self was apt to signifie a commission*, and again, *that the words are words of commission, and the thrice saying, a precept.*] I *answer*, 1. that a *prayer* is as much a *precept*, as an *Exhortation* is a *commission*, and therein onely was the *parallel* set, and I that think his part of it *irrational*, need not help that part, by which I *parallelled* it to any probability. But certainly it needed more than his bare word to justifie, that *Pasce oves are words of commission*, nor, if they were, would it streight follow that the *commission* were for no less than a *Supremacy*. He must here remember that he hath two things incumbent on him (not to beg, or assume, but) to prove, 1. that the *Imperative* pasce is a *form of commission*. 2. that my *sheep, and my lambs*, are the *whole Church* of *God*, *sheep* and *shepherds* too, and he that had those words spoken to him, thereby constituted the *Supreme Universal Pastour*; when he hath proved these *two*, I shall then yield to his *particularising circumstances* without farther proof, that what was thus said, was said *particularly* to St. *Peter*.

18. Seventhly, when he saith *I have unaware discovered what temper I am of,*] *he doth but according* to his *wont*, complete his *Cavils* with his *calumnies*. I said, *Peter was grieved because Christ said the third time, lovest thou me; which he would not have been, if he had looked on it as an introduction of so great a preferment.* Hence he infers, *that I make account the getting some great preferment is a ground of more gladness than our Saviour's seeming to doubt of his love to him would be occasion of sorrow.* But I, that by this of his being grieved, did conclude the design of *Christ's thrice* repeated speech, to be the *reproaching*, not advancing of St. *Peter*, the humbling, not exalting him, cannot be imagined to have made this comparison, or to have thought it possible that one should exceed or even allay the other. *S. W.* dreams of nothing but St. *Peter's preferment*, and when our Saviour reminds him of his foul fall, gathers particularising *Circumstances*, to be ingredient in a *Commission* to him for the *Universal Pastourship*; I took the whole speech to be an *Exhortation* to repair by future diligence, what he formerly fail'd in so foully, and supposing these to be opposite, not reconcilable interpretations, whereof one onely had the truth, I used the mention of his sorrow, as the proof of the latter, which therefore could not (without implicancy) refer, or reflect on a supposition of the former. And so we have an *Essay* of *S. W.*'s spirit, if that were news enough to be taken notice of.

19. On the back of this, he is carefull to express himself very tender of St. *Peter, lest Christ should seem to upbraid his thrice deniall, nor can he conceive there could be need of it to excite him, asking, had he shewn himself of so negligent a nature, as to give occasion to doubt, &c.*] And I shall ask this Disputer again, whether

whether he have not heard that *Peter* had not long since, thrice, and at last with *Execrations, denied Christ*? If he have, then is this a competent account, both that Christ might upbraid what was past, although it were now a *forgiven* sin (a Romanist can sometimes allow *Temporal punishments* for forgiven sins, and such mild *reproaches* and *remembrances* as these, though not *joyous but grievous* in one respect, are yet medicinal, and so mercies in another) and excite to *abundant labouring for the future*.

20. Once more, e'er he leaves this, he will render his most *connatural explication*, according to what is *most befitting the Divine wisedom*, viz. *to fit the person for the charge, e'er he imposes the charge it self*, and so by the Question thrice asked, to excite in him a greater affection. But this may as well peice with the *Exhortation* (which is our interpretation of the word) as with the *Commission* for a *Supremacy* (which is his) and therefore still let him prove that by some other *medium* (which is not rendred in the least-wise probable by this) and in this I need not contend with him.

21. Lastly, when he dislikes my parallel of a *General* promising a *Commission* this day to one, and to morrow to eleven more, and saith I leave out that in which the force of the *parallel* was to lie, and then offers another in stead of it, of the *King giving one the sirname of Bishop, and upon occasion of a particular service, breaking out, Happy art thou*, &c. *and I say unto you, Thou art Bishop, which*, saith he, *would imprint in his mind an expectation that he should be a Bishop in an higher degree, to wit, an Arch-Bishop of* Canterbury *or* York. To these I answer, that in my parallel the Circumstances omitted were either common to others with *Peter*, or of no force to found for him the Supremacy of power; His Name and Fathers Name do but distinguish him from other Disciples there present, and have not the least *Energy* in them towards instating of Supremacy; His *blessedness*, *Revelation* from God, were common with others, and yet not competent to infer Dominion of any sort to every one that had any or all of them. And so his confession too, for certainly other Apostles confest Christ's Divinity, as well as he, and if he confest it first before all others, yet Christ may reward others that doe it after, as highly as him; according to the Parable of the *Labourers* in the Vineyard, to the methods of which how scandalously opposite are *S. W.*'s * words in this matter? *viz. that he had no reason to think himself ingeniously dealt with, if his acknowledged desert being particular*, &c. *he had received an equal Commission onely.* But I shall rather conform my conceptions to those words of our Saviour, *Is thine eye evil because mine is good? I will give unto this last even as unto thee*, Mat. 20. 14, 15. So again, the title of *Stone* or *Rock* was common to all, as appears by the δώδεκα θεμέλιοι *twelve foundations*; And in sum, the *power of the Keys*, of *binding* and *loosing*, which alone is the donative (and the words whereby the authority is conveyed) *Mat.* 18. made over to all, as largely, as it is, *Mat.* 16. to St. *Peter*, not made to the *eleven, he standing by*, as *S. W.* would feign me to equivocate, but to the whole twelve together in the same plural style, as before in the singular it had been made to him, thereby assuring us, that the very same power was now promised to all, which before was promised to him, as the spokesman, and so proxy, as it were, of the whole company.

* P. 410.

22. Secondly, That in his parallel there are many excesses, this especially, that supposing the *Church of England* to be promised to be built on him, and the *power of binding and loosing whatsoever fault against our Ecclesiastical Laws, expresst particularly to him*; None of this is by him mentioned in the promise to all, but onely in a *common Exposition making him and the rest Bishops*, which laying the advantage most partially on St. *Peter*'s side, in those words which alone concern the matter, whereas the whole form of words signifying power, were as largely made to all, as to him, it must follow, there is no least sincerity in his parallel, the former being taken alone, certainly founding a power, and some shew of an *Universal power*, which the latter so soon subjoyn'd to it, must needs take off again, because there cannot be more Supremes in one Body. So again, his supposed Sirname of Bishop is somewhat above the proportion of *Cephas*, which signified in Christ's speech, a *stone* to build upon, and is no more than one of the many preachers of the *Gospel*, *founders* or *planters* of the *Church*, who though they were also to govern it being planted, yet the word *stone* did not signifie that *dominion*, as we know the word *Bishop* doth. So the opposing his *particular affection and acknowledgment of the King to others weakly doubting of his royalty*, when there is no appearance of others doubting, or of *Peter*'s being the onely *affectionate Confessour* at this time (and yet if there were, nothing were concludible from hence, in order to *Christ's reward*, as was just now shewed.) And when he appeals to my *Conscience*, whether this *person would not in prudence judge by this carriage, that he should have something particular given him, and that expectation still remain imprinted in his mind*: I answer, 1. That unless by particular, he mean some power, or degree of power, above all others, his question is impertinent; but supposing him to mean that, my Conscience tells me no more than this, that an ambitious person may probably be first easily possest, and then passionately transported with *expectations* on such terms, as *S. W.* hath provided to raise his *Appetite*: But I have a better opinion of St. *Peter*, than to fix on him such airy desires or expectations: And that others that stood by, were of my opinion, appears, because after this, some of them entertained themselves with *expectation* of the *Chiefdom*, which they could not reconcile with belief of Christ's veracity, if they had thought it by the words, *Mat.* 16. to have been promised to St. *Peter*.

23. Mean while it may be observed, that the utmost that *S. W.*'s machines have aspired to, is but to raise an expectation in *Peter* to be somewhat in the *Universal Church*, which may bear proportion with being *Arch-Bishop of Canterbury or York*, in this Nation, and if that were frankly granted, 'twould not serve his onely Interest, or be improvable into *supreme Universal Pastourship* of the *whole Church*; for the *Arch-Bishop* of *York* can in no sense pass for either *Universal*, or but *Supreme Governour* of this *Nation*, nor infer more than a Bishop of *Antioch*, in the ἀνταπόδοσις, and that he knows is the least we allow St. *Peter* to have been. And then, if such vast faculties as are those of *S. W.* when they are set on the Tenterhooks, with liberty to make his own choices of fictions, could not yet atchieve what was thus absolutely necessary to his pretensions, this is a greater prejudice to his cause, and an evidence of the desperateness of it, than all his diligence will repair, or his dexterities for this *wit-combat*, as he calls it, which the more vehemently he hath pursued, his failure being finally confest, is the more intolerable and irreparable, upon account of the *Si Pergama dextra*, for certainly if the matter had been capable, so great an *Artificer* as *S. W.* would not thus, in this last on set have destituted it. And so much for the gleanings also of this Section.

SECT. IV.

SECT. IV.

Of sitting on XII Thrones. S. Austin's *judgment of it.* Tostatus, Maldonate, Hilary. *The Authour* imperfecti operis. *Dogmatizing on a mystical sense. How little I am guilty of it.*

1. HIS fourth Section concerns my interpretation of the *Twelve Apostles sitting on the Twelve Thrones,* Mat. 19. *to judge,* i. e. *to rule or preside in the Church,* which he will have interpreted of the *Day of Judgment.* Now for the propriety of the words to my interpretation, that *judging* should signifie *ruling* or *presiding,* that θρόνος should signifie an *Episcopal chair,* or *See,* I had in my Answer appealed to any man that had either most *critically* or *most sleightly considered words*: Besides I referred him to my *Reply,* where I had proposed the interpretation of παλιγγενεσία, whether for *regeneration* or the *resurrection of Christ,* and if that were yielded in either sense, then *Christ's sitting on the Throne of his Glory,* would relate to his *ascension,* and then the *Apostles sitting* and *judging,* must needs be *presiding* in the *Church,* and not *judging onely* at the *day of judgment.* To this adding the notion of *judging the twelve Tribes,* in proportion to the *Jewish Custome* of *Phylarchæ,* Governours of the *Tribes,* a *dignity* next unto the *Regal,* and so fitly noting, that when Christ was instated in his Royalty, these should have the dignity next to him, that of *ruling* his Church; and lastly, shewing that my sense of the *Apostles ruling* in the Church, is reconcileable with his of judging the world at the last, and therefore was not imaginable to be refuted by it, should that be thought to have any probability or truth in it.

2. Now to all this S. *W.* thinks not fit to afford any the lightest reflexion, but hath another more hopefull game, which he is resolved to pursue, and he and his *Index* together have here sprung egregious *and most willfull falsifications of Fathers, renouncing all shame, honesty and conscience*; and whence this storm arose, we must now examine.

3. In the *Reply* I had said of my Interpretation, that St. *Augustine long before so understood it*; and in my *Answer,* that I might also add *Hilarius Pictaviensis,* and the Authour *imperfecti operis.* Now to the former of these, that of St. *Augustine,* all he hath to *Reply,* is, that I cite not any place in that Father; To the second, that of *Hilary,* he sets down some words of his, which relate to the time of *Judgment,* and *Christ's coming,* and saith, *I build on them:* To the third, he grants, that he *did more incline to the mystical sense,* but that *in all the rest he is expresly against me,* to which purpose he hath his six notes annext, which must doe whatsoever is for his Interest to be done.

4. Now to each of these I answer.

To the first, that of St. *Augustine,* that my bare *not citing* the place, is a strange argument to infer an *egregious and most willfull falsification:* 1. *S. W.* may herein be appealed to, who deals not much in *testimonies,* yet in his *Preface,* in defence of *contumelies,* hath cited two passages out of *Tertullian* and St. *Augustine,* but not named the place, where either is to be found; I demand then, hath this rendred him an *egregious and most willfull falsifier*? If not, by what fatality hath the doing but half so much, brought this charge on me?

2. There are many other accounts reasonably conceivable, why *naming* a *Father* for such an interpretation, I should not name the place wherein he speaks of it; I shall mention but these, that my notes or memory, or perhaps some modern Writer, furnished me with his name, but were not so exact as to retain the particular place (Which of these it was in *S. W.* when he thus cited *Tertullian* and St. *Augustine* at once, let him recollect, before he cast his first stone) In which case, were it supposeable that I were deceived, yet, as being deceived, differs from falsifying, so 'tis also as distant from *egregious willfull* and *most willfull,* as is that which is most light and most unvoluntary. And this truely was the very case; my Notes gave me St. *Augustine*'s name, but neither those, nor my memory were so exact, as to specifie the place, yet that herein I am not likely to have mistaken, I have these two Arguments to secure me.

1. The Authority of the Learned *Romanist,* * *Tostatus Abulensis,* who reckons St. *Augustine* among the Patrons of this interpretation. * *In Mat.* 19. *quest.* 191.

2. The expres words of that Father on another Text (so very near allied to this, that if that may be interpreted of the Governours of the Church, there can be no doubt but this may be also) *Rev.* 20. 4. *And I saw Thrones, and those that sate thereon, and Judgment was given them (thrones and sitting on Thrones,* and *judging,* all the same as here) of which saith that Father, *Non hoc putandum est de ultimo Judicio dici, sed sedes præpositorum, & ipsi præpositi intelligendi sunt, per quos Ecclesia gubernatur. This must not be thought to be spoken of the last judgment, but the seats of the Governours, and the Governours themselves must be understood, by whom the Church is now governed*; and for the interpreting of the *judgment* given them, *that,* saith he, *cannot be better taken, than of that which was said, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven*; *whence saith the Apostle, what have I to doe to judge them that are without?* De Civ. Dei l. 20. c. 9.

5. For the other two, I appeal to their own *Commentatours* also, *Tostatus,* who besides St. *Augustine,* reckons *Hilary* and St. *Chrysostome* (by him meaning the Authour *imperfecti operis*) for the *Patrons* of this interpretation; So likewise *Maldonate* on those words, *When the Son of man shall sit,* St. *Hilary,* saith, he, *and the Authour of the imperfect work, interpret the Son of man's sitting not on the Tribunal to judge, but at the right hand of his Father,* Ubi paulo post resurrectionem in cœlum ascendens sedere cœpit, *where a little after the resurrection he began to sit.* This I hope will clear me from the falsifications.

6. As for the place in *Hilary,* to which they refer, 'tis not I suppose, that which *S. W.* hath taken pains to transcribe (and confidence to affirm that I build on it) *Can.* 28. but *Can.* 20. *Vos qui secuti me estis in regeneratione, judicabitis 12 Tribus Israel*; *secuti in regeneratione sunt lavacro Baptismi in fidei sanctificatione,* &c. *Ye that have followed me in the regeneration, shall judge the twelve Tribes of Israel, They followed him in the Regeneration with the laver of Baptism in sanctification of Faith* (not in the resurrection of the last day, on which the other interpretation builds) *This is the regeneration which the Apostles followed, which the Law could not afford, which hath joyned them in the Glory of the XII Patriarches upon twelve*

Thrones, in judging the twelve Tribes of Iſrael, where as the *Twelve Patriarches judging the Twelve Tribes*, was the *Office of the Phylarchæ* here, ſo muſt that of the Apoſtles by Analogy be underſtood.

7. So again, in the Authour of the *imperfect work*, the words which concern this matter are theſe (*S.W.* might again have ſpared his pains in tranſcribing others) *Quod ergo ait in regeneratione, cum ſederit filius hominis in ſede Majeſtatis ſuæ, & vos ſedebitis ſuper duodecim Thrones, promittit eis tempus Chriſtianitatis futurum poſt aſcenſionem ſuam; quando omnes ſuſcipient verbum Apoſtolarum in ſe, ſicut verbum Chriſti*, &c. *That therefore he ſaith, in the Regeneration, when the Son of man ſhall ſit on the Throne of his Majeſty; Ye alſo ſhall ſit on Twelve Thrones*, he promiſes them the time of Chriſtianity, which ſhould be after his aſcenſion, when all ſhall receive the word of the Apoſtles, as the word of Chriſt, that is the time of the regeneration, when men being regenerate by Baptiſm, are made of Sons of men, Sons of God; and again, *Nos putabamus*, &c. *We did think that he ſaith this of the day of judgment, & vide quod non de tempore futuri judicii dicit, ſed de vocatione Gentium Univerſarum*, See, he ſaith it not of the time of the future judgment, but of the calling of all Nations.

8. Let *S.W.* now judge himſelf, if he pleaſe, on whoſe ſide lies the egregious and moſt wilfull falſification, and conſider whether all or any of his ſix notes will avail him, or prejudice me: I am ſo little concerned in them, that I ſhall not trouble my ſelf, or the Reader to reflect on any of them, having already voided the foundation of them, but onely mind him, that whereas he is ſo angry with me for dogmatizing upon a myſtical ſenſe, and ſets it down confidently in his *Index*, *D. H's manner of dogmatizing the ſeed of all blaſphemy*, noted to this p. 420. it cannot well be imagined what he means by that phraſe [*dogmatizing on a myſtical ſenſe*] which he chargeth ſo heavily. One would think it were, founding a *dogma* or doctrine upon a place of Scripture, underſtanding that Scripture not in the literal, but onely myſtical ſenſe. If this were it, there could be no leaſt colour of truth in his ſuggeſtion; the interpreting the place of the Day of Judgment, being, if any, the myſtical ſenſe, and this other of ruling in the *Church*, the more literal. But the following expreſſions whereby he labours to improve it into a blaſphemy [*which method* (of mine) *if it were followed, the Teſtament given in Mount* Sina, *ſhould be really a woman, Chriſt's doctrine corn*, &c.] convince me that he means my blaſphemy to conſiſt in this, that from a myſtical place I deduce dogmatically a real truth, meaning by a myſtical place, a myſtical explication of this Text, rendred by the Authour *imperfecti operis* in his Comment on it. But having now ſet down truely the words of that Authour, from which I conclude him favourable to my interpretation, my inference is made from thoſe words of his, that are moſt plainly and literally to be underſtood, that Chriſt in that Text promiſed them the time of Chriſtianity, which ſhould be after his aſcenſion, as that is oppoſed to the time of the future judgment, of which he ſaith he had underſtood it, but now hath changed his mind. And if in the making his explication good, he fly ſometimes, as his cuſtome is, to anagogical or myſtical ſenſes of ſome words, what is that to me, who make not uſe of them, but find him (and for that onely cite him) making the ſame concluſion with me, which is alſo the moſt literal, and no other perfectly literal but that, that they ſhall really ſit on *Seats*, and *judge*, i. e. *really preſide*, and exerciſe government in the Church, and that with the ſame independence and equality, one among another, that was obſervable in the *Phylarchæ* or heads of Tribes among the *Jews*.

SECT. V.

Of the no inequality in the deſcent of the Spirit. Some force of Negative arguments. Juriſdiction given the Apoſtles by the deſcent of the Spirit. Δύναμις ἐξ ὕψους. *Whether the Spirit deſcended on the* CXX. *Peter's higher degree of the Spirit not concluſible from his ſpeaking firſt.*

1. HIS fifth Section is laid out very profuſely upon a paſſage, which becauſe I laid no weight on, but mentioned *ex abundanti*, he therefore requires the Reader to obſerve particularly, and then exacts his pity, that he is tasked to anſwer ſuch a dreamer.

2. The matter lies thus; As the power promiſed by the Keys to *Peter*, was ſoon after promiſed all the Apoſtles, and no inequality diſcernible between him, and each of them, and this ſhewed to be the notion, the Fathers of the Church had of this buſineſs; ſo I added in a Parentheſis, that in the final performance of the promiſe in the deſcent of the Spirit, the fire that repreſented the Spirit ſate on every one of them, without any peculiar mark allowed Saint *Peter*, *and they were all filled with the holy Ghoſt*, and ſo the promiſe equally performed, as it was made to all.

3. The deſigned force of this paſſage, ſuch as it was (for every incidental paſſage in a book, is not bound to be a Demonſtration) was viſible enough, that as in the promiſe there was no inequality diſcernible, ſo in the ſolemn performance of it, there was as little. The Deſcent of the Spirit was the final performance of Chriſt's promiſe, the ſolemnity of their *commiſſion* from heaven, inſtating their deſigned *powers* upon them; and this being done *diſtinctly* to *every one*, was a proof *à poſteriori*, that it was meant *diſtinctly* to every one; and ſeeing there was no more in this, than in the former, peculiar to St. *Peter*, this though a *Negative Argument*, might be worth taking notice of, in conjunction with the former, in prejudice to the ſuppoſed *Supremacy of* St. *Peter*.

4. For were it not ſtrange, that in a *promiſe* of *Keys* made particularly to St. *Peter*, a *Supremacy* of *power* over *all* the *Apoſtles*, ſhould be reſolved to have been *promiſed* to him, when yet, as the very ſame words, wherein the *Keys* were promiſed him (whatſoever were meant by them) were ſoon after repeated to *all* the *Apoſtles*; ſo both when the *promiſed commiſſion* was given, with the ceremony of *Chriſt's breathing* upon them, and alſo when the *Holy Ghoſt*, according to *Chriſt's promiſe*, actually deſcended on them, and ſo finally performed that *promiſe*, there ſhould yet be nothing *particular* or *peculiar* to *Peter*, more than to any other *Apoſtle*, intimating the leaſt *inequality*, when yet an abſolute *Supremacy* is pretended? Is it not *S. W's* Argument, I know not how oft repeated, that

that it *was worthy of Christ to perform to* Peter *particularly, as he had promised particularly?* From whence he would infer some *particular performance*, which was not *common* to all the rest. And shall it be of no force, to *retort* this, or prove the contrary, that as every of the *Apostles* had the same promised them, which was *promised* St. *Peter*, so in the several passages, wherein the promise is described to have been performed, there was nothing *particular* to *Peter*, no note of the least *inequality*, much less *Supremacy*? From whence, if there were, as he pretends, a *Correspondence* betwixt the *promise*, and the *performance*, it must follow, there was nothing *particular* in the *promise*, because nothing in the *performance*.

5. 'Tis true there is not that *demonstrative* efficacy in such *negative* arguments, as there may be in *affirmative*; but when that, to which 'tis confronted, is so far from *demonstrative*, as is the inferring some *higher degree* of *power*, even a *Supremacy*, from *Christ's promising* the *Keys* to *Peter* after a *particularizing manner* (when yet what was once *promised him particularly*, *was presently promised*, and in like manner *performed* to *all the Twelve*) I yet see not what reason *S. W.* of all men living, should have, so *fastidiously* to despise the *some validity* of it.

6. As for that which he first produces, that there is not a word that seems to make against them, but these [*without any particular mark allowed* St. *Peter, and the having the Holy Ghost equally.*] It hath no *truth* in it, nor *force*, if it had *truth*. *Truth* it wants, for there was, before these, the comparing the *final performance* with the *promise*, the *final performance*, which was as it were the *sealing* of the *promise*, made *distinctly* to every one, and that an *Argument ab effectu*, that the *promise* was meant *distinctly* to every one, by force of this undeniable *Maxim*, that where *veracity* is concerned, as in all *Christ's* promises it is, the performance is always parallel to the making of the *promise*. And this was the *Argument of some validity* which *The answer to Sch. Disar. p.* 68. mentioned, if he could have pleased to take notice of it.

7. As for the *force*, if there were *truth*, it will be thus judged of; *Negative Arguments*, though not always, have sometimes efficacy in them, and especially, when that which can no farther be pretended, than it is proved by some *revelation*, is by Induction of all places which are or can be pretended to set down *revelations* of this sort, shewed to be destitute of all such *proof*. He that pretends a power by *commission*, is efficaciously disproved by view of all copies of his *Commission*, and shewing that therein no such power is conveyed to him. And that is the case here, when after the survey of the *promise*, then of *the commission*, *Joh.* xx. then again of the *promise*, *Mat.* xix. at last the *final performance* of the *promise* is considered; and in all these no mark or intimation of the pretended *Supremacy* appears. Against all which still barely to say, that the *Negative cannot be proved by any man living, because none but God can see the heart, or tell now that* Peter *had no peculiar mark*, is just as if he should pretend a power given him by the *King*, and when his *commission*, by which that was pretended, being produced and Examined in every period, every of them were found perfectly empty and vain, he should yet break out into a *Rant*, that this examination was of no force, *No man living could prove it was not given him*, or that he had no *peculiar mark of this power*, which whether it would be accepted as law, or *Logick* in any *Court*, or *Schools*, I leave the Reader to judge between us.

8. But, saith he, *this cannot make against St.* Peter's *authority, but by supposing the Dr's false and weak principles, that none can be higher in authority, but he must have more of the Holy Ghost in him.*] I *answer*, that this is not my *principle*, but this my way of arguing against him, that when *authority*, is made over by a *solemnity*, such was the *descent* of the *Holy Ghost* in *fiery tongues* upon the *Apostles*; if there be any indication of *Supremacy*, or if any *particular* mark allowed to any one, it is to be fetcht from some of the *circumstances* there mentioned, which being but two, the *sitting of the tongues* on them, and the effect thereof, the *filling them with the Holy Ghost*, and neither of these any otherwise mentioned than in *community*, and *equality* to all, the *conclusion* is rational and obvious, that no *Supremacy* or *circumstance* in favour of it, can thence be collected for St. *Peter*; and if as little from any former transactions, as they have been understood and interpreted by the *ancients*, then it cannot reasonably be pretended by the *Romanist* upon account either of *Scripture* or *Tradition*, properly so styled.

9. But all this is but the προπύγμα or slight *skirmish* procemial to what is most bloudily designed against this poor argument; It must now solemnly be brought out, *dissected* and *anatomized* before *S. W.* our great *Mr.* of *Controversies*, and in it no less than *five propositions* being found, he that even now was to be *pityed* for being so *sadly tasked*, is at leasure, and hath patience enough to impugn every one of these singly, and it seems I must follow him, and admire his *chivalry* through each of these. For once let it be so.

10. The *first Proposition*, saith he, is, *that the promise of the twelve thrones of Episcopal presidency* (the word *Episcopal* is *S. W's* insertion, my words being onely * these, xii. *thrones for each Apostle to sit on, to judge* i. e. *rule or preside in the Church*) *was finally performed in the descent of the Holy Ghost*] and then he must stand still, and *ask* the *Dr.* whether *it was ever heard of before, that the coming of the Holy Ghost gave Jurisdiction or Authority to the Apostles.* To this I answer, that the *Apostles Jurisdiction* and *authority*, being by several steps imparted to them, this of the *descent* of the *holy Ghost* upon them, was the *Ultimate completion* of it. That it was so, is so far from news, that I never before heard it doubted of, nor I suppose can there be reason of doubting, when first our *Saviour's* words of *Mission* or *commission*, *Joh.* xx. were introduced with the *Ceremony* of *breathing* on them, and these words, *Receive the holy Ghost*, which were visibly meant of, and completed in this *descent* of the *Spirit* in *fire* upon them. 2. The *commission* then given, *Joh.* xx. was not actually to be made use of, till this descent of the *Holy Ghost* at *Pentecost*, and this is called δύναμις ἐξ ὕψους, *Luk.* xxiv. 49. *power from on high*, which though it exclude not *zeal*, *charity*, *knowledge*, &c. and especially points at *power* of *miracles*, which is frequently called δύναμις *power*, yet as little doth it exclude *power* or *authority*, being the word that properly signifies *faculty*, or *power* of doing any thing, and when it is given *from above*, what is that, but a legitimate *commissionated power?* 3. By the style of *ordinations* ever since the *Apostles* times continued in the *Church*, where 'tis unquestionably manifest, that the *Jurisdiction* and *Authority* is designed to be given in those *Verba Solennia*, *Receive the holy Ghost*, &c.

* *Of Sch.* p. 88.

11. But he hath *two Objections* againſt this: 1. *That the holy Ghoſt fell upon the* 120, *as appears by Act.* 1. *and on multitudes of men and women in other places.* 2. *That the twelve thrones the Dr. expreſſes to be Epiſcopal chairs, and then the Holy Ghoſt conſecrated the twelve Apoſtles actually Biſhops, which agrees not with his words in other places.*] To theſe I anſwer; to the *firſt*, that it no otherwiſe appears by *Act.* 1. that the *holy Ghoſt fell on the* 120. than that there is mention of that *number* at the time when *Peter ſtood up, and ſpake about the choice* of a ſucceſſour to *Judas*, *Act.* 1. 15. And that is competently diſtant from the *deſcent* of the *Spirit*, on the day of *Pentecoſt*, *Act.* 2. Had I thus cited Scripture, I know what ſtyle it had met with in *S. W*'s *Index*. But then ſecondly, in caſe it did any way appear, that that whole number was ſtill preſent, *Act.* 2. and that the holy Ghoſt did deſcend upon them all, yet 'tis no difficulty to conceive, that the deſcent might be to ſeveral effects, to ſeveral ſorts of perſons, and ſo enſtate the power *Apoſtolical* on thoſe onely, to whom it was promiſed, and on whom conferred by *Chriſt* in his life time, *i. e.* on thoſe, to whom he ſaid, *Receive the holy Ghoſt*, and gave the *commiſſion* and power of binding and looſing. And then it matters not to what other purpoſes the holy Ghoſt deſcended on men and women in this or other places. I ſhall hope *S. W.* knows there are other purpoſes, (and that the *holy Ghoſt* hath been given in *confirmation*, as well as *Ordination*, in both by the *laying* on of the *Apoſtles hands*) and that whatſoever he thinks of *power* and *authority*, he will not queſtion the *gift* of *tongues* being an effect of this *deſcent*, as alſo that other of *miracles*, nor yet aſſume, that theſe were given to all the cxx. particularly to the *female* part of that number.

12. To the ſecond, that the *difference* is ſo ſmall betwixt *Apoſtles* and *Biſhops*, the firſt ſignifying *commiſſioners* of *Chriſt*, the ſecond *Governours* of the *Church*, and the ſame perſons expreſt promiſcuouſly by both titles, (as when *Judas* his *Apoſtolacy* is called his Ἐπισκοπὴ *Biſhoprick*, *Act.* 1. 20.) that by *Epiſcopal chairs* I might be well allowed to mean no more than the *Apoſtolical power* being ſetled on them; and then there is no place for *S. W*'s *Cavil*, which is founded in a *Critical difference* betwixt thoſe two, which I uſed in a *promiſcuous* indifference.

13. My ſecond *Propoſition*, ſaith he, *is that the fire which repreſented the ſpirit, was divided and ſate on each of them.* This he grants, and my inference from thence, that the *promiſe ſealed diſtinctly to every one, was meant* (in the making) *to every one.* But then this, ſaith he, *is not againſt any tenet of theirs, but onely againſt that which I by calumny forged to be their tenet*, viz. *that the power of the Keys was St.* Peter's *incloſure.* To this I anſwer, that it is no *Calumniating* their *tenet*, to ſuppoſe them to hold that ſome power or degree of power was promiſed to St. *Peter*, *Mat.* XVI. and I ſhew the very ſame *promiſe* given to all of them, *Mat.* XVIII. and actually conferred on all, *Jo.* XX. And the *Spirit's deſcent*, *Act.* 2. being the final ſealing of what was before promiſed and given, the *ſitting of this on every one of them*, I mention as a proof *à poſteriori*, that the power, whatſoever it was (not defining that in this place, and ſo ſecure from all poſſibility of appearing to *Calumniate his tenet*,) was meant to every one as particularly as to S. *Peter*.

14. My third propoſition, as it ſtands in his muſter-roll, *is that there was no peculiar mark of fire allowed to St. Peter.* This he had called a * *dumb Negative*, and added that the *Dr. was not here to ſee, and there is no hiſtory that Expreſſes the contrary.*] To which I replyed, that it ſeems, a Negative in *S. W*'s *mouth is perfectly vocal, though dumb in another man's.* And this he now ſaith is *an impertinent and prevaricating objection*, and that *I ſuppoſe he goes about to prove St.* Peter *to have had a peculiar mark of fire; becauſe 'tis no where heard of.*] What credit can be given to ſuch ſuggeſters, when 'tis viſible to any the dimmeſt ſight, that what I ſay, is by way of retortion to thoſe words of his, [*the Dr. was not there to ſee, and there is no hiſtory that Expreſſes the contrary*,] by minding him that this is a *Negative Argument* of his, which therefore could have no force; if *Negatives* may not be allowed to have any; and what can be *Negative*, if this be not [*the Dr. was not there, there is no Hiſtory.*] This alſo it was, that I called a doughty proof, and ſaid he brought it to Evidence I knew not what, and not that other, to which he applies it without any colour of truth, and ſo finds new abſurdities in my words, to which they were no-way liable, but by his confounding things, that were moſt diſparate.

* *Sch. Diſar.* p. 97.

14. As for his other *Argument*, which afterward I come to, whereby he ſaith, *perhaps the Dr. may receive ſome ſatisfaction, that* Peter *had in a more particular manner the holy Ghoſt from his firſt burſting out into that Sermon, that converted three thouſand*, by virtue of our *Saviour's* words, *out of the abundance of the heart the mouth ſpeaketh*, &c. He now ſaith he *meant it onely for my ſake, not for his own or tenets intereſt*, and I having received no ſatisfaction from it, told him that *there was one honeſt word the* [*perhaps.*] And upon this a ſhrewd charge is whiſpered, as if, ſaith he, *our Saviour's words and thoſe others of Scripture, were all diſhoneſt words.* This it ſeems I muſt anſwer alſo, or elſe be a blaſphemer, though I ſaid in expreſs words, that *I granted his* 2. *poſtulata, that we might judge by exteriour actions, and that our Saviour ſaid perfect truth.* But the *Reader* will ſoon diſcern my meaning, though *S. W.* will not; his *perhaps* I ſaid was the one honeſt word, *i. e.* the one word which could help his aſſumption to have any poſſible truth in it, which without it, had none, nothing being more improbable, than that this way of proof ſhould give any man the leaſt *ſatisfaction*, *St.* Peter *firſt burſt out into that Sermon*, Ergo. *He had in a more particular manner the holy Ghoſt.* This I thought the bare repeating would competently convince to be *unſatisfactory*, and then this is taken unkindly too, and ſo there is no pleaſing my *auſtere Mr.* that muſt have reverence paid to all his nothings.

15. But I had been long at peace from the charge of falſifications, and now he can no longer abſtain; I had ſaid, *The Dr. may not be ſatisfied thence, that St.* Peter *had received the holy Ghoſt in a more particular manner, or was deſigned head of the Apoſtles*, the latter of which, ſaith he, is added of my own falſifying invention. But 1. Why might not I out of my own invention without any colour of *falſifying*, add thoſe words, when I know the one thing, which 'tis his intereſt to have proved, is St. *Peter's headſhip* over the *Apoſtles*, and not any receiving the holy Ghoſt in a peculiar manner, without it. And yet 2. it is evident to every man's eye, that ſhall look on his *Schiſm. Diſar.* that this *Argument* of his, (that might, he ſaith, perhaps yield ſome ſatisfaction) was confronted to this of mine, in his own reciting, St. *Peter had no peculiar mark of fire*, Ergo. *He was not head of the Apoſtles.* To which how could he deem his proof of his receiving the holy Ghoſt in a particular manner, a ſatisfactory oppoſition, unleſs the *headſhip* were deducible from it? After all this, he will once more

propoſe

propoſe the import of his *late Argument*, even that which I thought ſufficiently refuted by repeating, and of which I expreſt my hope, and intimated my requeſt that (as Mr. *Calvin* had done to Dr. *Stapl.*) *my ſilence might not have ſuch efficacy in it, as to render this alſo a ſtrongeſt place for the Romaniſts pretenſions.* But this cannot it ſeems perſuade him to think meanly of it; and then he muſt be obeyed ſtill, or elſe I am non-pluſt, and as he concludes his paragraph, *hang down my head, and ſay juſt nothing.* Be it ſo; what then is the import of this worthy argument? Why, 'tis this, ſaith he, *that ſince out of the abundance of the heart the mouth ſpeaketh, 'tis probable that St.* Peter *had the Holy Ghoſt in his heart more abundantly or in an higher degree, ſince he firſt expreſt his interiour motions by ſpeaking, and ſpeaking ſo vigorouſly and powerfully. And then, if it be probable that St.* Peter *had the holy Ghoſt in an higher degree, it follows unavoidably* ad hominem, *that it is probable likewiſe he had an higher rule and preſidency in the Church performed to him.*] I *anſwer* then at length, though before I was willing to have ſpared ſo impertinent an expence of pains, that if a *thouſand probabilities* proved any thing, as they do nothing, by the rules of *S. W*'s great *Maſter*, yet it is not ſo much as probable that that *Text* [*out of the fulneſs of the heart the tongue ſpeaketh,*] ſhould infer an higher degree of the *holy Ghoſt in St.* Peter's *heart*, from his firſt expreſſing its interiour motions by ſpeaking, or ſpeaking ſo vigorouſly, and powerfully. For firſt, all that that *Text* inferred when *Chriſt* ſpake it, *Matth.* XII. 34. is but this, *how can ye being evil, ſpeak good things? i. e.* of ſuch wicked men, as that generation of Vipers was, it was not to be expected, that they ſhould ſpeak more reverently of *Chriſt*, than they did when they called him *Beelzebub.* And then from this ſenſe of thoſe words, what engines can ever extract this concluſion probably, *Ergo; He that expreſt the Spirit's interiour motions by ſpeaking, he that ſpake firſt, that ſpake ſo vigorouſly, had the holy Ghoſt in his heart, more abundantly than all others?* 1. Sure *expreſſing its inward motions by ſpeaking*, doth not infer it by force of that *Text*; for he that ſaith, ill men are not to be expected to ſpeak good things, doth not conclude, that he that ſpeaks good things, hath an higher degree of the *Spirit*, than all other; for others may and did ſpeak good things too. 2. Speaking firſt, doth not infer it, for that *Text* refers not at all to the *Order* in ſpeaking, and 'tis certain, that he who is moſt full of the ſpirit, unleſs he be alſo *Ecſtatick*, may ſo far contain his *Spirit*, as to ſpeak ſecond, or third, and not firſt: again, he that hath more of the ſpirit of zeal or fervour, which cauſes him to break forth firſt in ſpeaking, may yet have a lower degree in many other graces of the *Spirit. Laſtly, ſpeaking ſo powerfully*, doth not, for as that *Text* hath no aſpect on powerfull ſpeaking, ſo 'tis evident others might at other times *ſpeak* as *powerfully*, as now St. *Peter* did; and yet again, if they did not, might as much excell him in other Graces of the Spirit, as he them in ſpeaking *powerfully.* This I hope may now ſatisfy *S. W*'s importunity, and allay his fondneſs to his Creature. If not, let him farther conſider that his Argument being propoſed *ad hominem*, was in reaſon to underſtand by the *receiving the holy Ghoſt*, the ſame that I underſtood by it, and that was not the *efficacy in ſpeaking*, &c. (although I acknowledge that to be a gift of the Spirit) but the power and authority in the Church, promiſed in the promiſe of the Keys, conferred in the ſending them as the Father ſent *Chriſt*, with the *Ceremony* of *breathing* on them, and bidding them (and thereby promiſing them they ſhould) *receive the holy Ghoſt*, and ſo finally ſealed to them by the deſcent of the holy Ghoſt upon them. For him then to paſs from this fulneſs of the Spirit, as it ſignified fulneſs of power and authority, to the *degree of ſpeaking vigorouſly or powerfully*, what is it but *tranſire à Genere ad Genus*, to paſs from one to another ſort of fulneſs, and that is ſo far from being an ingredient in probable diſcourſe, that it is a groſs and branded fallacy, not fit to be made uſe of by any pretender to but probable arguing.

16. E'er I go hence, many things are again charged upon me; one not mentioned before, is, that I *calumniate him to bring this for a clear evidence, and put the words clear evidence in other letters, as if they had been his.*] And were it not moſt ſtrange, if in a matter of fact, and a charge of calumny, this ſhould prove to have no truth in it? Yet thus it is; For though if I had called it [*clear evidence*] and done ſo ironically, I might write it in other letters, without pretending it his, it being frequent in every line to change the letter, for words of *emphaſis*, and not onely of citation, as is manifeſt through the whole Book; Yet let the * place be conſulted, and thoſe words [*clear evidence*] will not be found in the whole Paragraph, nor in any other, ſpeaking of this matter, nor any thing nearer it, than this [*a proof to evidence on St.* Peter's *behalf*] and then what truth is there in his ſuggeſtions, even when he is accuſing other men of *Calumnies*, and hath that particular obligation to avoid what he ſo ſeverely reprehends?

* *Anſ. to Schiſ. Diſar.* p. 68. parag. 20.

17. The fourth Propoſition, that *they were all filled with the holy Ghoſt*, he had formerly called my fourth Argument, and I had told him that I mentioned it onely as a conſequent of the holy Ghoſt's deſcending and ſitting on every one of them, and yet he will again recite it, though it be to ſay no more, than that he had no ground to imagine but this was a diſtinct Argument, both equally impugning their tenet. I anſwer, I have again ſhewed him wherein the Argument conſiſted, and what it pretended to prove, and his not imagining ſignifies nothing, and therefore is to be anſwered with nothing.

18. The fifth and laſt Propoſition, that this *promiſe was equally performed, as it was made, to all*, was the reſult of all that went before in that Parentheſis, *viz.* that as the promiſe *was of twelve Thrones indifferently, not of one* mounted above the reſt of the Eleven, ſo the holy Ghoſt, that by deſcending on them ſealed that power, *ſate upon every one without any mark of inequality*, or precedence, much leſs of ſupremacy in any, and ſo the final inſtating gave teſtimony to the promiſe and donation of the power. And then with what truth can he again inſiſt, that this was *pretended as deduced out of the fourth, ſaying that they were all full of it*, when, as I ſaid, it was diſcernibly the reſult of the whole, and never pretended otherwiſe? This ſhews the vanity of his former, and now reſumed charge of my arguing from fulneſs to equality, on which head he hath very wittily coupled the fulneſs of glory, and the fulneſs of an Egg; I argued not ſo, but from the correſpondence betwixt the promiſe and the final performance, and therefore willingly yielded what I was not concerned to doubt, that they that were *full of the holy Ghoſt*, as that ſignifies *divine endowments*, might have it unequally.

19. But he muſt here needs ask, what I mean by the *holy Ghoſt's abiding in the ſouls of the Faithfull*, or *by what other way than by divine endowments onely*, hoping, he ſaith, *I do not mean that the holy Ghoſt is hypoſtatically*

ſtatically united to, or incarnate in them. And ſo he makes no farther ſtay, to conclude the *inequality of divine endowments is all that is imaginable in this matter.* To this I anſwer,

1. That he might have made any other the moſt impertinent Queſtion as ſeaſonably in this place (and we knew before, he was good at asking of Queſtions) it being certain, I ſpake not at all of the *holy Ghoſt's abiding in the ſouls of the faithfull.*

* Anſ. p.69.l.20. 2. That I expreſly * ſet down the other way oppoſed to *divine endowments* or *graces*, viz. *power* or *commiſſion* to *authority and dignity* in the Church, which every one without any diſcrimination or note of precedence had ſealed to them by the holy Ghoſt's deſcent. This being thus manifeſt, he hath yet the face to tell the Reader, that after the yielding inequality of divine endowments, when I ſhould tell him the other part of my diſtinction, I end ſhufflingly: Our Queſtion being onely of power and commiſſion to authority, *&c.* Could any thing be more contrary to, and deſtructive of ſhuffling, than thus diſtinctly to ſet down what it was, wherein alone our Queſtion was concerned, *viz.* power in the Church, and not divine endowments or graces, and that yielding inequality in the latter (and that *Peter* might therein ſurpaſs ſome, and be ſurpaſſed by others) this had no manner of influence on the former, and therefore could not be pertinently inſiſted on any farther?

20. But even here he hath five charges more ſprung up of a ſudden, when no man dreamed of them.

Firſt, That I ſay *the Queſtion is of power and dignity, whereas,* ſaith he, *it is of equality or inequality of this dignity.*] And ſo ſay I too; and when I oppoſed power to divine endowments, and ſaid, the inequality of the endowments ſhould be granted, what could that oppoſition ſignify, but that the inequality of power was the onely thing denied by me? and to that my words had been expreſs in the *Tr. of Sch.* [this promiſe equally performed as it was made to all] and being ſuppoſed throughout to be the Queſtion, needed not at every turn to be ſyllabically expreſt.

Secondly, ſaith he, *I never tell him in what manner of the holy Ghoſt's inexiſtence, beſide that of divine endowments, this Authority was founded.* I anſwer, that I was no-way concerned in this Queſtion of the holy Ghoſt's inexiſtence; yet can tell him plainly, that *Chriſt* having given the Apoſtles their commiſſion, with the ceremony of breathing on them, and bidding them receive the holy Ghoſt, and farther appointed them to wait at *Jeruſalem* till they were indued with power from above, this deſcent of the holy Ghoſt both ſealed their commiſſion finally to them, and qualified them with *miraculous gifts* for the diſcharge of it, and alſo took off the reſtraint that formerly lay upon them, and ſo let them looſe to the actual exerciſe of it.

Thirdly, ſaith he, *I inſtance onely againſt them, that every Apoſtle had power, and ſo calumniate their tenet again, and leave out the word equally.* But that is but the repeating of the firſt charge, and there was anſwered, and the calumniating his Tenet oft urged, and proved to be his Calumny.

Fourthly, That *this coming of the holy Ghoſt gave commiſſion and authority, is,* ſaith he, *onely my words, and proved by my own fancy*] I anſwer, 1. that my words were not, that the *coming of the holy Ghoſt gave commiſſion,* but that the promiſe was finally performed in it; *Chriſt*'s words, *Joh.* 20. were the words of miſſion and commiſſion; the deſcent of the holy Ghoſt was the time pitched on for the moſt ſolemn final inſtating them in that power; and this hath oft been ſhewed to be no fancy.

Laſtly, He ſaith, I conclude that there is no remaining difficulty, when *S.W.* can diſcern nothing but miſerable evaſions, never touching the difficulty, but avoiding it with as many pitifull ſhifts as a crafty inſincerity could ſuggeſt to an errour-hardened ſoul. I anſwer, that I knew before, that *S.W.* could rail bitterly, and then moſt variouſly, and rhetorically, when he moſt wanted ſuch aids; and I willingly afford him the triumph of ſurpaſſing all in this kind of eloquence, but more in the cauſeleſs profuſion of it. And ſo much for a very long and a very empty Section.

SECT. VI.

An Anſwer to all the Cavils of his ſixth Section. The power promiſed Peter, *promiſed and given all the Apoſtles. Epiſcopal power from* Chriſt's *donation to all, not from St.* Peter. S. W's *rare arguing. The argument enforced from* Tu es Petrus. Πέτρος *for a ſtone. The myſticalneſs of the Apocalypſe, yet ſomewhat plain in it. Anſwer to* S. W's *Objections. The parallel betwixt the name* Enoch *and* Peter.

1. HIS ſixth Section (like one that is to raiſe an eſtate by *complaining* of injuries) is again reſolved to faſten on me the guilt of having calumniated their Tenet, and pretending that the *Romaniſt builds not the Church on Biſhops in the plural, but holds that none hath the power of the Keys but St.* Peter *onely.* When this was in *Sch. Diſar.* objected to the Teſtimonies by me produced (the cheapeſt way of anſwering them) I not onely told him, it was apparent my words *injected not the leaſt ſuſpicion of it,* but withall added the proofs of my ſaying ſo, taken from the matter of the Teſtimonies, that though the words, *Mat.*16. were ſpoken particularly to *Peter*, yet the entire power there ſpoken of, was given to all the Apoſtles, all Epiſcopal power flowing from that *donation*; that in *Peter*'s receiving the Keys, all Biſhops received them; And this an evidence, that either he received more than was comprehended in the *Keys* (which by the promiſe of no more but the Keys, he cannot be ſuppoſed to have received) or elſe received no more than other Biſhops received from the reſt of the Apoſtles. What now can be more evident than this, that I do not ſuppoſe or charge them to hold, that none hath the Keys but *Peter*, but prove againſt them, that no ſupremacy can be inferr'd for St. *Peter* from thoſe words, which give him nothing but what is common to him with other men?

2. And what hath he to reply to a matter thus evident? why, forſooth, he recites the introduction to my Anſwer ['*tis apparent thoſe words injected not the leaſt ſuſpicion of that,*] but never conſiders my proof of it; then ſaith, it *was not ſuſpicion but plain and open evidence,* appealing to my words, page and line, in the *Tr. of Sch.* where having cited, that the Church is built on Biſhops, I add [*in the plural*] and of Epiſcopacy being the preſidency of the Apoſtles, I add, [*the very ſame that* Chriſt *beſtowed on all, and*

not

not onely on one of them.] But who ſo blind as he that hath eyes, and is obſtinately bent not to make uſe of them? Elſe nothing were more viſible in both theſe, than that all I contend hence, is onely this, that there is no more deducible from the promiſe to St. *Peter*, than what is promiſed others (elſewhere) in common with him, and this evidenced ſeaſonably (and by thoſe Fathers Teſtimonies effectually) againſt him, who deduceth a ſupremacy to one, from *Chriſt*'s promiſe of the *Keys* to him, which yet are in like manner promiſed to the reſt of his brethren.

3. To this purpoſe he might (had it not been for the ſame infirmity, not of blindneſs, but winking) have taken notice of thoſe words of St. *Ambroſe*, *Claves illas Regni Cœlorum in Beato* Petro *cuncti ſuſcepimus ſacerdotes*, that all ſuch *Prieſts as he*, i. e. *Biſhops*, *have received in Saint* Peter *the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.* If they did ſo, if all that there *Peter* received, were the *Keys* (as is evident it was) and all the *Biſhops* received the *Keys* in *Peter*, then where is the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, that *Peter* is imagined to have received there? what image of that or any thing like that, is to be drawn thence?

4. But, ſaith he, *there is not a word in the Teſtimonies expreſſing that this power was equally intruſted to every ſingle Apoſtle as to St.* Peter.] And what if the word [*equally*] was not expreſt? Is it not ſufficient, if it be expreſt, and manifeſted, that the ſame power (whatſoever that amounts to) which was promiſed St. *Peter* at one time, was at another promiſed and actually conferred on all the reſt? (For if ſo, then no *Supremacy* was given to *Peter* in thoſe words, *Mat.* XVI. it being viſible and granted by all, that *Supremacy* was not given to all the reſt, which yet it muſt be, if the ſame power being given St. *Peter*, and the reſt, the power that was given *Peter*, was *Supremacy*.) And this he knows was *expreſt* in the *Teſtimonies*, that of *Theophylact*, firſt produced, Εἰ δὲ καὶ πᾶσι Πέτρου μόνον, *though the words*, *I will give thee*, &c. *were ſaid to* Peter *alone*, *yet the power was conferred on all the Apoſtles.* What power? That, whatſoever it was, which was promiſed *Peter* alone, *Mat.* XVI. Which therefore without queſtion was not the *Supremacy*. So that of St. *Cyprian*, that *God's diſpoſing the honour of a Biſhop*, ſaith unto *Peter*, *I ſay unto thee*, *thou art* Peter, *&c.* What can be more manifeſt, than that the words to *Peter* diſpoſe the honour of a *Biſhop* in the *Church*, *i. e.* of one that *rules alone*, but yet in equality with many others? How then can that be of one *Univerſal Supreme Governour* of all *Biſhops* and *Apoſtles* too? What will all *S. W's Acts* prevail againſt this?

5. A remarkable attempt he hath in this place; when I had ſaid [*from that Donation it is*, *that all Epiſcopal power that is in the Church*, *flows*] *this*, ſaith he, *favours him*, *and proves their Tenet*, *as much as the being the foundation of honour and magiſtracy*, *argues that Perſon from whom theſe flow*, *to be higheſt in dignity and ſupreme in command*] To ſee the fortune, and confidence, or *Magick* of a good invention, at a dead lift; All that is moſt againſt him, aſſoon as it appears within his *Circle*, preſently wheels about, and ſerves on his ſide. But it will not long doe ſo. For 1. I no-where ſaid, that all *Epiſcopal* power flows from that perſon St. *Peter*, but from that *donation*, *i. e.* from *Chriſt*'s promiſing and giving the *Keys* to all the *Apoſtles*, as well as to *Peter*. And therefore 2. When he repeats theſe for my words, *that from the donation to* Peter *all Epiſcopal Power which is in the Church flows*, and cites for it my words, *Anſw. p.* 70. *l.* 2, 3. Let the Reader examine it, and he will find it groſsly, and palpably otherwiſe. My words are, from that *donation*, and what that was, muſt be reſolved from the words immediately precedent, which are theſe, *though the words were ſpoken particularly to St.* Peter, *yet the intire power was promiſed and given to all the Apoſtles*; and then add, from that donation it is, *i. e.* (as clear as the day) *from that donation of power to all the Apoſtles.* And yet this he can ſlily transform into the *donation to St.* Peter, and ſtill rail zealouſly at *falſifiers*, and make examples of them in his *Index*, as if he verily believed it (as indeed it is) an unpardonable fault in a writer. *Quis tulerit Gracchos.*——

6. The next feat is ſuperexcellent. He had ſaid that my *Teſtimonies rather make for the Romaniſts*, giving his proof, *for the Church being founded on Apoſtles*, *and Biſhops*, *prejudices not St.* Peter *to be the chiefeſt*, *and if ſo*, *then the Church is built moſt chiefly on St.* Peter.] Here I obſerved the manner of his arguing, *that if it prejudices not St.* Peter *to be the chiefeſt*, *then the Church is built moſt chiefly on him*, *as if not prejudicing or ſaying nothing againſt it*, *were a clear evidence for it*, *and then the firſt verſe of* Matthew *was for it*, *a clear evidence alſo.* Here I am now charged of *wilfull inſincerity*, (ſome ſuch guilt of mine is conſtantly the reſult of *S. W*'s want of *Mediums*, and that makes his Book and *Index* ſo full fraught of my *crimes*.) *For*, ſaith he, *his diſcourſe ſtood thus*, *If ſo*, i. e. *if St.* Peter *be the chiefeſt*, *whereas I interpret*, *if ſo*, i. e. *if it prejudice not.* But 1. Were not theſe the very words of his diſcourſe, or arguing? [*The Church being founded in Apoſtles and Biſhops*, *prejudices not St.* Peter *to be the chiefeſt*; *and if ſo*, *then the Church is built moſt chiefly on St.* Peter.] Doth not now [*If ſo*] refer to the *propoſition* immediately precedent? All Laws of diſcourſe will exact it to do ſo. And if it do ſo, then I demand, is [*St.* Peter *to be the chiefeſt*] that *propoſition*, or is it a propoſition at all, or capable of being the *antecedent*, to which [*If ſo*] can refer? What can be more unreaſonable? But then 2. if [*If ſo*] were poſſibly interpretable as *S. W.* now would have it, yet will this little aſſiſt, or contribute to the commendation of his *arguing*. For then his *Argument* muſt lie thus; the *Church* being *founded on Apoſtles*, &c. *prejudices not St.* Peter to be the *chiefeſt*, and if St. *Peter be the chiefeſt*, *then*, &c. Here 'tis viſible that having in the former part aſſumed no more than that his *chiefdom is not prejudiced*, in the *latter* he takes it for *granted*, without any tender of the leaſt word of *proof* that he is *chiefeſt*, and thence concludes that the *Church* is built *moſt chiefly* upon him. And ſo this malady of ſtrange arguing, after the application of his own πάτον φάρμακον, ſticks as cloſe, and as heavy upon him as before: for now the *not prejudicing him to be the chiefeſt*, immediately infers his *chiefdom*, or elſe 'tis aſſumed *gratis*, and ſo the main *queſtion begged*, without any *medium* to infer it.

7. Once more, to get out of theſe toils, he gives a plunge; *I made account*, ſaith he, (*as I lately ſhewed*) *that theſe Teſtimonies rather made St.* Peter *the chiefeſt.*] But 'tis certain he hath never ſhewed this, nor attempted more than to anſwer ſome of them, and to pretend that they did not prove the contrary; and that is no more than the not-prejudicing here, which is of all things moſt incompetent to prove his affirmative, that *Peter* is the *chiefeſt*, for which he produces it here. And therefore he could no otherwiſe make account of this, than he may make account the *Indies* are his, for that he may equally pretend, when he hath no other way to ſolve a difficulty.

8. But

8. But if after all this, he ſhould be able to lick himſelf whole, who would not look on his skill with reverence? If that be not compaſſable, yet he will have the comfort of railing at me, that I have calumniated him (good man) *moſt groſsly and manifeſtly, by making him bring this for a clear evidence, and printing the words clear evidence ſo that the honeſt Reader would eaſily take them to be his words.*] But to this I anſwer 1. that the other letter (as he hath oft been told, and may ſee it teſtified in every page, almoſt in every line of the Book) is no ſignification that the words are cited, or his; other uſes there are of the *Italick letter*, beſide that of noting a citation. 2. I had before exactly ſet down his words in the very ſtyle he now pretends, and therefore could not eaſily ſeduce any to a belief that [*clear evidence*] were his words. 3. It is but a copy of his countenance, that ſuch care is taken of the *honeſt Reader*, that he be not *deceived*; 'Tis not long ſince he dropt a proof of this. 4. It is not, as he pretends, that *I make him bring this for a clear evidence*; All that I there ſay of him, is to take notice of his *manner* of *arguing*, that from theſe *Teſtimonies not prejudicing*, he preſently aſſumes that it is *true*, as if ſaying nothing to hurt it, were a *clear evidence* on its ſide. Where by the abſurdity of a like caſe, that of aſſuming to evidence clearly from the barely *not prejudicing*, I ſhew the infirmity of his inference, that concludes it is, becauſe it is *not prejudiced*. This indeed is to ſay, that he doth *like* thoſe, but not that he uſes theſe words, which I muſt be ſuppoſed to acknowledge he uſes not, for if he did, this would not have been, *as if*, &c. not a *ſimilitude*, but the thing it ſelf.

9. After this, he takes occaſion to reſume the argument of the *Romaniſt*, from *Tu es* Petrus, accuſing me that I *did not at all put their argument, which*, ſaith he, *ſtands thus, that the name* Peter *ſignifying a Rock, and this not onely given particularly to St.* Peter, *but alſo after a particularizing manner, in all probability St.* Peter *was in a particular manner a Rock, to build God's Church, exemplifying this by* XII *Oratours, of whom one was called particularly Oratour, and was as well known by that name as his own.*] But how little efficacy there is in the giving *Peter* this Name particularly, or after the particularizing manner, hath now more largely been ſhewed, than to need any farther account in this place. The utmoſt that it can infer, is, that he, as a *particular* or *ſingle perſon*, was to be inſtated in that power noted by the Keys, and that he was by *Chriſt* deſtin'd before, at the impoſition of his Name, to be a *foundation-ſtone* in the *fabrick* of his *Church*, and this, if he pleaſe, in a particular and *ſingular* manner. But then as the impoſition of that name *Peter*, gave him no *Supremacy* over all the reſt of the Apoſtles, and the *whole Church* (which is moſt evident,

1. By his example of an *antonomaſtically called Oratour*, who hath by that Name no Title to *Supremacy* over all other *Oratours*, or other men:

2. Becauſe all the other were called *foundations* elſewhere, yet neither made thereby, nor ſuppoſed ſupreme; and

3. Becauſe he was by *Chriſt* ſirnamed *Peter* long before the promiſing him the Keys, *Mat.* 16. and then if by or at the impoſition of the name, he were inſtated in the power, with what propriety could it after be promiſed him, as *S. W.* ſuppoſes it was, and not actually conferred, till *Joh.* 21?) So the addreſſing the promiſe to him in the *particularizing manner*, proves it as little, unleſs the power it ſelf thus given him, can appear to be a ſingular, as that ſignifies a *Supreme power*; which alſo it doth not, as appears, becauſe the ſame power, whatever it is, was afterward promiſed, and at length performed to all the reſt of the Apoſtles; and if we may believe the Fathers, promiſed to all Biſhops in the *Church* in being promiſed him. Whether this ſound not to their diſadvantage, as much as his *ſimile* of *Oratour*, or his *particularizing Circumſtances*, ſound to his advantage, let the Reader judge.

10. Mean-while it may here be noted, that the utmoſt he now pretends, is, that he was in an *higher degree, or in a particular manner a Rock, than the reſt.*] Which as it is not proved by the *particularizing manner*, &c. but is diſproved by others being elſewhere joined with him in the thing ſignified by this *Appellation*, and in the power thus *particularly* given him, ſo if it were rendred probable, it might yet come ſhort of the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, the onely thing that his intereſts can be ſatiſfied with.

11. Three of them we have oft heard were προστιμηθέντες *dignified before the reſt*, δοκοῦντες εἶναι στῦλοι, *ſeeming to be Pillars* (as high a Title as that of *Foundation-ſtones*) yet this gave no *Supremacy* to all thoſe three; Why then ſhould the being a *foundation* in a *particular manner*, or *higher degree*, carry it for St. *Peter* over all? eſpecially when the Title of ἀκρογωνιαῖος, *Chief corner-ſtone*, which alone notes *Supremacy* among theſe *Foundation-ſtones*, is ſo far from belonging to *Peter*, that it cannot without *blaſphemy* be applied to him.

12. One thing more I ſhall note from his parallel betwixt the name *Peter*, and the name *Oratour*; That when as he ſaith, the *knowing Governour upon occaſion of ſome excellent Oration, gives one the Antonomaſtical Title of Oratour*] *'tis evident that this perſon was that eminent Oratour* before that Title was beſtowed on him, and not rendred ſuch by that Title, but onely approved to be ſuch by the judgment of that *knowing Governour*; and ſo, if the *parallel* hold, the Title of *Rock* or *Peter* muſt infer that he was, whatſoever is noted by that word, before the Title was given him; and then the *Supremacy*, if that were noted by it, could not be promiſed him, *Matth.* 16. on which his Argument proceeds.

13. After this, he will recite after his manner my proceſs in the *Tr. of Sch.* whereby I evacuate and retort the *Romaniſts* pretenſions from the word πέτρος; Of which when 1. I ſay, that it ſignifies vulgarly a ſtone, and cite *Homer* for it, he tells me, *I relinquiſh the ſignification which Scripture and our own Tranſlation gives it, and that I ſhew it out of an odd place in* Homer, *though I know that Poets are the worſt Authours to fetch propriety of words from.* To this I anſwer, and 1. To the laſt, That ſuch a *Claſſick* and ancient *Poet* as *Homer*, hath always been thought as fit an Authour for the propriety of words as any. 2. That for Scripture, it is ſo far from giving us another ſignification of the word, that both the *Syriack* word which this tranſlates, and the Context, here referring us to building the Church, as an houſe upon a foundation, doth oblige us to underſtand this of a *Foundation-ſtone.*

14. The force of the Context is viſible, and cannot be queſtioned; As for the word, the Hebrew כֵּיף, and *Chaldee* and *Syriack* כֵּיפָא and כֵּיפָא and כֵּיפָא which is the *Cepha* or *Cephas* which the Goſpel mentions and renders πέτρος, *Lexicographers* interpret it indifferently *Petra, ſaxum, lapis*; I ſhall mention but one example, *Iſa.* 8. 14. where the *ſtone of offence*, the ſtone at which one ſtumbles, is by the

Chaldee

Chaldee rendred כיף by the *Syriack* ܟܹܐܦܵܐ *Cepha*, exactly to the ſenſe that old *Homer* gave us. And thus *pretious ſtones* (the λίθοι τίμιοι I mentioned) are in the *Chaldee* טבתא כפין *good ſtones*, in this uſe of the word. 3. That our Tranſlatours rendring it a Rock to build upon, do not conſiderably differ from my rendring it a *ſtone*; a *Rock* being acknowledgedly a *ſtone*, though every ſtone be not a Rock, *viz.* a chalk or any other ſoft ſtone, which uſes not to have place in a *foundation*, and I ſuppoſe not to be meant here.

15. Secondly, when I ſay that the *Apoſtles*, *Rev.* 21. 14. are *Twelve foundations, each of which having the name of an Apoſtle on it, in reſpect of the power and dignity that belonged to every one, is ſeverally compared to a pretious ſtone, and the meaſure of the wall of the City, the Church thus built, was twelve times twelve cubits, aſſigning thereby an equal proportion whether of power or province to all and every of the Apoſtles*; All this he thus abbreviates, or transforms, that by *Mat.* 16. *applied to a building, it muſt needs ſignifie a foundation ſtone thence, by the* Apocalyps *a pretious ſtone, this done, that I deduce from the meaſuring the wall in* Apoc. *and dogmatize upon it, though I know it the moſt obſcure and myſtical part of Scripture.*] To this I reply.

1. That the Book of *Revelation* is indeed a Prophecy, and ſo obſcure and myſtical, and ſo is the Book of *Pſalms*, *Iſaiah*, and many more, eſpecially *Ezechiel*, and *Daniel*, and I have no reaſon to think that every one of theſe named, is leſs obſcure than this; and yet out of each of theſe, not onely Chriſt and his Apoſtles, but alſo the Fathers of the Church, have made no difficulty to cite Teſtimonies for the Confirmation of Articles of Faith, which is ſomewhat more than I have here attempted, bringing it onely for matters of leſſer moment, and in full accordance with other plain places.

And 2. That the paſſages I have produced, are far from obſcure, nor more ſo, than Chriſt's words to *Peter*, which both *S. W.* and I pretend to underſtand. For why ſhould it be more obſcure for twelve Apoſtles to be called Twelve Foundations and ſtones, and thoſe τίμιοι *pretious*, than for *Peter* to be ſtyled ſuch a ſtone, as the Church being built on, the *Gates of Hades ſhould not prevail againſt it?* It were eaſie to make the compariſon, and put into the former ſcale the menſuration of the wall, and yet to ſhew that this part of the Text, *Mat.* 16. is as (if not more) obſcure, as that of *Rev.* 21. But there is here nothing ſuggeſted againſt it, and therefore this task is unneceſſary. Onely I ſhall ask, why he ſhould, in reciting my proceſs, overskip the twelve θεμέλιοι *foundations*, expreſt by me from *v.* 14. and onely fetch from that place the *pretious ſtones*, and *meaſuring the wall*? 'Tis certain he ſaw them, for in the next Paragr. he mentions them. If then it were, leſt that which was ſo perſpicuous and pertinent to the matter, ſhould prejudice his Objection of obſcure and myſtical, it ſeems he had need of ſuch arts, elſe why ſhould he make uſe of them?

16. He will now reflect on ſuch toys, he ſaith, which I replyed to him in my Anſwer. The firſt was, that my anſwer to the Text of *Tu es Petrus*, though deformed by the *Diſarmer*, *could not miſs to have this efficacy in it, that there being no more meant by it, than that* Peter *was a foundation ſtone, and all the Apoſtles being ſuch as well as he, this cannot conſtitute him in any ſuperiority over them.* To this, what hath he to reply?

Why 1. that this *miſſes to be an anſwer to* Tu es Petrus, *and is turned to be an Argument from the foundation ſtones, in the Apocalyps*; and then he will ask, *Why I did not ſhew the particularizing Circumſtances had no force, but ramble as far as the* Apoc. *ferrying over the Queſtion by the mediation of* Homer.] and then what fit parallel for my proceſs, but that of *Cooper coming from King Pippin?* To his wit I return nothing but my due admiration; to his objection no more but this, that a denyal and a reaſon of it, hath been wont to be accounted a competent way of anſwering (and much more ſatisfactory, than the bare denyal, without any other reaſon, than his ſtanding upon the *Privilege of an anſwer*, to prove nothing, which *S. W.* ſo oft challengeth to himſelf) and ſuch is this, which denies and evacuates all force in the *Tu es Petrus*, or *ſirname*, *ſtone*, as that is applied to a *foundation*, by ſhewing all the reſt are ſtones and *foundation-ſtones* alſo; As for the *particularizing circumſtances*, of which this is the chief, they have oft been ſhewed to have no ſuch *Energy* in them, as either to make Πέτρος ſignifie more than a *foundation-ſtone*, or to raiſe the *Keys*, that were *promiſed Peter* in one place, and *all* in another, and accordingly conferred on *all*, into a quite other thing than what is meant by them, when they are gived to the reſt, *viz.* a *ſupremacy* over them.

17. Next he asks, *how I know no more is meant than a foundation-ſtone, unleſs I firſt anſwer the particularizing Circumſtances, which entitle him a Rock after a particular manner*;] But I have already ſhewed this, 1. that *Cephas* and Πέτρος ſignifie a *ſtone*, and in this place, of a *building* a *foundation-ſtone*, (and that is not a *Rock after a particular manner*) and this being common to him with the reſt, the *Circumſtances* have not the faculty to transform it into another thing, a *Supremacy* over them all. As for the [*as well*] ſignifying [*equally*] I have lately ſpoken in this Section, and need not ſo ſoon repeat it. This being thus unſucceſsfully performed, he next aſſaults my reaſon againſt St. *Peter's ſuperiority*, upon theſe grounds, *viz.* that *Chriſt onely is the chief corner-ſtone, and no other place in the foundation gives any* ὑπεροχὴν *of power to one foundation-ſtone above another*, which I ſaid was *manifeſt from the known poſition of foundation-ſtones, one by, not on the top of another.* To this paſſage he hath many exceptions; let us view them ſeverally; Firſt, he will ask me, *How I know that this place in the* Apocalyps *was deſigned to ſignifie the order of dignity among the things there ſpecified; and till I manifeſt this, I can*, he ſaith, *deduce nothing from it againſt them.* I anſwer, it is the eaſieſt thing in the world to ask an impertinent Queſtion, and impoſe an *unreaſonable Task* upon his Attendant. Elſe it could hardly be imagined with what pretence I, that maintain the *equality* of the *Apoſtles*, and bring this Text in favour of my pretenſions, ſhould be obliged to ſhew that it was deſigned to ſignifie *order of dignity*, which is ſome kind of *inequality*. And yet on this his following Objections are founded. The ſecond this, that 'tis *impoſſible to pretend that it was deſigned to prove any ſuch Order of dignity*, which he learnedly proves alſo; And it ſhall be willingly yielded without his aids, and let him conſider with his friends, who is moſt likely to gain by it, he whoſe intereſt it is, that they be equal, or he who contends for the *Supremacy* of one over all the other.

18. But he hath here one ſubtilty, that muſt be taken notice of; If, ſaith he, *the bringing no poſitive ſign of an higher poſition prejudices St.* Peter's *Superiority, it prejudices Chriſt's alſo as much, expreſſing no peculiar eminency to the head corner-ſtone more than to the reſt.*] The Reader may here refreſh himſelf if he be weary.

For 1. What can be more pleaſant than to obſerve *S. W.* comparing the *Superiority* of St. *Peter* with the *higher poſition of a ſtone in a foundation*, whereas it ſhould be in all reaſon the deeper, and that is the *lower poſition*, the loweſt being onely capable of that dignity of being *foundation-ſtones*, and the higher utterly unqualified for any, much more for an higher degree of that dignity. What wit-engine will help to recover *S. W.* out of this pit?

But then 2. how can the ſuppoſed equality of the *Twelve foundation-ſtones*, prejudice Chriſt? when 'tis viſible that *Chriſt* is one of the twelve, and conſequently, not mentioned in the place, but the *Twelve Apoſtles onely*, which had now the *Supreme power* after his aſcenſion, and not any ſingle perſon among them, and this *Ariſtocratical Supremacy* deſcribed by *Twelve foundations*, as *Chriſt's Monarchick Supremacy*, whilſt he was here, and now as he is in heaven, is expreſt in another ſtyle, that of the *chief Corner-ſtone*, or *head of the Corner*, *Pſa.* 118. *Mat.* 21. *Mar.* 12. *Luk.* 20. *Act.* 4. 1 *Pet.* 2. when therefore from this Title of our Saviour, he will fanſie three other *Corner-ſtones* beſides him, and make a *third Objection* of that on a ſuppoſed inference of *three Chiefs* in power beſides him, he now ſees the vanity of his *conceit*, there being but one place of dignity taken notice of by *Scripture* among *Foundation-ſtones*, and that is the ἀκρογωνιαῖος, *the head of the Corner*, in which the *whole building* συναρμολογεῖται, ſaith St. *Paul*, *Eph.* 2. 20. is *fitly coupled*, and ſo agreeably *framed* and *compacted together*, the Apoſtles and Prophets being there lookt on all together, as the *foundation*, *v.* 19. and none of them dignified by poſition in the *Corner*, any more than *Peter* by his *particularizing Circumſtances*. And let this ſerve for a view of *S. W's* skill in *Architecture*, which being joyned with his wit and eloquence (of one kind) and *Ruſhworthian Divinity*, may give us a complete image of him.

19. His fourth Objection; which is founded on the rendring of *Petra* a *Rock*, hath by our view of the notion of כיפא, and that which the *context*, (relating to building) gives it, in this place, being already ſuperſeded. Onely when my *Architecture* is objected againſt, and I am ſaid to *forget that to be in an higher degree a foundation-ſtone, is to be in an higher degree of firmneſs, but in a lower degree of poſition*, this cannot but be a little ſtrange to me. For 1. 'Tis certain I never ſeemed to think (what alone *S. W.* did) that the *higher poſition was the dignifying of a foundation-ſtone*; well knowing, that none but the loweſt in poſition is capable of that title, and thence concluding, that all foundations are equal, becauſe all loweſt. I ſaid indeed, that they *lye one by, not on the top of the other*; But is that to ſay, or ſuppoſe, that that which lies on the top, or uppermoſt, is moſt dignifyed? No, but that all being loweſt, there is none more dignifyed than other, yeilding that what is laid upon them is *leſs* (but I hope that doth not ſignifie in any dialect, *more*) *dignified*. 2. What he ſuggeſts, *that to be in an higher degree of foundation-ſtone, is to be in an higher degree of firmneſs*] hath no truth in it; the one thing that *dignifies* any *foundation-ſtone* above the reſt, being that of the *chief*, or *head of the corner*, becauſe that *couples* the *whole building*, the firmneſs being equally competible to all the ſtones in the *foundation*, and ſo not ſuppoſeable to be peculiar to any one of them, as that of the *coupling*, and being *head of the corner* is; And now forſooth *S. W.* profeſſes himſelf *weary of quibbling*, and I think indeed never any man had more reaſon for it.

20. He had formerly recited an argument of mine thus, *no diſtinction was put among the foundation ſtones, therefore there was none*; and then charged it of being a *Negative argument*; I anſwered him, that my *argument was this*, Simon *is by Chriſt called* Πέτρος *a foundation-ſtone in the building of the Church, and the ſame title in other words is given every of the Apoſtles, when they are called twelve foundations, from whence my concluſion, (not my proof) is negative*, Ergo: *the words* Tu es Petrus, *affirm no more of him, than is affirmed and given every of the other Apoſtles*. What hath he now to reply to this? Why he tells me, *I neither made any ſuch concluſion, nor any at all againſt* Tu es Petrus, *as they object it*. 2. *my proof is now onely this, that* Πέτρος *and* Σκάλος *are the ſame, as if there could not be foundation-ſtones leſs firm than a Rock.*] To this *I anſwer*, 1. that he ſets out with an untruth; for in the *Tr. of Sch. p.* 90. 'Tis viſible that I evacuate the *argument* from *Tu es Petrus* for *Supremacy*, by obſerving the ſignification of Πέτρος, and the *Apoſtles* being ſtyled *twelve foundations*, &c. And what is this, but concluding from thence, that the words *Tu es Petrus* affirm no more of him, than is affirmed of others? Is not their *argument* from hence for his *ſupremacy* founded in *more* being given him here, than is elſewhere given others? If it be but an *higher degree of the power of the Keys*, that is more. How then can he have confidence to ſay, *I made not any ſuch concluſion*? If that were not my *concluſion in terminis*, yet ſure it was *ſome ſuch concluſion*, which yet he fairly denys. 2. With what *truth* can he add, that *I make not any concluſion at all againſt the Text, as they object it*? Do not the *Romaniſts* from thoſe words prove the *Supremacy*? How then can my concluding againſt that inference, miſs of *concluding againſt it, as they object it*? What if in the *Tr.* of *Sch.* I took no notice of the weight now laid on the particularizing circumſtances, as not being able to divine, or foreſee all the little arts that *S. W.* would catch at, and call in to his aid? *Firſt*, all other *Romaniſts* have not done ſo, and *S. W.* ſhould be the mark of ſome *one*, and is not *we* in the plural. But however, 2. I have now ſhewn how little his particularizing circumſtances avail him, and that a particularity of addreſs does not infer a *Supremacy* of power. And ſo ſtill he hath gained little by the ſubtilty. *Laſtly*, I have often minded him, that Πέτρος ſignifies no more than a *foundation-ſtone* in this place; and then there is no notion of *Rock* ſuperadded to that of foundation, nor conſequently any *Superiority* of degree noted by it,

21. Next when to his objecting ignorance to me, that from plurality I infer equality, I anſwered, that that was not my reaſoning, but that the reſt of the *Apoſtles* being called foundation-ſtones, as well as he, *Tu es Petrus was no proof of inequality* (or *Supremacy*) he replies, *Thus the Dr. turns the ſame ſtone ſtill.*] Which is to ſay, that when he repeats an objection many times and in divers ſhapes, I give it conſtantly the ſame anſwer. But he will ask, whether I ſuppoſe this equality, or infer it? I anſwer I do neither at this time, (though elſewhere I infer it by ſeveral ways of proofs, *teſtimonies* for their ἰσοτιμία, &c.) but onely *evacuate* and *retort* his argument from *Tu es Petrus*; for if his being called

called a foundation-ſtone, be a proof of *Supremacy*, the title of twelve foundations will prove twelve *Supremes*, which being ridiculous on one ſide, the analogy muſt conclude it ſo on the other. From hence indeed follows, that if they be concluded *Supreme*, as well as he, then as far as this proof goes, they are all equal. But I did not, becauſe I needed not make uſe of that inference.

22. There is yet more of this batch; He had objected that I had quite deſtroyed mine own cauſe, ſince granting foundation-ſtone and Πέτρος to be the ſame, and onely *Peter* having that name, it follows on my grounds, that he onely and more particularly ſhould be a foundation-ſtone,] To this I anſwered, 1. That it would be a ſtrange *Syllogiſm*, if put in form; 2. That θεμέλιος and Πέτρος being the ſame, they that are every of them θεμέλιοι, muſt be by this argument as much foundation-ſtones, and as particularly as he that was called Πέτρος. 3. That *man* and *Enoſh* being the ſame, and onely the *Son of Seth called Enoſh*, it would follow, on theſe grounds, that he onely, and he more particularly ſhould be a man. To this he now replies, 1. That I recur to my own confident ſayings, that it is certain Πέτρος and θεμέλιος *are the ſame, which he*, ſaith he, *hath certainly ſhewn to be otherwiſe*. But 1. how can this be a confident ſaying of mine, when I have proved it as oft as I have ſaid it? for having proved Πέτρος to be a ſtone, and in this place a foundation-ſtone ſo evidently, that even *S. W.* * grants it, what can be far- * P. 440. l. 31.
ther required to prove it all one with θεμέλιος, in the notion wherein twelve θεμέλιοι are twelve foundation-ſtones? 2. He hath never ſhewed this to be certainly otherwiſe; nor can he, without contradicting this grant of his, that a foundation-ſtone and Πέτρος are the ſame, be imagined to attempt it.

23. Secondly to my parallel of *Enoſh*, &c. he replyes. 1. *That I conſider not, that if* Enoſh *be the onely man, it unmans D. H. as much as S. W.* 2. *That when the ordinary appellative ſignifying the ſpecifical notion is appropriated to ſome one, that ought to be eſteemed as participating in an higher manner of that notion; but then Enoſh*, ſaith he, *ſignifies not the ſpecies of man, but man as ſubject to miſeries, as* Mortalis *in Latine; where as* Adam *ſignifying man, according to his nature, denotes, that he in a particular manner was a man*, &c. *and ſo*, ſaith he, Filius hominis, *applied to our Saviour and* Orator *to* Cicero, *argues they had a particular right to theſe titles*, i.e. *were in an higher degree the thing ſignifyed.*] To theſe I anſwer, 1. That I did, and could not well eſcape conſidering that the ſuppoſition that *Enoſh* were the onely man, muſt needs unman me as well as him, it being certain that I am not *Enoſh* the *Son* of *Seth*, any more than *S. W.* is. But 1. I that drive him, by this inſtance, to an abſurdity, am not to be preſt with the inconveniences of it. 2. What avails this, to enervate the force of the parallel, which is not founded in *Enoſh* being the *onely man*, but in one particular man, the *Son of Seth* being called *Enoſh*, as one man the brother of *Andrew* was called Πέτρος? 3. To his *Criticiſm* I reply. 1. That granting it, that *Enoſh* is all one with *Mortalis*, my argument or parallel remains ſtill of the ſame force; For by *S. W's* reaſoning from the name Πέτρος, it muſt follow, that then the *Son of Seth* onely, and more particularly, ſhould be a *mortal*, or *afflicted*, or *miſerable* man; and then at the leaſt neither *Job* nor any other was *afflicted*, neither *S. W.* nor any other are *mortal* in ſo high a degree, as the *Son of Seth*. 2. I cannot yet conſent that *Enoſh* doth not properly ſignify the whole ſpecies of man, when yielding it to denote *Critically*, a *miſerable* or *afflicted* or *mortal* man, it is manifeſt, that every man that is born of a woman is not onely *mortal*, but of few days, not onely *afflicted*, but full of trouble, *Job* XIV. 1. 3. For *Adam*, that properly and originally ſignifies *earth*, it cannot quite ſo properly be applied to any man, as to him that was *created* immediately out of the *earth*, as no other but he was; yet granting this alſo, that *Adam* ſignifies man according to his *ſpecifical* nature, my parallel will hold of him, it no-way appearing that he onely, or in good reaſon more particularly ſhould be a man, all other men being men alſo, and equally with him, who alone was called *Adam*. 4. For *Son of man*, applied to our *Saviour*, 'tis moſt unfortunately inſtanced in; for 'tis certain *Chriſt* hath no more right to the title of *Son of man*, than any mere man hath; that he is very man, is all that the *Church* in this matter pretends for him, not that he is in a more *Eminent manner* a *man*, than any other man is. As for his *Supremacy* over all men, that is not derived from that title, or from his humane nature, but from his *Divine*, which denominated him *Filius Dei*, the *eternal, omnipotent Son* of *God*. And 5. If *Cicero* by being called *Oratour*, be yielded to have been eſteemed the *moſt Excellent Oratour*, yet neither will that infer that he onely was an *Oratour*, or that he had *Supremacy* of power over all *Oratours*, which alone will ſerve *S. W's* pretenſions.

24. What he ſubjoyns of the name *Enoſh*, that it might be in a manner accidentally impoſed by his *Parents*, 1. He hath himſelf ſuperſeded, by adding [*unleſs we ſuppoſe his Parents to have been prophetical*] which why may we not reaſonably ſuppoſe of *Seth?* However he now ſees, I can change it for other inſtances, of names, which were impoſed by *God* himſelf, ſuch was *Adam* and the *Son of man*, and yet he may remember that his inſtance of *Oratour*, was not of the number of thoſe that were by *prophecy*, or from heaven impoſed on *Cicero*, and therefore he that had made uſe of that, ſhould have abſtained from this exception.

25. Laſtly he had objected to me, *that I will have all the Apoſtles called Peter*. And I ſhewed the vanity of that, and aſſured him I was content with the *Scripture ſtyle*, that called them all θεμέλιοι. This will not content him, but he will reinforce this weighty obſervation, that if, as I ſay, *Each was ſuch, Chriſt that governed himſelf by perfect reaſon* (no leſs then) ought to give to all the reſt the name *Peter*: and on this head, he obſerves a ſpecial advantage on his ſide, that θεμέλιος doth not ſignify a foundation-ſtone, but onely a foundation, abſtracted from *ſand, ſtraw, wool-packs, wood, rock*, &c.] But I anſwer, 1. That as I doubt not of the wiſedom and reaſon of all *Chriſt's* actions, and impoſitions of names, ſo I muſt leave him his liberty in this and all the like particulars, and not preſcribe to him what he ought to doe; 2. That all the ſapiential motives imaginable are fully ſatisfied according to my ſuppoſition, by his calling them (as he doth in S. *John's viſion*, received from him, *Rev.* XXI) *twelve foundation ſtones*. 3. That though θεμέλιος, ſignify no more than a *foundation, Grammatically*, yet when the mention is of ſo many θεμέλιοι, as XII, and when the ſame XII θεμέλιοι are expreſly ſaid to be foundations of a wall, *v.* 19. the θεμέλιοι muſt needs be *foundation-ſtones*, the wall otherwiſe having but one, and that is not XII *foundations*. And ſo the πρῶτος θεμέλιος, *firſt foundation*, v. 20, being a *Jaſper* i.e. a *pretious ſtone*, and ſo forward to the reſt of the XII, 'tis evident they muſt be *foundation-ſtones*. And if, ſaith he, this obſervation of his much ſtrengthened his *argument*, then when it hath thus treacherouſly failed him, what will become of that poor argument, that received thus much ſtrength, took ſuch comfort in this (ſo much wanted, but ſoon blaſted) advantage? Thus we are at length at an end of his *Sixth Section*.

SECT. VII.

The obſcurities of the Apocalypſe farther conſidered. Commenters on it. The menſuration of the wall perſpicuous. Dogmatizing. S. W's *objections from the luſtre of the Jaſper*, &c.

1. HIS *Seventh* ſets out with great indignation at me, for undertaking, as he ſaith, *to dogmatize*, i.e. *build our Faith, and deſtroy theirs, from my interpretation of a myſtical part of Scripture.* On which head he falls into the higheſt expreſſions he could reach, to ſet out the *obſcurity* of that Book of the *Revelation*, making it ſo beyond all controverſie *obſcure* in the higheſt degree, that it ſeems to need another *Revelation* as great as that which firſt inſpired it, to know the meaning of it; and then laying on me as full a weight of *contumely*, as ſo great an *Artiſt* could furniſh, no leſs than the moſt openly pernicious folly that can be imagined, for doing this, and as he ſaith, calling it an evidence, of *Sch. p.* 9. *l.* 22.] To this fermentation of his *bitter zeal*, diſcovering it ſelf in the *diſarmer*, I had I thought in
* *P.* 73. * my *Anſwer* applied my lenitive, of force ſufficient to have prevented any farther working of it. To that I might ſafely refer any diſpaſſionate Reader. But to *S. W.* it ſeems more medicaments are needfull, the pulſe beats ſo high at this time. And therefore I ſhall more particularly apply my ſelf to his cure. 1. By demanding whether all his expreſſions of *Cimmerian* and *midnight-obſcurity* do belong to every part of the Book of *Revelation*, ſo that there is not in it one period that any mortal man can hope to underſtand the meaning of, without a viſion equal to that which *John* received in *Patmos?* or whether his words muſt be mollified with this Interpretation, that to underſtand the entire *Book* and every part of it, is thus impoſſible without *immediate Revelation?*

2. Should he pitch upon the former of theſe, common ſenſe would be his judge, and award me damages againſt his *Contumelies*, there being many parts of that Book as intelligible, as the firſt verſes of St. *John's Goſpel.* It were too long to enumerate them. And 'tis known to all, that many men that were in their *right* wits, both ancient and modern, the *Romaniſt Alcazar*, as well as others of our perſuaſions, have undertaken to interpret the whole Book, *i.e.* to know the meaning of it, and but one that I ever heard of, who thought fit to pretend to immediate *Revelation* for it, who alſo ſeems to interpret his meaning in thoſe pretenſions, that he thought dreaming of dreams to be ſeeing of *viſions*, or deſpair'd to put off ſo wild irrational fancies, as he had fetcht hence, without deriving them from the indiſputable fountain of truth. But ſetting him aſide, I demand, was *Andreas Caſarenſis*, or *Aretas*, or *Alcazar*, or *Grotius* guilty of the utmoſt folly in attempting to interpret this Book, even all of it? If he ſay they were, I leave him to combate it with their *Ghoſts*, or with the memory they have left in the world. If he ſay they were not, then hath he condemned himſelf for theſe his extravagant expreſſions, kept up to this higheſt meaning of them.

3. But if he will be content to be interpreted to a more moderate ſenſe, that he onely ſpake of the *entire Book*, &c. then ſtill we have his leave to think, that ſome paſſages are intelligible; and then, for ought he hath yet attempted to manifeſt, this, which alone I am concerned in at this time, may be of the number; and then, what heed is due to *S. W's* procemial general harangues of *midnight* and *Cimmerian obſcurities?* Nay, that as much as I pretend here to make uſe of, is thus plain, I appeal to the common ſenſe of all *Chriſtians*. For doth not the great *City*, *the holy Jeruſalem deſcending out of Heaven from God*, v. 10. as manifeſtly ſignify the *Church*, *the New Jeruſalem*, v. 2. as ἡ ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ, *the ſupernal Jeruſalem* ſignifies the ſame, *Gal.* 4. 26? Then is it not conſequent that the 14th verſe is as intelligible, where 'tis ſaid, the *wall* of the *City* had XII *foundations?* Nay, have we not the very guidance *S. W.* requires, a *Revelation* as great as that which inſpired thoſe words, to determine the ſenſe of them to the *twelve Apoſtles* of *Chriſt?* Unleſs there be difficulty with *S. W.* of interpreting the *Lamb* to be *Chriſt*, 'tis moſt certain we are thus provided; for it follows, *and in them the names of the twelve Apoſtles of the Lamb.* Who can now queſtion but theſe *twelve Apoſtles* were theſe *foundations?* And then all that remains, is, but the exacting of *S. W.* 1. So much plain underſtanding, that the *wall*, and the *foundation*, on which it was built, are commenſurate. 2. So much *Arithmetick* as to be able to divide CXLIV into *twelve* parts, *twelve times twelve*, and apply that to the *Foundations* or *Apoſtles*; and then he knows as much of the *Wall* as I ſhall deſire of him; for as to the determining the ſenſe of this, whether to power or province, he had his liberty to chuſe which he liked beſt; I know he will not take my judgment, elſe I ſhould recommend to him the notion of *power* as the more probable, and then what inſuperable difficulty was there in all this, or what violence to any the ſloweſt underſtanding, to diſcern that this menſuration aſſigns an *equal* proportion to all, and every the *Apoſtles?*

4. If this will not allay his high diſpleaſure, I then next beſeech him to conſider, what it is to *dogmatize from an obſcure Text*; Is it not to teach for *Doctrine* or *matter of Faith*, that which I have nothing for, but my own Interpretation of an *obſcure Text?* Thus he appears to underſtand the phraſe; If then, 1. I teach no *Article of Faith*, at this time, (for though I conceive the *Apoſtles* power was equal by *Chriſt's Donation*, yet I believe it not my ſelf, nor impoſe it on others, as an *Article of Faith,*) and 2. If I have the agreement of other plain places of *Scripture* for all that now I teach, *Chriſt's giving the ſame power to all the Apoſtles*, that he promiſed to one particularly; and 3. If *S. W.* be the man that both makes the *Supremacy of* Peter *a matter of Faith*, and infers it from no *Scripture*, that doth more clearly infer it, than the *meaſuring of the Wall* infers the equality of all (for though *Tu es Petrus* be a plainer ſenſe than *Rev.* XXI. 17. yet it doth not more convincingly infer *Peter's Supremacy,*) then am I freed, and *S. W.* fallen under this guilt of *dogmatizing.*

5. Laſtly, when he ſaith *I call my proof an evidence*, and cites *page* and *line* for it, if the Reader look, he ſhall find it otherwiſe, and that I onely ſay, that 'tis *evident that that menſuration aſſigns an equal proportion*, &c. and conclude not that this is an *evidence*, but in a meeker ſtyle, *prejudice to the Univerſal Paſtourſhip* of any one of them.

6. He next recites at large the objections he had uſed in *Sch. Diſar.* about the *inequality* of richneſs in ſome of the *ſtones*, and the firſt, the *Jaſper*, repreſenting St. *Peter*, and then tells us, that *in anſwer to th ſe firſt exceptions the Doctour ſays nothing at all, and twice objects to me the breach* of my word that I would,

would, and had *attended* him κ.τ.λ.] And yet 'tis visible in my * *answer*, that I did speak to as much of this, as the question was concerned in, and told him that the *quality* and *lustre* of the *first* of the *twelve stones*, in that *vision*, was most proper to signify the *lustre of zeal* and *other gifts*, and that if he could find means to assure, 1. *That* Peter *was signified by the Jasper*, 2. *That the lustre of that exceeded the lustre of all the rest*, *I should grant his conclusion*, viz. *of the greater zeal*, &c. in *Peter*, but deemed that still no proof of his *Supremacy*; *dominion* being not founded in those *graces* (but in *constitutions* and *commissions* of *Christ*'s) nor always accompanied with them. * P. 74. l. 11.

7. Now to my answer, that the *equality* and *lustre* of the *first stone* is most proper to signify the *lustre* of *zeal*, and *other gifts*, he replies, that I afford no reason to oppose his contrary exceptions.] To this I answer, 1. That in *S. W*'s methods and rules for controversie, I might be allowed to have learnt, that 'tis sufficient for an *Answerer* (such then I was, when I *answered* his argument) to *deny*, or *distinguish*, and give no *reason* for either of them; and therefore am not to be accused by him, who by imposing these rules, is obliged to stand to them. 2. I may be allowed sometimes to think *reasons* superfluous, when, 1. Common sense receives what is said, to which I appeal, whether *radiancy* or *lustre* of a *pretious stone*, be not more proper to signify, in a *man*, *gifts*, *Endowments*, such as *zeal*, &c. than *power* and *authority*. 2. When the objections against it are not backt with reasons of any weight. Thus also it is here, for his onely *argument* to prove St. *Peter* from hence to be *Christ's Vicar*, was, because the *same stone*, the *Jasper*, was it, whose *lustre shined in our Saviour*, *Apoc.* IV. 3. and also the *Church*, *Ch.* XXI. 11. But to this the *answer* was obvious, 1. That in both these, *Christ* in his humanity, and the *Church of Christ*, the *lustre* might signify that of *Divine Graces* without relating to that of *Authority*, and then that gained him nothing. 2. A circumstance in the former, prejudiced his pretensions, *viz.* that *Christ* as he was like a *Jasper*, so he was like a *Sardine stone* also, *Apoc.* IV. 3. Which λίθῳ σαρδίνῳ unless it differ from σαρδίῳ, will be found the *Emblem* of some other of the *twelve*, *Revel.* XXI. 20. Who consequently, if there were force in that, must but be *Christ's Vicegerent* also, as well as St. *Peter*, though 'twere, to his hearts desire, granted, that he is represented by the *Jasper*. So likewise *Ch.* XXI. 11. the *Church* that is represented by a *Jasper*, is at the same time resembled to *Crystal* also.

8. That what I now say, is arguing from *mystical places*, and *dogmatizing*, perhaps he may now again affirm. But 1. I do not take *answering* to be *arguing*; and 2. I onely obey his commands, to attend his motions, and I profess to infer nothing from hence, but pay respect to his discourses, be they but such as these. 3. That *S. W.* who applied himself to these succours, and so called them in, of his own accord, without my so much as naming them, hath not been able in the least-wise to serve himself of them; and that, if it be of no other use, may be of this, that my reasons are as efficacious against his exceptions as they need to be, till his exceptions are more weighty.

9. And this was it that made me propose to him those two *Conditions*, His proving 1. That the *Jasper* denoted *Peter*; and 2. that it exceeded all the rest in lustre; on which I was content to grant, that *Peter* had the *richer lustre* of some graces, rather than contend with him on such uncertainties, that had also so weak an influence on our present Question.

10. This one would have thought, might have composed, and ended such a debate betwixt us; But he resolves otherwise, *he will*, he saith, *make his advantages of it*. And 1. from the *Conclusion*, the *lustre of Graces*, he doubts not to infer the *advantage of Authority*, by my position that made *the coming of the holy Ghost* actually give *authority* to the *Apostles*, *when*, saith he, *the holy Ghost can be no otherwise in their hearts than by his gift*. Then for the *Conditions*, the first he will infer from my granting *Peter* the *priority of Order*, the latter from the *lustre* of the *Jasper shining in Christ*, and the *Church*, *and so used to represent persons of higher dignity and authority*: To these I answer, 1. That I may without any detriment of mine, safely yield him to have evinced the *first condition*; I have indeed acknowledged *Peter* the *priority of Order*, and therefore as I did not, so neither do I resist, or offer any exception against it; Onely not knowing that I was so good an Authour, as that *S. W.* could *assure himself* of any *Truth* upon my asserting somewhat that might infer it, he may pardon me, if I mentioned to him the finding means of assuring himself of it.

11. As for his second condition, I have already intimated to him my reasons, why his proofs convince me not of it, *viz.* because as *Christ* is represented by the *Jasper*, so he is also by the *Sardine stone* in the same place, *Rev.* IV. 3. and so the *Church* by *Crystal* also, *Ch.* XXI. 11. and then by his argument, the *Sardine stone* and the *Crystal* must represent *Supreme Authority* also, and the pretence for any one, must destroy or supersede it for the other, and unless each of these can exceed one another in lustre, the conclusion *S. W.* wants, cannot be drawn thence. 3. Then for the proof of the *higher Authority* following the *higher Graces*, it is of no force; the *Authority* being finally instated on the *Apostles*, not by the *inexistence of the holy Ghost in their hearts*, but by his *visible descending on them*, and marking them out (by the *fiery tongues sitting on each of them*) to that *Office Apostolical*, and this again by virtue of *Christ's Commission* given in these words, *Receive the holy Ghost*, as hath formerly been shewed.

12. After all this, he thinks fit again to return to the *mensuration* of the *Wall*, and espies through a *crevise* some gleam of advantage to him, which he cannot conclude before he lay hold on, that forsooth, *I my self know not whether this Argument make for me or against me*, *for I infer*, *that it assigns an equal proportion*, *whether of power or province to all and every of the Apostles*, *so that I doubt to which it relates*, *and then*, saith he, *what doth the equality of their particular Province prejudice him?* and so I *having left it between two*, he will *take his liberty to assent to neither*, *and think that it relates to the different disposition of souls*, *and that the heavenly Jerusalem shall be made up of such*, *some resembling the spirit*, &c. of St. *Peter*, *others of St.* John, *of St.* Paul, *&c.*] To this also I answer,

1. That from my leaving the *mensuration* indifferent to *power and province*, he may not infer my *not knowing whether it be for me or against me*: 'Tis visible it cannot be against me, whichsoever it be of these two; for how can equality of all, whether in *power* or *province*, infer *Supremacy* of *power*, and *Universality of Province* in one, (which is the least that the *Universal Pastourship* is content with.)

2. As, if the power be the thing meant, it is clearly on my side; so if the *Province* were pitcht on, that must include power; and that is the reason why I left it indifferent (as to my interests it was) whether were meant of them. For certainly *Province* and *Power* are *Relatives*, the power extends as far as

the *Province*, and the *Province* as far as the power; If we ſpeak of *Particular Provinces*, thoſe relate to *particular preſidencies*, if of the *whole World*, as one *Univerſal Province*, that is anſwerable to *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*. So that unleſs the ſame perſon be doubly provided with a particular and *Univerſal Province*, *S. W.* gains nothing; and if ſo, then ſure the Wall is not *equally meaſured* among *twelve* in reſpect of *Province*; for how can a part and the whole be counted equal?

3. That the *menſuration* of the wall of the *City*, and *diviſion* into *twelve equal* parts, and the name of an Apoſtle ſet upon each of them, ſhould be the reſembling the Spirit, *i.e.* the *particular manner of knowledge and affection of St.* Peter, John, Paul, *&c. that the heavenly Jeruſalem ſhall be made up of ſuch*, may paſs for a compound rarity of *S. W*'s extracting; when

1. Saint *Paul*, whom he names for one, was certainly none of the twelve.

2. That which he calls the *heavenly Jeruſalem*, and ſeems by the [*ſhall be*] to interpret of the yet *future ſtate* in Heaven, is in that place the *holy Jeruſalem, deſcending out of Heaven from God*, and ſo unqueſtionably the Church here below.

3. The *menſuration* and equal parts of the wall, is a very different thing from the *building* of the *wall of Jaſper*, &c. *i.e.* the *ſeveral illuſtrious radiances* in it, the latter of which having propriety to expreſs the *ſeveral ſpirits, manner of knowledge* or *affection* in the *Apoſtles*, can with no tolerable Analogy, by any but *S. W*'s meaſures, be applied to the former.

13. What remains to the end of this *Section*, is a recapitulating the heads of matter, and ſo making an *Inventory* of his *Victories*; and if he have now loſt again all the ground, that he had moſt triumphantly ſtalked over, he may ſit down, and on the ſame fingers and toes recount his *defeats*, if he pleaſe: If not, I am ſo much better pleaſed in concluding, than protracting theſe debates, that I ſhall not imitate him, or laviſh one minute to doe it for him; When he awakes, he will ſee what ſolid ſatisfaction it will yield, to have onely dreamt of *Conqueſts*.

SECT. VIII.

Anſwer to his concluding Section. How far S. W. *hath proceeded. His chief reaſon of proceeding no farther, fallacious. His tenderneſs. His Vindication from falſifications. The Baſilica.* Ὄνομα, πρᾶ. *The Canon of* Chalcedon, *and* Balſamon's *Scholion. His Charge of falſification retorted on me, How cauſeleſly.* Locum Apoſtolicæ ſedis. *Difference between* τίμην ἔχειν, *and* πρεσβεῖον, &c. *The Concluſion.*

1. HIS whole Reply being at length paſt through, there remains yet his *concluding Section*. And the firſt part of it is the rendring of nine (and omitting of two more) reaſons, why he proceeded no farther in his task. To his reaſons of this choice, I ſhall reply nothing, having ſo little to object to the choice it ſelf, that if I had been to make it for him, either as his friend or enemy, he ſhould have ſpared much of the pains he hath already taken.

2. How far indeed he hath proceeded, ſince he thinks fit to reflect upon it, it is not amiſs to advertiſe the Reader. When the *Catholick Gentleman*, and afterward the *Diſarmer* had undertaken, one briefly, the other more largely to refute the *Tr. of Sch.* I applied to the firſt a *Reply*, to the ſecond an *Anſwer*, omitting not to vindicate (that I know of) one paſſage in the Tract which either of them had excepted againſt. (He now pretends that I neglected almoſt all his *Ninth Section, and all his Tenth of the ſecond part of Sch. Diſar.* But the account of this is viſible; *Anſw. to Sch. Diſar.* p. 221, *&c.* To which I refer the Reader.) My Reply conſiſted of 22 Sheets, My Anſwer of 38. His *Schiſm Diſpatcht* he intitles a *Rejoinder to the Replies of D.* H. &c. and profeſſes to undertake both *Reply* and *Anſwer*, ſpends near 500 pages upon them, takes to task what he thinks fit in either of them, and omits what he pleaſes, as he paſſes, and yet advances no farther than to a fourth part of my Anſwer (the firſt 74 Pages) and to 73 of the Reply. For this the onely reaſon he renders, wherein I am concerned, I deſire the Reader will judge of, and of his ſincerity by it; It is taken from mine own words thus;

3. After I had in the Book of *Sch.* finiſht the Diſcourſe againſt St. *Peter's Supremacy* (the part to which alone he hath replied) I add, 'tis very *unneceſſary to proceed to the other parts*, &c. From whence he concludes, that I have *completed his juſt excuſe, and confeſs it needleſs he ſhould proceed, having vindicated their Tenet in that which I call the onely neceſſary*; The Antecedent he deduces from many ſpeeches of mine; and I confeſs them all; but can by no means allow his inference from them, any more than that I am he, or that all that is affirmable of me, is equally competible to him alſo. Should I ſay that I were a Member of the *Church of England*, and ſay it an hundred times over, could he infer it thence to be my Confeſſion, that he is a Member of the *Church of England* alſo? If he could not, no more can he infer, that needleſs to him, becauſe it was ſo to me, from my Confeſſion.

4. The *Romaniſts* pretenſion for the Papacy is founded in two things, either of which failing, they are neceſſarily nonſuited and defeated. 1. The Supremacy of St. *Peter* over all the Apoſtles by donation of *Chriſt*. 2. The Biſhop of *Rome* his ſucceeding St. *Peter* in this privilege. 'Tis not one, but both of theſe, on which his intereſts depend, and the former without the latter, avail him nothing; for ſuppoſing St. *Peter*'s perſon inveſted in the *Univerſal Paſtourſhip*, and the Biſhop of *Jeruſalem* or *Antioch*, or *Alexandria* to ſucceed him in it; What hath *Rome* acquired by the firſt ſuppoſition? From hence it inevitably follows, that he is obliged to make good both againſt us, and that it ſerves our turn to have refuted the former, for having done ſo, there is no place of pretence for the latter.

5. If this were yet ſo obſcure, that he could want an inſtance to illuminate him, I might give him a thouſand Parallels, in every of which it would be moſt evident; The *Catholick* againſt the *Arian* is bound to make good, both that *Chriſt* is God, and that he is equal with his Father, and if he ſhould fail in the firſt of theſe, the *Arians* buſineſs were done, without proceeding to the ſecond; but unleſs he perfect his proofs to the ſecond alſo, he hath not completed his undertaking againſt the *Arian*.

6. The truth is, *S. W*'s inference is ſo groſly falſe, that it could ſcarce have been more ſo, had he inferred one branch of a *contradiction* from another, concluded himſelf Emperour of the world, becauſe he was

he was not so. For wh[illegible]ld it be needless for me to proceed, after my refuting the first, to the second point or branch of his pretension, but because there were two parts of it, one depending upon the other, both which he was obliged to make good, and unless he did so, if he failed in either, his cause was lost? And if so, how hath he performed all that is incumbent on him, when he hath not pretended to proceed any farther, than the first part of it? Can any thing be more manifest? Yet to deceive the Reader, he * tells him, that I call this of St. *Peter's Supremacy* their *onely Ground*. But he that shall consult my words, *Tr. of Sch.* p. 92. l. 18. shall find them mis-represented; They are these; *As this of St.* Peter's *personal power and eminence is the Principal, so it is in effect the onely Ground of the Romanists' pretensions, this other of derivative power in the Successour, being like water that flows from a spring, apt to ascend no higher than the fountain stood*;] Where what is but the principal, *and in effect the onely ground*, is not yet the onely (for then how could I name [*the other*] in the next words) but that on which the other so wholly depended, that if the former were not evinced, there could be no place of attempt for the second; which being evidently my sense, is wholly lost by his mutilating my words; another Essay of his fidelity. * P. 457. l. 28.

7. This being a proof of his, on which his cause so mainly depends, and having now upon examination been convinced to be so strangely peccant, the Reader is to consider not onely how fallacious a concluder *S. W.* is, giving this instance at his last gasp, in his *concluding Section*, but how far he were from having prevailed any thing, had he solidly gone thorough, and successfully evinced all that he hath already attempted against so small a part of my *Reply* and *Answer*, when yet it hath (I must be allowed to believe, till I am shewed the contrary,) by this time been manifested, that in every attempt he hath made, he hath miscarried constantly.

8. Having given his Reasons for his proceeding no farther in his Rejoinder,

1. This he *calls his not vouchsafing me a longer Reply*: And

2. He saith, *In doing it, he spares the Doctour's credit*: And is not this a most superlatively *obliging* person? What he hath written must go for a *vouchsafement*, and what he hath not written, is to spare me. The heaping on me innumerable *calumnies* and *contumelies*, nearer the number of *lines*, than *Pages* of his Book, is a condescention and *donative*, and *vouchsafement* to me; I confess it in a sense he thought not of, as the πᾶν πονηρὸν ῥῆμα, *every evil word injuriously spoken* is an ingredient in a *Christians* μαχαιρισμὸς, and as such, matter of *exceeding gladness*; but this, God's, not *S. W.*'s *vouchsafement*. And so for his *sparing my credit*, who can consider the premisses, and withall consider, that after this, in the few Pages now remaining, all the mire in the street is gathered up by this well-natur'd Scavinger to be cast upon me, especially p. 463. and 465. and (that his *Clemency* may not determine with his Book) that after the writing of the *concluding Section*, the *Index* was collected (and that made up of little else but such acts of superabundant mercy, *sparings* and *vouchsafements*) who, I say can make all these reflexions, and yet doubt of the truth of *S. W.*'s affirmations?

9. Well, but though he spares me his *adversary*, he must not neglect his friend, and therefore his next care is to vindicate himself from my senseless aspersions (which if indeed they were senseless, might as well be allowed to need no *answer*, as three of four parts of my Book) adding that he can in nothing more discredit and disgrace me, than in rehearsing and clearing what I object in this kind. This then he is resolved to doe (and yet within three lines, this was the man that spared the *Dr's Credit*.) And I shall accompany him to this also.

10. And 1. the Reader is obliged to discern him an *ingenuous Adversary*, and so that it was the *power of truth, not sleight of tricks, which thus baffled the Doctour, because the worst I can say against him is unconsiderable*. This he proves, because the *greatest vices of a writer are falsifications*, and *I object to him faults of this sort onely in two places, as far as he observes*.] And to this I *answer*, that the proof of his *ingenuity*, is of the same force that his arguings all along have been, and that it had been much more efficacious, according to another custome of his, to have supposed it *unquestioned*, or humbly begged it, than thus unsufficiently to infer it. 1. The utmost he pretends to, is but to conclude an *Universal* from one *particular*, an entire ingenuity from one sort of *innocence* onely. And that 2. Such as he had least temptation to offend against *falsifying of Testimonies* being hardly competible to him that produceth so very few, as *S. W.*'s place of *answerer*, and profest aversion to *wordish Testimonies* concludes him to have done; so that it must be numbred amongst his special excellencies, that he can work without tools, if in these circumstances he can make shift to *falsify*. 3. To suppose me *baffled*, before he hath seen my *Returns*, and to tell the *Candid Reader* that he will judge on his side, that 'tis *truth, not tricks* hath *baffled me*, is another *fallacy* of the same mode, a double *begging* the *Question*, and supposing without *proof*, and before trial, 1. That *I am baffled*, 2. That none but *truth* was guilty of it. Till he can speak more concludingly for himself, I shall not need to collect any other *Inventory* of his *sleights*, than that one of his *Unconcluding* probations, with which he constantly satisfies himself, and these are so manifest also, that I shall not trouble my self to *engross* them.

11. In the survey of his falsifications, he begins with observing the *onely touch-stone* and *reason of falsifying*, that of *gaining* or *endeavouring to gain advantage by the mistake*. And herein I willingly concur with him, deeming it unreasonable to charge that as *falsification*, which hath no appearance of being *voluntary*, and allowing no certain κριτήριον of voluntariness, but the endeavour to *gain* by the *deceit*. By this test as I am content to be judged my self, so I shall now deal with *S. W.* in this matter.

12. The first he cites is from * these words of mine. [*He is come to that meanness of changing my words, that he may get some advantage of carping at them, which otherwise he must miss of; I said that in the* Βασιλικὰ *the whole third book is made up of* Justinian's, i.e. *of the Emperour's Constitutions* de Episcopis Clericis & Sacris.— *And he will reade this* that *Justinian's third book is made up of Constitutions* de Episcopis Clericis & Laicis— *and then answer, that all the Laws found there, must not be necessarily* Justinian's.] Here I mentioned *two* changes, 1. *Justinian's third book*, for the *third Book* in the Βασιλικὰ, 2. *Laicis* for *Sacris*. By the latter I pretend not, that he could probably gain any *advantage*, and therefore though, in conjunction with the other, I thought fit to mention it, (as that which the *Printer* could not be guilty of, because he had *englished* it *Laymen*, instead of *Sacred offices*) yet the former being such as yielded him *advantage*, and wherein his whole *answer* was founded, as far as it had any semblance of force, how can he ever be excused by his *own* measures? * *Answ. to Sch. Disar.* p. 201.

13. I

13. I had mentioned the *Laws of Emperours*, made in *Eccleſiaſtical matters*, and cited the Βασιλικὰ for ſuch; he anſwers, *that all the Laws found there* (the relative [*there*] referring to *Juſtinian's third Book*, in his way of ſetting it) muſt not neceſſarily be *Juſtinian's*, *ſince the keepers of Laws uſe not onely to put in their Law-books thoſe Conſtitutions themſelves made, but alſo thoſe they are to ſee obſerved, among which are the Laws and Canons of the Church made before by Councils, and other Eccleſiaſtical powers.*] And how could he ever have given this *anſwer* or received *advantage* by it, had he not *changed* my words, and turned the third *Book* of the Βασιλικὰ into *Juſtinian's third Book?* His *anſwer* proceeds of *Emperours*, being *keepers as well as makers of Laws*, and ſo obliged to ſee the *Laws* made by others, obſerved. And were it not for his ſubtile *change*, he could not have ſuggeſted this, or had any appearance of an *anſwer* by ſuggeſting it. To my citation from the third of the *Baſilica*, this could not poſſibly be accommodated; for 1. The *Baſilica* is not *Juſtinian's Law-book*, but a *Synopſis of* XL *books Univerſi Juris Romani*, ſet out with *Scholia* LXXX years ſince by *Joh. Leunclavius*; and ſo his foundation of anſwer is ſunk. 2. Though the *Laws* in the *third Book* of the *Baſilica*, be *Juſtinian's Laws*, yet they are not *Juſtinian's third Book*, any more than the *firſt or ſecond*, or all the LX Books are *Juſtinian's* LX *Books*; is there any Book to be heard of in the world, which can own that title he beſtows on this, *Juſtinian's third Book?* 3. The *Laws* that are in the *third Book* of the *Baſilica abbreviated* from *Juſtinian*, are from his *Novells*: In them there are many *Conſtitutions* of *Eccleſiaſtical* affairs made *perſonally* by *Juſtinian*, as appears by prefixing of his *name*, and the *perſons* to whom they were written; and of ſuch my *Argument* proceeded. And ſo this is point-blank contrary to all the force of his *anſwer*, for what is *perſonally* made by him, is not inſerted by him, as a *keeper* of the *Laws*, as one obliged to ſee others. *Laws* obſerved, but as a *Legiſlatour*, i. e. *Emperour*, acting by his own *power* intruſted to him by *God*. And would it not amaze any man, that were not familiarly acquainted with *S. W's Dialect*, to ſee him deſpiſe this * *anſwer* of mine, and ſay I leave untoucht what he objects, and that all this might be done whether the Conſtitutions had been *originally* his own or no.] Is not the one thing that he *objects*, this, that keepers of Laws uſe not onely to put into their *Law-books* thoſe Conſtitutions themſelves made, but *Laws* made by others? And is not the force of his *anſwer* comprehended in this, that though the *Laws* were found in *Juſtinian*, they muſt not neceſſarily be *Juſtinian's*? And might all this be, whether they had been *originally* his or no? Might they be *originally* his (as I proved unavoidably that many of them were) and yet poſſibly be none of his? If this be the choſen inſtance, how weak the *Dr.* is, in the following part of his *Book*, and ſo an ingredient in *S. W's Apology* for not following him, he could not well have ſaid more on his *Enemy's* ſide, and therefore may *excuſe* this alſo by the *no advantage* he hath reaped (I cannot ſay, *attempted* to reape) by it.

* *See Sch. Diſp.* p. 460. l. 23.

14. For the darkening what is thus clear, his principal art is, to begin with, and ſet down by it ſelf the miſtaking of *Laicis* for *Sacris*, and to call that his great falſification (when I gave it no part of that title) and to tender his proofs, that he neither made nor ſought any advantage by this, and then at leaſure to deſcend to the other, and onely to recite it and ask where is the difference? Anſwering himſelf, *onely here, that Juſtinian* writ theſe *Laws*, but another collected them; and then I am to be pitied with, *alas poor man!* and the Reader aſſured, that I do not pretend that this *Chimera* of *falſification* hath any *influence* at all on his cauſe or *anſwer*. And ſo he gallops off like another *Timotheus* with his πᾶν ἐνδικοῦσι, all good *fortune* and *victory* in his net, no piece of *ill luck* but one in all this, that his time is loſt in confuting ſo weak an *Adverſary*] But ſetting aſide his *Contumelies*, the reſt is quickly anſwered; 1. That the difference and *change* is ſo groſs, that none that knew any thing of ſuch affairs could be guilty of it excuſably; and that if he knew them not, he ſhould not ſo demurely have ſpoken to them. 2. That the difference was ſuch as had a real influence on his *anſwer*, and his *anſwer* no leaſt appearance of force without it, as I have now more largely ſhewed. 3. That I did, what he ſaith I did not, *pretend*, and more than pretend, that his change (I called it not by his other title) had an *influence* upon his *anſwer*. This I did † when I told him that he changed my words, that he might get ſome advantage of carping at them, which otherwiſe he muſt miſs of; What I meant by carping, I preſently expreſt by his *changing my words*, and then anſwering that all the Laws found there muſt not neceſſarily be *Juſtinian's*. This I took, and ſhewed to be a *Carping* or *Cavilling* Anſwer, founded onely in this change of his; and * afterward again I told him, that the *Anſwer* applied to *Juſtinian's third Book*, could not poſſibly be accommodated to the matter in hand, and gave him my proofs of it. Which is ſomewhat more than bare pretending that his change had ſome influence on his *Anſwer*. And ſo now his preſent Anſwer yields no leaſt excuſe for the change.

† *Anſw.* p. 201. *lin.* 18.

* P. 202. *l.* 2.

15. The third and *fourth falſification*, which he ſaith I have charged him with, are together in the ſame matter of the *Twelfth Canon* of *Chalcedon*, and I have laid down the matter ſo largely in the *anſwer* to *Schiſ. Diſarmed*, for the diſcovering of a ſpecial ſubtilty of his, as likely to impoſe on the incautious Reader, as any in that Book, that I choſe to refer the Reader to review it there, rather than to tranſcribe ſo long a *Diſcourſe*. But the former of theſe having brought ſo ſharp a fit of *S. W's* rage upon me, that he tells me plainly *I have committed a piece of moſt open knavery*, and in his *Index* ſtyled it my falſifying my Adverſary's manner of expreſſion, wilfully to accuſe him of a falſification, I muſt it ſeems change my *offenſive* arms into *defenſive*, and clear my ſelf of this higheſt accuſation.

Cap. V. *ſect.* 5. p. 164. &c.

16. The matter lies thus; I had cited theſe words from that *Canon*, Πόλεις διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν τὸ τῆς Μητροπόλεως ὀνόματι τιμηθεῖσαι, and rendred them, *Cities* honoured by *Letters Patents* from the *Kings* or *Emperours* with the *name* and dignity of *Metropolis*. To this rendring he † replies in theſe words, *The Council ſaith onely that thoſe Cities were honoured with* τὸ ὄνομα, *the name alone, which the Dr. fluent in his Expreſſions Engliſhes the name and dignity, the latter whereof they wanted, that which ſhould dignify them in a degree of a Metropolitan, being abſolutely interdicted them in this very Canon,* Μόνης ἀπολαυέτωσαν τῆς τιμῆς, *Let them enjoy onely the honour.* To this I * anſwered, by taking notice of his meaning in the mention of my fluency of *Expreſſion*, then by giving my reaſons, why I rendred ὀνόματι by *name* and *dignity* (in the ſame manner as I did γράμματα βασιλικὰ, *Letters Patents* from the *Kings* or *Emperours*, the reddition equally paraphraſtical in both, ſuch as I knew I could juſtify to be the ſenſe, though the literal exactneſs did not neceſſarily, extend to it) 1. Becauſe in the ſame *Canon*, τιμὴ is uſed of the ſame thing, and that is promiſcuouſly rendred *honour* and *dignity*; 2. Becauſe it is in the very words τιμηθεῖσα τῷ ὀνόματι, *honoured by the name*, and the *Lawyers* tell us that honour is an adminiſtration *cum gradu dignitatis*, with a degree of dignity (and the like cited from others) which could not be, if *name* did not carry dignity along with

† *Sch. Diſar.* p. 145.

* *Anſw.* p. 166.

with it; 3. Because ὄνομα signifies ordinarily *dignity* and power, not onely name, and if it did so, then I could not doe amiss to render it by so obvious a *Paraphrase* as [*honoured by the name and dignity*] when both the word *honour* and the word *name*, which were there expresly used, had connotation of dignity in them. This hitherto was but the defence of my self, I hope a full defence; and then how can he be excused, who styles this rendring both in his *Dispatcher* and *Index*, a *falsification*?

17. But I went yet farther, and reflecting on those words, the Council saith onely that they were honoured with the name alone, (the dignity saith he, being absolutely interdicted them in the present *Canon*) I said there is no sincerity in this; for 1. The word *alone* is put in by *S. W.* 2. 'Tis in the second part of the *Canon*, not the first, that that interdict is found in these words, *Let them enjoy onely the honour*, and so 'tis so far from being hence inferred, that they had from the *Pragmatick* nothing but the name, that 'tis on the contrary clear by the *Canon*, that before they were thus punisht, they did injoy more than the honour alone, and so more than onely the name. Now to these words his objection is, that this particle *alone* after [*name*] *I call a falsification, insincerity, and alledge it put in by him*, whereas, saith he, 'tis palpable he used it as his own word not the Councils, and so put it in the *common Letter*, whereas the *Dr.* changes it from the *Roman* into the *Italick* or *Translation letter*, &c.

18. This is his charge; let the Reader now judge between us. And 1. Where do I call the particle [*alone*] a *falsification*? His saying, that the *Council saith onely that they were honoured with the name alone* I say *hath no sincerity in it*; and I now ask, how it can have, if the *Council* do not say at all (for then it doth not say *onely*) that it was honoured with the name alone? If he had declared his meaning, that the Council mentions no more than ὄνομα *name*, I should have cleared the ambiguity of that passage, but never have accused him of insincerity. But if that had been it, it had been sufficiently expresst by [*the Council onely saith of that they were honoured by the name*] without the addition [*alone*] Of that word therefore I now demand, 1. Is it not put in, or added there by *S. W.*? 'Tis visible it is; and then I that said it was put in, (not put in to the Council, or as the word of the Council) by *S. W.* said no more than was exactly truth. 2. Was it put in to signify, or not to signify? If to signify, then let it be printed in what letter it will, *Roman* or *Italick*, it must have this influence on the proposition concluded by it, as to make it signify, that the Council saith, and onely saith they were honoured with *name* alone, as that is opposed to *name and dignity*, and I have proved from the Council's words, and from the notion both of τιμᾶσθαι and ὄνομα used by the Council, that the Council saith not that either in words, or (which is more) in sense; and then I must still conclude (who can resist it?) that there was no sincerity in his saying, the Council onely said that, which it neither said nor intimated, but, as hath appeared, presumed and supposed the Contrary.

19. All then that he can possible say in his own defence is, that [*alone*] was meant to signify nothing, *i. e.* that he talked *non-sense*, or he knew not what; But neither will that confession secure him; for that which immediately follows, shews this word had its signification, if not *Emphasis*, for 1. saith he positively, the latter thereof (*i. e.* the dignity) they wanted, that being absolutely interdicted them, by the present *Canon*. This is far more than affirming that the *Canon* saith onely they were honoured with the *name*; 'tis affirming, that any honour of *dignity* or more than bare *name*, was interdicted them by the *Canon*; and that gives the fullest signification to the word [*alone*] (over and above the [*onely*] in the beginning) that the word most *Emphatically* used is capable of; and in this affirmation of his, as applyed to the first part of the *Canon*, I do profess to require, and miss his sincerity, it being already shewed, what is in it self most manifest, that their *mulct* or *punishment* consisting in this, that they should injoy the τιμὴ μόνη the honour or dignity alone, is an argument, that, before they were thus punished, they had the τιμὴ; honour or dignity, and so not name alone.

20. As for my changing the print of [*alone*] from the *Roman* to the *Italick*, the account is evident; I cited his whole period, and as his words, not mine, I put all together in the *Letter*, that belongs to a *Citation* of anothers words, as every where I do, and particularly my adversaries, when I recite them as well as the testimonies of *Fathers* or *Councils*. I have no more to account for in this matter, and now let not the candidst, but severest *Aristarchus* judge on which side the want of sincerity or the guilt of unjust accusing and all the virulent attendants thereof, is to be charged regularly.

21. Proceed we then to his *fourth* and *last falsification*, which he will yield to be such another as the former, but having leave to tell his own story partially, he hopes it will not be accounted such. Whether it be or no, others must judge for him. The case lies thus; The *Disarmer* having first resolved of those *Cities honoured by the Royal Letters, &c.* That the *Council onely saith they were honoured with the name alone*, and proved that that which *should dignify them was absolutely interdicted them by this very Canon, in these words, let them enjoy onely the honour*, proceeds thus, *What this honour was, your friend* Balsamon *tells you, saying, some desired to know what the honour meant, and received answer, that except that this Bishoprick was called a Metropolis, in all other things it was subject to the former Metropolis.* To these words of his, particularly to this part of them, his saying that *Balsamon tells me what that honour meant*, viz. *onely to be called a Metropolis*] * I did affix this censure. *This is another falsification.* And whether it were or no, it shall be now tryed. * *Answ.* p. 167.

22. But 1. He needed not have purged himself, as he † doth, from having put down his *Author's* words mangledly and corruptly, he knows and confesses this was not laid to his charge, and then 'tis easie to avert a species of crime of which no man accuses him. But I suppose there be more ways than one of *falsifying*, and the slyer way, that which is least discernible at first sight, though it be not the grossest, as that signifies the most palpable, is yet the most deceitfull, and so dangerous act of falsification. † *Sch. Dispat.* p. 466.

23. What *S. W's* was in this place, my Answer had more than intimated; 'tis made up of two branches, the first I was content not to lay weight on, but to gratifie *S. W.* that, according to his manner, most insists on that which I least insisted on; It shall now a while be examined, whether it be so perfectly innocent as he pretends.

24. He saith of the honour of which before he had spoken, that our *friend* Balsamon *tells us what it was*, and then onely sets down, *what he saith some received by way of answer to that Question*. Is this a due treating of *Balsamon*, to say, he tells us, that which he doth not tell us? This is the case; *Balsamon* tells us what *some desired to know, and what they heard*: This *S. W.* calls *telling us what this honour was*; and

makes his proofs againſt me, as from the *Teſtimony* of one of our party, that thus it was. Is every *hear-ſay a Truth?* Did the *Diſciples* when they told *Chriſt*, *Some ſay thou art Elias*, &c. tell us, that *Chriſt was Elias*? If not, then how can this be cleared from being a *falſification*? But ſaith *S. W.* he *put down minutely in Greek and Engliſh thoſe very words as told us by Balſamon.*] I anſwer, he is not accuſed for ſetting down words of *Balſamon*, which were not his, but for ſaying he told us what neither in the words cited from him, nor in any other he hath told us, *viz.* what the honour mentioned in the beginning of the *Canon* was. This *S. W.* ſaid *our Friend Balſamon* tells us, and 'tis now evident he tells us ſome mens *hear-ſay*, which is not always the *Truth* I hope (and that, as ſhall by and by appear, of *another matter*) and ſo by *S. W*'s favour, he tells us not *what that honour was*, which he ſaith he tells us. But again ſaith *S. W.* never pretended that *Balſamon* told us this as his own opinion.] I anſwer, that I ſaid not he ſo pretended, but reſerved my ſelf within thoſe bounds, wherein I could not miſcarry, kept cloſe to his very words, that he ſaith *Balſamon* tells us what this honour was. Yet again to comply with *S. W.* and yield ſome conſideration to this anſwer of his, I demand, Can *Balſamon* be imagined to tell us what it was, by telling us other mens and not his own opinion? That were to intimate, that other men were in the right, but himſelf in the wrong, and yet that he adhered to his own wrong opinion. This cannot be believed of *Balſamon*; therefore if I had concluded it *S. W*'s aſſertion, that *Balſamon* told this as his own opinion (I ſay not onely his own) the Reader ſees who furniſht me with my premiſſes, even he that ſaith, that *Balſamon told me what that honour was*, not what ſome others heard or ſaid it to be. But again, ſaith *S. W. he never conceived it* (i. e. this *anſwer* or *hear-ſay*) *came from perſons of greater authority*, i. e. *from ſome Council, or ſome of the Council, at leaſt from perſons who perfectly underſtood its meaning.*] But if *S. W.* ſhould now ſay, what here he confeſſes he *always conceived*, this would but cure one *falſification* with another; for when all that his Authour ſaith, is, that *ſome asked or deſired to know*, and *received anſwer*, with what *juſtice* could he ſay, or on what motives *always conceive*, that this was the anſwer of the *Council*, &c? But I ſhall yield *S. W.* leave to conceive what he pleaſe (and therefore do not charge this with that fouler crime) whilſt I require the ſame leave to *conceive* alſo the *contrary*, or not at all, where I have no better grounds on either ſide to interpoſe my own conceit. Thus much for my firſt branch, which indeed though I mentioned in the way to the other, yet I expreſt my inclination ſo far to paſs it by, as to lay no ſtreſs on it, and had not now reſumed it, had not *S. W's* diſcourſe more than invited me to it.

25. But the more conſiderable branch is yet behind, that what is ſpoken by *Balſamon* (and that barely from the opinion of others) of the *puniſhment* mentioned in the *latter part* of the *Canon*, which this Council inflicted on irregular ambitions, he ſets to interpret the *former* part, and to tell us what that honour was, which was given theſe *Cities* by the *King's Letters*. The firſt part of the *Canon*, of which onely our debate is, ſpake of the honour conferred on ſome Cities by the Kings, and *what that honour meant*, he ſaith *Balſamon* tells us, citing words of *Balſamon* which belong to another matter, and not at all to that for which he brings them. This manifeſtly appears in my * Anſwer, where I ſhew that two diſtant things are ſpoken of in that canon;

* *P. 164. &c.*

1. The practice of *erecting Metropoles*, by *Regal Conſtitutions*.

2. A cenſure of the Council on ſome perſons, who had in an undue manner, even to the *cutting one Province into two*, acquired this dignity by that means, that *they ſhould enjoy the honour alone*. Now of this latter, *Balſamon* tells us what interpretation ſome gave, that the meaning was onely καλεῖσθαι Μητρόπολιν, *to be called a Metropolis*, and then comes *S. W.* and to relieve and gain to himſelf advantage, confounds theſe two which are ſo widely diſtinguiſht, interprets one by the other, cites *Balſamon*'s words that are ſpoken of the latter, and ſaith they *tell us what this honour*, i. e. the honour ſpoken of in the firſt part, *was*, and ſo quite interverts the meaning, both of the *Canon* and *Scholiaſt*, Concludes againſt me, that the Cities thus advanced by the King, wanted the dignity, and were advanced to name onely, when on the contrary the truth is viſible, that if they had been onely honoured with the name by the King, their cenſure which left them that, muſt ſignify nothing. And ſo this is the falſification I charged on him, a down-right falſifying the ſenſe of the Authours before him, making it to conclude no leſs than the contrary to what is really concluded; and the willfulneſs of this, proved by his * own *medium*, *his gaining* (more then) *the leaſt poſſible advantage* by the miſtake, even his *whole Concluſion*, that the *Kings Patents gave them onely a Name without dignity*, which at that time he ſtood in need of, both to defend his cauſe, and to prove the fluency (as he was pleaſed to ſtyle it) of my expreſſions.

* *Schiſ. Diſ.* p. 459. l. 17.

26. This was briefly told him before in my *Anſwer*, but he will not ſee it, but inſiſts in theſe words, [*Let the Council ſay what it pleaſe, or let his conſequence hold well or ill, that is another Queſtion; but*, ſaith he, *did he omit any word of* Balſamon *which ſeemed to oppoſe his Tenet? Did he add or change any Tittle? Did he add, or change, or detract the leaſt particle?* &c.] I anſwer, he applied that to one thing which belongs to another, and that is a concernant change, he omitted to tell us it was the puniſhment or mulct, that both the Canon and *Balſamon* ſpoke of, and brought it for the interpreting the honour conferred by the *King's Letters Patents*, and that was a competent omiſſion, and all this is ſo ſeaſonably in favour to his own tenet, that it could not have ſubſiſted or tolerably ſupported it ſelf without it: And ſo his weight is bound cloſe upon his ſhoulders, and 'tis not all his impatience, or contumely will make it ſit eaſier. And now let him ſit down, and caſt what he hath gained by theſe impertinent reflexions; And thus will it always be, till the guilty review their faults, to forſake and not to defend them, think of making ſatisfaction rather than Apologies.

27. I ſhall not here (nor hereafter) be ſo near imitating *S. W.* as to gather an *Index* or Catalogue of his changes of my expreſs words, as well as ſenſe, I am not fond of ſuch repetitions: If I were, it would ſoon appear (what the Reader cannot miſs in their proper places) that *S. W.* had no cauſe to be ſo nice and modeſt in things of this nature, as to trouble himſelf and his Reader, with ſuch Vindications.

28. But now having thus cleared himſelf, he returns again to his new-faſhioned modes of ſparing me, by affirming he could (were it not for his rich mercy and reſolute good nature) *preſent the Reader with a long black ſcroll with egregious and wilfull falſifications from the reſt of my long book, nay he could ſhew a new brood of enormous ones in the Book of Schiſ. which eſcaped his obſervation, when he firſt anſwered it.* To all this I ſend him not my defiance, for I doubt not but the ſame arts that have extracted ſo many out of ſo few

pages,

pages, may if dexterously managed, improve upon his hands, and work unimaginable miracles in this way. That in any other sense but this of proportion with his former performances, he doth not believe himself, I have this Argument to perswade me, because he here talks of sparing me so mercifully. That phrase, or any like it, hath not used in his dialect, to signifie less than the attempts of the utmost malice (this concluding Section hath given us Essays of it) and accordingly here, after the mention of his long Scroll, and new brood, his mercy is exemplified in saying, *he could let the Reader see*, and again, *he could shew him*, by which figure he sets down most artificially, the one passage in the book, which he thought, with any pretence could be named by him, and that will not fill a long scroll, or denominate a new brood in the vulgar usage of those phrases. What that one passage is, and how he came to his observation of it, I shall now briefly declare for him.

29. In the * *Tr. of Sch.* speaking of the Bishop of *Justiniana prima*, and bringing many things out of *Justinian's Novels* or *Imperial Constitutions*, about the *foundation* and impowring of that *Primate*; among the rest I recite this, that he shall have in all that Diocese, *Locum Apostolicæ sedis, the place or dignity of an Apostolical seat.* How this phrase [*an Apostolical*] came there, whether by the Errour of the Printer, or mine own haste and inadvertence, it is so long since, and the variation so small, that truely at this distance I cannot tell, but am sure I soon took notice of the mistake, and many years since corrected it with my hand from [*an*] to [*the Apostolical seat*] That this is true, and was no effect of this *Dispatchers* present advertisement, I shall not perswade him, by so contemptible an Authority as that of mine own affirmations, but by referring to my *Reply* and my *Answer* both, the last of which was published some years before this *Dispatch* appeared. In the * Reply resuming that matter, I set down the word more at large out of the Νεαραὶ or *Novels* in *Greek*, Ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἀποκειμέναις αὐτῷ ἐπαρχίαις τὸν τόπον ἐπέχειν αὐτὸν τῆς Ἀποστολικῆς Ῥώμης θρόνου, *In the Provinces subject to him, he should hold the place of the Apostolical seat of Rome*, i.e. to doe all within those *Provinces* that the *Bishop of Rome* was wont to doe, before this *Primacy* was erected, and this by direct *consent of Virgilius then Pope*, as there it follows, κατὰ τὰ ὁρισθέντα ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πάπα Βιγιλίου, *according to what was defined by the holy Father Virgilius*, and then proceeding to expound those words, and prevent all cavil that might arise on occasion of them.

* P. 103.

* P. 96.

30. After this, being not satisfied that I had yet done enough to prevent the mistake of them that sought occasions, I resumed it again in the *Answer*: And when I had accommodated solutions to the *Disarmers* exceptions, I then added above what they exacted, a large * *Paragraph*, beginning thus; *In this matter it is possible* S. W. *may have a little mistaken my meaning, and therefore to cure it in him, or prevent that possibility on others, I assure him I mean by* Locum Apostolicæ sedis, *the same that he would have me* (who yet then not onely did not, but could not except against the former rendring, because he now numbers it among those *that then escaped his Observation*) *the place of the Apostolick, as that signifies the* Roman *seat*; *And though the particle* [*an*] *in stead of* [*the*] *seem to prejudice that sense, yet I never made use of it, but contrarywise in the Reply added the Greek words, which take away all ambiguity, &c.* But still this far enough from favouring *S. W's* pretension, of his being no more but the *Pope's substitute*, in the shewing of which I there enlarge, to which, and what follows in the Reply, I refer the Reader.

P. 117.

* 12.

31. Thus far I have long since gone to prevent *S. W's* displeasure in this point, having not so much as a μία νουθεσία *first admonition* from him or any other, but my self, to engage me to it. Now this Errour, though in effect but of *an* for *the* being thus discovered to *S. W.* he in great mercy and longanimity, and out of the inexhaustible Treasure of his compassion and sparing (no Confessour could have been more meek to his humblest penitent) first multiplies it into a new brood (it hath at least a Wrens Nest in the belly of it) then to bring it in more pompously, talks of another long black Scroll, then by saying what he could doe if he would, charges this upon me with all the advantage of railing Rhetorick that could well be expected from one that was to go out in a Tempest, and leaving me in *this pickle, he then becomes intercessour in my behalf, requests the Reader not to be too rigorous in his Censures of me*, &c.]

32. What return may he now expect to this his candour? Truely not to imitate him in the least, not so much as to tell him what I might doe by all Laws of God and man, but simply to appeal to his own Conscience, whether I have not both in the Reply and Answer acknowledged the utmost that he himself demands to be the meaning of *Apostolicæ sedis*, (and then by his own rules of *neither seeking nor reaping advantages by the change*, if there be any the least, I am absolved from having falsified) having founded my Answer onely in the difference betwixt τὸν ἔχειν, ἐπέχειν, and τὸν τηρεῖν, φυλάττειν, διάπτειν, the latter three onely denoting *Vicegerency*, *Substitution*, but not the two former, and this evidenced by *Julianus Antecessor*, saying, That the *Arch-Bishop of Justiniana shall have* eadem Jura, *the same rights over the Bishops under him, which the Pope of* Rome *hath over the Bishops under him*: and by *Justinian's Novell* it self, that he shall have *summum sacerdotium, summum fastigium, summam dignitatem, the highest Priesthood, Eminency, Dignity*, (which is incompetible with a *Vice-gerency*) and that whatever difference arise in those Provinces, that Arch-Bishop shall finally determine it, without appeal unto, or acknowledging any other but him, and accordingly it was esteemed αὐτοκέφαλον, *an head unto it self, independent from all other*: What could more secure mine or refute *S. W's* pretensions?

33. So likewise for the second branch of his charge, my *leaving out*, saith he, *what follows immediately to my prejudice*, κατὰ τὰ ὁρισθέντα, &c. *according to what was decreed by the holy Pope* Vigilius.] He knows, that although in the *Tr. of Sch.* I had no occasion or necessity of taking it in, yet in the * Reply, the Catholick Gentleman not demanding it, and before the *Disarmer* appeared, I did spontaneously add it, and shewed that it did not prejudice me: And then again by his own rules (to which I shall therefore add no other Arguments) it is impossible this should be any falsification.

* P. 96.

34. I am now at an end of his Rejoynder, there remains nothing but his Use of Exhortation to the Doctour, that he would confess all the faults which he hath charged on him, (*i. e.* own all the monstrous births of *Africk*, to be of his begetting) and sit still, and write no more in defence of himself and his cause; and to this, as a prudent manager, he joyns threats and promises, holds his *Index* over me, as the *Lictor* his scourge, and protests a *prompt zeal and natural alacrity to honour and serve me*: And who would not be wrought on efficaciously by such methods? The ill luck of it is, my Returns

to him are finiſht, before I had laid to heart his Exhortation. And all that I can now promiſe him is, that when, as he is by his undertaking obliged, he ſhall have prepared and perfected his Returns to the remaining Chapters of the Reply and Anſwer, and then confirmed his Argument in the firſt Queſtion, againſt all the fruſtrations that this hath now diſcovered to him, if his performance ſhall appear to be manlike and Chriſtian, and in ſtead of the τελα κόπτα κόψω, *Calumnies, Contumelies, Cavils*, he ſhall once betake himſelf to that which he ſo often talks of, ſatisfying of underſtandings, and not inſnaring the Credulous, or baffling the timorous by noiſes, he ſhall not diſcern himſelf deſpiſed, but receive returns of truth and ſoberneſs, what defiance ſoever he hath hitherto offered them.

Follow peace with all men, and holineſs, without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord.

AIEN

ΑΙΕΝ ΑΛΗΘΕΥΕΙΝ,

OR, A

BRIEF ACCOUNT

OF

One SUGGESTION

OF THE

ROMANIST

Againſt the

Diſpatcher Diſpatched.

By *HENRY HAMMOND*, D. D.

Ἕτοιμοι ἀεὶ πρὸς ἀπολογίαν μετὰ πραΰτητος.

LONDON, 1660.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF One SUGGESTION OF THE ROMANIST.

§. 1. IT is the Stateman's Maxime concerning a falſe Suggeſtion, that if it be believed but four and twenty hours, the value of it is ineſtimable; which though it muſt be allowed to receive a grand abatement, when it is applied to inferiour and leſs conſiderable tranſactions, yet the intereſts of Religion, in the maintenance of truth, are not ſo deſpiſeable, as that he that hath appeared or embarked in them, can ſafely neglect the advantages which evil arts may yield, or furniſh an Adverſary againſt him.

§. 2. Such in reaſon, and in experience, beyond all others is the charge of *falſifying*, which if it be but ſuggeſted, and believed of any, and much more if a pregnant and viſible proof of it be tendred, there needs no other blaſt, or ſmut, or vermine to lay waſte the whole field, and deprive him of all harveſt of his ſeed and labours.

§. 3. How this is my concernment at this time, the Reader will not ſuddenly divine, till I have entertain'd him with a ſhort relation of that, which I had rather my ſelf *proclaim* on the *houſe-top*, than leave others to whiſper it in *corners*.

§. 4. I was lately advertiſed by a judicious and reverend Friend, that it was particularly urged againſt me, by a *Romaniſt*, that I had *miſtaken, or perverted M.* White's *words, which I refer to, in the Diſpatcher Diſpatcht*, Chap. *III.* Sect. 4. p.279. *where I ſuppoſe him to anſwer* (in his *Apology for Trad.* p. 56.) *that the beatifical viſion of the Saints before the day of Judgment was not yet held a matter of Faith, but onely a Theological concluſion*; *when* (ſaid he) *the Apologiſt in that very place had expreſly ſaid, that this point is a matter of Faith, grounded on Tradition, and not a Theological concluſion.* See p. 253.

§. 5. That I ſhould be guilty if but of ſuch an oſcitancy or *miſtake*, much more of ſuch a vile *perverſion* as this, I may be allowed to have been as unwilling my ſelf to believe, as I am obliged to take care that others ſhould not cauſeleſly apprehend it of me. Therefore without delay I turned firſt to mine own words (which as I then could not doubt, ſo now I acknowledge to be faithfully related) then to Maſter *White*'s words, in the page of his *Apology*, whence I had cited them, and thoſe I found exactly, and to a letter concordant to my tranſcript of them in *Diſp. Diſp.*

§. 6. For thus I ſtill reade (if I will not at noon-day ſuſpect mine own eyes) in that *Apologiſt*, p. 56. l. 12. [*For, nothing is more clear, than that the validity of Baptiſm by Hereticks was a Tradition, and decided by it: ſo the Beatifical Viſion of the Saints before the day of Judgment, the Spirituality of Angels, are not yet held matters of Faith, but onely Theological concluſions; as likewiſe the Soul's being concreated to the perfecting of the Body.*] What can be more manifeſt, than that in this period the *Beatifical Viſion of Saints before the day of Judgment* is by that *Apologiſt* ſet down, as one of the *two* things (to which after a *third* is ſubjoyn'd) of which it is affirmed in the plural, that they *are not yet held matters of Faith, but onely Theological concluſions?* which was all to a ſyllable, that I cited from him in that place, with this onely change, that ſpeaking onely of *one* of theſe, *the Beatifical Viſion*, &c. I ſet it (as it was neceſſary) in the ſingular [*is not yet held a matter of Faith, but onely a Theological concluſion.*]

§. 7. That I might be ſure not to have miſtaken my Authour, I carefully conſulted the *Errata*; but there was none noted, relating to that page: and indeed the whole compoſure of the period was ſuch, that there muſt be a concurrence of very many changes in the compaſs of very few lines (more I believe than the moſt negligent Compoſitour and Correctour have at any time conſpired to be guilty of) to wreſt this Teſtimony from me, or change it into what this *Romaniſt* had affirmed it to be.

§. 8. Having diſpatcht this account to my Friend, from whom I received the former advertiſement, I had no cauſe of doubt, but that this affair had received its full period, the *Romaniſt* being obliged to yield to ſuch full uncontrollable evidence, and every man's eyes, to whom the contrary Suggeſtion could be offered, being as well qualified as mine, to ſecure him from being miſled by it. And on theſe grounds of ſafety

of ſafety I had no leaſt thought of troubling the Reader with any account, or complaint, which I now ſee is become ſome part of my intereſt, and my duty.

§. 9. For I was ſoon aſſured by my Friend, that the words which I had punctually tranſcribed from my copy of the Apology, were not to be found in that, which he had before him, but quite transformed into the contrary ſenſe, even that for which the *Romaniſt* had vouch'd them; for thus he found them [*For, nothing is more clear, than that the validity of Baptiſm by Hereticks was a Tradition, and decided by it: ſo the Beatifical Viſion of the Saints before the day of Judgment. The Spirituality of Angels is not yet held a matter of Faith, but onely a Theological concluſion.*]

§. 10. By this repreſentation I was ſoon forced to confeſs, that the whole ſcene was changed, the firſt part of the words remaining the ſame, but the ſecond (of the *Beatifical Viſion of the Saints*) which were my onely concernment, wholly transformed, that which before was joined with the *Spirituality of Angels, as not yet held matters of Faith, but onely Theological concluſions*, being now annext to the *validity of Baptiſm by Hereticks*, and ſo affirmed to be a *Tradition* (and that is with him a matter of *Faith*) *and decided by it*. And then I had reaſon to acknowledge the candour of that *Romaniſt*, who proceeding on theſe appearances, had laid no heavier a cenſure on me, than that of *either miſtaking, or perverting Mr.* White's *words*.

§. 11. In this new poſture of affairs, firſt it was preſently diſcernible, that the very many changes, which I had foreſeen, had been really made, to bring this about. And as all this was obvious, and credible to be done by a *new Edition* of the Book, ſo it remained uncertain to me whether mine, or that other ſo contrary to it, were the true and authentick *Edition*: this therefore was my next care to examine.

§. 12. And herein again I met with an intricacy; for if the Title-pages, and a concurrence of all obvious indications, might be believed, there was all this while but *one edition*, both copies carrying in their front, *A Paris, chez Jean Billain Rue S. Jacques à l'enſign S. Auguſtin* 1654. the ſame volume, print, number of pages, beginning and end of every page, *&c.* This ſoon ſuggeſted that which was the onely clue to extricate me then (and the Reader now) out of this labyrinth. For ſending to the Stationers for another Copy of the *Apology*, as from one I received a Copy perfectly agreeing with mine, ſo by the help of another I was furniſht with one exactly accordant to what my Monitour from the *Romaniſt* had repreſented to me, yet not diſcernibly differing from my own in any other, ſave in this one paſſage; and looking more narrowly, firſt the Paper and Ink wherein that leaf was printed (diſcernibly differing from all the reſt of the Book) was apt to inject ſome ſuſpicion: but I ſoon ſaw that I had no need of this, or other obſcurer intimation, it being groſly viſible, that in this place a leaf had been cut out, and a new one paſted in. And what *Gordian* knot might not have been untied by the like inſtrument?

§. 13. *When* this change was thought fit to be made, I did, and ſtill want augury to divine; onely this is apparent, that it was a work which ſecond thoughts ſuggeſted, after the Book was publiſhed, elſe my Copy which came regularly to me from the *Worceſter Stationer*, (in the year, if my memory fail me not, 1655.) and another now ſent me from another Stationer (which aſſures me there be many more) muſt have had their parts in the change.

§. 14. Having given the Reader a brief and ſingle view of this matter, I abſtain from any farther obſervation, or reflexion on it, than what a

Quo teneam vultus mutantem——?

will amount to. But that is alſo unneceſſary, my whole deſign being completed in this, that it is now manifeſt to the moſt impersuaſible of their diſciples, that dare reade what is written againſt their Maſters, (which I perceive few are permitted to do) that I neither *miſtook*, nor *perverted* the *Apologiſt*'s ſenſe or words, thoſe, I mean, which I read in his Book, from which alone I could be imagined to receive cognizance of them, not being able to forecaſt, that what I had thus really tranſcribed from him, would be ſo ſoon ſnatcht from me again, or that what was to me ſo viſible, ſhould vaniſh, and become inviſible to other men.

§. 15. This indeed is an unexpected proof of what *S. W.* had told me, concerning the *Wits* (enormous) power to transform *Teſtimonies*; which yet ſhall not diſcourage me from dealing in that ware, (being firmly reſolved never to make uſe of my *duller* faculties, to work ſuch *Metamorphoſes*) nor yet from diverting ſometimes into ſuch pleaſant fields, adorned with ſo great varieties, as that *Apologiſt* frequently affords the world, hoping, that I ſhall not again meet with ſuch miſadventures as theſe, or any greater interruptions in reading him, than what a competent attention, and a table of *Errata* ſhall enable me to overcome.

§. 16. This account I conceived would more pardonably, becauſe more moderately, divert the Reader at this time, than if I ſhould ſtay till it were ſolemnly and articulately call'd for, and moreover deliver *S. W.* from ſome temptation, himſelf to think, or to perſuade others, that he had ſprang ſome *real* game to invite his chaſes, ſome guilt to ſupport his *contumelies*, and perhaps prevail with ſome of their moſt credulous followers, to think it equitable to ſubject the Suggeſtions they meet with, to ſome other ways of examination and trial, than the bare authority or confidence of the Suggeſters.

THE END.

A VINDICATION OF THE DISSERTATIONS CONCERNING EPISCOPACY,

From the ANSWERS, or EXCEPTIONS offered againſt them by the *London* Miniſters, in their *Jus Divinum Miniſterii Evangelici.*

By *H. HAMMOND*, D.D.

TO THE READER.

IN Eraſmus's diſtribution *of his own writings into* Tomes, *the Eighth we find thus inſcribed by him*, Octavum occupent Apologiæ. Me miſerum. Et hæ juſtum volumen efficient. *It was his great* infelicity, *that the* Apologies *and* Anſwers *to* exceptions *and* calumnies, *which he was conſtrained to* write, *made up an* intire *large Volume in Folio: Now though I have that pleaſure in the* temper *of that perſon, which gives me* ſecurity, *by the* Romaniſt Proverb, *never to be deemed one of their good* Catholicks, *and ſo may probably* partake *of ſome* part *of his* fate, *yet it were great inſolence in me, who have not troubled the World with a* tenth *proportion to that wherewith he hath* favoured *it, to expect the* Tithe *of that* conſideration, *which is required to make one capable of that* degree *of* infelicity, *which lay a full load on him; Nevertheleſs theſe few laſt months have given me a taſte and* δεῖξις *what I am to expect. For beſides the* reproaches *of one* learned Gentleman (*to which, being barely ſuch, I have no one word to retribute, but that of the* εὐλογεῖν *which* Chriſt *directs me to*) *I have farther met with ſome* variety; *many* exceptions, *though little of* contumely *from theſe* Aſſemblers: *More, and in a very diſtant* Character *from a large* Preface *of* Animadverſions *on the* Diſſertations *lately ſent me from* Oxford; *others alſo there are which I have not yet had leiſure to weigh, but ſoon purpoſe and hope to do it; and if either I diſcern my ſelf, or find it the opinion of others, that what is already ſaid in the* Tracts, *which they oppoſe, be not ſufficient to* prevent, *or* remove *the* ſcruples *propoſed by them, I ſhall willingly* dedicate *ſome time of* vacancy *to that imployment. At the preſent, the* Exceptions *of the* London Miniſters *have challenged the* precedence, *and here are offered to* conſideration. *And becauſe the* Preface *from* Oxford *falls on the ſame ſort of matter,* Epiſcopacy *and* Ignatius's Epiſtles, *as they are defended in the* Diſſertations, *I purpoſe,* God willing, *that an* Anſwer *to that ſhall now follow, as ſoon as the* Printer *can diſpatch it. And that is all that I had to ſay to the* Reader *by way of* Preface.

The INTRODUCTION.

Of the occaſion of this Work, The ſtate of the Controverſie, The Heads of the Prelatiſts Plea, from Scripture and Antiquity, with ſome Obſervations aſſiſtant to them. The conſiderable concernments of the Queſtion.

Numb. 1. [1651.] BEING advertiſed from many hands, that the Book called *Jus Divinum Miniſterii Evangelici*, which is lately publiſhed by ſome, who intitle themſelves the *Provincial Aſſembly of London*, hath undertaken to conſider and confute many paſſages of the *Diſſertations*, three years ſince publiſhed in *Latine*, in defence of *Epiſcopacy*, againſt Dr *Blondell* and others, I have thought my ſelf obliged to examine, whether there be any thing objected by them in relation to thoſe *Diſſertations*, which may reaſonably move me to *retract* what was there either with *diffidence* propoſed, or more *confidently* aſſerted by me.

2. And having diligently ſurveyed the whole *Book*, that I might omit no paſſage, wherein my intereſts might be in the leaſt concerned, and being truly able to affirm from that view, that it hath yielded me no one ſyllable of uſeful *Exhortation*, no motive to *retract* any period, or alter any expreſſion in thoſe *Diſſertations* (but as far, as I do perſwade my ſelf that this *Provincial Synod* contains in it Men of *judgment* and *abilities* to maintain the truth and *convince gain-ſayers*, ſo far I am forced to aſſume, that what I have written is teſtified to be *Truth*, and by that priviledge competently ſecured againſt all *oppoſers*) I might herein reaſonably *acquieſce*, without farther importuning the Reader or my ſelf with impertinent *vindications*, only truſting and adventuring the whole matter to the judgment of each intelligent Reader, who is obliged by all Rules of *Juſtice* to compare either by his *Memory*, or by his *Eye*, thoſe paſſages in this Book, and the *Chapters* in the *Diſſertations* to which they are confronted.

3. But I am again told that many, who have read and are moved by the *Arguments* and *Anſwers* of this Book, and the *Authority* of a *Provincial Synod*, are yet diſabled to be ſo juſt as to examine them by comparing them with the *Latine Diſſertations*, and that we are fallen upon thoſe times, wherein whatſoever is not anſwered, is cried up as unanſwerable; (an humour, of which, if I might be permitted to receive the *fruits*, I ſhould have no temptation to complain, there being ſo much a greater part of thoſe *Diſſertations*, which was never attempted to be *anſwered*) I continue ſtill under ſome ſeeming obligation to give an exact account of the whole matter as it lies in conteſt between this *Provincial Synod* and thoſe *Diſſertations*, and I ſhall haſten to do it, when I have firſt by way of *neceſſary Introduction* premiſed theſe two things.

4. *Firſt*, The *ſtate* of the *Controverſie*, as it generally lies between us, which is this; whether the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, when they planted *Churches* in each City, left them in the hands of *many* to be governed by the *Common Council* of thoſe *many*, erecting an *equality* or *parity* of ſeveral *Rulers* in every City, to whom all others were ſubjected, and they to none: or whether they placed the *ſuperior* power and *Authority* in ſome *one*, and ſubjected all others to him. Other conſequent differences there are ariſing from hence, (and thoſe of ſuch *weight* and *concernment* to thoſe with whom I now diſpute, in caſe the *Truth* be not on their ſides, as will make this *return* to their *Objections*, no leſs than a duty of *Charity*, as to *Brethren*, if by the *Grace* of *God* they ſhall judge it *reaſonable* to make that uſe of it) but this is the one *Baſis* of all, whether the *Apoſtles* planted *parity* or *imparity* in the *Church*, *many* equal *Governours* in one City, or but *one* in each; The former is the *Preſbyterians* intereſt to defend, the latter the *Prelatiſts*; And ſo the Controverſie ſtands between them to be debated and evinced by ſuch evidences as a matter of *Fact* is capable of, (the *Right* being by both ſides acknowledged to follow that *Fact*) *i. e.* by the *Teſtimonies* of thoſe who are fit to be credited in this matter.

5. *Secondly*, The *brief heads* of the Plea, by which I have undertaken to maintain the *Prelatiſts* aſſertion: 1. By *Scripture*: 2. By the *Records* of the firſt times, the *Writings* of thoſe who were neareſt the *Apoſtles*, and either affirm what was done by the *Apoſtles*, or how it ſtood practiſed in the *Churches*, all the World over, which were planted by them. As for the *third* way of arguing from the *univerſal* conſent and practice of all *Churches* for about *fourteen hundred* years together, *i. e.* from about the year 140. till the *Reformation*, this I do not inſiſt on, as I might with all evidence, becauſe it is known and *confeſt* by the *Adverſaries*; and all that is by them pretended, is, that *parity* and *equality* being preſcribed and practiſed by the *Apoſtles*, ſoon after their death, and quite *contrary* to their plat-form, *Prelacy* was introduced into all *Churches*; It being their deſire and demand now (a little different from what Mr *Calvin* at firſt propoſed to the *Churches* of *Helvetia*) that all may be *reformed* and reduced to the ſtate wherein the *Apoſtles* left it.

6. In the managing the proofs propoſed by me, I have uſed this method, which ſeemed to me moſt convincing: 1. To inſiſt on ſome *few Teſtimonies* under each head, which are ſufficient to conclude the matter on the *Prelatiſts* ſide; and then to propoſe ſome obſervations, which may accord all other places both of *Scripture* and *antient* Writers, with thoſe *Teſtimonies* and that concluſion.

7. The ſpecial proofs of *Scripture* are taken, *Firſt*, from the *power* derived (as from *God* the *Father*, to *Chriſt*, ſo) from *Chriſt* to the *Apoſtles*; not as to a *Common Council* of *ſocial Rulers*, but as ſo many *ſeveral planters* and *Governours* of the *Church*, each having all power committed to him, and depending on no conjunction of any one or more *Apoſtles* for the exerciſe of it; And this is largely and clearly deduced, *Diſſert.* 3. *c.* 1, 2, 3, 4. And this *power* being by them derived to *Biſhops* in each *City*, in the ſame manner as they uſed it themſelves (which is alſo farther evidenced and vindicated, *c.* 5, *&c.*) this was deemed a firſt competent proof of this matter, and as a *confirmation* of it, it was obſervable, that the firſt *Biſhops* made by them, were in the very *Scripture* called *Apoſtles*, *James* the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, &c. *Diſſ.* 4. *c.* 3.

A *ſecond*

A *second principal* proof of *Scripture* is taken from the ſeveral mentions of the ſo many *Churches* of *Aſia*, and the ſo many Angels aſſigned to them, one to each, as a *ſingular Governour* or *Biſhop* in the *Revelation*. And in diſcourſe of theſe, we have found great evidence of the fact, to authorize us to *improve* the concluſion a little higher, than was *neceſſary* to the defence of the main cauſe, *viz.* to affirm of theſe Angels, that each of them was an *Archbiſhop* or *Metropolitan*, and having done ſo, to diſcern upon undeniable grounds that there were many other ſuch, mentioned in the *Scripture* (though not under that title) as *James* the *Brother* of the *Lord*, *Metropolitan* of all *Judea*, *Titus* of all *Crete*, with an *hundred* Cities in it, *&c.* 8.

And the ways of according all other *Scriptures* with theſe, have been briefly theſe: 1. By obſerving this difference betwixt Cities and Metropoles, as the true cauſe and occaſion of the mentions of many *Biſhops* in (not of) one City, meaning thereby the *Biſhops* of all the Cities under that *Metropolis*, as *Phil.* 1. 1. *Act.* 20. 17. *Secondly*, By examining the Nature of all the words, which I conceived to be uſed in *Scripture* for *Biſhops*, as (beſide *Apoſtle* and *Angel* forementioned) Ἐπίσκοπος, *Biſhop*, Ἡγούμενος, *Ruler*, Διδάσκαλος, *Doctor*, Ποιμὴν, *Paſtor*, Πρόεδρος, *Preſident*, Πρεσβύτερος, *Elder* (and in the *Fathers*, Ἀρχιερεὺς, *Chief Prieſt*, and *Sacerdos*, *Prieſt*) each denoting *Dignity* and *Authority*, and all cleared to be in their own nature applicable, and by the circumſtances of the *Context* to be actually applied to the *ſingular Governours* in each *City*; moſt of them conſtantly ſo, and that one of Πρεσβύτερος, if not conſtantly ſo, yet very rarely otherwiſe. And this is done *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 7. and ſo to the end of that *Diſſ.* *Thirdly*, By obſerving the *paucity* of believers in many Cities in the firſt *Plantations*, which made it unneceſſary that there ſhould by the *Apoſtles* be ordained any more than a *Biſhop* and *Deacon* (one or more) in each *City*, and that this was accordingly done by them at the firſt, is approved by the moſt undeniable *antient Records*. Such as thoſe Βαθυλάτα ἱστορίαι the *profoundeſt Hiſtories*, out of which * *Epiphanius* makes this Obſervation; Ὅπου γέγονε χρεία, καὶ ἦσαν ἄξιοι ἐπισκοπῆς, καλεσθῆναι ἐπίσκοποι, πλήθους δὲ μὴ ὄντος οὐχ εὑρέθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτεροι καλασθῶσι, καὶ ἀρκέσθησαν ἐπὶ τοῦ καθ' τόπον μόνῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἄνευ δὲ διακόνου ἐπίσκοπον ἀδύνατον εἶναι, *Where there wanted* Biſhops, *and there were found perſons worthy of the Office*, Biſhops *were conſtituted*; *but where there was no multitude, there none were found among them to be conſtituted* Presbyters, *and they ſatisfied themſelves with a* Biſhop *alone in a place*; *only the* Biſhop *could not poſſibly be without a* Deacon, *and accordingly the* Apoſtle *took care that the* Biſhop *ſhould have his* Deacons *to miniſter to him*. That which is thus cited by *Epiphanius* out of thoſe *Antient* Records, is found clearly affirmed by † *Clemens Romanus*, an *Apoſtolical* perſon, and witneſs of the *Apoſtles* practice; that they being *ſent out by Chriſt*, *as he by his Father*, *went out Preaching the Goſpel*, *and proclaiming it through Regions and Cities*, καθίσανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν εἰς Ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν, *they conſtituted their firſt-fruits into* Biſhops *and* Deacons, *of thoſe which ſhould afterward believe*. To both which when we ſhall again add what *Epiphanius* preſaceth in that place, Νέου ὄντος τοῦ κηρύγματος πρὸς τὰ ὑποπίπτοντα γράφειν Ἀπόστολον, *that when the preaching was new*, *the Apoſtle St.* Paul *wrote agreeably to the preſent ſtate of affairs*, We have then ſo clear an account of the reaſon of the *Apoſtles* immediate ſubjoyning of *Deacons* to *Biſhops*, *Phil.* 1. 1. and 1 *Tim.* 3. (*viz.* becauſe thoſe were the only *two Orders* then conſtituted in every *Church*) that theſe two places (which are made uſe of by the *adverſaries* againſt us) are moſt punctual *evidences* of the *truth* of ours, and of the *unſeaſonableneſs* of their pretenſions. 9.

* *L.* 1. *l.* 1. t. 1.

† *Ep. ad Cor.*

As for the *teſtimonies* out of the *firſt Antiquity*; The ground-work I have choſen to lay in *Ignatius his Epiſtles*, becauſe the *Teſtimonies* thence are ſo many and ſo evident, and the *Writer* ſo near the *Apoſtles* time (that *holy* man being *Martyr'd* in the *tenth* of *Trajan*, to whoſe *Reign* S^t *John* lived) and moſt of his *Epiſtles* written to the very *Churches* of *Aſia* planted by S^t *John*, and the Biſhops of many of them named by him, and of one *Biſhop*, the *Preſbyters* under him, that if that one Authors Teſtimonies be attended to, there is an abſolute deciſion of the whole matter on the *Prelatiſts* ſide; To which purpoſe I have alſo vindicated theſe Epiſtles from all that hath been objected to them in theſe late years, and aſſerted their *Authority* by as *antient* and *authentick* evidences, as can be vouched for any antient piece, next the Holy Scriptures themſelves, and contented my ſelf with the moſt *pure* and *uncorrupted Copies* and *Editions* of them. 10.

In accord with theſe *Teſtimonies* I have alſo produced many others out of *Clemens Romanus*, *Hegeſippus*, *Polycarp*, *Papias*, *Polycrates*, *Juſtin*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Tertullian*, and as many of the firſt times as have ſaid any thing to this matter, and found a full *conſent* in all, and in moſt, irrefragable *ſuffrages*, which conclude this whole *Controverſie* on the *Prelatiſts* ſide. To which I have alſo added ſome few obſervations of unqueſtionable truth; as *Firſt*, That of the continuance of the uſe of Πρεσβύτερος, *Elder*, to ſignifie *Biſhop* (in our *Modern* ſenſe) among ſome of theſe moſt *antient Church writers* (whereas the word Ἐπίσκοπος is never uſed by any, but for a *ſingular Governour*.) *Secondly*, That of the diſtinct *Congregations* of *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Chriſtians* in the ſame *City* (the grounds of which are evident in *Scripture*) and conſequently of the ſeveral *Governours* or *Biſhops* over them (which was uſeful for the removing ſome ſeeming difficulties in the *Catalogues* of the *firſt Biſhops* of *Rome*, *Antioch*, *&c.*) and ſome other the like, not for the ſerving the *Neceſſities* of our *Cauſe*, but as ſupernumerary, and *ex abundanti*. And upon theſe and ſuch like heads of probation we have built our plea, deſcending alſo to a particular ſurvey of *Saint Hierom's teſtimonies*, which are by the *adverſaries* principally made uſe of againſt us. 11.

And if what is thus *copiouſly* deduced in the *Diſſertations*, together with *Anſwers*, and *refutations* of the principal *Objections* of D^r *Blondel*, and *Walo Meſſalinus*, do really ſtand in force, and appear not to be refuted now in whole, or in part, by theſe men, who have often attempted to *refute* them, I ſhall then leave them ſeriouſly, and *Chriſtianly* to conſider but this one thing, and to return their anſwer not to me, but to themſelves, what *ſecurity* of grounds they can build upon in their preſent *practices*, particularly in their *aſſuming* to themſelves that *power* or *authority* which doth not belong to them; For 1. if the *Præfecture* in each *Church* were (as by *Chriſt* to the *Apoſtles*, ſo) by the *Apoſtles* given to the *ſingular Governour* or *Biſhop* (by them καθεσὼς ἐπὶ πᾶσι, *conſtituted over all*) and from that time to this, regularly continued in a *ſucceſſion* of *Biſhops* in every *Church*; and *ſecondly*, if thoſe which are now called *Preſbyters*, were by thoſe, who firſt inſtituted them, placed in a *ſecond* 12.

rank as of *dignity*, so of *power*, and never had *all* that power committed to them, which to the *Bishop* was committed, particularly not that of *Ordaining* the meanest *Deacon*, much less *Presbyters* with power of *Ordaining* other *Presbyters*; and, *thirdly*, if they, on whose *authority* they most depend (* S. *Hierome* the *Presbyter*, &c.) do expressly assure them, that the *Presbyters* in their times had not power of *Ordination*, but acknowledge the *Bishop superior* to the *Presbyter* in that (and it is not imaginable how that power should be conveyed to any *Presbyter* now, which was not vested in any at that time, nor pretended to be so in above a *thousand* years after them.) And, *lastly*, if no man may take that which is not *given him from Heaven* (or give that which he hath not) which the *Scripture* yields to, as a rule by which both *John Baptist*, *John* 3. 27. and *Christ* himself, *Luk.* 12. 14. was to be judged, and the *Apostle*, *Heb.* 5. 4. hath applied that general rule to this particularity, of *Priesthood* in the *Church*, *viz.* that no man may λαμβάνειν τιμὴν *assume an honour* to himself, but who is ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ καλούμενος, *called by God*, (θεοπρόβλητος, *advanced by God*, saith *Theophylact*) either *immediately* or *mediately*, either by the *Apostles*, or by those which received it *successively* from them (all others being truly affirmed by the † *Antients* ὑπερπηδᾶν τὴν τιμὴν, *to leap into the honour*, καὶ νόμον διαφθείρειν, *and to corrupt the rule* or *law* by which they should be guided) then, I say, upon what solid *grounds* can they satisfie *Conscience*, who without all pretence of *necessity* (which by some is here made use of as an excuse) the regular way being open and plain before them, have *run* before they were *sent*, *assumed* that *power* to themselves, which belongs not to them, nor was ever by any, which had it, bestowed upon them?

I do not foresee any more here necessary to be premised to our future debates, and shall therefore hasten to them, as to an *unpleasant* progress, that I would willingly be at the end of, and commit all to the *grace* and *unerring judgment* of him, whom we all profess to *serve* and obey in this, as in all other things.

*Exceptâ Ordinatione, Hier. Ep. 85. ad Evagr. Χειροτονίαν αὐτῶν ἀναβιβάκασι ἐπίσκοποι. Chrysost. Hom. 11 1 Tim.

In Ep. ad Heb. p. 913.

† Theophylact ibid.

CHAP. I.

Concerning the Angels of the Churches of Asia.

SECT. I.

The grounds of affirming them to be Bishops.

Numb. 1. FOR the *vindicating* of the *Dissertations* from all the *Exceptions* which are offered against them in the *Book*, which I have now before me; It is no whit necessary that I give the *Reader* any the most *cursory* view of the *whole Book*; I shall therefore fall in, though abruptly, on the sixth Chapter of the *second part* of it. For although in some of the former Chapters of that part, some indeavours are used to assert *Presbytery* against *Episcopacy* by Arguments so frequently produced by that party, that they were every one foreseen; and in the *Dissertations* largely evidenced to have no validity in them; yet it falls out somewhat to mine own and the *Readers* ease, that I am not *personally* called into the *lists*, till the beginning of the sixth Chapter; which by the *signal* of some *Latine* words in the Margine out of *Dissert.* 4. *Chap.* 4. *Sect.* 4. have markt me out as the person against whom that Chapter was intirely designed, and I shall readily answer the call, and not refuse the pains to examine every *Section* of that Chapter.

2. The subject of this Chapter is the *pretended* (as they please to stile it) *Episcopacy of the seven* Asian Angels; And thus they begin their assault; *The second Scripture ground brought to prove the Divine right of Prelacy, is from the* Angels *of the seven Churches of* Asia; *These* Angels, *say they* (the asserters of Prelacy) *were seven single persons, and* (*as one hath lately written*) *not only* Bishops, *but Metropolitans and* Archbishops. *This is said with so much confidence that all men are condemned as blind or wilful that endeavour to oppose it: And it is reckoned as one of the great prodigies of this unhappy Age, that Men should still continue blind, and not see light enough in this Scripture to build the great Fabrick of Episcopacy by Divine Right upon.*

In tanta luce adhuc cæcutire aliquos, inter pessimi & inauspicatissimi sæculi prodigia numerandum est.

3. This is, it seems, the first crime chargeable on me as Author of the *Dissertations*, that I am confident of my Assertion, and *condemn all others as blind or wilful that indeavour to oppose it.* And although this be no competent way of disproving what is asserted, for it is no *universal maxim* or *Datum* among the *Objecters*, that confident asserting should be lookt on as a character of falsity, yet I, that would much more be ashamed to have been presumptuous than mistaken, and deem it not a sin to have *erred modestly*, am concerned to avert the envy of this their *Proœme*, and to give this essay, how far any the most *moderate* speeches may be disguised and deformed by a *disadvantageous* interpretation.

4. These words [*in tantâ luce* —] lie thus in the *Dissertations*; [Ad tertium accedo — *I proceed to the third thing, that which concerns the* Angels *in the Apocalypse, that by them are noted so many Prefects of the chief Cities or Churches in* Asia, *whom you may call not only* Bishops, *but* Primates, Exarchs, *or* Metropolitans. *Each of these things must be briefly taken notice of. First, that each of these were single and properly called* Bishops. *So* Andreas Cæsariensis *pronounceth of them,* Ἕπτα ἐκκλησίαις ἰσάριθμοι ἔφοροι Ἄγγελοι λέγονται, *The seven* Ephori (Inspectors *or* Bishops, *so called from the* Greek ἐπίσκοποι *Inspectors*, directly equivalent to ἔφοροι) *parallel to the number of the seven* Churches, *are in that place of the Apocalypse called* Angels. *This title of* Angel *is sufficiently known from* Malach. 2. 7. *to belong to the chief Priest of the* Jews, *for he is called the* Angel *of the Lord of Hosts, as the person from whom the Law was to be derived to the people. Furthermore these* Angels *in that vision of* Johns *are likened to so many* Stars, *which, seeing* Christ *is said to bear or carry in his right hand,* Apoc. 1. 16. 20. & 21. *an argument of competent validity may be drawn from thence, that this dignity and power of them in the* Church

is,

is, if not immediately instituted, yet approved and confirmed by Christ; *especially when in these so many parts of this Epistle,* Christ *himself hath written to every of them under this title of honour and dignity. In the presence of so much light that some Men should still continue blind, is to be numbred among the prodigies of this worst and most unhappy age. For as to that which from the one word* [*you*] *in the plural,* c. 4. 24. *I find objected by some against so many single mentions of the* Angels (*one in every* Church) *that will immediately vanish,* &c.

These words thus intirely set down, have a face very distant from that so much *confidence* and *censoriousness*, that I am here charged with, by the *Provincial Synod*. For, *First*, For the *conclusion* deduced from the mention of these *Angels*, 'tis not the *Divine Right of Prelacy* (which phrase might yet have been reconciled with rules of Sobriety and Modesty, as well as the *Jus Divinum* of Presbytery) but Christs approbation and confirmation of this *dignity* and power of Bishops, which conclusion hath evident grounds in those Texts which mention *Christ's holding them in his Hand*, and his addressing an *Epistle* to them, supposing only, what is undertaken to be evidenced by other *mediums*, that these Angels were *single* persons in each *Church*. 5.

Secondly, That which is by me so confidently affirmed, is not, as this learned *Assembly* is pleased to suggest, that these Angels were Metropolitans or Archbishops. That they were such, is afterwards as a distinct matter in the next Chapter proposed in a much more *moderate style, statim credibile fiet, it will straightways become credible*, and with no more shew of confidence than the premises which are there at large set down, will Authorize. 6.

These be *two* competent essays to begin with, by which we may proportion our expectations; But there is yet a *third* which hath somewhat more of *injustice* in it, to mention my so much *confidence* in *asserting*, but never to take notice of the grounds produced, whereon this confidence (as far as it extends) is built, the want of which, is so constantly the one thing, which renders *confidence* unseasonable or blameable, that it is not in the power of any man to have apprehended grounds as proper to induce a *conclusion*, and to suspend the *belief* and *confidence* of the truth of that *conclusion*, which is so inferred. The *injustice*, I say, is their not taking notice of the *mediums*, whereon the *confidence* is founded, very competent to infer a conclusion in that stile, wherein it was there inferred, if they had been pleased to advertise their Readers of it. 7.

The inference lies thus; The *Angel* of each Church of *Asia* was a *single* person, therefore not a *Colledge* or *Consistory* of Presbyters, and the singularity of the person is there supposed to be *evidenced* sufficiently by that which is so many times repeated in the *Text*, *the Angel of the* Church *of* Ephesus, *the* Angel *of the* Church *of* Smyrna, and the like, by the testimony of *Andreas Cæsariensis*, the principal Annotator or Interpreter of the *Revelation*, transcribed by *Aretas* in expres words, ἴσα ἐκκλησίαις ἰσάριθμοι ἔφοροι, *the number of the Bishops equal to the number of the Churches*; and by the answer rendred to that one *Objection* which is brought by the *Presbyterians* against the *singularity* of the person of each *Angel*. 8.

Secondly, This *singular* person was a *Bishop* in that notion of the word which signifies a *precedence of power* and *dignity* over all others in that *Church*. This again was made evident, both by the forementioned *singularity* of his power and person in each Church, and farther by the *propriety* of the title bestowed on him, an *Angel*, such as among the *Jews* the *chief Priest* was styled, *Malac.* 2. to which matter I shall now superadd one Testimony which *Photius* hath out of *Diodorus Siculus* concerning the *Jews*; Ἀρχιερέα τοῦτον προσαγορεύουσι, καὶ νομίζουσιν αὐτοῖς ἄγγελον γενέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ προσταγμάτων, *Him they call the High Priest, and deem him to be to them an Angel or Messenger of the commands of God* (a *Commissioner of Heaven*, impowered from thence for the execution of his *Office* among them.) 9.

This by the way, gives us the reason of the *denomination*, because as *Angels* do not only carry up our *Prayers* to *God*, but also bring down *Gods Commands* to us, so did the *High Priest* under the *Law*. This *dialect* is also said to be derived from the *Hebrews* to the *Ægyptians*, who call their *Chief Priest Angel* also. And then how fitly the *parallel* runs betwixt the *High Priest* among the *Jews*, and the *Bishop* in the *Christian Church*, taken in the *Prelatists* notion of him, was a theme which seemed not to need any length of *harangue* to confirm or illustrate it. And yet after a Section spent to clear that one difficulty of the [*ὑμῖν*, *you*, in the *plural*, c. 2. 24.] there are two Sections added more for the farther fortifying of this evidence, 1. From the Council of *Chalcedon*, *Act.* 2. which * from *Timothy* till the time of their *Session*, numbers 27. *Bishops* in one of these *Sees*, that of *Ephesus*, all ordained there (and *Timothy* we know being ordained by the laying on of S^t *Paul*'s hands, 2 *Tim.* 1.6. will devolve it to that *Original*, *Apostolical institution*) and 2. from *Polycrates*, † who was born soon after S^t *John*'s days, and is a witness of a competent *antiquity*, and affirms himself to be the * eighth *Bishop* of that *See*; From both which testimonies of the *Catalogue*, and number of *Bishops*, ascending to S^t *Timothy*, as the first of that rank (who certainly was constituted there before the Epistle of *Christ* to the *Angel* of that *Church*) the conclusion is obvious and irrefragable, that either *Timothy*, or some *successor* of his, was personally the *Angel* to which the *Epistle* was addrest; and I profes not to wish for a greater evidence to justifie a *Prelatist* in his desire to live in obedience to that order so signally confirmed by *Christ*. 10.

* Ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου Τιμοθέου μέχρι νῦν κζ. ἐπίσκοποι ἐγένοντο πάντες ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐχειροτονήθησαν.

† *De Martyr. Timoth.*

* *Ep. ad Victor. ap. Euseb. Eccl. Hist. l. 5. c. 25.*

The like is in the next *Section* produced out of *Irenæus* l. 3. c. 3. concerning the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*. *Irenæus* lived in the time of *Polycarp* that antient *Primitive Martyr*, and being a youth had the honour to see that *venerable old Man*, and of him he affirms, that he was * *not only a Disciple of the Apostles, and converst with many that saw Christ, but that also he was sent to* Asia, *and constituted Bishop in the Church of* Smyrna; And if there needed any more light after so clear and *authentick* a testimony (which again concludes either *Polycarp*, or some predecessor of his, to be the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, to whom *Christ* addresseth his *Epistle*) there is another added out of *Tertullian*, a Writer of great Antiquity and reputation for knowledge in the *Records* of the *Church*, in these words; † *As the Church of* Smyrna *relates* Polycarp *to have been constituted there by* John, *as the* 11.

* ὃν μόνον ἴσασι Ἀποστόλων μαθητεύσαντα, καὶ συναναστραφέντα πολλοῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἑωρακόσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὸ Ἀποστόλων καταστάσει εἰς τὴν ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίαν ἐπίσκοπον. † *Sicut Smyrnæorum Ecclesia Polycarpum à Johanne collocatum refert, sicut Romanorum Clementem à Petro ordinatum edit, perinde utique & cæteræ exhibent, quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum constitutos, Apostolici seminis traduces habent.* De Præscrip. c. 32.

Church

Church of Rome *affirms* Clement *to have been ordained by* Peter, *so in like manner the rest of the Churches exhibite the Records of those whom they have had their Bishops constituted by the Apostles and conveyers of the Apostolical seed to them.* And more particularly of the *Churches* of *Asia*, the subject of our present discourse, * *We have the Churches fed by* John, *and the course of Bishops being driven to the Original, acknowledge* John (*the Apostle*) *to be the Author of them.* Here certainly is light enough to make some *confidence* excusable in a *Prelatist*, and to make his *wonder* seasonable, that any that have eyes, should in so clear a *sunshine* want the *use* of them, and to think it no very *auspicious omen* that they do. Yet because I had much rather assist, than upbraid other mens infirmities, I have here given them an instance, how easie it had been for them to have informed themselves and their *respective charges*, of the *grounds* of the *Prelatists confidence*, that the *Epistle* of *Christ* to the *Angels* of the seven *Asian* Churches was an evidence of his approbation of the Order of *Bishops*, in our *modern* notion of that word for a *single overseer* in every *Church*.

* *Habemus Johannis alumnas Ecclesias— Ordo Episcoporum ad originem recensus in Johannem stabit author.* Adv. Marc. l. 4. c. 5.

12. And if there be any obscurity still remaining in the premises, because the Council of *Chalcedon* (and *Polycrates*) makes *Timothy*, who was ordained by *Paul* the first *Bishop* or *Angel* of the *Church* of *Ephesus*, but *Tertullian* devolves the *Original* of the course or Catalogue to S^t *John*; the answer is easie, that there were two sorts of Christians in *Ephesus*, and throughout all *Asia*, the first of *Gentile* converts, brought into the faith by S^t *Paul* the *Apostle* of the *Gentiles*, and over them it was that *Timothy* was by him placed in *Ephesus* their *Bishop*; the second of *Jewish Proselytes* converted by S^t *John* (by compact designed to go to the *Jews*, as his *Province*, Gal. 2. 9. and those peculiarly the *Asian Jews*, as appears every where in † *Eusebius*'s story, and by the relation of his death in that place, given us by * *Polycrates*, an early *Bishop* there) and the Author of the *constitution* out of an antient *tradition* tells us that another of the same name, (Ἰωάννης ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς Ἰωάννου κεχειροτονημένος) was by that *Apostle ordained Bishop* of the *Jewish Christians* there, as *Timothy* by S^t *Paul* of the other Congregation of *Gentile Christians*. An observation which is largely deduced and exemplified in the † *Dissertations*, and of which there is no small use for the *dilucidating* of *obscurities in antient* story, and the clearing of this Controversie betwixt us and the *Presbyterians*; but I must not here take liberty to inlarge on it unnecessarily, having been thus far forced to expatiate somewhat above proportion to the length of their own period, wherein my *confidence* and *censoriousness* were shortly accused; how deservedly I hope hath now been made manifest.

† τὰς αὐτόθι διέπειν ἐκκλησίας, l. 3. c. 23.
* Ibid. c. 31.
† *Dissert.* 4. c. 1. & 7, &c.

SECT. II.

Of Timothy, *of* Onesimus, *of* Polycarp.

Numb. 1. THE next period in their charge against me runs thus: *It is farther added, that some of the Antient Fathers mention the very men that were the Angels of those Churches. Some say* Timothy *was Bishop of* Ephesus, *when* John *wrote his Epistle to it; others say* Onesimus, *others say that* Polycarp *was Bishop of* Smyrna: *And from hence they conclude with a great deal of plausibility, that the Angels of the Churches were seven individual Bishops.*

2. Here is as yet no great charge offered, but a confession rather, that I had some temptation for the *confidence*, of which I was formerly accused, my *conclusion* being acknowledged by the adversaries to be *inferred with a great deal of plausibility.* But I have not so much reason to depend on their *civilities*, as to omit the inserting here, what may be useful to prevent mistakes, and shall therefore think it necessary to set down intirely, what it is which I have affirmed in this matter.

3. And 1. I have yet no where said that *Timothy* was *Bishop* of *Ephesus* when *John* writ this *Epistle* to that *Church*; my words are expresly otherwise, *Ex quibus patet vel* Timotheum *ipsum, vel aliquem ei succedaneum, hunc ipsum Angelum fuisse, quem* c. 2. 1. *Christus alloquitur. By which it appears* (having formerly set down my *grounds* to induce this *conclusion*) *that either* Timothy *himself, or some body that succeeded him, was that very Angel to whom Christ addrest his speech,* c. 2. 1. But that is not to affirm it of *Timothy*, but purposely to abstain from affirming any thing that could be denyed or doubted, and only to affirm it either of *Timothy* or some *successor* of his, which evidently and infallibly it must be, if there be truth in the premise from which it was inferred, the words of the *Council*, and the *Father*, that after *Timothy*, the first, there succeeded a *continual* series of *Bishops* there.

4. What my opinion is in this matter, I shall now freely tell them, though before I had not occasion to do it, together professing it to be only my *opinion*, and so still *affirming* nothing in a matter of some *uncertainty*, or farther than the grounds, on which my *opinion* is founded, shall appear able to support it. My opinion briefly is, that *Timothy* was then *Bishop* of *Ephesus* at the time of addressing that *Epistle* to the *Angel* of that *Church*; And the *grounds* are these: 1. That S^t *John*'s banishment and prophesying are by *Epiphanius* twice expresly affirmed to have been ἐν χρόνοις Κλαυδίου Καίσαρος, *in the times of Claudius Cæsar*; Then *secondly*, that as it is by *Chronologers* set down to be in the *thirteenth* of *Claudius*, that *Timothy* was left by *Paul* at *Ephesus*, when he went into *Macedonia*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *Act.* 20. so it is generally resolved that *Timothy* suffered at *Ephesus* under *Nerva*, and that agreeable enough with his age, who appears to be *young* when *Paul* first placed him *Bishop* of *Ephesus*. If these grounds have truth in them, then *Timothy* cannot be doubted to be *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, when S^t *Johns* vision was received; And though 'tis true, that *Irenæus* seems to assign another *date* of these *visions*, at least of some of them, πρὸς τῷ τέλει Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς, *at the end of* Domitians *Reign* (which what it is to be deemed to signifie, is * elsewhere explained) yet still that is within the compass of *Timothy*'s life, if he suffered not till *Nerva*'s Reign. And so much for that of *Timothy*'s.

Hær. Ἄλλογ.
**Annot.* p. 906.

5. *Secondly*, That *Onesimus* was *Bishop* of *Ephesus* at the *date* of that *Epistle*, is no where so much as intimated to be my opinion, much less affirmed by me. And therefore I need reply no more to that. Yet because *Ignatius* in his *Epistle* to the *Ephesians* mentions *Onesimus* their *Bishop* (and that *testimony* is produced by me, *Dissert.* 2. *Chap.* 25. *Sect.* 9.) I shall here freely give them my opinion also of that matter.

First,

First, That there is little ground of *question*, but that one of that name, *Onesimus* was *Bishop* of *Ephesus* in the tenth year of *Trajan*, wherein *Ignatius* wrote that *Epistle*. 6.

Secondly, That by one indication there is some small reason to guess, that this *Onesimus* was then lately come to that dignity; I mean *Ignatius* his words of gratulation to that *Church*, that *God* had *given them the favour to obtain or have such a Bishop*; εὐλογητὸς ὁ χαρισάμενος ὑμῖν τοιούτοις ὄσι τοιοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον κεκτῆσθαι. 7.

Thirdly, That according to *Epiphanius* his setting down the time of *John*'s banishment and *visions*, in the days of *Claudius*, there must be above fifty years distance between the *date* of this *Epistle* of *Christ*, and that of *Ignatius*, and consequently that it is not so likely that *Onesimus*, that was their *Bishop* in the latter, should be that very *Angel* in the former. 8.

Fourthly, That as I can have no cause to consent with *Ado* (*in lib. de Fest. Apost. ad* 14. *Cal. Mart.*) that this *Onesimus* in *Ignatius* was he that is mentioned by S^t *Paul* to *Philemon*, so nor to adhere to the *Roman Martyrology*, that he whom *Paul* mentions, was constituted *Bishop* of *Ephesus* after *Timothy*. 9.

And therefore, *fifthly*, it must be remembred, that both the *Greek Menologies*, and *Simeon Metaphrastes* (who celebrate his memory on *March* 13.) acknowledge not that *Onesimus* to have been at all *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, and that others also of the *antients* make him to have been *Bishop* of *Beræa*, and *martyr'd* in *Domitian*'s Reign: and *Dorotheus* in *Synopsi* expresly affirmeth that *Gaius* succeeded *Timothy* in *Ephesus*. 10.

From all which it follows, that *Onesimus* mentioned by *Ignatius*, was some later *Bishop* of that City, who bare that *ordinary Greek* name, and so that his being *Bishop* of *Ephesus* no way belongs to that time of the *Angel* in the *Revelation*, nor interferes with their opinion, who think *Timothy* to have been that *Angel*; The appearing incompetibility whereof was it, I suppose, that brought in here the mention of *Onesimus*. 11.

This was here seasonable enough to be confronted to their words in this place, and will be of use to be remembred in the *proces* of their *Discourse*. 12.

Thirdly, For *Polycarp*'s being *Bishop* of *Smyrna*, as there is left no place for the doubting of that (if either *Irenæus*, that lived in his time and *saw* him, or if *Tertullian*, who lived not long after, and was a curious *Antiquary*, way be believed in their joynt affirmations of a known matter of *Fact*) so it is again no where affirmed by me, that he was the very man, to whom that *Epistle* to the *Angel* of *Symrna* was sent, and if that were their meaning, they have again *misreported* my words. 13.

All that I had said, I think was proved irrefragably, that in two of those *Churches* mentioned in the *Apocalypse*, *Timothy* and *Polycarp* are by *authentick testimonies* affirmed to be constituted *Bishops*, the one by S^t *Paul*, the other by S^t *John*; and that is a competent argument added to others, to infer that the *Angel* of each of those *Churches* was a *single* person, and so a *Bishop* in the *Prelatists*, not in the *Presbyterians* notion of the word; an assertion which I need not fear will yield any advantage to the *adversaries*, and so I as briefly commit it to them. 14.

SECT. III.

Of the negative Argument from St. John's *not using the word Bishop.*
Of Πρεσβύτερος *in the Revelation.*

IN the next place by way of *answer* to this plea of the *Prelatists*, we are referred to three writings of their party, *Smectymnuus*, the *Vindication of Smectymnuus*, the *Humble Addresses of the Divines at the Isle of* Wight, wherein, say they, *these things are fully, clearly, and satisfactorily handled.* *Numb.* 1.

But it being certain that every one of these three was publisht some years before the *Dissertations*, I should think it strange that the particulars there insisted on by me, should by *divination* be thus *answered* before their *conception*, being able truly to profess, that though I am not unwilling to make use of any mans aid for defending truth, yet none of those writings, to which any of those three were given in *answer*, were by me made use of in those *compositions*. 2.

But we are superseded the trouble of examining any of these three, by the *leave* that is *craved* to *borrow* from them what may be *useful* for the turn, and then in like manner I shall more willingly receive from these, what shall appear to answer, or prejudge our plea, than undertake new troubles in farther unnecessary search of it. 3.

First, Then, they desire it may be *considered, that St.* John, *the Penman of the Revelation, doth neither in it, nor in any of his other writings so much as upon the* (*by*; I suppose, for the Printer fails me) *name* Bishop. *He names the name* Presbyter *frequently in the Revelation, yea, when he would set out the Office of those who are nearest the throne of Christ in his Church,* Rev. 4. *he calls himself a* Presbyter, Ep. 2. *And whereas in St.* John's *days some new expressions were used in the Christian Church, which we c not in Scripture, as the Christian Sabbath began to be called the Lords day, and Christ himself the Word, now both these are found in the writings of St.* John; *And it is strange to us that the Apostle should mention a new phrase, and not mention a new Office erected by this time* (*as our Brethren say*) *in the Church, especially if we consider that* Polycarp (*as is related*) *was made Bishop by him*; *And no doubt if he had been made Bishop in a prelatical sense, we should have found the name Bishop in some of his writings, who lived so long as to see Episcopacy setled in the Church, as our Adversaries would make us believe.* 4.

We are now to consider what degree of *conviction*, or Argument, to the *prejudice* of our *pretensions*, can be fetcht from this large *consideration*. And first it is most evident and notorious among all Artists, that an argument from Authority cannot conclude *negatively* that there were no Bishops in S^t *John*'s time, because S^t *John* doth not mention Bishops. It is the same way of arguing, as if they should conclude that there was no *God* in the time of writing the *Canonical Chapters* of *Hester*, because God is not found once mentioned in those *Chapters*. And yet of this *inartificial* kind is the whole 5.

discourse

discourse of this *Paragraph*, the premisses barely *negative* throughout all the *consideration*; And so nothing is concludible from it to the *prejudice* of us, or *benefit* of our adversaries.

6. Secondly, All that this *consideration* pretends to, is terminated in the bare name of *Bishop*, that is it which they pretend is not to be found in St. *John*. But first, They knew that the word *Angel* is oft in St. *John*, and by us contested, by the *singularity* of the person, one *Angel* in each *Church* (and other Characters) to conclude the *Office* of *Bishop* as irrefragably, as if the word *Bishop* were there specified. Nay of this we have a competent experience, that if the word *Bishop* had been found there, it would by *Presbyterians* be as readily expounded to signifie a Presbyter, or *Colledge* of such (for so certainly they have done in other places) and truly with as much *reason* and satisfaction to any *impartial* judge, as they have affirmed the word *Angel* in each *Church* to denote such. And therefore

7. Thirdly, I shall demand, would the *Apostle* St. *John*'s using the name *Bishop*, be at all useful to the *Prelatists* interests, to conclude that there was such an *Office* in the *Church* in his time, or would it not? If not, then sure it is not to our *prejudice*, that he hath not mentioned that name, and then this whole *consideration* is perfectly to no purpose. If it would, then sure St. *Pauls* and St. *Lukes* frequent mentions of them (I may adde St. *Peter* also) will supply St. *John*'s omissions, and conclude there were *Bishops* in their time, and that was long before St. *John*'s death, if it had been considered.

8. Fourthly, When it is said that St. *John* frequently names the name *Presbyter* in the *Apocalyps*, 'tis not imaginable that they should think the *Author* of the *Dissertations* could receive any prejudice from thence, when he hath avowed to believe that those Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, mentioned in those so many places of the *Revelation*, were the twenty four *Bishops* of *Judea* sitting in *Councel* at *Jerusalem* their *Metropolis*, encompassing *James* the *Bishop* there, together with the *four living creatures*, denoting the four *Apostles* that were joined with them in the *councel*, and the seven Lamps, the Emblems of the seven *Deacons* attending; Of which matter till they have disproved what is commodiously deduced *Dissert.* 4. *c.* 20. *Sect.* 10. I shall have no need farther to inlarge, it being perfectly useless to our present inquiry, that either the word *Bishop* or *Elder* should be used by St. *John*, for a single *Prefect* in the *Christian Church*, supposing (as now we do in the *Objection*, and 'tis but a begging of the *question* in the *respondent* to suppose the *contrary*) that the word *Angel* is a notation of it.

9. By this it appears fifthly, how little we are incommodated by the *position* of these *Elders* in the *Revelation* placed neerest to the *throne* of *Christ* in his Church; for supposing, as I do, that *Christ* is by way of *vision* represented there under the person of the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem* sitting in *councel*, and encompassed (on each side) with a *Semicircle* of *Thrones*, on which sat the twenty four *Bishops* of *Judea*, I can well allow these twenty four (call them *Elders*, or what you please) to be neerest to that *middle throne*, whereon *Christ* is seated. And truly if it should be otherwise interpreted of Presbyters in the *modern* notion of the word, it would be hard to make the other parts of the *vision* to bear proportion with that fancy; For I must suppose, according to St. *John*'s words, that in the *vision* these *thrones* were set up in *Heaven*; And then I shall demand, was that a *representation* of any *councel* or *Judicature* on *Earth*, or not? If it were not, then nothing can be inferred thence in favour of *Presbyters*, more than of *Bishops*, for of both these we speak, as of *Officers* on Earth; But if it were, then applying it to *Presbyters*, it must follow, that in the *midst* of them there is some other (invironed on each side by them) καθήμενον ἐπὶ τῷ θρόνῳ, *sitting upon that throne of principal dignity*, before whom also they on the *other thrones* must *fall down*, v. 10. (or else the *parallel* will not hold throughout) and the least that can be signified hereby, will be *superiority* of *dignity* in him that sits on that *middle throne* above all the twenty four *Elders*, which will be deemed to exceed the case of a *Prolocutor* or *Moderator* of an *Assembly*, which is the *utmost* that the *Presbyterian* Ἰσότιμία or *equality* can admit of, but much more commodiously agrees to the *Metropolitan* of all *Judea*, sitting in a *National Councel* with the *Bishops* about him, for of these we doubt not to affirm that they were as much inferior to him, as this *representation* doth pretend them to be.

10. As for the sence affixt to it by the *Assemblers*, that the Πρεσβύτεροι are *Presbyters* in the *modern* notion, and that he that sits in the *midst* of them is *Christ*, this is against all *analogy*, and rules of interpreting, a mixing and confounding the *Original* with the *Copy*, the *type* with the *Antitype*, interpreting one part of the *vision*, as if it were in *Heaven* (for it was there where *Christ* did sit as *Judge*) and the other as if it were on *Earth*, for sure the *Presbyters* in this notion are to be considered as there; And this is a very sufficient prejudice against their interpretation (if there were not enough besides), and such as no way presseth our way of setting it, as hath been already manifested.

11. Sixthly, for his calling himself a *Presbyter Ep.* 2. I answer, that as far as this allegation hath truth, it hath no *force* in it at all against our pretensions. He doth indeed call himself ὁ πρεσβύτερος (the *Elder*, we fitly render it) noting thereby (according to *analogy* with the solemn notion of the word both among *sacred* and *prophane* Writers, set down at large *Dissert.* 4. *c.* 19.) a person of *authority* in the *Church* of *Christ*, an *Apostle* first, and then the *supreme Governour* of the whole *Jewish Church* in *Asia*, which is but proportionable to Saint *Pauls* beginning his *Epistles* with *Paul an Apostle* (or *Commissioner*) *of Jesus Christ* (placed in that power in the *Church* by *Christ* himself) and with the same style in the front of Saint *Peters Epistles*, only with this *Characteristick* note peculiar to Saint *John* in his *Gospel* and *Epistles*, of omitting the expression of his own name; And then all that this text is of force to do, is to prove that the word Πρεσβύτερος doth not import a *Presbyter* (in our *modern* use of the word) governing in *common* with other *Presbyters*, but rather a *singular Governour* of the *Church*, such as *Bishops* are by us contested to be; And so the *Greek Scholiasts* have expressed it, διάκονον ἑαυτὸν καλῶν διὰ τῆς Πρεσβυτέρου, *By the word Elder he calls himself Bishop*. And this, 'tis certain, is for the interest of the *Author* of the *Dissertations*, and no way to his prejudice, if it had been adverted by them that produce it.

12. *Seventhly*, when 'tis said that in *Saint John's days some new expressions were used in the Christian Church, which were not in Scripture*, as the *Lords day*, and the *Word*, I profess not to comprehend what advantage to their pretensions could be designed or aimed at in this part of the *consideration*: For first, how can it truly be said, that the word Κυριακὴ, *Lord's day*, which is in the *Revelation*, and ὁ Λόγος, *the Word*,

Word, which is in S. *John's Gospel*, were not in *Scripture*? I must suppose the meaning is, that they were not in any other writings of *Scripture*, except S. *John's*: But then 2. that doth not infer them to be *new expressions* in S. *John's days*, as these days are distinguisht from the *days* of the *other Apostles*, whom *John* survived, but only that they were *idioms* or *characters* of speech that S. *John* delighted to make use of.

Thus indeed 'tis ordinarily observed of his *expressing* of *Christ* by ὁ Λόγος *the word*, which yet is taken from the *Ancients* of the *Jewish Church* (the *Chaldee Paraphrase* being known frequently to use מימר דוי *the word of the Lord*, and *Plato* seems to have been acquainted with the expression, which caused *Amelius* to swear at the reading the beginning of *S. John's Gospel*, that that *Barbarian* was of their *Plato's* mind, that the word of *God* was in order of a *Principle*) and perhaps not peculiarly to him appropriate, for * *Budæus* a very learned *Critick* in *Greek*, affirms S. *Luke* to have used it in this notion, *Cap.* 1. 2. and if he doth not, yet still 'twill be but a peculiar part of S. *John's* style, which if he had written his *Gospel* in the same year that S. *Matthew* did his, he would doubtless have made use of the phrase being certainly in the world before that time (and so not *new*, as they would have it) and the usage of it in the Church being in all reason to be derived from S. *John's* use of it (who was from thence called θεολόγος *the Divine*) not S. *John's* use of it from the *new admission* of it into the *Christian Church*. 13.

* *In Pandect. pag.* 31.

And for the word Κυριακὴ, *Lord's day*, as it is not certain that it is the *Christian Sabbath* (I mean the *weekly Lord's day*,) which is meant by that title once used in the *Revelation*, but as probably the *feast* of *Easter*, the *annual commemoration* of *Christ's* rising from the *dead* (and accordingly *Andreas Cæsariensis* sets it indifferently, yet so as it seems rather to incline to the *latter*, Κυριακὴ τῆς ἀναστάσεως χαιρεῖ μνημόσυνον φέρουσα, *the Lord's day bearing the memorial of the resurrection of Christ*) so in what notion so ever it be taken, it was again S. *John's* use of the word that gave it *authority* in the following dialect of the *Church*, not the *Churches* usage (that we any where can discern) from whence S. *John* derived it; And so this will be an instance as ineffectual as the former, to infer the conclusion to which it is designed: For indeed bating the *unskilfulness* of the *argument*, *ab authoritate negativè*, already mentioned, what a strange way of concluding would this be? S. *John* useth the words [ὁ Λόγος, *the word*] and [Κυριακὴ, *Lord's day*] (supposing also, that 'tis true which is added) and no other *writer* of the *Scripture* useth them, but instead of them, [*the Son of God*] (*Messias*, *Christ*) and the [*first day of the week*] therefore if there had been any *office* of *Bishops* erected in the *Church* in S. *John's* time, it is strange that S. *John* should not mention the name Ἐπίσκοπος *Bishop*: 'Tis at the first hearing clear enough, that there is no *strangeness* in this, both because S. *John* undertook not to set down a *Dictionary* of all words or customs which were in his time in the *Church*, and because there is no proportion held betwixt the members of the *comparison*, as hath been shewed. And it will yet be less strange, because 1. it is easily supposeable and not strange, that he should have no occasion at all to mention that office, or that mentioning it, he should do it in his own chosen expression, Ἄγγελος *Angel*, or πρεσβύτερος, *Elder* (as in other greater matters he is acknowledged and allowed to do) by either of those signifying the same thing as expressly, as the using of Ἐπίσκοπος *Bishop* would have done: And 2. It is otherwise as manifest by S. *Paul* and S. *Luke*, that the word Ἐπίσκοπος *Bishop*, and the office belonging to it, were before the time of S. *John's* writings used in the *Church*, as it could be, if S. *John* had made express mention of it 14.

And lastly, for the highest round in the κλίμαξ, the special part of the *consideration*, our affirmation that *Polycarp* was made *Bishop* by S. *John*, that doth not (any more than all the rest) infer it necessary, that S. *John* should mention the name *Bishop*: S. *Jude*, I hope, is supposed by the *Assemblers* to have constituted some *Presbyters* in the *Church*, and yet he in his *Epistle* hath made no mention of any such *name* or *office*. And so much for that first *consideration*. 15.

SECT. IV.

Of Saint John's *Writings. And in them, of* Diotrephes.

A Second *consideration* now follows to be added to this, *That there is not any the least intimation in all S.* John's *writings, of the superiority of one Presbyter over another, save only where he names and chides* Diotrephes, *as one ambitiously affecting such a Primacy*. *Numb.* 1.

A *consideration* of the same unhappy constitution with the former, 1. *à testimonio negativè* again; S. *John* had no occasion to mention it, therefore there was in his time no such thing; and 2. In respect of the matter, just the same again, put only in other words; there 'twas, [No mention of *Bishop* in all S. *John's* writings,] here, [No *superiority* of one *Presbyter* over another in all S. *John's* writings] And so it can add no accumulation of weight to the former. 2.

But then 2. (Bating again those two infirmities in discourse) what if it were granted that at the time of S. *John's* writing, there were not in the *whole Church* of *Christ* any one *Presbyter*, superior to another *Presbyter*, what hath the *Author* of the *Dissert.* lost, or they gained by this? He makes no doubt willingly to yield to any inforcing reason that is or shall be produced to conclude that at that time, there was above *Deacons* but *one degree* in the *Church*, and yet to be never the less qualified to maintain his pretensions; Nay he is known to have expressed it as his opinion probably inferred, and not easily confuted (and that by which, if it be true, or because there is no *evidence* to the contrary, all the *Presbyterian* pretensions, founded in the *doubtfulness* of words in *Scripture*, are utterly excluded) that there were not in the space within compass of which, all the *Books* of the *New Testament* were written, any *Presbyters* in our *Modern* notion of them, created in the *Church*, though soon after, certainly in *Ignatius's* time, there were; and then if the *consideration* now before us were of any force at all, this would be the one direct and proper use of it, to add more *confidence* to this opinion, and so to *confirm*, not to *invalidate* our *pretensions*. 3.

4. Thirdly for *Diotrephes*, and S. *John*'s chiding of him for *ambitiously affecting* a *Primacy* over other *Presbyters*, there will appear to be more than one misadventure in it. For 1. it is apparent in the *Text* that this *Diotrephes* (whom * *Walo Messalinus*, a good friend to the petensions of the *Assemblies*, describes so, as will conclude him a meer *Presbyterian*. *Noluit*, saith he, *agnoscere superiorem aliquem in Presbyteros habentem potestatem*, *he would not acknowledge any superior having power over Presbyters*) contended for *superiority*, not only over his *equals*, but over S. *John* himself, ὐκ ἐπιδέχεται ἡμᾶς, saith that *Apostle*, he *receiveth not us*, yields no *obedience*, gives no *heed* to our *letter* of directions; This certainly belongs not to the *superiority* or *dignity* of *Bishops*, which reserves the *Primacy* to the *Apostles* intire, and no way clasheth with it, and only pretends to that power and *office* of duty, which for the preserving of *unity*, and the good of the *flock*, the *Apostles* thought fit to intrust and commit to them.

* Pag. 24.

5. *Secondly*, *Diotrephes* was not (as far as appears, or we have reason to conjecture) *ordained* to any *office* of power in the *Asian Church*, committed to that *Apostles* care, but of himself without any *mission*, nay expresly against the *Apostles* consent, was willing to assume and exercise this *power*, and is but an example of *Corah*'s sedition and presumptuous humour (and that is inevitably the case of the *Presbyterian*, unless he can shew his *commission* for the *power* he pretends to) all one with that of the *Gnosticks* censured by S. *Jude* under the style of ἀντιλογία Κορὲ the *gainsaying of Corah*, and this no way belongs, or is appliable to the *practice* of the *Bishop*, who by *Commission* from the *Apostle*, not by any *ambition* or *presumption* of his own, regularly ascends to this *degree* of *office* and *dignity* in the *Church*, and useth it as regularly also, in subordination to all his *superiours*.

6. On this Occasion the *Dissertations* have offered a *Dilemma* to these *Disputants* which I should be willing to hear answered by them, in this form, Either *Diotrephes* exercised in the *Church* the power of the *Bishop*, in the notion of a *singular Præfect*, assuming power over the *Presbyters*, or he did not; If he did not, then is this *consideration* presently at an end, *Diotrephes* is falsly accused, and the *innocent Bishop* unjustly wounded through his sides, who it seems was no *Bishop*: But if it be said he did, then I demand, Why is not *Diotrephes* checkt by S. *John* for that *presumption* of affecting a power over his *equals*? And why doth the whole charge lie another way, that he received not S. *John*'s *Letters*, nor paid due *obedience* to them? Or why is that very thing charged so heavily on the *Bishops* in our age, and punisht so severely in them, which the *Apostle* living and seeing, and upon occasion taking notice of *Diotrephes* his insolence, doth not so much as reprehend or accuse in him?

7. For as to the *Epithet* which he bestows upon him, that he was φιλοπρωτεύων, one that *loved the preeminence*, supposing that were the title of his *fault*, yet that extends not the *Apostles* speech to *censuring* or blaming the *use* of that power, but only the *ambition* and *affectation* of it, which were otherwise lawful to be enjoy'd; as when tis noted in the *Pharisees*, that they did φιλεῖν πρωτοκαθεδρίας, *love* or *affect* the *uppermost seats* in the *Synagogues*, which otherwise *simply* to have sat in, had implyed no *crime* of theirs, for to this very end, that some body should *sit* in them, they were certainly *erected*, and 'tis known that there was among them a ראש הקהל *head of the Consistory*, an ἀρχισυνάγωγος *Governor* of the *Synagogue*, to whom that *seat* belonged by *God*'s appointment.

8. Nay for the very *desire*, as far as is expreſt by ὀρέγεσθαι or ἐπιθυμεῖν 1 *Tim.* 3. 1. *desiring* and *coveting*, it is allowed by the *Apostle* to be terminated in ἐπισκοπὴ the *office* of a *Bishop*, καλὸν ἔργον, as a *good*, and consequently a *desirable work*; and if *Diotrephes* be supposed guilty of any other, it may safely be yielded to have been a *fault* in him, without prejudice to the *good office* which he so *vitiously* and *criminously* affected, according to that of * *Theodoret*, that the *Apostle*, ὐκ ἁπλῶς τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς φιλαρχίας κατηγορεῖ, *accuses not the desire simply, but the desire of rule*, καὶ διδάσκει μὴ τιμῆς ἀλλ' ἀρετῆς ὀρέγεσθαι, μὴ τὸ ἀξίωμα ποθεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀξίας τὸ ἔργον ἐπιζητεῖν, *and teacheth to desire not the honour, but the vertue, not to covet the dignity, but to seek the work of the dignity*, the *task* to which it belongs. By all which, and much more added in the * *Dissertations*, it is evident, how little advantage hath accrued to the *Assemblers* from their mention of *Diotrephes* out of S. *John*, and by consequence, from their *second consideration*.

* In 1 Tim. 3. 1.

* Dissert. 1. cap. 13.

SECT. V.

Of S. John's *being Bishop of* Asia. *Of the Apostles being Bishops.*

Numb. 1. NOw succeeds a *third consideration*, viz. *That the same Authors that say that S.* John *made* Polycarp *Bishop of* Smyrna, *and that S.* Peter *made* Ignatius *Bishop of* Antioch, *do also say that S.* John *himself sat many years Bishop of* Ephesus, *and was the Metropolitan of all* Asia, *which* (say they) *is an evident demonstration to us, that these Authors did not use the word Bishop in a Prelatical sense. For it is certain that the Apostles cannot be properly called Bishops; For though they do eminently contain the Episcopal Office, yet they were not formally Bishops. For this were to degrade the Apostles, and to make their Office Ordinary and perpetual, this were to exalt the Bishop above his degree, and make him an Apostle, and to make the Apostle a Bishop. It doth not much differ from madness, to say that* Peter *or any one of the Apostles were properly Bishops, as learned* Whitaker *saith, whom we shall have occasion to cite to this purpose hereafter.*

2. Whether this *consideration* be likely to contribute any thing to their advantage, save only by *amusing* the Reader, and keeping him longer in expectation, that somewhat may possibly be produced to the disparagement of our plea, I desire may distinctly be considered by these *degrees*.

3. First, I acknowledge that stile [*the same Authors*——] to belong truly to antient Writers produced by me in the *Dissertations*, who, as they do affirm S. *John* to have constituted *Polycarp Bishop* of *Smyrna*, *Diss.* 4. c. 5. Sect. 5. and S. *Peter* to have placed *Ignatius Bishop* of *Antioch*. *Diss.* 5. c. 1. Sect. 18. so they consent also that S. *John* sat *Bishop* of *Ephesus* and *Metropolitan* of all *Asia*: so * *Eusebius* frequently, that after his return from his banishment τὰς ἀνὰ Δώτειν ἐκκλησίας, he *administred*

* L. 3. c. 23.

ministred or *governed the Churches there*, *i. e.* in *Asia*; and (as he cites it *lib.* 3. *cap.* 31. out of *Polycrates* his *Epistle*) died there. So the antient Writer of the *Martyrdom* of *Timothy*, † in *Photius* Ψηφίαμαι δὲ Νερβᾶ τῆς βασιλείας ἀναληθεὶς τὴν Ἐφεσίων ἐπαρχίαν Μιλησίοις καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ ἑαυτῷ ἕπεσθαι συμπαραλαβὼν ἐπισκόπων τῆς Ἐφεσίων ἀντιλαμβάνεται Μιλησιάδος. *Being recalled by* Nerva's *decree*, *he sat down at* Ephesus, *and himself personally*, *with seven Bishops his adsessors* (those in all probability the *Bishops* of the *seven Churches* in the *Revelation*) *he governed the Metropolitan City of Ephesus* that prime *Metropolis* of all *Asia*, to the *Bishop* whereof, saith * *Chrysostome*, was intrusted ἔθνους ὁλόκληρου τῆς Ἀσίας, *the whole Nation of* Asia; These testimonies may suffice for the substance of the *affirmation* that St. *John* governed the *Church* of *Ephesus*, and under it all *Asia*, which is the notion we now have of a *Bishop Metropolitane* and *Primate*.

† *Biblioth.* Num. 254.

* *Hom.* 15. *in* 1 Tim. 5. 19.

As for the word *Bishop*, how can it be inconvenient to bestow that upon him, when he discharged the *Office*, nay when *Christ* himself that great *exemplar* and *original* of this power, is expressly called the *Bishop* of our *Souls*, as well as the *Apostle*; when the *Office* from which *Judas* fell, and to which *Matthias* is assumed, is by St. *Luke* out of the *Septuagint*, called ἐπισκοπὴ *Bishoprick*, *Act.* 1. 20. When accordingly, from the *Scripture* usage, the *Fathers* of the *Church* have continued the style; *Apostolos*, id est *Episcopos & Præpositos Dominus elegit*, *the Lord chose Apostles*, i. e. *Bishops and Governours* of the *Church*, saith † *Cyprian*; and ἐν Ῥώμῃ γεγόνασι πρῶτοι Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἀμφοὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, Peter *and* Paul *were the first or chief in* Rome, *the same persons*, *Apostles and Bishops*, *saith* * Epiphanius; and *Apostoli Episcopi sunt*, *firmante illud* Petro *Apostolo* — *the Apostles were Bishops*, *as is confirmed by* Peter *in these words*, *His Bishoprick let another take*, saith † *Hilarius Sardus*; and again, *Are all Apostles? 'Tis true*, saith he, *quia in Ecclesia unus Episcopus*, *because in each Church there is one Bishop*. And, *Nemo ignorat Episcopos servatorem Ecclesiis instituisse*; *Ipse enim priusquam ascenderet*, *imponens manum Apostolis ordinavit eos Episcopos*. *No man is ignorant that our Saviour instituted Bishops in the Church*; *for before he ascended to Heaven*, *he laid his hands on the Disciples and ordained them Bishops*; saith the * *Writer* of the *questions* on the *Old* and *New Testament*; and, *Sanctus Matthæus Episcopatum sortitus est*, *St.* Matthew *was Bishop*, saith *Gildas*. And to shut up all; φανερόν ἐστιν ὅτι οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἦσαν ἐπίσκοποι. — *It is manifest that the Apostles were Bishops*, *St.* John *in* Asia, *St.* Andrew *in* Achaia, *St.* Thomas *in* India; saith † *Gabriel Philadelph.* And agreeably when St. *John* of whom we now speak, calls himself in the front of *two Epistles* ὁ Πρεσβύτερος, *the Elder*, the Greek Scholiast, resolves ἐπίσκοπον ἑαυτὸν καλεῖ διὰ τοῦ πρεσβυτέρου, *by the word Elder he calls himself Bishop*. And so there is no news in thus affirming. 4.

† *Ep.* 65.

* *L.* 1. *Cont. Carpocr.*

† *In Eph.* 4. & 1 *Cor.* 12. 29.

* *Quæst.* 27.

† ἐπὶ τῆς βί. διαφ.

But then secondly, when they take this for an *evident demonstration*, that these *Authors* did not use the word *Bishop* in a *Prelatical* sense, this is very far distant from a *demonstration*, having not arrived to the lowest degree of *probability* or *credibility*. For what is a *Bishop* in the *Prelatical* sense, but a *single* person *governing* in *chief* in a *City* or wider circuit? And such certainly was St. *Peter* at *Rome*, St. *John* at *Ephesus*, *&c.* as long as they continued to execute that *power* of the *Keyes* (the donation of which instituted them οἰκονόμοι *Stewards* in *Gods House*, *Governours* of the *Church*) in this or that *City* or *Region*, and ordained other *Bishops* there. 5.

Thirdly, Therefore when 'tis added, that it is certain that the *Apostles* cannot be properly called *Bishops*, I reply, that it is most certain they may, not only because these so many *antient Writers*, through several Ages have called them so, and may not, with any *justice* from us, be accused of *impropriety*, but because the *donation* of the *Keyes* did as properly make them *Bishops*, as the *Commission* to go *preach* to all Nations, being added to it, made them *Apostles*. To which purpose let these few things be considered, First, That it is here by the *Assemblers* acknowledged, that the *Apostles* did eminently contain the *Episcopal Office*; which though it be a little hastily expressed, and should be, I suppose, that the *Apostolical Office* did *eminently* contain the *Episcopal*; yet there is no doubt, but this is the meaning of it, that the *Apostles* had all the *Episcopal* power in their hands, and over and above, something more, and if they had *Episcopal* power, then sure in respect of that, they may as properly be called *Bishops*, as in respect of their *Apostolical Commission*, which they had also, they may be properly called *Apostles*. Thus we know, that they that have first the power of *Deacons* bestowed on them, and after of Presbyters, are questionless *Deacons* still, though they be also Presbyters, and they which from the *Office* of Presbyters are advanced to *Bishops*, are certainly Presbyters still, though they be also *Bishops*, and do not lose the *former* power by being advanced to the *latter*, are not *lessened* by this *increase* of their *dignity*. 6.

Secondly, That when an *Apostle* is differenced from a *Bishop*, it is either by his extraordinary power granted him for the *planting* of the *Church*, or by the *Universality* of his *Diocese*, the [*all the World*] to which his *Commission* extended, whereas the ordinary *Bishop's* power and *Diocese* are more limited. But then these differences are of no force in this matter, they only conclude that the *Apostle* is more than a *Bishop* in those two respects, not that in other sufficient respects he is not a *Bishop*. 7.

Thirdly, When the *Apostles* had each of them (not only all together in a *consistory*) that unlimited power, in respect of the *extent* to all the World, given to them by *Christ*, we know that after his *ascent* they parted and distributed this *Province* among them, assigned every one ἴδιον τόπον, or κλῆρον, his *proper place* or *lot*, to which he should betake himself for the *planting* of the *faith* of *Christ*; And then there will be no doubt but that he, who according to his *line* (in St. *Paul's* phrase) had *planted* the *faith* in such a *City* or *Province*, and sat down, and *confirmed*, and farther *instituted* (which is the meaning of *labouring in the Doctrine*, as well as in the *word*) and *govern'd* them, and exercised all *Episcopal* acts among them, might in so doing be stiled a *Bishop* in that *City* or *Province*, and that as truly and as *properly* as he that could do all the *latter* and not the *former* (building on another mans *foundation*, *governing* and *instructing*, where another had *planted* the *faith*) might be said to be. 8.

Nay fourthly, We know, that although by *Canons* of the *Church* there is provision made, upon prudential *considerations*, that no man shall be made a Bishop *sine titulo*, *without a title* or particular See, to which he is assigned, yet before those *Canons* forbad it, such *Bishops* there were, and those never doubted to be properly *Bishops*, though they were not affixt to any *Diocese*; And then nothing can hinder but that the *Apostle*, who had each the *whole World* for his *Title*, though he were never 9.

affixed to any particular *Diocese* or *Province*, might be most properly styled a *Bishop* for all that. But this is *ex abundanti*, more than is needful to our present pretensions of St. *John*, who, we know, was after his return from *banishment*, *affixt* to *Asia*, and *seated* at *Ephesus* the chief *Metropolis* there, to *superintend* in the Jewish part of the *Asian Church* over all the *Bishops* and *Metropolitans* there.

10. To this I might add fifthly, that the *Bishops* in every *City* were *Successors* of the Apostles, as is largely *deduced Diss.* 3. *c.* 3. *Sect.* 14. *&c.* which they could not truly be, if the *Apostles*, whom they *succeeded*, were not invested with that *power*, wherein they *succeeded* them, *i. e.* were not first *Bishops* before them. But I shall not inlarge of this, having no need of more evidences in this matter.

11. Fourthly therefore, when it is added, that if the *Apostles* be affirmed to be properly Bishops, this *were to degrade the* Apostles, *and to make their office ordinary and perpetual*: This is but a shortness of discourse, of which a very few words will suffice to admonish any; for there is no more strength in that *consequence*, than there would be in *affirming* that such an one is a *Man*, therefore he is not a *living Creature*, or that he that saith he is a *living Creature*, degrades him from being a *man*; For as to that of [*ordinary* and *perpetual*] 'tis no way inconvenient, that the Apostles, who had somewhat *temporary* and *extraordinary* for the *first planting* of Churches (in respect of which especially they were called Apostles) might also have somewhat, which was of *ordinary perpetual* use in the *Church*, wherein others might and should succeed them; and that is it unquestionably which we mean by the word *Bishops*, when we ascribe it to them or any of them, or to *Christ* himself, the source and *original* Copy of that *power* in the *Church*.

12. Fifthly, When another inconvenience is accumulated on this, (much to the former purpose, but in more words) *this were to exalt the* Bishop *above his degree, and make him an* Apostle, *and to make the* Apostle *a* Bishop: First, It is evident, that if the forementioned *exception* were true, *viz.* That it were the *degrading* the *Apostle*, it could not farther be truly said, that it were the *exalting the* Bishop *above his degree*, for supposing one to be above the other, the *degrading* one would make the other *equal* to him without any *new* act of *exalting* him; if the *Apostle* have already *descended* to the *Bishop*, sure the *Bishop* need not, cannot *ascend* to the *Apostle*; I cannot go up stairs to him who hath prevented me by his *dignation* or misfortune, and is already *come* or *fallen down* to me. Secondly therefore, this makes not the *Bishop* an *Apostle*, which is a degree higher than he, (though in respect of the *Episcopal* power common to them with the *Apostles*, it is nothing strange in the *Antient* Writers for the first *Bishops* of the Churches, *James* the *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, *Thaddæus*, *Luke*, *Barnabas*, *Mark*, *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Clemens*, *Ignatius*, to be called *Apostles*, as is evidenced at large in the * *Dissertations*) but only supposes the *Apostle* to be a *Bishop*, which he may well be (as the *greater* containeth the *less*) though the *Bishop* be no *Apostle*, as it is confest that the *less* contains not the *greater*.

* *Diss.* 4. *c.* 3.

13. And lastly for the citation out of Dr. *Whitaker*, I have no directions to the place, which may inable me to examine it; And I know *circumstances* of the *context*, or the *design* of the speech, may much alter it, from what it signifies to me at my reading it thus cited; But if it be distinctly thus, and incapable of a more *commodious* interpretation, I cannot consent to the truth of it, or comprehend upon what grounds of reason he should so severely censure those *Scriptures* and *Fathers*, which have been produced to affirm that the *Apostles* were *Bishops*, and particularly St. *John* and St. *Peter*. And indeed when it falls out, that each of those two *Apostles* peculiarly calls himself πρεσβύτερος an *Elder*, or as they render it *Presbyter*, I shall demand, did either of those speak *properly* or no? If they did, were either of those *little distant from mad-men?* If so I shall be content to be under any *censure* in their *company*. And therefore if they spake not so *properly*, I shall be content with them to have spoken *improperly* also: But if *Apostles* may be called *Presbyters* without any of these inconveniences of *degradation* in them, any *insolence* in the *Presbyter*, or *madness* in the *Speaker*, my only remaining *Quare* is, why they might not, without all this ado, be called *Bishops* also, meaning by *Bishops*, as I now mean? For I am sure that is the same thing that I understand by πρεσβύτερος, *Elder*, in those *three* places; and they, who differ from me herein, do yet understand it of *Presbyters* (and so had said in the *second consideration* expresly, that S^t *John* calls himself a Presbyter) and then all the spice of *madness* consists in this, thinking a *Bishop* capable of that *exaltation*, that a Presbyter in perfect *sobriety* is capable of. And so much for the *third consideration*.

SECT. VI.

Of the word Angel, *and* Star, *pretended to be common to all Ministers. Of Messenger, and Embassadour. The singularity of the word* Angel.

Numb. 1. THE *fourth consideration* is, *That the word Angel* (*which is the title given to those supposed* Bishops) *doth not import any peculiar jurisdiction, or pre-eminence, but is a common name to all* Ministers, *and so is used in* Scripture. *For all* Ministers *are Gods* Messengers *and* Embassadors *sent for the good of the elect, and therefore the name being common to all* Ministers, *why should we think that there should be any thing spoken to one* Minister, *that doth not belong to all? The same may be said of the word* Star (*which is also a title given to those supposed Metropolitans*) *It is evident that all faithful* Ministers *are called* Stars *in Scripture, whose duty is to shine as lights unto the* Churches *in all purity of Doctrine, and holiness of conversation; There is nothing in these titles that argue these* Ministers *to be* Bishops *in our brethrens sense: Insomuch as had they not been called* Bishops *by some authors that succeeded them, (who spake of former times in the language of their own times) this way of arguing would have been counted ridiculous.*

2. To this *consideration* I might, if it were needful, reply, 1. That the word *Angel* is no where used for any other *Officer* or *Minister* in the *Church*, save only the *Prophets* (such as *Haggai*, *c.* 1. 13. and *John Baptist*, *Mat.* 11. 10.) and the *chief Priest*, *Mal.* 2. 7.

Secondly,

Secondly, that, as to the words *Messenger*, and *Embassador*, there is in ordinary speech some con- 3.
siderable difference between them, the latter having in it a connotation of *dignity*, sustaining the person of the *King*, from whom he is sent *immediately*, which is not applicable to the former; And agreeably when it is used of S. *Paul* and *Timothy*, in whose name that *Epistle* is written [πρεσβεύομεν, we are *Embassadors*, 2 *Cor.* 5. 20.] there is added ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, *for*, or, *in the name*, and *authority* of *Christ*, and again *we pray you* ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ, which we well render, *in Christs stead*, as his *Proxies*, for so *Embassadors* are; which being there applied to S. *Paul* an *Apostle*, and to *Timothy*, one imployed by *him* immediately to *preach* and *plant* the *faith*, and after to *govern*, in the *Church*, may by proportion belong to the *Bishops* their successors peculiarly.

Thirdly, that as the word Ἄγγελος signifies a *Messenger*, or *Nuntio*, so the word Ἀπόστολος, *Apostle* 4.
(according to the *origination* of it from ἀποστέλλεσθαι *to be sent*) signifies also without any considerable difference, but yet is never thought fit, either in *Scripture*, or in the style of the *Church*, to be applied to ordinary *Ministers*, but only to those sent immediately by *Christ*, as he by his *Father* to *plant* and *rule Churches*, and to those who first *succeeded* them, or were imployed by them in that great *Office*.

But that which wholly frustrates the design of the *consideration*, is this, that the *singularity* of the 5.
person, (*one Angel* in each of the seven *Churches*) is all that we argue from in this matter; For as to the *power* and *authority* in each *Church*, That is certainly pretended to (and not declin'd) by the *Presbyterian* as well as the *Prelatist*, the only *Question* is, whether it be placed in *one* over the rest, or in *more* than one, *ruling* together in *common*; and from the style of *Christs Epistle* to the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Ephesus*, and the like in each of the *seven*, we think we conclude regularly, that it was *one*, it being certain that the *singular* number is not the *dual* or *plural*, and that [*Angel*] is a *person*, not an *aggregate* body or *multitude*.

And to the same purpose again, we conclude not from the mention of the *Stars*, not from their 6.
light or *shining*, but from their *number*, but *seven* in all, no more than there are *Churches*, i. e. *one* only in each *Church*; And we know there is difference between a *Star* and an *Asterism* or *constellation*, one *single* light, and a *conjunction* of many; And accordingly Mr. *Brightman*, that is resolved not to find this truth in that *Text*, is forced to deal plainly, and to tell us, that the Epistles are not each of them sent to any *one Angel*, but to the *Colledge of* Pastors, *nec uni alicui Angelo mittuntur, sed toti, ut ita dicam, collegio Pastorum*, in *Apoc.* c. 2. 1. which being sufficiently contrary to the evidence of the *Text*, which reads ἀγγέλῳ *to the Angel*, in the *singular*, he thinks fit to add his reason for it; *Non enim unus erat Angelus Ephesi sed plures, nec inter istos aliquis Princeps, for there was not one Angel of* Ephesus, *but many*; *nor any one among those principal or chief*; which is the *begging* of the Question, or proving his *assertion* only by *asserting* it; whereas *Beza* finding himself more prest by the force of the place, is forced to render it πρὸ ἀγγέλου, i. e. πρεσβύτῃ, *to the Angel, i. e. to the president, quem nimirum oportuit inprimis de his rebus admoneri, who was in the first place to be admonished of these things*

What the Πρεσβῦς in the use of the *Antient Church* properly signifies, is shown at large out of 7.
Justin Martyr, *Dionysius Bishop* of *Corinth*, *Marcellus Ancyranus*, and the *Council* of *Ephesus*, *Dissert.* 4. c. 17. directly the same that we mean now by *Bishop*; But that, I pretend not to think *Beza* meant by it (his *Prolepses* and espoused Principles leading him another way) All that I observe from the *citation*, is, that by the *singularity* of [Ἀγγέλῳ the *Angel*] not *Angels*, he was forced to confess a single person to be understood, which is contrary to Mr *Brightman*, and those that comprehend a *Colledge* of *Presbyters* under the title; which being yielded, I doubt not but our other evidences already produced (which must not be at every turn repeated) from the *Catalogue* of *Bishops* in the *Church* of *Ephesus*, *&c.* and the judgment of the *Universal Church* concerning those *single* persons, will conclude them indeed πρεσβῦτες, not in *Beza*'s notion, but in *Justin Martyrs* (who was much a more competent judge) i. e. the *very Bishops* which we pretend them to be: And truly I cannot discern any weak part (which may hazard being counted *ridiculous*) in this way of *arguing*.

SECT. VII.

Of their exception to our arguing from Symbols: Of Bishop and Elder being the same.

THE last *Consideration* now remains in these words, *These titles of Stars and Angels are mysteri-* *Numb.* 1.
ous and metaphorical, It is said Rev. 1. 20. *The Mystery of the seven Stars — And certainly it cannot be safe or solid to build the structure of Episcopacy by Divine Right upon mysterious and metaphorical denominations*, Theologia Symbolica non est argumentativa, *Especially if we consider that there are abundance of clear texts that make Bishops and Presbyters to be one and the same; and it cannot be praise-worthy for any men (though never so learned in the esteem of the world) to oppose certain allegorical and mysterious titles to so many expres testimonies of Scripture.*

To this the *Answer* will be *satisfactory*, though it should be but *brief*, that we do not found our 2.
argument in an *allegory*. For 1. though the word *Stars* applyed to the *Governors* of *Churches* be only *figuratively* so applyed, yet the word ἄγγελος (if the *Authors* of this *consideration* may be believed in that which immediately preceded) signifies (not an *Angel* from *Heaven*, or *incorporeal* substance, but) a *Messenger* or *Embassador*, such as, say they, all *Ministers* are; And agreeably, in that which is here annexed to prove the *allegorical* or *mystical* phrases (from *Rev.* 1. 20. *Mystery of the seven Stars*) it is evident, that only the word [*Stars*] is *Symbolical* or *Mystical*, and as evident that the *Angels* are not, for it is in the explicating and not in the forming of the *figure*, that the *Angels* of the *Churches* are mentioned as the things which are *signified* by the *mystery* of the *Stars*, as the *Churches* themselves by the *Lamps*; and therefore as it would be absurd to say that a *symbol* is explicated by a *symbol*, one *mystery* by another, or proportionably that the *Churches*, by which the *Lamps* are exprest, are a *mystical*

stical allegorical phrase, so it will be as unreasonable to affirm of the *Angels*, that they are a *mystery* or *allegory*, because of the *Stars* it is affirmed that they are such, when indeed the word *Angel* is the interpretation and unfolding of the *mystery*, which is as far from being the *mystery*, as the *light* is from being *darkness*, which it expels out of the *horizon*, and is purposely sent by God to do so.

3. But then *secondly*, 'tis yet more manifest, that if the word *Angel* were here used *figuratively* (as it is evident it was not, and was so confest, when it appeared *useful* to the *Objectors* that it should not) yet it being the *singularity* of the person, wherein our *argument* is founded, our *argument* is not founded on that which is *mystical*; For certainly this *number* is a plain *Grammatical* notation of a *singular* person, and that is proof enough that it was not a *collective* body, a *Presbytery* or *Consistory*, that is meant by it. And in this all the controversie betwixt us and the adversary consists, whether it was in *many* or in *one* in each *Church*, that the *Ecclesiastical* jurisdiction was vested, and that is sufficiently decided by that which is clear and *unfigurative* in this *Text*, and cannot be imagined otherwise, but by forcing some *figure* on it, by which one *Angel* may be set for more *Ministers*, which if it be done, would not by their rule be *argumentative*.

4. *Thirdly*, Whereas it is suggested, that this which we conclude from hence, is *opposite to many expres testimonies of Scripture*, I have no more to say in this place, where this is only *affirmed*, but not attempted to be *proved*, but to profess my perswasion and assurance (the truth of which must be in the process of this discourse *contested*) that there is no such thing, but on the *contrary*, that the whole *Scripture*, and *practice*, and *writings* of the *first* ages of the *Church*, and the succeeding through all the world, agree directly with what I conclude from the *singularity* of the *Angel*; And when in the following words, the *testimonies* are expressed to be those which make *Bishops* and *Presbyters* to be one and the same, This also will immediately vanish, when it is remembred, what is largely deduced in the *Dissertations*, that the word *Bishop* in the *Scripture* is never used for a *Presbyter* in our *Modern* notion of the word, but constantly for the one *single Governour* in a *Church* or *City*, and that if there be any truth in that which is here affirmed, *Presbyters* must be taken in a notion distant from that in which now we use it, and signifie, as Πρεσβύτερος hath already been said to do, the *singular Bishop* in each *Church*, and 'tis certain such an *identity* of the names, will never be deemed contrary to what we have concluded from the *Angel*, but directly confirm it for us.

5. And although here is no occasion in this place to prove and make good this assertion in each part of it, (the first *positivè*, that 'Επίσκοπος or *Bishop* in *Scripture* always signifies the *singular Bishop*; the second *suppositivè*, that if 'Επίσκοπος, *Bishop*, and Πρεσβύτερος *Elder*, be *one and the same* in *Scripture*, it must be by interpreting Πρεσβύτερος *Elder*, so as to signifie a *Bishop* in all places) yet 'tis certain, that this is already done at large in *Dissert.* 4. *cap.* 6. *Sect.* 19, 20, 21, 22. and shall here again be repeated and vindicated, when the proper place requires it, which I foresee it will speedily do.

6. In the mean, I must take leave to express my present sense, and hope that others will not think it too hasty, that no one of these *five Considerations*, nor consequently all of them together, have at all prejudged our *Conclusion* (now in hand) inferred from that of the *Epistle* of *Christ* to the seven *Angels* of the seven *Churches*.

SECT. VIII.

Of the singularity of each Angel. The objections from the use of the plural number.

Numb. 1. THese *considerations* being thus laid as their foundation, (and I suppose being already removed from superseding or hindring our *superstructure*) The next part of their method is, having mentioned our objection from the *singularity* of each *Angel*'s person, to whom *Christ*'s *message* or *Epistle* is sent, and the *conclusion* of an *high Prelatist* from hence, that these *Angels* are not only *Bishops* but *Archbishops*, to apply *solid and every way sufficient answers to this Objection.*

2. In this proposal of our *Objection*, I shall not need to inquire who this *high Prelatist* is; The former intimations and directions have perswaded me that I am lookt on as this *Objector*, though it be sufficiently known that the most *Reverend Archbishop* of *Armagh*, *Lord Primate* of *Ireland*, hath many years since deduced this *conclusion* in every part from this *Text*, and might, if they had pleased, have secured me from the opinion either of *novelty*, or *singularity* in the *Assertion*.

3. But I shall most willingly assume the burthen, and proceed to the view of the *solid and every way sufficient answers*, which are said to be given to this *Objection*; which though they be, it seems to be fetcht out of *Smectymnuus*, &c. yet it happens well, that we shall (without need of consulting those larger *Volumes*) find them here with more ease, reduced to *two heads*, One, *that the word Angel signifies not a singular person*, the second, *that if it did, it will not at all advantage the Episcopal cause.*

4. These two, I confess, if either of them be solidly proved, will utterly drive us from our hold: The only *question* at present is, whether in either part the *proofs* be *solid*, and of this we must now inquire, and first of the *former* of them.

5. This they thus propose, *That the word Angel is not to be taken* Ἰδιωτικῶς *but* συλλογιστικῶς, *not individually, but collectively, for all the Pastors and Ministers of the respective Churches.*

6. But before their proofs for such an assertion (that the *Angel* of such a *Church*, which is certainly an *individual*, as much as the *Bishop* of such a *Diocese*, is not yet to be taken *individually*) they first add their *confession* that this answer is *called a poor shift, a vain conceit*, &c. but promise such *reasons for the justification of it, which cannot be answered.*

7. To the view of these *unanswerable Reasons* therefore we shall now hasten; And the first *reason* is, because our *Saviour* speaks to the *Angel* often in the *plural* number, *Rev.* 2. 24. *But unto you I say, and the rest of Thyatira*, and so *Rev.* 2. 10. and 13. *By which*, say they, *it is evident, that by the word Angel is not meant one singular person, but the collective body of Rulers.*

8. To this first reason I shall answer, by separating that one text of *Thyatira* from the other two, and all

all that are of the ſame nature with them, and ſpeak firſt of theſe two, and remind them firſt, that in an *Epiſtle* unqueſtionably addreſt to a *particular perſon*, others under his care and charge may be, and are *occaſionally* mentioned; ſo in that to *Titus*, *Paul*'s own *Son*, *i. e* under the particular *character* of the *beloved* perſon converted by him; in the concluſion we find theſe words, *Grace be with you all*, *i. e.* not with him as he muſt ſignifie a whole *Presbytery*, but all the *ſincere lovers* of *Chriſt*, and Saint *Paul*, *they that love us in the faith*, in the former part of the *verſe*.

Secondly, That though the *one Angel* of the *Church* be the perſon to whom each part of the *Epiſtle* is addreſt, yet in it are ſet down the *ſins* and *fate* of the *whole Church*, *i. e.* of all the *believers* in it; Thus when the people of *Iſrael* or *Judah* were fallen into foul ſins and provocations againſt *God*, it was ordinary for *God* to ſend a *Prophet* to the *King* of either of them, and admoniſh him what *reformations* were to be wrought, and what *judgments* were a coming in caſe of neglect. In which kind of Meſſages of the *Prophet* delivered to the *King*, 'tis certain that the whole people were concerned; and ſo without queſtion was it here, *Rev.* 2. 10. the *Devil ſhall caſt ſome of you*, i. e. ſome *Members* of that *Church*, *into priſon*, &c. and ſo ver. 13. *among you*, i. e. among you of that *Church* or *City*. 9.

And indeed if each of thoſe *Churches* had been governed by a *Conſiſtory* of *co-equal Preſbyters*, and thoſe (as is pretended by our *adverſaries*) ſignified by the *Angel*, yet there would be as little reaſon to doubt, but the ſins of the people, as well as the *Clergy* were here reprehended by *Chriſt*, and the judgment threatned to one as well as to the other. And ſo this can be no reaſon to infer the *Angel* to be no *ſingular* perſon; the *Church* ruled by *one*, making up a *multitude*, as well as if it were ruled by a *Presbytery*. 10.

As for the place, *cap.* 2. 24. concerning *Thyatira*, that hath a different appearance. For the *Greek copy* ordinarily reading it [ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω καὶ λοιποῖς τοῖς ἐν Θυατείροις, *But I ſay unto you* (in the *plural*) *and to the reſt which are in Thyatira*] the [*you*] in the *plural*, is by the *Objectors* thought neceſſarily to belong to the *Angel* of that *City*, as [*the reſt*] to the *community* of the people. To this place therefore we have formerly anſwered, that the reading in the *Antient Manuſcripts*, particularly in that belonging to the *Kings Library* at Saint *James*'s, leaves out the [καὶ, *and*] and reads thus, ὑμῖν δὲ λέγω τοῖς λοιποῖς, *But to you I ſay the reſt which are in Thyatira*] And this takes away all force from the *objection*; for the former part of the *Epiſtle* belonging to the *Angel*, who permitted *Jezebel*, and to them that *committed fornication with her*, the [*But*] in the *front* ſeparates the [ὑμῖν λοιποῖς, *you the reſt*] from the *Angel*, and thoſe *other* formerly ſpoken to, and therefore the ὑμῖν, *you*, cannot poſſibly be the *Angel*, wherein all the ſtrength of the *Objection* conſiſts. 11.

But this Anſwer, though taken notice of, is diſliked: *For*, ſay they, *he that ſhall view the Antecedent and Conſequent*, *and conſider that* ver. 23. *it is ſaid*, *I will give to every one of you*, &c. *and then follows*, *but I ſay unto you*, *and then in the concluſion of the verſe*, *I will put upon you no other burthen*, *will confeſs that the old copies are better than that which is ſaid to be* Tecla's *Manuſcript*. 12.

And here I ſhall deſire the *Reader* to bear me company in obeying their *directions*, and obſerve what the *Antecedents* and *Conſequents* can afford to the prejudice of that *Antient* copy. 'Tis moſt true, that *v.* 23. we read, *I will give to every one of you*, and that then it follows, *v.* 24. *But I ſay unto you*, and in the concluſion of the verſe, *I will put upon you* — But I demand, what will they conclude from hence? That by the word [*you*] in all theſe places the *ſame* perſons are to be underſtood, and that thoſe perſons are the *interpretation* of the *Angel*, v. 18? Theſe two things they muſt conclude, or elſe they will fail in their deſign, which is, to ſhew that by the word *Angel* the *collective* body of *Rulers* is meant. But the firſt of theſe is evidently falſe, whatſoever reading be retained, for beſides that the [δὲ, *But*] doth clearly ſeparate the ſecond [*you*] from the firſt, and makes them *diſtinct* perſons, The very matter of the ſpeeches will convince it: For in the 23. *v* the [*you*] are thoſe that were *corrupted by Jezebel*, *v.* 20. 22. who are now to be exemplarily *puniſht* and *deſtroyed*, *I will kill her* (i. e. *Jezebels*) *children with death* (as alſo thoſe that had *committed Fornication with her*, v. 22.) *and all the Churches ſhall know that I am the ſearcher of hearts*, *and I will give to every of you according to your works*; But the ſecond [*you*] and ſo alſo the *third*, are the *quite* contrary to theſe, *As many as have not this Doctrine*, *and who have not known theſe depths of Satan*, and conſequently, who are *not* to be *puniſhed*, nor ſo much as admoniſhed, but only *confirmed* in their preſent practice, to *hold faſt what they have already*. 13.

So contrary is it to all appearance of truth, that the *Antecedent* and *Conſequent* ſhould favour their pretenſion. 14.

This matter is ſo evident (the contrary conditions and fates of the [*you*] in *v.* 23. and the [*you*] in *v.* 24.) that if the ordinary reading were to be retained [ὑμῖν δὲ καὶ λοιποῖς] and that rendred [*to you and the reſt in Thyatira*] ſo as to difference [*you*] and [*the reſt*] another *Antecedent* to the *Relative* [*you*] muſt neceſſarily be ſought out, and then that can be no other but the *Churches* incidentally mentioned, *v.* 23. who had not been charged for this *crime*. For as for the *Angel*, *v.* 18. if he were not ſo remote (6. *verſes* off) and if the *ſingular* number could be the *Antecedent* to the *plural* [ὑμῖν, *you*] (as it cannot) yet ſtill he is charged for *ſuffering the Woman Jezebel*, and ſo is numbred among the *guilty* perſons, that are to *repent* or be *puniſht*, and not to have *no other burthen laid on them*, *ſave only to hold faſt what they have*, as is ſaid of the ſecond [ὑμῖν, *you*] *v.* 24. 15.

But the truth is, that of making the *Churches* the *Relative* is ſo inconvenient (and yet no other way imaginable to reconcile the *ordinary* reading) and the whole ſenſe is ſo much more *clear* and current in the reading of the *King's* MS. [*But to you the reſt in Thyatira*] (thoſe that had not been guilty of the misbehaviours cenſured, and threatned in the former Verſes) that I profeſs I cannot diſcern any appearance of reaſon to *queſtion* the truth of it, much leſs to *conceive* that the *ordinary* copies are better, which yet however they read it, muſt oppoſe the [ὑμῖν *you*] to thoſe before mentioned, and ſo cannot apply it with any appearance of probability to the *Angel*, or conſequently prejudge *ours*, or confirm *their* pretenſions. 16.

SECT.

SECT. IX.

Of the Elders at Ephesus *Act.* 20.

Numb. 1. A Second *reason* to prove the *Angel* to be a *collective* body, is this, because *it is certain that the Church of* Ephesus *was a collective body, and that there were many* Presbyters *to whom S.* Paul, *at his final departure from them, committed the charge of that Church. And these* Presbyters *are called* Bishops, *and were all of them* Stars *of the same magnitude, and* Angels *of the same order without a difference or distinction.*

2. But this is a way of proving a thing which is *denied*, by another which they know is equally *denied* by him, against whom they dispute, and therefore that *argument* can be of no force with us.

3. 'Tis most true indeed, what they begin with, that the *Church* of *Ephesus* was a *collective* body, for so 'tis certain every *Church* is, whether governed by one or more *Rulers*; But the *Church* is not the *Angel*, any more than the *Candlesticks* are the *Stars*, but punctually distinguished from them, *Rev.* 1. 20. But this I suppose was a mistake hastily fallen from them, and I shall not pursue it any farther.

4. Their argument, I conceive, depends upon the *plurality* of *Elders* [πρεσβύτεροι] which were at *Ephesus* Act. 20. when *Paul* takes his leave of them, and calls them *Bishops*. But to this they know I have answered clearly, that as in other places of *Scripture*, so in that, the word πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, being all one with Ἐπίσκοποι, *Bishops*, denote (not the many *Presbyters* of the *one* City of *Ephesus*, but) the many *Bishops* of that and other Cities of *Asia*, which at that time by S. *Paul's* summons sent to *Ephesus*, the chief *Metropolis* of *Asia*, were called and met together at *Miletus*.

5. To this purpose * *Irenæus* is a witness beyond exception, who speaking of these *Elders* or *Bishops*,
* *L.* 3. *c.* 14. adds, *ab Epheso & proximis civitatibus convocatos esse, that they were assembled from* Ephesus *and the next Cities*, in which as the *faith* was planted, as well as in *Ephesus* (even in all *Asia*) so there is no reason to doubt but there were *Bishops* in them, as well as in *Ephesus* (seven such *Churches* we know are here mentioned in the *Revelation*) and that *Paul* was as careful to take his leave of them (as many as could conveniently come to *Miletus* in his hasty progress) as of the *Bishop* of *Ephesus* he is justly deemed to have been.

6. Other *arguments* and *authorities* I need not here accumulate for this notion of *Elders* Act. 20. because here is no appearance of reason offered to prove their, or impugne our *Assertion*. This perhaps will be afterward attempted, and then I shall, as occasion requires, farther enlarge: In the mean it sufficeth that it yet no way appears, that *Ephesus* was governed by *many Presbyters*, and not by *one Bishop*, and therefore this second offer of *reason* is as deficient as the first, to prove the *Angel* of that *Church* to have been a *collective* body.

SECT. X.

Of expressing a number by singulars. A Church by a Candlestick. Of the seven Angels *Rev.* 8.

Numb. 1. THeir *third reason is*, because *It is usual with the Holy Ghost, not only in other Books of Scripture, but in this very Book of the Revelation, in mysterious and prophetick writings, and visional representations (such as this of the* Stars *and Golden Candlestick is) to express a number of things or persons, in singulars. And this in visions is the usual way of Representation of things, a thousand persons making up one Church is represented by one Candlestick, many* Ministers *making up one* Presbytery *by one* Angel. *Thus* Rev. 8. 2. *It is said that* John *saw seven* Angels *which stood before God. By these seven Candlesticks* (I suppose it should be *seven* Angels) *Dr.* Reynolds *doth not understand seven individual* Angels, *but all the* Angels; *For there are no seven individual* Angels *that stand before God, but all do*, Dan. 7. *there are many more instances brought in the Books forementioned.*

2. To this *third Reason* I have no obligation or notice to give credit, any farther than the *evidences* perswade, for many of which, though we are referred to *Smectymnuus*, &c. yet having received promise from these, that they would borrow a *few things* from those others; I shall with reason hope that what they have upon *choice borrowed, leaving*, as they say, *much more behind*, is the most *satisfactory* and *solid* of any thing by them produced; and consequently if there be no force in these instances to oppugne our *conclusion*, we shall not expect to find more *convincing* ones by travailing farther, and gathering up out of those *dispersions*, what they have refused to take up and offer to us.

3. The thing they would prove is, that *'tis usual with the Holy Ghost in this (as in other mysterious prophetick Books) to express a number of things or persons by singulars.* Their proofs are but three, and the first is of no force, because the word *Church* denotes a *singular* thing, as well as *Candlestick* that represents it; for though a *thousand* men make up one *Church*, yet *one Church* is but *one* thing, considered as a *Church*, and proportionably as *one Candlestick* in the *singular* is set to denote each *Church*, so there are *seven Candlesticks* to represent the *seven Churches*.

4. As for the second, that of the *Angels*, that that signifies *many Ministers*, that cannot be offered as a *proof*, being it self the matter of the *question*. And indeed, though *Church* be a *collective* body, and so one *Church* is known to consist of *many men*, yet *Angel* is not of that nature, *one Angel* neither signifies *many* men, nor *many Angels*.

5. And whereas the *parallel* is set betwixt the word *Candlestick*, and the word *Angel*, that they (each) are *singular* words, by which *multitudes* are represented, that is a mistake; for the *parallel* lies betwixt *Church* and *Angel* (and on the other side betwixt *Candlestick* and *Star*, as appears *Rev.* 1. 20.) and both

both theſe are *individual* things, the *Church* an *individual Church*, and there be ſeven ſuch *individual Churches*, and the *Angel* an *individual Angel*, and there be ſeven ſuch *individual Angels*, and there can be no more pretence that one *Angel* ſhould ſignify *many Miniſters*, than that one *Church* ſhould ſignify *many Congregations*.

Laſtly, for the third proof, that of ſeven *Angels*, *Rev.* 8. 2. if that were granted to Doctor *Reynold*'s authority, that the [*ſeven Angels*] there ſignifies *all the Angels*, yet would it not at all contribute to the proof of the point in hand, which is, that *many* ſhall be ſignified by a *ſingular*, for we know that *ſeven* are not a *ſingular*; but the cuſtom indeed being ordinary, to uſe a *certain definite* number, for an *uncertain* or *indefinite*, and the *ſeptenary* being a *perfect* number, and ſo fitteſt for the turne, 'tis more tolerable that the number of *ſeven* may repreſent ſome greater number, one *plural* a larger *plural*, than that a *ſingular* one ſhould do ſo. 6.

And yet ſecondly, there is no great reaſon to doubt, but that the *ſeven Angels* are indeed very *ſeven Angels*, and no more; This I collect, 1. from the *ſeven Trumpets* that were given them, *ver.* 2. and the ſpecifying them by that *Character*, *the ſeven Angels, which had the ſeven Trumpets*, ver. 6. *Secondly*, by the ſeveral employments aſſigned them in the ſubſequent parts of the *Viſion* which brings them upon the *ſcene* one after another, the *firſt Angel*. ver. 7. the *ſecond Angel*, ver. 8. and ſo to the *ſeventh*. Thirdly, by the diſtinction that is evidently made between thoſe *ſeven Angels* and *another Angel*, ver. 3. *And another came and ſtood at the Altar:* which makes it certain that the former *ſeven* did not ſignify *all the Angels*, unleſs after *all*, there could yet be *one* more. Fourthly, from the mention of the *ſeven Spirits*, cap. 1. 4. which are ſaid to be *before Gods throne*, that ſure is all one with *ſtanding before* him here, and it being certain that *Angels* are *Spirits*, I have no reaſon to doubt but that theſe *ſeven Angels* are thoſe *ſeven Spirits*, and ſo ſtill a *definite* number of *ſeven*, and no more. Fifthly, from the mention of the *ſeven Eyes*, *Zach.* 4. 10. which ſeem to be interpreted to this ſence, *Rev.* 5. 6. *ſeven eyes which are the ſeven Spirits of God ſent into all the Land.* 7.

And though in ſome of theſe places other men have had other notions, yet δοκιμώτερον τὰς ἀγγέλους ταῦτα νοεῖν, *'tis more to be approved that we underſtand Angels by that phraſe*, cap. 1. ſaith *Andreas Cæſarienſis*; And of the whole matter, Ἑπτὰ μέν εἰσιν οἱ τῷ μεγίστῳ δυνάμιν ἔχοντες, πρωτόγονοι Ἀγγέλων ἄρχοντες, *there are ſeven which have the greateſt power, the firſt-born Princes of the Angels*, ſaith *Clemens Alexandrinus*. In which words of his, the *firſt-born Princes* are evidently taken from *Dan.* 10. 13. where the *Hebrew* reads שרים חד אשנים *the Principal* or *firſt Rulers* or *Princes*, of which *Michael* is the *firſt*, and thence called *Archangel*. 8. *Strom. 6.*

And ſo in *Tobit*, cap. 12. 15. we find *ſeven holy Angels which preſent the prayers of the Saints*, which deſcription of them and their *office*, to *preſent the prayers of the Saints*, if it be thought unagreeable to their *ſtanding* here *before God* or being *before his throne*, it will ſoon be reconciled by that ſpeech of *Chriſt*, that the *Angels* of the *infant* tender *Chriſtians always behold the face of God*, and by that means are qualified to make their wants known unto him, which is all one with *preſenting* of *prayers*. 9.

Sixthly, from the mention of the *ſeven Lamps*, *Rev* 4. 5. (ſtyled *Lamps*, in reference to the like number of *Lamps* on the *Candleſtick* in the *Sanctuary*) which *burn before the throne*, as cap. 1. they *are before the throne*, For of theſe it is added αἵ εἰσι τὰ ἑπτὰ πνεύματα τοῦ θεοῦ, *which are the ſeven* (by way of eminency, or the *ſeven Principal*) *ſpirits of God*. 10.

Seventhly, from the no appearance of the leaſt reaſon produced to the contrary; For as to that which is introduced with a [*For*] and ſupplyes the place of a *reaſon*, it is evidently a bare *aſſertion* of the contrary, [*there are no ſeven individual Angels that ſtand before God*] without any offer of proof; that *teſtimony* out of *Dan.* 7. that *all* do, being far from concluding that there are not ſuch *ſeven principal Angels*, which theſe ſo many evidences aſſure us there are. 11.

In that of *Dan.* 7. 10. upon that ſolemn occaſion of *God*'s *judgments* expreſt by a *fiery ſtream*, *thouſand thouſands* are ſaid to *Miniſter to him*, and *ten thouſand times ten thouſand* to *ſtand before him*. But how doth that hinder, but at another time, *ſeven principal Angels* may be employed by him, and in order to that, *ſtand before him* too, and when we ſo oft read of ſuch *ſeven*, what queſtion but they were *individual Angels?* And ſo much for the *third reaſon*. 12.

SECT. XI.

Of the Epiſtles being ſent to the whole Church, not to the Biſhop only. Of Timothy, Oneſimus *and* Polycarp, *being Biſhops of ſome of the* Aſian *Churches, without any charge of Apoſtaſie falling on them by this means.*

THere is a *fourth* behind ſtill, *that though but one Angel be mentioned in the fore-front, yet it is evident that the Epiſtles themſelves* (*though we are far from thinking that in formal denomination, the Angels and the Candleſticks are the ſame*) *are dedicated to all the Angels and Miniſters in the Church, and to the Churches themſelves, as appears*, Rev. 1. 10. Rev. 2. 7. 11. 17. *And therefore when it is ſaid in the ſingular number, I know thy works, This thou haſt, Repent and do thy firſt works*, &c. *All theſe and the like places are not to be underſtood as meant of one individual perſon, but of the whole company of Miniſters, and alſo of the whole Church, becauſe the puniſhment threatned is to the whole Church*, Rev. 2. 5. 16. 2. *Now we have no warrant in the word to think that Chriſt would remove his Goſpel from a Church for the ſin of one Biſhop, when all the other miniſters and Churches are far from thoſe ſins.* *Numb.* 1.

To this I ſhall need make no reply, having done it ſufficiently already, by conceſſion that the *Angel* being the *Ruler* of a *Church*, the whole *Epiſtle* belongs to him and the *Church* promiſcuouſly, and agreeably thoſe expreſſions, which are uſed in the *ſingular* number, do not all belong to the *Biſhop*, but to the *Church* wherein he *preſides*: But certainly this is far from inferring that the *Biſhop* and *Church* are all one, or that the word *Angel* ſignifies the *collective* body of the *Church*, for, beſides 2.

that the *Text* is expres in making a signal difference between the *Stars* and the *Candlesticks*, the *Angels* and the *Churches* (and the *Assemblers* are here forced to confess that the *Angels* and *Candlesticks* are not the same) the confounding them will be as disadvantageous to them as to us, and I shall as regularly be able to conclude that the word *Angel* signifies not the *Presbytery*, but the whole *diffusive* body of the *Church*, as they can pretend to do upon their own *postulatum*, that the *Angel* denotes not the *Bishop* but the whole *Church*, it being as certain that they make a difference between the *Church* or multitude of *believers*, and the *Presbytery* that is set over them to *rule*, as we do between the same *Church* and the *Bishop*.

3. Thus have we viewed all the reasons produced by them to assert or confirm their first *answer*, and shewed divers wayes how no manner of validity there is in any one or all of them, to evidence it to be a *solid and every way sufficient answer*. And therefore there was some use of the next part of the Method, to call in the *authority* of other men to countenance this *interpretation*, Master *Brightman*, Master *Perkins*, Master *Foxe*, (who citeth *Primasius*, *Haymo*, *Beda*, *Richardus*, *Thomas*, &c.) Doctor *Fulke*, Master *Meade*, *Gregory* and Saint *Austin*; But although they have thought fit to set down these names, yet having omitted to add their *Testimonies*, and indeed having resolved to forbear, because *Smectymnuus* hath done it already, I shall confess my self willing to leave this *chace*, and in stead of leading the Reader so wearisome a walk, to examine the several *comments* here named (and but named) give him more shortly my *conjecture* what truth may be in them.

4. Master *Brightman*, I know (and some others 'tis possible) may have interpreted the *Angel* to signifie the *whole College* of *Pastors*, and truly I should much sooner take up an *Interpretation* upon the bare word of these *Assemblers*, than I would upon no better evidence from Mr. *Brightman*; He was *one learned* man, long known to be unkind to our *Prelates*, and here are many, for ought I know, as *learned*, though under the same *prejudices*.

5. Some others here cited, I cannot believe are brought to testifie this, but only that what is said to the *Angel* in each part of the *Epistle*, was said to the *whole Church*, and not only to the *Bishop*; and if that be all they say, it is that which we cannot doubt to affirm with them, and have oft confest to understand *Christ*'s *Epistle* so, without any incommodity to our pretensions.

6. If I mistake in these *conjectures*, I desire pardon, and shall hope to give a better account, when I read the *testimonies* in the *Authors* from whence they are cited. For in these *derivations* of *testimonies*, the *Assemblers* citing them from *Smectymnuus*, *Smectymnuus* from Master *Foxe*, Master *Foxe* from *Primasius*, &c. there is great possibility of mistake, and therefore I shall follow the example before me, *forbear* adding any more of this matter.

7. In the next place they are pleased to take notice as of an *objection* against their *interpretation*, that *some Authors say*, Timothy *was Bishop of* Ephesus *when our Saviour wrote this Epistle*, *others that* Onesimus *was Bishop*, *others that* Polycarp *was Bishop of* Smyrna *at that time*, *and therefore these Angels must needs be taken individually for so many single persons*.

8. Of this *Objection*, which they have thus formed for us, there is only thus much of truth, that out of *authentick Records* we bring undeniable evidences for *Timothies* being constituted by S^t *Paul* Bishop of *Ephesus*, for *Onesimus* being placed in that *See* at the time of *Ignatius*'s writing to the *Ephesians*, that *Polycarp* was constituted *Bishop* of *Smyrna* by S^t *John*, of all which we have spoken enough already.

9. But of all or any of these being *Bishops* in those *Cities* at the very time of *Christ*'s addressing this *Epistle* to the *Angels* of each, this had no where been our affirmation, nor would it have been useful to us in any considerable degree, if we had grounds positively to affirm it. All that is needful to us is this, that by the *Antient* Records, which evidence them to have been so early *Bishops* in two of those *Churches*, to which *Christ*'s *Epistle* was sent, and *Bishops* in the notion wherein we now use the word, we are secured of the truth of our *collections*, when from the mention of the *seven Angels* of the *seven Churches*, we assert the *Ecclesiastical* power in the hands of a *single Bishop* in each *Church*, to be owned and confirmed by *Christ*; And supposing some other persons, and none of these three, to have been those very *numerical Angels* to whom those *Epistles* were written, this *conclusion* of ours stands yet as firm, as if we could *demonstrate* it of those very *numerical* persons, there being no reason to doubt but the same manner of *Government* continued all the *Scripture* times; and so *Timothies successour* and *Onesimus*'s *predecessor*, being as certainly *Bishops*, as either *Onesimus* or *Timothy* himself; when withal, we have already produced mentions from the *Antients* of the *Catalogues* of those *Bishops* which succeeded *Timothy* in that *See*

10. Having thus set right the *Objection* for them, so as it is owned by us to be an *Objection* against them, it will now soon appear what force there is in their *answers* to it, and those are three.

11. First, *That they that say that* Timothy *was then Bishop, offer no little injury to him, for they thereby charge him to be guilty of Apostasie, and of losing his first love, and so out of a blind zeal to Episcopacy, they make that glorious Saint to stand charged as an Apostate. The like injury is offered by Objections to* Onesimus.

12. But first you see, whatever our *opinion* is expres to be, we have not *affirmed* either of these, as to the *person* either of *Timothy* or *Onesimus*, but left it uncertain who the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Ephesus* was, whether either or neither of these, but some *successor* of the one, and *predecessor* of the other, and so what charge soever falls on that *Angel*, it falls not necessarily on *either* of these.

13. Secondly, It is already agreed betwixt the parties, affirmed by them, and acknowledged by me, that the *Epistle* being addrest to the *Angel* of *Ephesus*, the *Church* or *diffusive* body, the *Christians* in it, were concerned in the *contents* of it; And then whatsoever charge be found in the *Epistle*, of how heavy a nature soever, even of *Apostasie* it self, yet there is no necessity the *Angel* or *Bishop* should be *personally* guilty of it; and so whosoever the *Bishop* was, though *Timothy* himself, our *zeal* to *Episcopacy* hath not been so *blind* or transporting, as to put us on any *uncharitable censure*, to affix any *unhandsome* character upon so *glorious* a *Saint*.

14. Lastly, To remove this answer yet one degree farther from being satisfactory, it no where appears that *Apostasie* is in that *Epistle* laid to the charge, whether of the *Church* or *Angel*; The first part is all

all in *commendation* of their *former zeal*, and the latter, wherein their charge conſiſts, *v.* 4. is only this [ἀγάπλω σε τλὴ πρώτλω ἀφῆκας] which is not (as is ſuggeſted) *loſing* their *firſt love*, but *remitting* it; Their *love* to *Chriſt* had formerly been *ſtrong as death*, pure and vehement, ſuch as had *caſt out* all *fear* of dangers, and evidenced it ſelf in couragious *confeſſion*; but now, though it were not quite loſt, yet it was remitted, leſſened in the degree, not ſo *intenſe* as formerly, and therefore when they are bid *remember from whence* they *are fallen*, that *fall* doth not neceſſarily ſignifie *Apoſtaſy* or *renouncing* of *Chriſtianity* (for then it had been an impertinent *threatning* to *remove* their *Candleſtick v.* 5.) but a *falling* from the former degree, a *cooling* of the *intenſe heat*, which had been ſo laudable in them. And ſo ſtill there is more invalidity in this firſt *anſwer*.

SECT. XII.

Of Timothies *being an Evangeliſt, that it hinders not his being a Biſhop.*

THE *ſecond* is, that they *have already proved that* Timothy *was an Evangeliſt in a proper ſenſe, and therefore cannot be called Biſhop of* Epheſus *in their ſenſe.* *Numb.* 1.

To this I reply, 1. That *Timothies* being an *Evangeliſt* no way prejudgeth his being a *Biſhop* in our ſenſe; An *Evangeliſt* is one commiſſionated by any of the *Apoſtles* εὐαγγελίζεσθαι to *preach the Goſpel* to any *City* or *People*; And a *Biſhop* is one *commiſſionated* by the like *Apoſtle* to *preſide* in, and *govern* a *Church* already planted. And what hinders but that he that hath been employed in the former capacity to *plant*, may elſewhere or in the ſame place be appointed to *Govern*, and ſo the *Evangeliſt* be a *Biſhop?* 2.

Whatſoever *Objections* can be brought againſt this, I ſhall not doubt will be eaſily *anſwered*, but there is no offer of any here, and therefore it will not be pertinent farther to treat it in this place. 3.

Secondly, It muſt again be remembred, that what is here ſaid of *Timothy*, is proper to his *perſon*, both from *Oneſimus* and *Polycarp*, and all other *Angels*, whether ſucceeding *Timothy* in *Epheſus*, or *preſiding* in the other ſeven *Aſian Churches*, and therefore though *Timothy* by being an Evangeliſt were rendred uncapable (which yet he was not) of being the *Biſhop* of *Epheſus* in our ſenſe, yet thoſe other *ſeven Angels* at the very time of the writing this *Epiſtle* of which none have been proved to be Evangeliſts, may ſtill be *Biſhops* in our ſenſe. 4.

Thirdly, I ſhall demand upon the *Aſſemblers* principles, who allow a *Primus Presbyter*, a *Prolocutor* in their *conſiſtory* or *Councel* of *Presbyters*, might *Timothy* be that *firſt Presbyter* in the *Church* of *Epheſus*. or did his being an *Evangeliſt* hinder him from being ſo, when he was by S^t *Paul* exhorted or appointed παραμεῖναι *to abide* in that *City?* I cannot imagine they will ſay he could not, who gave both S^t *Peter* and S^t *John* leave to call themſelves *Presbyters*; But if he could in their opinion, then why might he not be a *Biſhop* in our ſenſe (notwithſtanding that he was an *Evangeliſt*) as well as a *Presbyter* in theirs? I foreſee not what anſwer can be adapted to this *Dilemma*. 5.

SECT. XIII.

Of the Biſhops *at* Epheſus. *Of the plural number in the Epiſtle to the* Angel *of* Smyrna.

THere remains a *third* branch of the *Anſwer*, that *it will not follow becauſe* Oneſimus *was Biſhop of* Epheſus *in* S^t John's *dayes, that therefore he was the only perſon to whom Chriſt wrote his Epiſtle; For* S^t Paul *tells us there were many Biſhops at* Epheſus *(beſides the ſuppoſed* Oneſimus*) and Chriſt may very well write to him, and to all the reſt as well as him. The like may be ſaid concerning* Polycarp, *for our Saviour ſpeaks to the* Angel *of the Church of* Smyrna *in the plural number*, Rev. 2. 10. *And therefore he may truly be ſaid to write to all the other* Angels *that were at* Smyrna, *as well as to one.* *Numb.* 1.

Here is nothing in this branch but what hath been diſtinctly foreſtall'd, and ſpoken to largely already; it will ſuffice that we repeat the heads, and leave the Reader to view the places, where they are more explicitly handled. And firſt though S^t *Paul* ſhould tell us that there were *many Biſhops* at *Epheſus*, as there might be from other *Cities* occaſionally met there, yet it would not follow that there were more than one *Biſhop* of that *City*, or conſequently, that *Chriſt* in a peculiar addreſs to the *Angel* of that *City*, could write to more *Biſhops* there. 2.

But then ſecondly, the whole truth is this, that St. *Luke* (and not St. *Paul*) tells, that upon St. *Pauls* ſummons ſent to *Epheſus*, many *Biſhops* met him at *Miletus*; *Epheſus* being the chief *Metropolis* was the fitteſt means to convey the *ſummons* to the Cities near it, and from *them* and not only from *Epheſus*, came the *Biſhops* to him, as hath been declared out of *Irenæus*. 3.

Thirdly, For our *Saviour*'s ſpeaking to the *Angel* of the *Church* of *Smyrna* in the *plural* number; that is not punctually true; for though the Letter be written and inſcribed to the *Angel*, yet, as hath oft been ſaid, the *whole Church* is concerned in the contents of it, and ſo ſpeaking to the *Angel* in the *ſingular*, he may yet ſpeak to the *Church* or any members thereof, in the *plural* number. And ſo much again to demonſtrate the ineffectualneſs of the firſt Head of Anſwers. 4.

SECT. XIV.

Of Beza's *Interpretation, of the President.*

Numb. 1. THE *second* follows upon a *supposition* (but not *grant*) *that these* Angels *were personæ singulares, and that the word* Angel *is to be taken individually, yet they conceive this will not at all advantage the Episcopal cause. For* 1. *Mr.* Beza *(no great friend to Episcopacy) acknowledgeth that by these words* to the Angel *is meant* πρὸς πρεσβύτερον *to the President, as whom it behoved specially to be admonished touching those matters, and by him both the rest of his Collegues, and the whole Church likewise; but then he addeth, But that Episcopal degree which was afterward by humane invention brought into the Church of God, certainly neither can nor ought to be from hence concluded. Nay, not so much as the Office of a perpetual President should be of necessity as the thence arising Oligarchical tyranny (whose head is the Antichristian beast) now at length with the most certain ruine, not of the Church only, but of the word also, maketh manifest; By which quotation it is evident, that though* Beza *held the* Angel *to be a singular person, yet he held him to be* Angelus Præses, *not* Angelus Princeps; *and that he was* Præses pro tempore, *just as a Moderator in an Assembly, or as a Speaker in Parliament.*

2. To this I reply, First, That Mr. *Beza*'s interpretation, as it was foreknown and formerly mentioned by us, so was it not in reason to be of any force or *authority* with us, if it be but upon the score intimated here, that he was not only *no great friend*, but a known *profest enemy* of *Episcopacy*, and so was obliged to be, by the course wherein he was engaged at *Geneva*. All that his authority concludes, is, that to avoid a plain testimony, which is not for his turn, a man may be induced to affirm that *confidently*, for which he hath no ground of proof, nay, wherein all wayes of *evidence*, that the matter is capable of, are *absolutely* against him.

3. Thus 'tis certainly in this matter; for when *Beza* hath here acknowledged that the *Angel* was the πρεσβὺς *President*, Who will be the most competent *Judge* or *Witness*, to determine what was meant by the πρεσβὺς *President*] in the *Primitive Church*, what kind of *Presidency* he had, whether only of *place* or *order*, and that only for a *time*, or of *superiority* of *power* and *office*, and that *perpetual?* In all reason this is to be fetcht from those first Writers which speak of it, and either use the very word πρεσβὺς *President*, for such a *Bishop*, as we now assert (a *singular* person in every *Church*, having a power for life over all the *Officers* and Members of the *Church*, and succeeding some *Apostle*, or *Apostolical* person in that *power*) or else in other words affirm the same thing.

4. Of this, store of evidences are * elsewhere produced, in the explication of the several titles, by which this *singular prefect* was antiently known, whether of *Apostle*, in a *secondary* use of that word, of *Angel*, of *Bishop*, of *Elder*, of *Ruler*, of *Pastor*, of *Doctor*, of *Steward*, of *President*, of *Priest*; Against which the bare authority of Mr *Beza*'s name, who hath fansied a temporary *President* or *Prolocutor*, and brought no manner of reason to confirm it, will have very little validity in it.

* *Dissert.* 4.

5. What is proved by the bare *testimony* of *Beza*, is farther confirmed by a like citation out of the *Reverend Divines at the Isle of* Wight, *who by the example of the King sending a message to both Houses, and directing it To the Speaker of the House of Peers, which infers not that either the Speaker is always the same person, or the Governour, or Ruler of the two Houses in the least, conclude, that notwithstanding this direction of Christ's Epistle to the* Angels, *yet they might be neither* Bishops, *nor yet perpetual Moderators.*

6. But the authority of those *Divines*, which had this answer from *Beza*, adds nothing of *weight*, because nothing of *proof* to it; As for their *similitude*, it concludes nothing but this, that these *Divines* thought fit to make use of this instance of a *Speaker* in *Parliament*, to shew the thing *possible* to have been, not to prove that so it *was*; And the matter of our present inquiry, is not, what a kind of *president Christ* and his *Apostles* might, if they would, have left in each *Church*, but what really they did; And that must be contested by the best *Records* of those times, not by a *similitude* of a *Speaker* in our *Parliaments*. And that is all I need to say to that *Section*.

SECT. XV.

Of Dr. Reynolds *interpretation, of the Bishop in* Cyprian. *Of Ordination by Bishops not without Presbyters, from the Testimonies of* Cyprian, *and* Fermilian.

Numb. 1. AFter the *authority* of Mr. *Beza* backt with that of the *Divines* at the *Isle* of *Wight*, is added, in the *second* place, the *authority* of Dr. *Reynolds*, who as he hath a *Letter in print against the Divine Right of Episcopacy, so he acknowledgeth also in his conference with* Hart, Dial. 3. *That this* Angel *was* persona singularis: *For he saith,*

2. The whole place of Dr. *Reynolds* is set down at large by the *Archbishop* of *Armagh* in the front of his *learned Dissertation* of the *Original* of *Bishops* and *Metropolitanes*, and I shall not need here to recite it, being of some *length*, and indeed nothing in it defined or expresst of his opinion, that the *President*, when he was made such, either continued to be *equal* with the rest of the *Presbyters*, or lasted but for a *time*, so as the *Prolocutor* of an *Assembly* doth; I am sure he affirms him to have had the *Presidentship* (not among, but) *over Elders* (which I suppose must imply some *power*) and that this was he that in the *Primitive Church* the *Fathers* called *Bishop*, and applies to him the mentions of *Bishops* made by S^t *Cyprian* (and *Cornelius*) of whose notion of *Bishops*, that it belongs not to a bare *Prolocutor* of an *Assembly*, nay, that in nothing it differeth from ours, I am sufficiently assured, and so will the *Reader* by what is cited from him *Dissert.* 3. *c.* 3. §. 13. And because from some other *intimations* in this *Book*

* *Appnd.* p. 229. † I see there is need of it, I shall here πρὸς πλείονα out of many, mention this one *evidence* more.

In

In the 60. *Epistle* to *Rogatian* a *Bishop*, who had been wronged and *contumeliously* used by a *Deacon* of his *Church*, and had written an account of it to *Cyprian* and the * *annual Council* of *Bishops* with him, *Cyprian* returns this Answer, that it was his *humility* to make this *complaint* to the *Council*, *Cum pro Episcopatûs vigore, & Cathedræ authoritate, haberes potestatem, quî possis de illo statim vindicari*, *when by force of his Episcopal power, and by authority of his Chair, he had power himself to inflict punishment on him immediately*, and that *punishment* afterwards specified, *ut eum deponas vel abstineas*, *either to depose him or suspend him.* 3.

* *Ego & Collegæ mei qui præsentes aderant.*

Here it was a part of *Rogatian's Episcopal power*, without any *joyning* with him, to *judge* and *censure* the *inferior Officers* of the *Church*, and they were bound *honorem sacerdotis agnoscere & Episcopo præposito suo* — as it follows in that *Epistle*, *to acknowledge the honour of their Priest, and with full humility make satisfaction to the Bishop which is set over them.* All *power* in the hands of *one* set over all, call'd *promiscuously*, *Priest* and *Bishop* in *Cyprian's* stile. 4.

And therefore when in the *Appendix* to this Book, these men to prove that *Ordination by Bishops without the assistance of* Presbyters *was always forbidden and opposed*, tell us of *Aurelius* being ordained by *Cyprian*, and his *Collegues*, Ep. 33. and then assure us from *Ep.* 58. that by his *Collegues* he means his *Presbyters* (where yet there is no other proof of it, but the using of these *words* in the *Inscription* of the *Epistle*, Cyprianus *cum Collegis*, and *Ego & collegæ*, Cyprian *with his collegues*, and *I and my Collegues.*) This is a great but discernible *fallacy* put upon the *Reader*, as will soon appear, 1. If we but observe that the 33 *Epistle*, where he tells of *Aurelius*, was written by *Cyprian* to his *Presbyters*, and so they are the persons whom he advertiseth, what *he and his Collegues* had done, and so sure were not those *Collegues* that did it *with* him. Or secondly, if for the understanding *Cyprian's* notion of *Collegues*, *Ep.* 58. we shall but look forward to the next *Epistle* 59. for that will fully discover it, being this, *Cyprianus & cæteri Collegæ qui in Concilio affuerunt numero LXVI.* where *Cyprians Collegues* are evidently the 66. *Bishops* that were in *Council* with him. And so S. *Austin* in his 28. *Epistle* to S. *Hierome*, mentioning this very *Epistle*, saith, *Cyprianus cum Coepiscopis suis*, *Cyprian with his fellow Bishops*; An irrefragable evidence that these his *Collegues* were *Bishops.* 5.

The like might be also observed of the *Testimony* out of *Firmilian*, which they there subjoyn, of the *Seniores* and *Præpositi* that have *power* of *ordaining*, by whom, say they, *the Presbyters as well as the Bishops are understood*; But again 'tis clear by the express words of the *Epistle*, that by them are meant the *Bishops* in their *annual Council*; *Necessario apud nos fit ut per singulos annos, Seniores & Præpositi in unum conveniamus* — *'Tis necessary that every year we the Elders and Governors should meet together to dispose and order those things which are committed to our care*; adding concerning the *Church* (in opposition to *Hereticks*) *that all power and grace is placed in it*, *ubi præsident majores natu, qui & Baptizandi & manum imponendi & ordinandi possident potestatem*, *Wherein the Elders præside, and have power of Baptizing, absolving and ordaining*, an evident *description* of the *Bishops*. But this by the way, as an essay, what their *testimonies* out of the *Fathers*, scattered sometimes in this Book, would be found to be, if this were a place to *examine* them. 6.

Lastly, Dr *Reinolds* acknowledges another *President* even among *Bishops*, the *Bishop* of the *chiefest* City in the *Province*, and so a *Metropolitan*. All which are contrary enough to the pretensions of the *Presbyterians* (what amends he hath made them in his *Printed Letter*, I know not.) 7.

Yet after all this, there lies no obligation upon us to regulate our *Doctrine* by Doctor *Reinolds's* Scheme in this matter, being sufficiently instructed by the *Primitive* Records and practice, what kind of *power* and *dignity* belonged to the Πρῶτος or *President* among them, the very same that we now pretend to be the *Bishops* due, And if *Christ's* Letter were addrest to the *Angel*, as to such a Πρῶτος or *President*, 'tis all that we desire, to erect our fabrick of *Episcopacy* on this one place, if there were not (as there are) others able to support the weight of it. 8.

And so we see what reasons have been brought to make good their *second* head of *Answers*, of which we had promise that they were *solid and every way sufficient answers*, and yet in the issue there is nothing so much as offered toward it, save only the *testimony* of Master *Beza*, the *Divines* at the *Isle* of *Wight* (which is by interpretation themselves) and Dr *Reinolds*, who yet is not perfectly of their party neither. 9.

SECT. XVI.

Of the Churches of Asia *being Metropolitical. Of the paucity of believers.*

HAving thus done, they say *It is objected by some men that the seven* Cities, *in which these seven* Asian Churches *had their seat, were all of them Metropolitical, and so had relation to the rest of the* Towns *and* Cities *of* Asia, *as unto daughters rising under them, and that therefore these* Churches *were Metropolitical* Churches, *and their* Angels *Metropolitical* Bishops. *Numb.* 1.

How this comes to be styled an *objection*, I cannot well guess, or what it is, against which it is thought to be *objected*. The truth of it, as far as any *Episcopal* person I know, is interested in it, is this; It is not only evident of the *Angels* of the *seven Asian Churches*, that they were *Bishops*, which is sufficient for us against the *Assemblers*, but there is over and above that, all reason to deem them *Stars* of a *first magnitude*, i. e. *Bishops* of *Mother-Cities*, *Metropolitanes*, and that very pertinent to be urged in this matter of the *Asian Angels*, not to secure the proofs of *Episcopacy* taken from thence, but to render a reason why in all *Asia* but *seven Churches* and their *Bishops* are named there. To this purpose the discourse is inlarged (above what it needed to have been) *Dissert.* 4, 5. to set down the nature of *Metropolitans*, the *exemplars* of them among the *Jews*, the expresses of the *Institution* in the *Apostles* writings, and the *signal* evidences of it in the *Primitive Church*, and the *Ancient Canons* in the *Council* of *Nice* and *Antioch*, and *Ephesus*, all owning them as *Primitive* and *Apostolical Institutions*, and all this exemplified in *Jerusalem*, in *Antioch*, in *Rome*, in *Alexandria*, in *Gortyna* of *Creet*, and at length in all the *seven Churches of Asia*. 2.

What

3. What is there thus set down, if it have not perfect truth in it, I shall be very glad to see the weak parts of that discourse discovered, and therefore though I never proposed or meant it as an *Objection* of ours against the *Presbyterians*, having no need of such *auxiliaries*, and the whole matter being sufficiently proved without it, and this only added *ex abundanti*, yet I shall most willingly attend their motions, and see what *answers* they will adapt to this *Objection*, as they call it.

4. And first they answer, that it *will hardly be proved that these* seven Cities *were all of them* Metropolitical Cities *in S^t* John's *dayes, And the situation of most of them, lying near together on the Sea side, makes it very improbable.*

5. To this I reply, that for *five* of them, *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, *Sardis*, *Pergamus*, and *Laodicæa*, *Pliny*, *Lib.5.c.29,30.* that lived and wrote in the beginning of *Vespasian*'s reign, is a competent witness, that they were *Cities* wherein the *Roman Proconsuls* fixt their *Courts* or *Seats* of *Judicature*, and administred *justice* there to all the *Cities* about them, and that is the *interpretation* of a *chief City* or *Metropolis*, in the *secular account*, and agreeably *Ulpian* mentions *Ephesus* as the *chief* of these *Metropoles*. And for the other **Greg. l.5. c.21* two, *Philadelphia* and *Thyatira*, the latter of these by * *Ptolomy*, the former by the *Council* of *Constantinople sub Menâ*, is punctually affirmed to be a *Metropolis*. To these are added other *evidences* and *reasons*, and the *Lord Archbishop* of *Armagh* hath written (besides his *Original* of *Metropolitanes*) a very *learned Dissertation* of the *Lydian Asia*, on purpose to clear this matter.

6. And when a thing is so largely *proved* already, and when a *satisfactory* proof of it in any *one* of the seven *Cities* is abundantly sufficient to the asserting of *Metropolitanes*, (for then the *Angel* of that *one* was a *Metropolitan*) 'tis then certainly a very incompetent confutation barely to say, that *it will hardly be proved, that these* seven Cities *were all of them* Metropolitical Cities *in Saint* John's *days*, for if it be *proved*, it matters not how *hardly*, and if any one were so in St. *John*'s dayes, it matters not, if possibly some other were not; that one was a *Metropolitical Angel*, which is all we need insist on.

7. And for the *Argument* to make it *improbable*, drawn from the *situation* of the *Cities*, that is as *infirm*; for this, as all other controversies of *matters of fact*, must be waged by *authorities* of those which were likely to *know* the truth, and to testifie aright, and to those we have all reason to *adhere*, and not to be moved by *arguments* that seem probable to those that live sixteen hundred years after, and are not perhaps so perfect *Masters* of the *Geography* of the place as duly to be able to judge even what is in that respect most *probable*.

8. Nay for the distances of these *Cities*, though I have not now Mr. *Brightman* by me, yet my notes out of him tell me, that in his scale of *furlongs*, *Pergamus* was distant from *Smyrna* five hundred and forty Furlongs, *i.e.* about sixty eight *English miles*, and *Ephesus* from *Smyrna* three hundred and twenty *i.e.* about forty miles, and *Thyatira* from *Pergamus* eighty *English* miles, which is a distance very reconcileable with their being *Metropoles*.

9. But they are content to *suppose* this was true, and then have *answers* ready another way, 1. *That it is no good argument from the greatness of the* Cities *to infer the greatness of the* Churches, *for though the* Cities *were great, yet the* Churches *were but small, and the number of believers very few in comparison of the rest of the people.*

10. To this I reply, First, By *concession*, that in all places and times the greatness of the *Church* cannot absolutely be concluded from the *greatneß* of the *City*, because it is possible that a *great City* may have utterly *resisted* the *faith*, and a *lesser* City *received* it; or again a *greater City*, that hath received the *Faith* in some of the Members, may yet have *fewer* believers in it, than another City, which is not so great. This therefore is not our way of concluding, from the bare *greatness* of the *Cities*, to infer the great number of *believers* in them.

11. Our way of *concluding* is this; *Paul* had spent *three years*, *Act.* 20. 31. in this *Lydian* or *Proconsular Asia*, ver. 18. In this time he had pursued his work very *diligently* and *zealously*, not *ceasing to warn every one night and day with tears*, and herein his *harvest* was proportionable to his *labour*; After *two years* space and upwards spent at *Ephesus*, it is said, *ver.* 19. that by the continuance of his *preaching* and gathering *Disciples*, *all they that dwelt in* Asia, *heard the word of the Lord, both* Jews *and* Greeks, and though many were *hardned* and *believed not*, and *spake evil of that way*, ver. 9. yet *ver.* 17. by some *extraordinary* works of his, which were made *known to all the* Jews *and* Greeks *dwelling at* Ephesus, *fear fell on them all, and the name of the Lord Jesus was magnified*, a conversion in a manner *general*, and therefore it follows, *and many that believed* — ver. 18. and *so mightily grew the word of God and prevailed*, ver. 20. Whereupon Saint *Paul* himself speaking of these successes, calls it a *great door and an effectual*, 1 *Cor.* 16.9. which at *Ephesus*, v. 8. was *opened* unto him.

12. From hence we conclude, and sure safely may, First, That in *Asia* generally, and especially in *Ephesus* there was a great number of *Christians*, before this time of *Christs Epistle*, (which is not a concluding it barely from the *greatness* of that or any other *Cities* of *Asia*) Secondly from hence, together with *Ephesus*'s being in the *secular account* (the *Notitiæ Imperiales*) a *Metropolis*, where the *Assizes* were kept, we conclude that *Ephesus* was in the *Christian* account also a *Metropolis*, and the *chief* of all *Asia*; and this I hope is not so *improbable* infirm a way of *concluding*, as the other imposed on us seemed to be.

13. Thirdly, From hence, and from other exemplifications of it (as that *Trallis* and *Magnesia*, which appear to be under the *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, are by *Ignatius* written to as *Episcopal Sees*, in our present notion of the word *Bishop*) we conclude that *other* Cities of *Asia* beside these *seven*, had received the *Christian* faith, and were certainly taken care for by *Paul*, which had planted it among them, and agreeably had *Rulers* setled in them, *i.e. Bishops* subordinate to the *Metropolitans*. And all these inferences, I doubt not, will appear regular enough, and I should farther *enlarge* on them, if there were any thing in the *answer*, which could render it *needful* or *seasonable*.

14. As for the *paucity* of *Christians* in those times in *comparison* of the rest of the people, that cannot be pertinently opposed to our pretensions, because still the number of *Christians* in a *great* City, might bear the same *proportion* to the number of the *Christians* in the *smaller* Cities, that the *people* in the one did to the *people* in the other, *one thousand* bearing the same *proportion* to *one hundred*, that an *hundred thousand* doth to *ten thousand*.

And

And it being the affirmation of *Clemens*, that the *Apostles* in *each City*, where they received any *pro-* 15.
selytes, though never so *few*, before their parting constituted a *Bishop* (with his *Deacon*) who was to be *governor* ἀῦ μελλόντων πιστεύειν, *of those that should after believe*, it follows unquestionably from thence, that in the *Cities* which had but *few Christians*, *Bishops* might be and were *constituted*, and those very regularly depending on the *greater* (their *Metropolitical*) Cities, from whence the *faith* was derived to them, (as from *Ephesus*, where *Paul* chiefly resided, to the Cities about it) and all this without any need of *ballancing* the *parties*, or considering what *comparison* the number of the *Christians* in one, or the other, bore to the number of the *unbelievers* in either *City*. And let this serve by way of Reply to the first branch of the second Answer.

SECT. XVII.

Of modelling Churches according to the Government of the Roman *state. Of exemplars of Metropolitans among the* Jews. *Testimonies of the Apostles instituting Metropolitans.*

THeir *second answer* is, *We do not believe that ever it can be proved that the Apostles did model the Go-* *Numb.* 1.
vernment of the Church, according to the Government of the Roman *state. This was the after policy of Christian Emperours and Bishops, but no part of Apostolical policy; And therefore it doth not follow, that because there were divers Cities under the jurisdiction of those seven Cities, that therefore there should be divers Churches subordinate to the seven* Asian *Churches.*

That the *Apostles*, which designed to plant a *Church* in the *Heathen* World, should do it in that 2.
manner as would be most *advantageous* to their *end*, will not I hope be accounted *strange*. This generally was, by betaking themselves to the *Cities*, rather than the *villages*, and first to the *greater Cities*, unto which was the most *frequent resort*, that by that means the *faith* might be most *compendiously* and *successfully* propagated. If a *greater City* resisted their *preaching*, or fewer *Saints* were gathered there, I do not then pretend to prove, or to believe, that that was constituted a *Metropolitan Church* with *superiority* over others of greater *antiquity*, or larger *growth* in the *faith*, whatsoever the *dignity* of it were in the *secular* account; But when a whole *Nation* is converted, and the greatest and most populous *Cities first*, and from thence the *sound gone out into all the Region*, and lesser *Cities* in it, that then the *Apostles*, which certainly constituted *Bishops* in every *believing City* (and therefore what is reported to have been done κατ' ἐκκλησίαν *in every Church*, Acts 14. 23. is appointed to be done κατὰ πόλιν *in every City*, Tit. 1. 5. should set up the *principal Sees* in those most *Christian Cities*, which had formerly the *priority* in the *Roman* state, as it is the *wisest* method, and fittest for the *wisest* planters to take, so we have all reason to believe it was done particularly in the *Lydian* or *Proconsular Asia*, in which there being many more *Christian Cities*, than those *seven*, to whom *Christ's Epistle* is addrest, those are in all reason to be accounted the *chief* of that *Region*, and those which are not named, less *principal* than they; which concurring with what we find recorded in *Pliny* and *Ptolomy*, of the account of them in the *imperial notitiæ*, if it *demonstrate* not, is yet matter of exceeding great *probability*, and may perswade with any reasonable man, as long as there is nothing in any degree such, which is offered to be *confronted* against it.

If that which scandalizeth the *Assemblers* (for we are left to *Divine* what it is) be the *unfitness* that 3.
the *Apostles* should model the *Church* according to the *Roman state*; I shall first demand, how it is possible to imagine a *plantation* of a *Church* in any, whether *Jewish* or *Heathen* state, without doing somewhat *equivalent* to this? For suppose *Joseph* of *Arimathea* to have (as * *Gildas* saith) converted the *Britannick Church* in *Tiberius*'s time, is it to be imagined that he should meddle with the *civil* power of this Nation, as it stood in respect of it's *separation* from other *Nations*, *toto divisa Orbe*, or with the *divisions* or *distributions* of this *Nation* within it self, into *Cities*, and *Provinces*, &c. or go about to innovate any thing in that matter? Is it not certain that it was no part of the *Christian faith* to be such a *judge* or *divider*; but on the other side, that all should remain as it did (in that respect) before the coming of *Christianity*? And therefore supposing first, That this *Nation* were governed by a *King* of its own; is it not certain that this *national Church* should follow the boundaries of the *Nation*, and so be model'd according to the *government* of the (formerly *Heathen*) *Britannick state*? And supposing again (what hath already been proved by the *testimony* of *Clemens*, and by comparing *Act.* 14 23. with *Tit.* 1. 5.) that a *Bishop* were constituted in every *Church*, in each *City*, will there be any reason of doubting but that those *Cities* being *subordinate* one to another, according to the *customs* of the *Nation*, the *Churches* in those *Cities*, and the *Bishops* in those *Churches* shall be so also? This I hope will not be deemed an impious compliance with *heathenism*, or *conformity* with the *World*, nay, though the *Emperour* of *Rome* (by his conquests here) were the author of these *distributions*.

* *De excid. & Conqu. Brit.*

But then secondly, It is already cleared in the *Dissertations*, that this *Ecclesiastick* division of *Cities* 4.
into *Mothers* and *Daughters*, *Metropoles* and *inferiour Cities*, was by the *Apostle* copied out from the *Jews*; as when *God* commands by *Moses*, that *Judges* and *Officers* should be *ordained* in every *City*, *Deut.* 16. 18. and that in matters of *weight* and *doubt* they should resort to *Jerusalem*, to the *Judge* and *Sanhedrim* there, according to which it appears that *Jerusalem* was the *Metropolis* of those other *Cities*, and so is evident, *Act.* 9. by the story of *Saul* carrying Letters of *Commission* from the *Sanhedrim* there, to the *consistories* in *Damascus*, and by many other evidences. So likewise *Numb.* 3. when *three Families* of the *Levites*, the *sons* of *Aaron*, were *separated for the service of the Tabernacle*, and an *head* or *Prince* or *President* of every of these, called נשיא *v.* 24. 30. 35. *Eleazar Aaron's Son* is constituted over all these, and styled נשיא נשיאו *the head of the heads of the Levites*. This is clearly a pattern of the *Metropolitanes* in the *Christian Church*, which may therefore own it's derivation from thence, and not from the *Heathen models* of *Government*, which yet it was not reasonable to disturb, being found so *concordant* to, and commodious for it.

And

5. And that what was done in this kind, was done by the *Apostles* themselves and *Apostolical* persons, the first *founders* of Churches, and not only by the *after policy* (as is suggested) of *Christian Emperours* and *Bishops*, might have appeared abundantly by these few testimonies, if they had been worthy to be taken notice of. First, of the *Council* of *Nice*, *An. Domini* 325. not many years after the *conversion* of *Constantine*, the first *Christian Emperour*; the sixth Canon which takes care for the *preserving the priviledges of the Metropolitans* (by name, that the *Bishop* of *Alexandria* should have power over the *Churches* in *Ægypt*, *Lybia* and *Pentapolis*, that in *Antioch* and the rest of the *Provinces* τὰ πρεσβεῖα σώζεσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις, *the priviledges should be preserved to the Churches*) begins with this rule τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, *Let the ancient Customes continue in force*, which certainly refers to that which was long before the *Christian Emperours*, and (without any reason of doubting) to the first *constitutions* of those *Churches* by S. *Mark*, and S. *Peter*, and then the *Canon* goes on to exact this by way of *conformity* with other places, with *Rome* it self, Ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο συνήθες ἐστιν, *for this is the custom of force with the Bishop of* Rome, and upon these grounds the Canon requires καθόλου *universally*, that if any man be made a *Bishop* χωρὶς γνώμης τοῦ Μητροπολίτου, *without the judgement of the Metropolitan, he ought not to be Bishop* ——

6. So in the 9. Canon of the *Council* of *Antioch*, in the year 341. which begins thus, that *the Bishop, which presides in the Metropolis, ought to know the Bishops in every Province, and to take care of the whole Province, διὰ τὸ ἐν τῇ Μητροπόλει πανταχόθεν συντρέχειν πάντας τοὺς τὰ πράγματα ἔχοντας, because all that have business, resort from all sides to the Metropolis* (which is the very thing we now contend, to be the *reason* of conforming the *Ecclesiastick* to the *civil* models) and then proceeds to forbid other *Bishops* acting any thing of such a nature without him; this is backt with these words, καλὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον κρατήσαντα τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν κανόνα, *according to the ancient* Canon *of our Fathers, which hath been in force*, referring again to the *immemorial Custom* of all Churches since the first *Plantation*, and not the *after-policy of Christian Emperours and* Bishops, as is here suggested.

7. Lastly, in the last *canon* of the *Great Council* of *Ephesus*, in the year 431. which is the defining a special matter of Metropolitical right) where the occasion of the *controversy* is rehearsed, how the *Bishop* of *Antioch* invaded the *priviledges* of the *Cypriots*, contrary to the ἀρχαῖον ἔθος the *ancient Custom*, and the Decree is made that the *Bishops* of *Cyprus* shall *retain* them *inviolate*, καλὰ τοὺς κανόνας τῶν ὁσίων πατέρων, καὶ τὴν ἀρχαίαν συνήθειαν, *according to the* Canons *of the Holy Fathers, and the ancient Custom*; The Canon extends it self to all other *Dioceses* and *Provinces*, that no *Bishop* shall meddle with *another Province* ἐκ ὅσαν ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπὸ τὸν αὐτὸν ἦγεν τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν χεῖρα, *which was not upward and from the beginning, under his*, i. e. *his predecessors power*, where it is most evident that the *Metropolitical power*, and *primacy Ecclesiastical* is derived from the *beginning* of the *Plantation* of each *Church*, and consequently that this was a part of *Apostolical policy*, and not only an *after policy of* Christian Emperours, *&c.*

8. And upon these grounds of probation, I shall be competently secured that this is proved, which they do not *believe ever can be*, and have no other argument to prove their *negative*, but their not *believing* the *affirmative*.

SECT. XVIII.

Of the objection against Metropoles from the seven Stars *in seven Churches.*

Numb. 1. OF the same temper is their third *answer*, that they *are fully assured that it can never be made out, that any of these* Asian Angels *were* Archbishops *or* Bishops *over other* Bishops, *or* Bishops *over divers setled Churches. The seven* Stars *are said in Scripture to be fixed in their seven Candlesticks or Churches, not one* Star *over divers Candlesticks or Churches.*

2. What they are already *fully assured* of, that *it can never be made out*, I shall have little confidence to *perswade* them was *formerly* done to their hands; Otherwise I should hope that by what had long since been said, and hath now been more *largely* deduced in *Reply* to their last *answer*, they might find cause to alter their *judgments*, and retract their so *definitive* sentence of *full assurance*.

3. As for the only *appearance* of *reason*, which is here superadded, *viz.* that the *seven Stars* are found *fixed in seven*, not one *over divers Churches*, this I conceive not to be of any force. For it being by us *granted* and presumed that *each* of the *seven Asian Angels* was *Bishop* of his particular *Church*, one of *Ephesus*, another of *Smyrna*, &c. it is perfectly reconcileable herewith, that in case these *seven* were not the only Cities and Churches in *Asia* (as it is certain they were not; all *Asia*, consisting of *many* more Cities, being before this converted to the *Faith*) all the other might have *dependance* on these *seven*.

4. For this we know, that two *Bishops* in *England*, that were each of them fixt in one *City*, for example in *Canterbury* or *York*, had yet each of them a *superiority* or *Metropolitical* power over divers other Cities, and when any *Record* styles one of them *Bishop* of *Canterbury*, as the *Scripture* doth *Angel* of *Ephesus*, we should sure acknowledge it a very infirm inference from the words of that *Record*, to conclude that being *Bishop* of *Canterbury*, he could not be *Metropolitan* of *London*, *Rochester*, &c.

5. And this is the very parallel to the present instance, and if it were not *invalid* enough, by being a bare *negative* argument [*they are not said in Scripture to be one* Star *over divers Churches*] (all things that *are*, are not *said* in *Scripture*; those *Angels* have not therefore no *names*, because they are not there recorded) this parallel instance, which supposes the *contrary* to their pretensions, would be sufficient to *invalidate* it.

SECT.

SECT. XIX.

Of the use of the word Bishop for Archbishop in Tertullian: *Of* Angel *in Christs Epistle.*

A *Fourth Answer*, or rather *confutation*, is added, That *if this opinion were true, then* Tertullian *did not do well in saying that St.* John *made* Polycarp *Bishop of* Smyrna, *but he should rather have said that he made him Archbishop. And our Saviour* Christ *had not given to these seven* Angels *their due Titles, for he must have written to the* Angel *of the Church of* Ephesus, *together with all those Churches in the Cities subordinate to* Ephesus. *And so likewise of the other six.* *Numb.* 1.

To this I reply, that the affirming the *seven Angels* to have been *Metropolitanes*, no way obligeth us to find fault either with *Tertullians* or our *Saviour*'s style. Not with *Tertullian*'s, for first an *Arch-Bishop* is a *Bishop*, though dignified above some others of that order. Secondly, Supposing *Smyrna* to be a *Metropolis* (as no doubt, if it were, *Tertullian* knew and supposed it to be) then his styling *Polycarp Bishop* of *Smyrna*, is equivalent to his calling him a *Metropolitan* or *Archbishop*, As, acknowledging *Canterbury* to be a *Metropolitical See* in *England*, the affirming *William Laud* to be constituted *Bishop* of *Canterbury*, is all one, as to affirm him *Archbishop*. 2.

Thus when * *Chrysostome* saith of *Titus*, that ὁλόκληρος νῆσος καὶ τοσούτων ἐπισκόπων κρίσις, *an intire Island and the judgment of so many Bishops* was committed to him, what is this but to affirm *Titus Archbishop* of *Crete?* And yet † *Eusebius*, who believed this, and adverted to it, as much as *Chrysostome*, uses this phrase, ἀφ' ὅτι Κρήτης ἐκκλησιῶν ἐπισκοπὼν ἐπίνευσα, *that he was Bishop of the* Churches *of* Creet, calling him *Bishop* distinctly, though by the mention of the *Churches* in the *plural*, 'tis evident he meant the same that we do by *Arch-Bishop*. 3. * *In Tit.* 1. *Hom.* 1. † *Lib.*3. *cap.*4.

So again * *Eusebius* of *Irenæus*, that he τὰς κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικίας ἐπεσκόπει, *was Bishop of the Provinces of France*, which must needs signifie *Archbishop* of *Lyons*, for so he was. And 'tis certain that other of the *Antients* use the word Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος *Arch-Bishop*, of those which were no otherwise qualified for that title, as when Saint *Cyprian* the *Bishop* of *Carthage*, under which the whole *Province* of *Africk* is comprehended, is by the † *Council* of *Constantinople* called Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Ἀφρων χώρας, *Archbishop of the region of Africk.* 4. * *Lib.*5.*cap.*23. † *In Trullo. can.* 2.

The same answer will competently suffice, for the reconciling *Christ*'s style and ours; for supposing *Ephesus* to have been a *Metropolis*, the writing to the *Angel* of that *Church*, implies writing to those other *Churches* in the *Cities* subordinate to *Ephesus*, and need not be more fully expresst, as when the *Apostle* wrote to the *Church* of *Corinth*, and not only so, but to *all the Saints* (and so all the *Churches*) *in all Achaia*, 2 *Cor.* 1 1. 'tis certain that the former *Epistle* was written to those very same *Churches* (*viz.* all under the *Metropolis* of *Corinth*) and yet it is inscribed *to the* Church *of* God *which is at* Corinth, 1 *Cor.* 1. 1. without mentioning of *Achaia*, save only in a general *indefinite* phrase, *with all that in every place call on the name of Jesus.* 5.

Secondly, The word in *Christ*'s *Epistle* being not *Bishop* but *Angel*, is not at all lyable to this *exception*; For why may not an *Arch-Bishop* be as fitly called an *Angel*, as a *Bishop* would be? nay if it be remembred what was formerly cited out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Strom.* 6. that there are *seven Angels which have the greatest power*, by him styled πρωτόγονοι Ἀγγέλων ἄρχοντες, *the first-born rulers of the Angels*; parallel to the phrase in *Dan.* 7. 10. 13. שרים הראשנים the *head-Lords* or *chief Princes*, or, as we ordinarily stile them, the *Archangels*, of which number *Michael* is there named to be one, There will then be more than a tolerable *propriety* of speech in *Christ*'s style, a most exact critical notation of their being *Arch-bishops*; and withal, a farther account of *Tertullian*'s calling *Polycarp* a *Bishop* of *Smyrna*, though he were *Arch-Bishop*, just as the *Archangels* in *Daniel*, are more than once called *Angels* in the *Revelation.* 6.

For a close of this matter they are pleased to add their Character, not over-benign of those by whom this *device*, as they style it, *was found out for the honour of Archiepiscopacy*, [*that they did aspire unto that dignity.*] 7.

If hereby be meant the *Lord Primate* of *Ireland* in his discourse of the *Original* of *Bishops*, this character can have no *propriety* in it, he having quietly enjoyed that *dignity* many years before the writing hereof. If it be designed for a reproach to *me*, I shall elude the blow by not thinking it such. For as at a time when *Episcopacy* it self was by the *Parliament* abolisht, (and that *Act* of *severity* actually put in *execution*) it had been a great *folly* in any to hope that he should ever attain to that *Office* of *Dignity* in the *Church*, (and what ever other follies I have been guilty of, truly that was none of them) so I think there could not a point of time more commodiously have been chosen in the space of above sixteen hundred years, wherein a man might have better secured a *Discourse* for *Bishops* and *Metropolitanes*, from the *Censure* of *aspiring* to either of those *Dignities*, than was that, wherein that Book was *published.* 8.

To this if I add by way of *retortion*, that it is evident that they which write this *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici* do aspire every one of them to their part of a *Ruling Presbytery*, which their *brethren* that have not those *Ambitions*, are far from thinking to have any *Divine Stamp* upon it, I shall have given an account of the unskilfulness of their *Reproaches*, as well as of the *invalidity* of their *Answers.* 9.

As for the *fear* which their Discourse on this matter suggests to their more *moderate brethren*, that if a *Jus Divinum be stampt on Archbishops and Primates, and Patriarchs*, they may be *forced* by the same proportion to put a *Divine stamp* upon the *Pope* himself, I perswade my self that I have given the *ingenious* Reader a satisfactory account of the inconsequence hereof, in a *Discourse* of *Schism*, to which I shall refer him, if he need, or desire farther *trouble* or *direction* in this business. 10.

SECT. XX.

Of Division into Parishes, and Union into Dioceses. Of Diocesan Bishops in the Apostles dayes. Elders in every Church, Act. 14. *Elders of the Church,* Act. 20. *That place vindicated from exception.*

Numb. 1. After all this, they add a *fourth* (whether *Answer* or *suppletory Consideration*) for the *conclusion* of this Discourse concerning the *Asian Angels*, and I shall follow them to that more cheerfully, because it looks like a *conclusion*.

2. It is this, *That it can never be proved that these Asian Angels were Bishops in a Prelatical sense, much less Arch-Bishops and Metropolitanes. For it is believed upon all parts, that believers in great Cities, were not divided into set and fixt Congregations and Parishes, till long after the Apostles dayes, and that Parishes were not united into Dioceses till two hundred and sixty years after Christ. And therefore sure we are that there could not be Diocesan Churches and Diocesan Bishops formally so called in the Apostles dayes; These Angels were Congregational, not Diocesan. In the beginning of Christianity the number of Believers, even in the greatest Cities were so few, that they might well meet ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ in the same place. And these were called the Church of the City, and therefore to ordain Elders κατ' ἐκκλησίαν and κατὰ πόλιν, are all one in Scripture.*

3. To the *Preface* of this conclusion, that *it cannot be proved* ——] it is again very sufficient to answer, that when a *proposition* hath already been proved so far, that no answer hath been rendred, which at all satisfies, or invalidates the force of the proofs, it is very unlike Artists to say, that *it cannot be proved*. Nay, although some *inconvenience* were producible, which would press our *assertion* yet the old rule would require it's place, *incommodum non solvit argumentum*, the mention of an *inconvenience* insuing, doth not take off the force of an *argument*.

4. But we need not that warines here; the reason which is here annext to prove that *it cannot be proved*, is of no force against us; For first, As Congregations and Parishes are *synonymous* in their style, so I yield that Believers in great Cities were not at first divided into Parishes, while the number of the Christians in a City was so small, that they might well *assemble* in the *same place*, and so needed no *partitions* or divisions.

5. But what disadvantage is this to us, who affirm that one *Bishop*, not a College of *Presbyters*, presided in this one Congregation, and that the Believers in the Region and Villages about, did belong to the care of that *single Bishop* of the *City-Church*? May not these be ruled by a *Bishop* as well before, as after the division into Parishes? Or is this division more necessary to the *Government* by one *Bishop* in each City, than to the Government of more *Presbyters* in every City? In all reason the division of this one into several Parishes, should make *Presbyters* more necessary after than before such division, that each Parish might have one *Presbyter*, to officiate among them in things of daily use; and upon that account I suppose it was, that when the number of Believers was so far increased, that all the Christians of a City could not meet commodiously in one place, and when the Regions and Villages so abounded with *Proselytes*, that in respect of them also it was necessary, then the *Bishop* of each City thought fit to constitute *Presbyters*, in our modern notion of them, many in every City, and many in every Region, one in every Village, though as yet the word Parish, in our modern sense, was not come into the World.

6. And so this is far from being *Argumentative* against us; it is rather useful to confirm what is asserted by us, that it is against the whole *Scheme* which the Scriptures or first Writers give us of Churches, to imagine that in every City there was by the *Apostles* a *College* of *Presbyters* constituted, when as they agree to assure us, a *Bishop* and his *Deacon* were sufficient at the first (so thin) Plantations.

7. So again when they take it for granted, that Parishes were *not united into Dioceses till two hundred and sixty years after Christ*; I shall ask first, whether they were sooner *divided* into *Classes*, &c. and if not, what they have gained to their *Jus Divinum* by this observation?

8. But then secondly, 'Tis clear that there might be *Dioceses* before this division into *Parishes*, in our modern notion; For what is a *Diocese* but a *Church* in a *City* with the *Suburbs* and *Territory* or *Region* belonging to it? And this certainly might be, and remain under the *Government* of a *single Bishop*, as well *before*, as *after* any more minute distributions into such, as we now call *Parishes*.

9. For it is one thing for the *Church* of this City to be divided from the *Church* of every other City, another thing for the same *Church* to be divided into *many Assemblies*; The first is it which is required for the setting up of *Government*; and of any such *Church* so bounded, there may be a *Bishop*, and that whole *Church* shall be his *Diocese*, and so he a *Diocesan Bishop*, though as yet this *Church* be not subdivided into more several *Assemblies*.

10. And therefore when they add, that *there could not be* Diocesan Churches *and* Bishops *formally so called in the* Apostles *dayes*, unless they have some little *equivocation* in the word *Diocesan*, it is most certain they have no reason on which to found their *confidence*; For that there was a *Church* in each City, and it's *territory* (howsoever *governed* by *one* or *more*) is most certain, and equally affirmed by them and us, and equally their interest and ours, that it be affirmed. As for the use of the word Διοίκησις, that hath oft *varied*, and hath sometimes been of a *larger*, sometimes of a *narrower* signification, and so hath Παροικία the *original* of our *Parish* also; but I hope our contentions must not be always about *words*, when the matter is sufficiently agreed on among us, and the words sufficiently explained to express that matter.

11. And therefore when they add, these *Angels* were *congregational*, not *Diocesan*, the reply is obvious, they were every of them *Angels* of a *Church* in a *City*, having *authority* over the *Region* adjacent, and pertaining to that *City*, and so as *Church* and *Congregation* are all one (as in ordinary use in all languages they are) they were *Congregational* and *Diocesan* also.

12. What follows of the *paucity* of *believers* in the *greatest* Cities, and their *meeting in one place*, as also of

of a *Church* and City being all one, is willingly granted by us, and hath not the least appearance of being *useful* to their pretensions, or *hurtful* to ours, and therefore I have no temptation to make any the least *Reply* to it.

That which next follows, though it concern us not to *examine* it, our interest being equally secured, be it true or false, yet I cannot but take some notice of it in passing, because it is a little *extraordinary*. 13.

Afterwards, say they, *we conceive that belivers became so numerous in these great* Cities, *as that they could not conveniently meet in one place*; *Thus it was in the Church of* Jerusalem, *Act.* 2. 41. *and* 4. 4. *and* 5. 14. *and thus possibly it might be in most of these* Asian Churches *in S.* John's *time*. 14.

Here certainly the word [*Afterwards*] is relative, and refers to the *Antecedent* in the former Paragraph, and that is, [*In the beginning of Christianity*] Hereupon I demand, what time is that which they call [*the beginning of Christianity?*] Is it that wherein Christ continued on the Earth? If so, they will easily believe us, that we do not think, that *Diocesan* Bishops were placed in the Church, within that *period*. If it be the time immediately following the Resurrection of *Christ*, when the Apostles began to preach and propagate the Faith, then how come they to divide that time, which is spoken of, *Act.* 2. 41. from that time of the *beginning* of *Christianity*, by this word [*Afterward*] for tis certain what is there storied of the 3000. Converts, is the effect of the *first Sermon* preached by any of the Apostles immediately upon the descent of the *Holy Ghost* upon them, and the *gift of Tongues*, the wonderment whereof brought those so many Auditors together. 15.

So secondly, when they say of this point of time, *Act.* 2. 41. *The believers were so numerous that they could not conveniently meet in one place*, This is contrary to the evidence of the *Text*, which saith expresly *v.* 44. *That all the believers were* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, which in the *last Paragraph*, they interpreted, *meeting in one and the same place*. The like might be said of the other places *Act.* 4. 4. and 5. 14. for certainly, as yet, though the *number* of *Believers increased*, yet they were not distributed into several *Congregations*. But this by the way, being assured that this disquisition is perfecty extrinsecal to the matter in debate between us, because as at *Jerusalem* the antients are clear in affirming, that soon after Christ's Ascension, * *Peter* and *James* and *John* chose *James the just*, the *Brother of the Lord*, and constituted him *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, which is all that we need pretend to from the story of that Church, so it matters not much, at what *point* of time that was done, whether at the very *beginning* or *afterwards*; much less, how soon it was that that Church was distributed into several divided *Assemblies*, the Creation of the *Bishop* not at all depending on that, as hath formerly been shewed. 16.

* Πέτρον, καὶ Ἰάκωβον τὸν Ἰωάννου — μὴ ἐπιδικάζειν δόξης, ἀλλ' Ἰάκωβον τὸν Δίκαιον ἐπίσκοπον Ἱεροσολύμων ἑλέσθαι. *Euseb. Eccl. Hist.* l. 2. c. 1. *Exc. Clem. Hypotyp.* 5.

Hence will it appear to how very little purpose are those *cautions* added, and *observations* made in the remaining part of this sixth Chapter. 17.

Thus, say they, *possibly it might be* (i. e. the *believers* be so *numerous* in great *Cities*, that they could not *conveniently meet in one place*) *in most of these* Asian *Churches in S.* John's *time*. *But yet notwithstanding all this, there are three things diligently to be observed*; *First*, *that these meeting places were frequented promiscuously and indistinctly, and that believers were not divided into set and fixed Churches or Congregations in the Apostles days*. 18.

But first I demand, Is there any truth in this observation? was not the Church of *Jerusalem* in the Apostles days a set and fixed Church, so as to be perfectly severed from the Church of *Alexandria* and *Ephesus*? Was not *James* the Brother of the Lord *Bishop* of the one, and not of the other? 19.

Secondly, why was this for the *Presbyterians* interest to be so *diligently observed*? If one of these Churches were not thus *divided* and severed from others, how could it be *governed* by a *Presbytery*, as they pretend it was? Must it not be a *determinate fixed* body that is governed by any whether *Bishop* or *Presbyters*? I profess not to be able to discern by my most *diligent observation*, why this was so necessary to be so *diligently observed*. 20.

Secondly, (say they, it must be as *diligently observed*) *that notwithstanding these different meeting places, yet the Believers of one* City *made but one* Church *in the Apostles days, as is evident in the* Church *of* Jerusalem, *which is called a* Church, *not* Churches, *Act.* 8. 1. & 15. 6. & 22. 16. *And so likewise it is called the* Church *of* Ephesus, *and the* Church *of* Thyatira, *&c. not* Churches, *&c.* 21.

This *Observation* I acknowledge to have perfect *truth* in it, and not to be confutable in any part (save only that the two latter *Texts* are certainly *misquoted*, and not rectified in the *Errata*) and therefore instead of rejecting, I shall imbrace it, and from thence *conclude*, that there is no manner of *incongruity* in assigning of one *Bishop* to one *Church*, and so one *Bishop* in the *Church* of *Jerusalem*, because it is a *Church* not *Churches*, being forced to acknowledge that where there were *more Churches* there were *more Bishops*, and so likewise *one Angel* of *Ephesus*, and of *Thyatira*, &c. This I suppose was not the thing they meant to infer from hence, nor indeed do I conceive it necessarily inferred from (only very agreeable to) the *oneness* of each *Church*, without other *arguments* to joyn with it. But I am still to seek, and demand, what advantage accrues to their cause, or disadvantage to ours by this *observation*? 22.

But then thirdly they add, that *this* Church *in the* City *was governed in the Apostles days by the Common Council of* Presbyters *or* Bishops. 23.

This indeed were worth their *diligent observing*, if it could be descried, and would abundantly recompence them for the no profit their *two* former *observations* brought them in, if it could be obtained by all their *diligence*. But this being the τὸ ζητούμενον, the *only* thing in *question* betwixt us, whether the *Church* in each *City* was in the *Apostles* days governed by the *Common Council* of *Presbyters* or *Bishops*, or by one *single Bishop*, called sometimes πρεσβύτερος *Elder* (as that signifies simply a *Governor*, not with restriction, a member of a *Colledge* of *Governours*) this I say being the only *question* in debate between us, it must not be any farther yielded to them, than their *proofs* and evidences will enforce it: And these of what virtue they are, must now appear by the *view* of them. And the first they produce is this. 24.

The Apostles *went about ordaining* Presbyters *in every* Church, *Act.* 14. 23. 25.

26. But surely this is an *infirm* argument. *Every Church* signifies without question *more Churches* than one, viz. *Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, Antioch, v.* 20. 21. And if in *each* of those, *one* Πρεσβύτερος be supposed to be *ordained*, that certainly will satisfie the importunity of that *Text*, and the mention of πρεσβυτέρους *Elders* in the *plural*, viz. *four Elders* in those so many *Churches*. And if, because ἐκκλησίαν is in the *singular number*, they therefore think that those *plural Elders* must be *ordained* in *each* of those *Churches*; This is too gross a mistake for *Scholars* to be guilty of, it being certain that that is not the *importance* of the phrase καθ' ἐκκλησίαν, any more than of the *English* [*Church by Church*] or [*in every Church*] i. e. *more Elders* in *more Churches*, *one* in every *one*.

27. Their next *proof* is from *Act.* 20. 17. Paul *called for the Elders of the Church of* Ephesus (*one of these seven Churches*) *and calls them Bishops, and commits the whole government of the Church to them*; *The like may be said of the other six* Churches.

28. What may be said of *Ephesus*, I grant may be said of the *other six Churches*, but the *Text* no where affirms it of *Ephesus*, and so the *analogy* will no way prove it of the *rest*. All that the *Text* saith, is this, *And from* Miletus *he sent to* Ephesus, *and called the Elders of the* Church. This is not to say the *Elders* (as that signifies *Presbyters* in our *modern* notion) of the *one City*, and so *Church* of *Ephesus*, but the *Elders*, i. e. *Bishops* either of the *Asian Church* of that whole *Region*, or at least of the *Ephesine Province*, the neighbouring *Bishops* of the *Churches* or *Cities* that were under that *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, who by St. *Paul*'s sending his summons to *Ephesus*, the *chief City* of the one, and *chief Metropolis* of the other (which consequently had daily means of *communicating* intelligence to those other *Cities*) might thus most *commodiously* be advertised of St. *Paul*'s coming, and provide to meet him at *Miletus*.

29. That this is no *strain'd interpretation* or answer, is elsewhere evidenced, and may summarily appear by these two testimonies; one of *Irenæus* here formerly mentioned, *l.* 3. *c.* 14. *ab Epheso & reliquis proximis civitatibus convocatos esse*, *that they were called from* Ephesus *and the rest of the neareſt Cities* adjoining to it; This is an *expres* evidence, which being allowed puts the whole matter out of *question*. And although in a matter of *fact*, a *testimony* of so credible a person that lived so near the times, being an *auditour* of *Polycarp* the first *Bishop* of *Smyrna*, and is not contradicted by any *contemporary*, is of a competent *authority*, and need not any other *Topicks* to assist it; yet for the removing all possible prejudices from it, and rendring it yet more *indubitable*. I shall a little farther enlarge for the confirming of it.

30. And first the *Apostle* at his meeting with them, *v.* 18. begins in this *style*, *ye know from the first day that I came into* Asia, *after what manner I have been with you at all seasons*; An address to them, either as to the *Elders* of *Asia* indefinitely, as many as could conveniently come to *Miletus* at that time, or at least as to more than to the *Elder* (or *Elders*, if that could be truly pretended) of *one* City of *Asia*, peculiarly, or *exclusively* to all others.

31. So again *v.* 25. *And now behold I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the Kingdom of God, shall see my face no more*; This evidently addresses the speech not only to the inhabitants of *one City*, but to all those (as many as were then present) *among whom he had gone preaching the Faith of Christ*, and that we know was done by him to the *other Cities*, and not only to that of *Ephesus*, καὶ τὸν παρόδον τὸν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διαπορεύων κύκλον, *in passage* (though not so solemnly as at *Ephesus*) *going through all the Region and preaching the Gospel to all*, saith *Oecumenius* on 2 *Joh.* And so 'tis expressly said *Act.* 19. 21. that after the *two years* and *three months* spent at *Ephesus*, ἐπέσχε χρόνον εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν, *he staid* and *spent some time in* Asia, And accordingly *v.* 26. *Demetrius* truly saith, that *not only at* Ephesus *but almost throughout all* Asia, Paul *had perswaded and turned away the people*.

32. Secondly then, the *Faith* being before this time successfully propagated through all *Asia*, and not only in this one *City* of *Ephesus*, there were without question Churches accordingly gathered and compacted in many other *Cities*, as well as in *Ephesus*, before this time of *Paul*'s parting never to *see* them again. And not only in the other *Metropolis*, (*six* more of which are owned by the *Objectors*, *Smyrna* and the rest *Rev.* 1.) but also in the *lesser* Cities, which were not *Metropolitical*, and yet more especially in those Cities which were neareſt *Ephesus*, and which as belonging to that *Metropolis*, had frequent resort thither to the *Assises* which were there kept, *Act.* 19. 38. and so must be supposed to have received special influences from the *Apostle*'s residing there for the space of *two years* and *three months*, Act. 19. 8. 10.

33. To which purpose it must again be remembred, that as *Timothy* is by *Eusebius* styled τῆς ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας ἐπίσκοπος, *Bishop of the Province that belongs to* Ephesus, *l.* 3. *c.* 4. which is all one as to make that a *Metropolis* over other Cities, and accordingly in the order of *Metropolitical Sees* at the end of *Codinus*, the *Bishop* of *Ephesus* is called ὁ Ἐφέσου ὑπέρτιμος, ἢ Ἐξαρχος πάσης Ἀσίας, *Primate of all Asia*, so *Ignatius* in *Trajan*'s time is by joint consent of the *antients* affirmed to have written *Epistles* to two *Churches*, *Magnesia* and *Trallis*, which are known to be *Cities* under this *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, and to have named the *Bishops* of each, *Damas* of the one, and *Polybius* of the other.

34. And as there is no question among any, but that *Ignatius* wrote such *Epistles* to those *Churches* (*Salmasius* cites that to the * *Trallians* expressly as the *Epistle* of *Ignatius*, which certainly he would never have done, if he had doubted whether ever *Ignatius* wrote to them; and indeed, all that is questioned by him and D. *Blondell* is but this, whether the *Epistles* now extant under his name, be *genuine* or no, not whether *Ignatius*, as all Writers accord, wrote *seven Epistles*, of which these which we now speak of, are two) so there is no ground of imagining that they were of a *later plantation*, than that which is here recorded to be wrought by St. *Paul*, *Act.* 19. *All* Asia *having then heard the Faith*, v. 10. and received it in a remarkable manner, *v.* 20. and a *great door*, saith St. *Paul*, being *opened* to him at *Ephesus* peculiarly, which must needs have influence on the Cities next adjoining to it in a *special* manner.

* *Anacletum & Clementem Petri Ministros facit Ignatius in Epistolâ ad Trallenses* Wal. Mess. p. 222.

35. To this I shall add thirdly, that as † *Aristides* saith of *Ephesus*, that it was ταμιεῖον κοινὸν τῆς Ἀσίας, the *common magazine* or *store-house* of *Asia*, ἢ τῆς χρείας καταφυγὴ, their *refuge for all wants*, so it must needs be the fittest way of conveying *intelligence* speedily to all the *Cities* of *Asia*, especially the *proxima civitates*, as *Irenæus* said, the *Cities next adjoining*, and so most commodious to assemble those other

† *Or ad Asiat. Civ. de concord.*

other *Bishops* to *Paul* at *Miletus*, and not only him, or those that are supposed to have resided at *Ephesus*.

And accordingly we find in *Eusebius*, that the *Epistle* of *Antoninus Pius* concerning the *Christians*, 36.
which was to be communicated to all *Asia*, προεκλήθη ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἐν τῷ κοινῷ τῆς Ἀσίας, *was proclaimed* ✱ *Eccl. Hist. l. 4.*
divulged at Ephesus, *in the common meeting of* Asia, as the readiest way to make it *universally* *c. 23.*
known.

All which being premised, and withal that there is no reason to imagine, that St. *Paul* at the time 37.
of his *final* parting, (taking his solemn last leave) of them *v.* 38. should not so much consider, as to call for, or desire to see any of the *rest* of his *Sons*, the *Governours* of the Inferiour *Churches*, to whom he had committed that numerous flock (which was now so *universally* in such danger of *Wolves*) save only those of the *one Church*, of that *one* City of *Ephesus* (supposing there had been more than one there :) This will be a very competent *confirmation* of *Irenæus* his *testimony*, that indeed thus it was, as he hath delivered, that the *Bishops* of the Cities nearest adjoining to *Ephesus* (as many as by *summons* from thence could speedily be called together, in all reason the *Bishops* of the Cities which were under that *Metropolis*) were sent for to meet the *Apostle* at *Miletus*, and accordingly met him there.

The second *testimony* is that maxime of the *Greek Scholiast* on 1 *Pet.* 1. 5. Πρεσβυτέρους γὰρ τοὺς ὁπισκόπους ἡ τῶν Πράξεων βίβλος οἶδε λεγομένους. *The Book of the* Acts *calls the Bishops Elders*; which being 38.
avow'd by me in the *Dissertations*, and cleared through all the places in the *Acts*, they ought, by all Laws of *disputing*, either to have endeavoured the *refuting* of what is there said, or the proving that Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* must needs there signifie *Presbyters* in the *modern* notion, which having not here attempted to do, there is no kind of force in what is here *dictated*, nothing said but what had been long since largely and clearly *answered*.

Yet because in the next *Chapter*, where this place of the *Acts* is viewed again, one argument I see 39.
produced in favour of their *pretensions*, which they found in an *observation* of mine, I shall think my self concern'd to give an account of it.

It is this, Pag. 85. *If the Apostle by the Elders of the* Church *had meant the Bishops of the* Church *of all* 40.
Asia, *he would have said, not the Elders of the* Church, *but of the* Churches. *It is an observation made use of by one of those that makes use of this answer we are now confuting, That when the Scripture speaks of* Churches *in* Cities, *it always useth the singular number, as the* Church *of* Jerusalem, *the* Church *of* Corinth, &c. *but when it speaks of Provinces where there are many* Cities, *then it uses the plural number, as the* Churches *of* Judæa, *and the* Churches *of* Asia, *Rev.* 1. 11. *According to this observation, if the Apostle had meant of the Bishops of all* Asia, *he would have said the Elders of the* Churches, *whereas he calls them Elders of the* Church, *v.* 17. *and so must mean the Elders of the* Church *of* Ephesus, *and so meer* Presbyters, *not* Bishops.

But herein is a manifest *mistake*; For the *observation* is not made as is here suggested, of Churches 41.
in Cities and Provinces, that the former of them are *constantly* to be understood, where there is mention of a Church in the *singular* number (without any name of *particular* City added to it) and that when a Province is mention'd, 'tis always done by Churches in the *plural* number; This is the sense on which their *argument* is founded. But if the *Reader* consult the *Dissertations*, *p.* 190. He shall find there is no such thing, 'tis only this, That in the *New Testament* there is mention made of Churches in the *plural* number, the Churches of *Judæa*, of *Samaria*, of *Galilee*, of *Syria*, of *Cilicia*, of *Galatia*, of *Asia*, of *Macedonia*, whereas in other places there was as frequent mention of a Church in the *singular*, the Church in *Jerusalem*, in *Antioch*, in *Cenchrea*, in *Corinth*, of the *Thessalonians*, of *Ephesus*, of *Smyrna*, of *Pergamus*, of *Thyatira*, of *Sardis*, of *Laodicea*.

The cause of that difference is there said to be this, that *Judæa*, &c. was the name of a Province, 42.
in which there being many Cities, there were consequently many Churches and Bishops in them; whereas one City with the *territory* adjoining to it, being ruled by one *single Bishop*, was to be called a *singular Church*, and therefore that which is said to be done in *every Church*, Acts 14. 13. is said to be done in *every* City, *Tit.* 1. 5. The sum of which observation is only this, that one City, with the *territory* adjoining to it, never makes above one Church in the *Scripture* style, whereas a *Province* or *Country*, or *Nation* consists of *many Cities*, and so of many Episcopal *Sees* or Churches.

This was all that was said in that place, or that was useful to be said in order to the end (to shew 43.
the *Original* of *Metropolitanes*) there. And what a wresting of a plain obvious observation is it, to conclude it from hence to be my *assertion*, that *when* (that must be, *whensoever*, or else the *conclusion* cannot be deducible from it) *the Scripture speaks of a Province, it is in the plural number?* It doth sometimes do so, and that was all that was useful to me. If it had done so but once, though twenty times it had done the contrary, it had been sufficient (for some reasonable account there must be, for the doing it *once*, and what could that be, but the *number* of the Cities and so of Churches in each *Province* or *Nation*) much more when there were so *many* examples of it.

But this is not to *affirm* that it always doth so, especially when being left at large without any re- 44.
straint, not the Church of *Ephesus*, or the like, but *indefinitely* the Church, it is very capable of another *interpretation*. For sure when I wrote that, I had not forgotten my *Creed*, or in it the name *Church* in the *singular* number, which by the adjunct of *Catholick* must needs be more than the *Church* of one *City*. And having read *Mat.* 16. where the whole *Church* of *Christ* is called *my Church* in the *singular*, a like phrase to that of the *Church of God*, which the Bishops here are commanded to *feed*, and in the one *Epistle* to the *Ephesians* having *six* examples of the word *Church* in the *singular*, each signifying evidently the *universal Church*, I might very well be allowed to discern the word *Church* in the *singular*, without any addition of *Ephesus* or the like, which restrains it in all the *examples* there produced, to be appliable to a far *larger* body, than the *Church* of *one* City, and consequently be quit from all *obligation* of making the *Elders* of the *Church*, *Act.* 20. 17. the *Elders* of the *one* City of *Ephesus*.

There is little doubt I suppose, but the *Church* of the whole World, consisting of many Churches, 45.
as the parts thereof, may be, and is in *Scripture* called the *Church* in the *singular*, and so certainly may the *Church* of a *Nation* or a *Province*, especially if it be united together under one *Primate* or *Metropolitane*,

politane, as it is certain the *Churches* and *Cities* neer *Ephesus*, nay over all *Asia* were, according to the plain words of S. *Chrysostome*, who when * others affirm of *Timothy* that he was by *Paul* ordained *Bishop* of the *Metropolis* of *Ephesus*, expresseth the same thing thus, Δῆλον ὅτι ἐκκλησίαν λοιπὸν ὁ Παῦλος ἐπιτετραμμένος ὁ Τιμόθεος, ἢ μᾶλλον ὅλον τὸ τῆς Ἀσίας, *It is manifest that* Timothy *had a Church committed to him, or indeed an intire Nation, that of Asia.* The like is ordinarily observable of *Crete*, a whole *Island* with an *hundred* Cities in it (in each of which *Titus* was appointed to ordain a *Bishop* or *Elder*) which yet is stiled in the subscription of the *Epistle* to *Titus*, ἡ τῶν Κρητῶν ἐκκλησία, *the Church of Crete*, and the *subscription* never questioned upon that score by any, that it spake *improperly* herein.

* Τιμόθεος ὑπὸ τοῦ μεγάλου Παύλου χειροτονεῖται τῶν Ἐφεσίων μητροπόλεως Ἐπίσκοπος. *Anon. ap. Phot. num.* 254.

46. And consequently there can be no harshness in this interpretation, Paul *sent to* Ephesus *and call'd the Elders of the Church* to come to him to *Miletus*, and in his *Oration* addrest to them, called them *Bishops* of the *flock* and of the *Church of God*, meaning them *singular prafects* of several Cities of the *Church* of *Asia*, especially of those which were nearest *Ephesus*, the chief *Metropolis* of the whole Nation.

47. And so much in answer to that Objection, in defence of their argument from the Elders of *Ephesus*, as they call them.

48. Another *proof* of the same is there added *Pag.* 85. Thus, *The Syriack translation reads it, he sent to* Ephesus, *and called the* Elders of the Church *of* Ephesus, *so Hierome, Presbyteros Ecclesiæ Ephesinæ*, so *Concilium Aquisgranense*.

49. What authority S. *Hierome*'s testimony is to carry with us in this matter, hath been elsewhere largely shewed, and we may hereafter have farther occasion to declare it, and our *reasons* of it. At the present it is willingly confest, that S. *Hierome* on *Tit.* 1. doth indeavour to prove that in *Scripture*, *Bishop* and *Presbyter* is the same, and from him *Isidore Hispalensis de officiis Eccl.* l. 2. hath the same, and both have according to that *prolepsis* changed the words of the *Text* in the *Acts*, and instead of what there we read, *sent to* Ephesus *and called the* Elders *of the Church*, *they* read, *sent to* Ephesus *and called the* Elders *of the same Church*, expressing themselves to mean of the *Church* of *Ephesus*. And the *Council* of *Aken* (*Aquisgranense*) having transcribed *nine Chapters* from *Isidore verbatim*, consequently do the like. So that the authority of *Isidore* and that *Council* being as great as S. *Hierome* can make it, from whom evidently it proceeds, may yet be allowed to yield to the far greater authority of *Polycarp*'s *Auditor Irenæus* who hath sufficiently cleared it to the contrary.

50. As for the *Syriack* translation, it is not here recited exactly accordingly, to the truth, For in that, thus the words lie: ומנה מז מיליטוס שרר איתי לקשישא רעדתא דאפסוס *And from* Miletus *he sent and called for the* Elders *of the Church of* Ephesus, where is but *one* mention of *Ephesus*, not *two*, as is here suggested from the *translation*, that it reads, *he sent to* Ephesus *and callell the* Elders *of the Church of* Ephesus. The short of it is, *Ephesus* being but once named in that verse, the *Greek* placeth it in the *beginning* Ἀπὸ Μιλήτου πέμψας εἰς Ἔφεσον, *from* Miletus *he sent to Ephesus*, and this being the *Original* must certainly over-rule all *translations*, and accordingly all *translations* but one so read it, only the *Syriack* hath mis-placed the word *Ephesus*, put it in the *latter* part of the period, quite against all *Syntaxis*, and for doing so, are here cited, and their *testimony* made use of to assist *Presbytery*, when the manifest truth in the *Original*, and by all other *translations* acknowledged, would not allow them any the least *advantage*.

51. After they had produced these two arguments, to prove that the *Church* in the *City* was *governed* in the *Apostles* days by a *Common Council* of *Presbyters*, the Reader would hardly expect that which now next follows in these words.

52. *From all this we gather, that the* Asian *Angels were not Diocesan Bishops, but Congregational* Presbyters, *seated each of them in one Church, not any of them in more than one.*

53. This *Conclusion*, as the words lie, consists of two parts, 1. That *each* of these *Asian Angels*, under the title of *Congregational Presbyters*, was *seated in one Church*; This, if it were meant, as the words sound, were the granting to us all that we contend for, and would hardly be reconciled with the *third observation*, that the *Church* in the *City* was governed by the *Common Council* of *Presbyters*; For sure *each* of those *Presbyters* is not a *Common Council*; But I rather believe they have not so soon disclaimed their *premisses*, and therefore that it is more reasonable to interpret their *words* by their *principles*, than their *meaning* by their *words*, and so that by *Congregational Presbyters* they meant so many *Colledges* of such *Presbyters*, seated *each* of them, *i. e.* each of those *Colledges* in *one Church*; And if that be their *Conclusion*, I must acknowledge it to accord perfectly with their *premisses*, which being already *answered*, there remains no force in the *Conclusion*.

54. And for the second part, that *not any of them was seated in more than one*, understanding it again as the words sound, it is no way *contrary* to our *pretensions*, for we do not think that the *Angel* of *Ephesus* was seated in *Smyrna*, or in any *Church* but that of *Ephesus*, and the *territory* thereof; and although as that was a *Metropolis*, other *Cities* were under it, and so other *Bishops subordinate* to the *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, yet was not any other *City* the *Seat* of that *Metropolitane*, but only *Ephesus*, whereof he takes his denomination, as although *Rochester* be under the *Metropolis* of *Canterbury*, yet the *Archbishop* of *Canterbury* is not seated at *Rochester*, but some other *Bishop* affixt to that *City* and *Diocese*. As for any other meaning of it, proportionable to that which we were fain to affix to the former, I confess my self ignorant what it can tend to; For it is as if they should say, not any *Council* of *Presbyters* was seated in more *Churches* than one. Which is as if they should say, no *one body* is in *several* places. And I know no *Prelatist* that either *directly* or by *consequence* hath affirmed it is.

55. What remains in the last *Paragraph* of this *Chapter*, is only to state the *Question* betwixt us, which is all the while no more but this, whether *Tertullian and* Irenæus *that call* Polycarp *and* Onesimus *Bishop of* Smyrna *and* Ephesus, *mean Bishops, διαιρετικῶς in a peculiar sense, or in a general phrase, as all* Presbyters *are called Bishops*. And this I acknowledge to be the *only question* between us, and if Bishops do signify Bishops, I cannot doubt but the cause is by them adjudged on *our side*; And why it should not, they have, to conclude, only this offer of *argument*, that *Bishops* and *Presbyters* had all one name in the *Apostles* days, and long after in *Irenæus*'s time.

I am

I am truly weary of the length of this *Chapter*, and cannot but by conſent have ſome *compaſſion* on the Reader, and therefore I ſhall bring the matter to this ſhort iſſue. This *reaſon* of theirs is no *reaſon*, unleſs the word *Biſhop*, both in the *Apoſtles dayes* and long after *Irenæus*'s time, ſignified a *Presbyter* in our *modern* notion; For if both ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος *Biſhop* and *Elder* ſignified *Biſhop* in our notion, this again gives the cauſe to us from them. And upon theſe terms I am content to leave it; if ever they find in *Irenæus* that *Epiſcopus* ſignifies a *Presbyter* in our *modern* notion, I will confeſs them Conquerours; but this they have not offered here to do, and I have ſome moderate aſſurance they never will. 56.

And ſo much for that *Chapter*.

CHAP. II.

Of the equivalence of the words Biſhop *and* Elder *in the New Teſtament.*

SECT. I.

Four ſorts of equivalence of theſe words propoſed.

THE next place where I find my ſelf called forth, is about the midſt of their *ſeventh Chapter*, toward the bottom of *pag.* 92. *Only for the concluſion of this Diſcourſe*, &c. for although in the former part of that *Chapter* they undertake to vindicate their *chief* proofs of *Scripture*, Act. 20. 17. 28. *Phil.* 1. 1. 1 *Tim.* 3. 1 *Pet.* 5. and to make replies to the *Anſwers* given to them, and although it is moſt certain that in the *Diſſertations* every of thoſe places are anſwered, and ſhew'd to be fully reconcileable with our *pretenſions* for *Prelacy*, yet they have not pleaſed to take any notice of what is there ſaid, which if they had done, I might, without inſolence, undertake to ſhew, that it had prevented all appearance of force in any of their *Replies*; And therefore being by this means perfectly freed from all obligation to view any *Paragraph* of that former part of the *Chapter*, and having already ſaid ſomewhat to the chief of their places, *Act.* 20. and foreſeeing a fit opportunity for the reſt, I ſhall for my own, and the *Readers* eaſe, punctually expect and obey the Summons, appear when I am call'd before them, but no ſooner, avert their *charge*, and not multiply debates above what is *neceſſary*. *Numb.* 1.

Thus then they begin, that *there is a Doctor, a high Prelatiſt*, &c. *That in a late Book of his hath undertaken to make out theſe two great Paradoxes*, 1. *That whereſoever the word Biſhop is uſed in the New Teſtament, it is to be taken in a prelatical ſenſe.* 2. *That whereſoever the word Presbyter is uſed in the New Teſtament, it is to be underſtood, not of a meer* Presbyter, *but of a Biſhop properly ſo called. And whereas we ſay that the Scripture-Biſhop is nothing elſe but a* Presbyter, *and that there was no* Biſhops *diſtinct from* Presbyters *in the Apoſtles dayes, this Author on the contrary ſaith, that the Scripture-Presbyter is a true Biſhop, and that there were no ſingle and meer Presbyters in the Apoſtles dayes. For our parts we do not think it neceſſary to take a particular ſurvey of all that is ſaid in juſtification of theſe Paradoxes, only we deſire it may be conſidered.* 2.

There is ſo much of the ſenſe of ſome paſſages in the *Diſſertations* ſet down in theſe words, that I am forced to believe, that I am the *Author* here charged for theſe two *Paradoxes*. That they are ſo ſtyled by thoſe who are contrary minded, and who have aſſumed a power, which, if either of theſe *propoſitions* be true, they muſt be obliged to part with, I cannot think ſtrange; And if I ſhould ſtyle their *aſſertions* as perfectly *Paradox* (*i. e.* as *contrary* to all the *antients* ſenſe or *Doctrine* in this matter) when they ſay that the *Scripture-Biſhop* is nothing elſe but a *Preſbyter*, &c. this were certainly an *introduction* fit to be *confronted* to theirs, as being equally *argumentative*. But becauſe this *verbal* eloquence hath little of *efficacy* in it, and will never be a means of evincing the truth of our pretenſions, by affirming the contrary to be *errours* or *Paradoxes*, and becauſe what is affixt to me, is not intirely my ſenſe, though it recite it in ſome part, and approach near to it, I ſhall here begin with a brief relation of what is affirmed by the *Diſſertations* in this matter, and then inquire what is here produced to invalidate it. 3.

Diſſert. 4. *c.* 6. the method leading to the conſideration of the word [*Biſhop*] and [*Elder*] in the *Scripture*, the firſt thing taken notice of was the ἰσοδυναμία or *equivalence* of theſe words in the opinion of many. To which purpoſe *Theodoret*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Oecumenius*, and S^t *Hierome* are cited, as favourers of this opinion, but this with ſome difference of the one from the other. And for the diſtinct ſtating of the *Queſtion*, four ſenſes were ſet down, wherein it was poſſible that this *equivalence* of the words might be underſtood. 1. That both *Biſhop* and *Elder* ſhould ſignifie one and the ſame, *viz.* a *Biſhop* in our *modern* notion. 2. That both ſhould ſignifie the ſame thing, *viz.* a *Preſbyter*. 3. That both of them ſhould ſignifie promiſcuouſly, ſometimes a *Biſhop*, ſometimes a *Preſbyter*, *i. e.* that the word Ἐπίσκοπος ſhould ſometime ſignifie a *Biſhop*, ſometime a *Preſbyter*, and in like manner Πρεσβύτερος ſignifie ſometime a *Biſhop*, ſometime a *Preſbyter*. 4. That the word *Biſhop* ſhould always ſignifie a *ſingular Biſhop*, and the word *Elder* ſometimes a *Biſhop*, and ſometimes a *Presbyter*. 4.

Of theſe *four* ſenſes of the *equivalence* of theſe words, it was ſure no error to conclude, that they were not all of them true, each being *excluſive* of the other three; and although ſome of the *antients* might be brought in favour to one, more than to the other, yet this was eminently obſervable, that thoſe that favoured that *ſpecies*, which is moſt for the *Presbyterians* intereſt to be accepted, do yet aſſert the cauſe of the *Prelatiſts* as confidently as any. So *Theodoret*, who ſeems moſt to aſſert the *ſecond ſpecies*, doth yet propugn the μείζων τιμὴ, the *ſuperiour dignity* of *Biſhops* above *Presbyters*, and affirms, * Thoſe who were in his time called *Biſhops* (the *ſingular prefects* of *Cities*) to have been ſtyled *Apoſtles* in the *Scripture*-times, and that *Epaphroditus* was called ſo by S^t *Paul*, 5.

* Τὰς νυνὶ καλουμένας ἐπισκόπους Ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζον, &c. Theod. in 1 Tim. 3. 1.

as

as being *Biſhop* of the *Philippians*, and ſo ſaith he, *Titus* was *Apoſtle* of the *Cretans*, and *Timothy* of the *Aſiaticks*.

6. So when *Chryſoſtome*, and *Theophylact*, and *Oecumenius* approve of the third *ſpecies*, and affirm Biſhops to be called Presbyters (and Deacons alſo) and on the contrary Presbyters to be called Biſhops, yet of each of them it is notorious, that they aſſerted the *ſuperiority* of Biſhops over Presbyters, not only in their own, but in the Apoſtles time. And to that purpoſe the *conceſſion* and *teſtimony* of *Peter Moulin* was produced, that the *moſt famous Biſhops of the antient Church, Chryſoſtome*, &c. *did not think it any diminution to their dignity that the words Biſhop and Elder were at firſt conceived to be uſed in the ſame ſenſe*; which obſervation being premiſed, and thereby the *Prelatiſts* pretenſions competently ſecured, which ſoever of thoſe ſenſes ſhould be accepted, ſo long as they that were authors of the *aſſertions* be permitted to give their own *interpretation* of them; It was then, I thought, perfectly *ſeaſonable* and ſafe to diſcuſs the *queſtion* freely, and to ſet down what to me appeared moſt *probable*, without *prejudice* to any other *Diſſenter*, and upon thoſe terms, and not otherwiſe, theſe two *propoſitions* were offered to farther conſideration of *learned* men.

In *Phil* 1. and *Act.* 20. and 1 *Pet.* 5. 1.

Epiſt. 1. *ad Epiſc. Winton.*

7. 1. *That the word* Ἐπίσκοπος *in Scripture conſtantly ſignifies a ſingular Biſhop.*

2. *That the word* Πρεσβύτερος *either conſtantly ſignifies a Biſhop alſo, or elſe commonly a Biſhop, and ſometime, but rarely, a Presbyter.*

8. Theſe are ſomewhat different from the *two paradoxes* affixt to me, and in theſe terms I ſhall now reſume them again, and clear them to be no *paradoxes*. And begin firſt with the former of them, concerning the word Ἐπίσκοπος *Biſhop*. And this is already done, Firſt, By conſidering the *original* notation, and uſe in the *Old Teſtament*, of the word Ἐπίσκοπος, then by going over every place in the *New Teſtament*, where the word *Biſhop* is uſed.

SECT. II.

Of the word Ἐπίσκοπος.

Numb. 1. THE word Ἐπίσκοπος naturally ſignifying an *overſeer*, and uſed by *Ariſtides* for ἡγεμὼν the *Governour*, the ſame that *Juſtinian* calls Ἄρχων ἐπαρχιῶν ἢ Μητροπόλεως, *the Ruler of Provinces and Metropoles*, and by *Cicero ad Atticum* rendred *ſpeculator & cuſtos*, one that *looks* to, and *guards* a *Province* (and ſo fitly ſtyled *Angel*, who is generally deemed to have thoſe two *Offices*, and is in the *Scripture* called an *eye*, and vulgarly a *Guardian*) doth in the *Greek* of the *Old Teſtament* ſometime render the *Hebrew* אֵר, which is common to *God*, *Lord*, *Angel*, and generally denotes *Dominion*; ſometimes מִמְכָּר a *Prefect* or *Commiſſary*, intruſted with the *adminiſtration* of ſome affair, whether in *Army*, as a *Commander*, *Numb.* 31. 14. in *Mechanical* working, as a *Maſter-workman*, 2 Chron. 34. 12. 17. in a *City*, a *Ruler*, or *Prince*, Nehem. 11. 9. peculiarly the *chief* of the *Prieſts*, v. 10. in the *Miniſtery* of the *Temple* as *Eleazar* (the *Ruler* of the *Levites*) *Num.* 4. 16. and laſtly in the *Houſe of the Lord*, the *Ruler ſet* over that, 2 *Kin.* 11. 18. And the reſult of all this is, that it generally ſignifies an *office* of *charge* and *dignity* and *power* and *ſuperiority* over others, all one with ὑπασπίστης, πρεσβύτης, ἄρχων, κωμάρχης, τοπάρχης, which are all uſed to render the ſame word that Ἐπίσκοπος doth, and ſo is moſt fitly qualified to ſignifie the like, *viz.* a *prefecture* in the *Chriſtian Church* under the *New Teſtament*.

2. Accordingly there we find it applied, Firſt, To *Chriſt* himſelf, the *Biſhop of our Souls*, who though he *miniſtred* to his *Diſciples*, yet owned the title of *Lord* and *Maſter*, as that which from them belonged to him, *Joh.* 13. 13. Secondly, To the *Apoſtles* Act 1. 20. And for all other places where it is uſed, it is evidently capable of a ſenſe very agreeable to theſe premiſſes, being never once uſed in the *New Teſtament*, but where it will be very commodious to render it *Biſhop* in our modern notion of the word, for a *ſingular prefect* in each *Church*, not a *Collegue* in a *Presbytery*.

3. This is at large ſhew'd by a ſurvey of every of thoſe places; Firſt, That of *Act.* 20. 28. where the *Apoſtle* takes leave, and exhorts the *Biſhops* ſet over the *flock* by the *Holy Ghoſt*: They are there bid to *feed the Church of God*, i. e. the *Chriſtians* of the ſeveral Cities of *Aſia*, or near about *Epheſus*, as was in the *laſt* Chapter evidenced out of *Irenæus*, Auditor to *Polycarp*, made *Biſhop* of *Smyrna* by S^t *John*, and therefore may well be reſolved to be the *ſingular Biſhops* of thoſe Cities, and not only of the one City of *Epheſus*, as was largely ſhewed in the *laſt* Chapter.

4. The *ſecond* place is that of *Phil.* 1. 1. where after the mention of all the *Saints in* Chriſt Jeſus *which are at* Philippi, *is added*, *with the Biſhops and Deacons*; where although ſome of the *Greek Commentators*, which at the ſame time aſſert *Epiſcopacy*, do for that very reaſon, becauſe there could not be *many Biſhops* in one City, underſtand that place of *Presbyters* in our modern notion, and add that the words * *Biſhop* and *Presbyter*, yea and *Deacon* too, were not as yet diſtinct, but promiſcuouſly uſed, the one for the other; here the word *Biſhops* for *Presbyters*, as elſewhere the *Presbytery* is uſed for *Biſhops*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 4. adding this reaſon †, becauſe *Presbyters* ordained not a *Biſhop*; And although many expedients were ready at hand to keep the *Text* from being uſeful to the *Presbyterians*, in caſe it were granted that by *Biſhops* the *Presbyters* were meant, as that *Epaphroditus* their preſent *Biſhop* (as is acknowledged by *Theodoret*, *Chryſoſtome* and *Theophylact*, who are moſt favourable to that interpretation) was with S^t *Paul* at the writing that *Epiſtle*, *c.* 4. 18. yet I have the authority of *Epiphanius* to affirm, that ἐπίσκοποι there ſignifies peculiarly *Biſhops*, and I doubt not but it may do ſo, referring it to all the *Biſhops* of the *ſeveral* Cities belonging to that *Metropolis*.

* Εἶπε τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους, ἃ γὰρ δὲ ἐν μιᾷ πόλει πολλοὶ ἦσαν ἐπίσκοποι, ἔπω γὰρ ἦσαν διακεκριμένα τὰ ὀνόματα, *Theophyl.* in *Phil.* 1. 1.

† Οὐ γὰρ πρεσβυτέροις τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἐχειροτόνουν.

For ſuch was *Philippi*, both as the *Firſt-fruits* of all *Macedonia*, firſt converted to the *Faith*, *Act.* 16. 9. and πρώτη τῆς μερίδος Μακεδονίας πόλις, *a prime City of that Province of Macedon*, v. 12. of it ſelf, before it's *converſion*, and ſo ſaith * *Photius* diſtinctly, Ἡ Φιλίππων πόλις τῆς Μακεδόνων ἐπαρχίας μητρόπολις ὅσα, and accordingly *Polycarps Epiſtle* to them is inſcribed τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παροικούσῃ Φιλίππους to the whole *Province* that belongs to *Philippi*; In which there being diverſe Cities, and *Biſhops* in them,

5. * *Epiſt.* 247.

them, the *Epiſtle* to S. *Paul* is to be conceived written to them all, (as the *Epiſtle* to the *Corinthians* appears to have been written to the Saints of all *Achaia*) and being inſcribed to *Philippi*, was to be communicated to thoſe others, as the *Epiſtle* to the *Coloſſians* was to be communicated to the *Laodiceans*, Col. 4. 16. and that which the *Laodiceans* had received (whether, as *Tertullian* ſeems to believe, that to the *Epheſians*, or any other) in like manner to be communicated to the *Colloſſians*, and the *Epiſtle* of the *Church* of *Jeruſalem* to the *Church* of *Antioch* did belong and was communicated to all the *Churches* of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, Act. 16. 4.

And then all that the immediate ſubjoyning of the *Deacons* in that place, will conclude, is only this (which is far from yielding the *Presbyterians* any profit) that as * *Epiphanius* ſaith, νέᾳ ὄνϑ κτεύγματϑ, the *Churches* being but *newly* planted, there were not *Presbyters* as yet conſtituted among them, only a *Biſhop* with one *Deacon* or more in each City, in like manner as it was at *Jeruſalem Act.* 6. where after *James*'s aſſumption to the *Biſhoprick*, which the *Eccleſiaſtical* writers tell us of, the *ſeven Deacons* are ſoon inſtituted, no *Presbyters* being created in the middle, betwixt the *Biſhop* and them, that either *Scripture* or antient *Record* inform us of. 6.

* πλήθους μὴ ὄντ]ϑ ἐν εὑρέθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτεροι καθεσθῆναι, ἀ ἠνέῳθησαν ὅτι τῷ χῳ τόπον μόνῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἄνευ ϑ διακόνου ἐπίσκοπον εἶναι. *l.* 1. *Contr. Aër.*

And † *Clemens*, *S.* Pauls *fellow Labourer*, mentions it as the general practice, that the *Apoſtles preaching through Regions and Cities conſtituted their firſt-fruits into* Biſhops *and* Deacons *of thoſe which ſhould come into the faith.* 7. † *Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Corinth.*

Thus far is this from being a *forced* interpretation being perfectly regular, and conformable to what we read of thoſe times, out of the *beſt* and antienteſt *Records* of them; And if in any circumſtance we ſhould be lyable to miſtake, yet for the main, the *Reader* will hardly think it poſſible, when he remembers this very *Church* of the *Philippians* to be one of thoſe expreſly named by *Tertullian*, among whom in his time, *Apoſtolorum Cathedræ ſuis adhuc locis præſidebantur*, *The Chairs of the* Apoſtles *were yet extant preſiding in their due places*, which concludes ſome *Biſhop* or *ſingular prefect* to have ſucceeded the *Apoſtles* in this *Church* (as in thoſe other, *Theſſalonica*, &c.) and by *Theodoret*, whoſe authority is moſt uſed againſt us in this matter, to prove that the *Biſhops* were *Presbyters* here, *Epaphroditus* is expreſly affirmed to be that *Biſhop*. 8.

The next place is that of 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2. *If any man deſire the Office of a Biſhop he coveteth a good work: A Biſhop therefore muſt be blameleſs* — where there is no reaſon of doubting, but the *Biſhop* is the *ſingular prefect* or *Governour* of the *Church*; For the only appearance of the contrary being again (as in that to the *Philippians*) the *immediate* ſubjoyning of *Deacons* and their *qualifications*, *v.* 8. that preſently vaniſheth, if again we remember the obſervation of *Epiphanius*, which he had out of the moſt *antient Records*, and was found exactly conformable to the expreſs words of *Clemens Romanus*, the contemporary of the *Apoſtles*, that at the beginning of the *Church* τὰ πληρώματα τῆς οἰκονομίας ἔτω λαβόντες, *before the government was compleat* in all the Offices, the *Apoſtles* and *Apoſtolical* perſons placed in the *Church* by them, ſuch as *Timothy* to whom here he gives the directions, created no more but a *Biſhop* and *Deacon* (one or more) in each *Church*, the preſent ſtate of things neither *requiring* nor being well capable of any more, in reſpect of the *paucity* of the Chriſtians to be governed or inſtructed, and of thoſe which were fit to be made Presbyters. 9.

And although *Theodoret* again (with ſome few others) interpret the place of *Presbyters*, yet 'tis as evident, he doth it not to the diſadvantage of *Biſhops*, adding in the ſame place, that the *Biſhops* eſpecially ſhould obſerve theſe Laws ἅτε ϑ κ μείζονϑ μεταλαχόντας τιμῆς, *as thoſe which had attained to a greater honour*. 10.

Mean while S. *Chryſoſtome* interprets it diſtinctly of * *Biſhops*, as I have done, and in that notion of *Biſhops* which ſevers them from *Presbyters*, ſuch as *govern in each City*, and addeth the qualifications to be ſuch, as being ſpoken of *Biſhops*, κ Πρεσβυτέροις ἁρμόττει, *do agree to* Presbyters *alſo*. And accordingly *Theophylact* interprets it of the ἡγεμὼς and ἄρχων, the Preſident and Ruler, without any mention of Presbyters. 11.

* Ἐπισκόπῳ ἔδει πόλλων καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν προηγησαμένων.

There remains but one place, and that of the very ſame nature with this laſt, and muſt certainly be regulated by it, *Tit.* 1. 7. *For a Biſhop muſt be blameleſs, as the ſteward of God* (anſwerable to that notion of the word *Biſhop* in the *Old Teſtament* for the *Ruler ſet over the Houſe of the Lord*, 2 *Kin.* 11. 18. *i. e.* the *Steward*, to whom the Keyes of the *Houſe* were committed, *Iſa.* 22. 22.) That this is the *ſingular Biſhop* in *every City*, ſignified before *v.* 5. by the Elders, which *Titus* was *left* in *Crete* to *conſtitute*, is the joynt affirmation of S. *Chryſoſtome*, *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius* on thoſe words of *v.* 5. Elders *in every City*, Ἐπισκόπους ἔτως εἰλαῦθα φήσι, ὡς κ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Τιμόθεον, &c. *By* Elders *he there means* Biſhops, *as in the Epiſtle to* Timothy, *appointing them to be conſtituted in every City, for he would not have the whole Iſland adminiſtred by one, but that every City ſhould have it's proper Paſtor* (or *Biſhop*) that ſo the labour might be the *lighter*, and the care more *exact*. In *Crete* there were certainly many Cities, *Euſebius* mentions an *hundred*, of all which, * ſaith he, *Titus* was made *Biſhop* by S. *Paul*, that under him, ſaith † *Theodoret*, he might *ordain Biſhops*: to which * *Chryſoſtome* and *Theophylact* add τῶ κεῖσιν ἐπισκόπων, that he might have *power* to *judge* or *cenſure* thoſe *Biſhops*, as a *Metropolitan* and *Primate* over them. 12.

* *L.* 3. *c.* 4. † *Arg. Ep. ad Tit. In tit.* 1. *Hom.* 1. * τοσούτων ἐπισκόπων κεῖσιν κ χειροτονίαν, *Arg. Ep.*

There is now no other place wherein the word *Biſhop* is uſed, and by this brief view of theſe, I hope the firſt *propoſition* is competently reſcued from meriting the cenſure of *Paradox*, whether that ſignify *novel* or *ſtrange*; this being ſo conformable both to the *nature* and uſe of the word, to the *tradition* of the *ancient Church*, and the importance of each *Scripture*, where it is uſed, that *Biſhops* ſhould ſignify ἴδιϑ ποιμὴν the *ſingular Paſtor* or *Governour* in each *City* or *Church*. 13.

SECT. III.

Of the word Πρεσβύτερος *Elder.*

Numb. 1. NOW to the *second Proposition*, which pretended not to so much *positiveness*, but is set down in a greater *latitude* of defining, that the word πρεσβύτερος either *constantly* signifies a *Bishop* also, or else *commonly* a *Bishop*, though sometimes, but most *rarely* a *Presbyter*. Of this I shall now need to *premise* but these few things.

2. First, That the nature of the זקן commonly rendred πρεσβύτερος *Elder* in the *Old Testament*, doth denote most *properly*, and signifie most *constantly* (as in all *Languages* the word is found vulgarly to do) a *Ruler* or *Governour*. This is so largely deduced and demonstrated in the *Annotation* on *Act.* 11. 30. that I shall not indeavour farther to manifest it.

3. Secondly, That as in some places of the *New Testament* the word is necessarily to be understood of *Bishops*, so in every other place it is very fitly capable of that *interpretation*; This is again so particularly evidenced to the *Latine Reader Diss.* 4. *c.* 19, 20, 21, 22.) and to the *English* Reader *Annot.* on *Act.* 11. *b.* and 14. *a.* that I cannot deem it reasonable to tire my self further with transcribing it.

4. Thirdly, That if any one or more places shall be thought by any man to belong to *Presbyters* in our modern sense, as that of *Jam.* 5. 14. or the like, I shall only desire, that he will bring any convincing proof or *authentick Testimony*, that in that or those places it so signifies, and I shall most willingly grant it to him, and be so far from thinking it, in the least degree, disadvantageous to our pretensions, that I shall not doubt to evidence it a *demonstrative* argument to confirm them, but shall not need to insist on that, till such proof be offered.

5. Fourthly, That by this it is already most evident, that my *assertion* was not truly cited, *p.* 92. in these words, that *whereſoever the word* Presbyter *is used in the New Testament, it is to be understood not of a meer* Presbyter, *but of a* Bishop *properly so called*; Certainly neither my words nor sense extended to the *whereſoever* — and, *it is to be* —] being only in a *disjunctive* form, *either constantly* so, or *sometimes* but *rarely* otherwise.

6. Fifthly, That if I were not misreported, and the *Paradox* were as high and as *positive*, as it is represented, yet I conceive not the reason why they that have with great *confidence* affirmed that both *Bishops* and *Elders* do alway signifie in *Scripture* their *Presbyters* and no more, (for if either of those words do but once signify a *Bishop*, their *Jus Divinum*, and whole cause falls to the ground irrecoverably) should be so much at leisure from *excusing* themselves, to *accuse* that for a *Paradox* in others, which is not imaginable to be more an *extreme* on one side, than theirs is on the other.

7. Lastly, That if they *do not think it necessary to take a particular survey of all that is said in justification of these* (which they thus please to style) *Paradoxes*, which is in effect, as if they should profess to *deny* and declaim against the *conclusion*, without attempting to satisfie any *reason*, by which it is inferr'd; It might be as just in me to tender them *answers* of the same making, and so to supersede any farther dispute in this matter.

8. But I shall not *imitate* their method, but rather prepare to attend them in it, and having thus far served them, by undertaking the task which was *due to them*, in giving the *Reader* a brief view of the grounds of my Assertions, which were *too long* for them to *take notice* of, I shall now trace their steps, and follow them which way soever they lead.

SECT. IV.

Of Reverence to Antiquity, and the Interpretations of the Antients. Of Prelatists disagreement among themselves.

Numb. 1. FIrst then, say they, *we desire it may be considered, that these assertions are contrary to antiquity, which yet notwithstanding our Brethren do so highly magnifie and boast of it in this controversy, and for receding from which, as they say we do, they do most deeply charge us.*

2. That these *Assertions*, as far as they are owned by me, and are *Assertions*, are so distant from being *contrary* to *antiquity*, that they are founded in the *Records* of the most *antient reverend authority*, hath appeared most plainly by what hath now been said, and had before been laid, as the *ground* of the interpretations, in the fourth *Dissert.* if they, which gathered the *conclusion* from thence, would have vouchsafed to take notice of the *premisses*.

3. The utmost that can be with truth pretended, is, that some of the *Texts*, which we have insisted on here, and so likewise some of those where πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* are mentioned, are not by all the *antients* interpreted just in that manner, as I think they may safely and most probably be *interpreted*, and so as they will best accord with the opinions which those very *antients* appeared to have concerning the *Original* of *Episcopacy*.

4. In this I hope I have not offended against the *antient Church*, or if I had, as I should have expected other *accusers*, than those I have, so should I wait for no other *judge* but my self, and immediately submit to any *penance* for it.

5. But they which truly *reverence antiquity*, discern also wherein this *Reverence* is terminated, not in *adhering* to every *interpretation* of each *Text* of *Scripture* given by any *antient Commentator* or *Interpreter*, for truly that is absolutely *impossible*, several of them being known in *interpreting* of *Texts* very frequently to differ one from the other; This can be no news to any man, who hath but lightly viewed them, or but *occasionally* consulted *Tirinus*, or such like later *Commentators*, who have *collected* the *Interpretations*

terpretations of the *Antients*, and *marſhalled* their names, and told us how many have been for *one*, how many for *another* ſenſe of ſuch a *Text*.

And in affairs of this nature, wherein they have neither taught *Doctrines*, nor teſtified *Traditions*, 6.
but only expreſt their ſingle *opinions*, or *conjectures* of an *Apoſtles* meaning in words capable of more ſenſes than one, I know no *Prelatiſt* that ever denied later Writers *liberty* to recede from *one*, and adhere to ſome other of the *antients*, or if more convincing reaſons appeared for any *freſh* interpretation, never given before, the like liberty hath been *allowed*; Thus among the *Romaniſts* which pretend ſo much to tradition and reverence to Antiquity, *Baronius*, for example, when about S^t *Pauls* reprehending S^t *Peter*, *Gal.* 2. the antients are found divided, and their diſtant interpretations ſet down by him, *An. Ch.* 52. *n.* 32, *&c.* he himſelf takes a third way different from both, *n.* 40. and applauds himſelf much in it, *n.* 46. And indeed if it were not ſo, our *ſtudying* of the *Originals*, inquiry into the nature of *words* and *phraſes*, obſervation of *cuſtoms* amongſt the *antients*, and all wherein *learned* men differ from *unlearned*, conſideration of the *context* and *argument*, τὸ λογικὸν as well as τὸ ῥητὸν of each *difficult* place, and all the other skills and advantages of a good *Interpreter*, would all be *unuſeful* firſt, and then *dangerous*, would tempt one oft to recede from ſome *former* Writers, to forſake the road and method (ſo ordinary) of *tranſcribing* other mens labours, and by inciting him to ſay any thing which had not oft been ſaid before, (which if it have, why doth he again trouble himſelf and others to *repeat* it?) would infallibly involve him under the *burthen* and *guilt* that is here laid on me, of being *contrary* to *Antiquity*.

But I am unwilling to diſcourage them from any ſort of degree of *reverence* to *antiquity*, and on 7.
condition they will be fairly tried by it in any notion by which they can imagine to define that *Reverence*, or the word *Antiquity*, I will forgo all my novel *interpretations*, and ſay no one word which the *Antients* have not diſtinctly ſaid before me, and refer the whole *fate* of the cauſe to this *judicature*.

Their *ſecond conſideration is*, that *they are contrary to all that have ever written in defence of Epiſcopacy,* 8.
from whence they conclude that till their brethren (i. e. we *Prelatiſts*) *agree among themſelves, they need not ſpend time to anſwer the private Opinions of one Doctor.*

To this I anſwer, that it hath always been deemed lawful to any man, which hath undertaken the 9.
defence of a *Chriſtian cauſe*, aſſerted conſtantly by the *Church*, to chooſe his *arguments* (as *combatants* do their *weapons*) ſuch as he thinks are fitteſt for his *managery*, and will moſt probably (in his opinion) convince the *gainſayers*; No obligation lying upon him by the *Laws* of theſe *agones*, to uſe thoſe *arguments* (and no other, nor otherwiſe improved) which *all* other writers of that ſide have done before him; For if this were the manner of the νομιμὸς ἆθλησις, the *legal combate*, to what end ſhould any *ſecond* writing on the ſame ſubject ever appear to the World? That which had been formerly ſaid, needed not to be tranſcribed and ſaid again, but either the book might be *Re-printed*, or tranſlated into a language more intelligible (as I have here been fain oft to do.) And though I might truly ſay, that for thoſe more minute *conſiderations* or *conjectures*, wherein this *Doctor* differs from ſome others, who have written *before* him (as to the manner of *interpreting* ſome few *Texts*) he hath the *ſuffrages* of many the *learneſt* men of this *Church* at this day (and as far as he knows, of all that imbrace the ſame cauſe with him) yet I do not think it neceſſary to prove my *agreement* with others of my *brethren* by this *only medium*; It being certain that they who believe the ſame *concluſion* upon ſeveral *mediums* or ways of *inferring* it, are in that, and may be in all other *concluſions* at perfect accord and *unity* among themſelves.

All that I can conclude from this and the former *conſideration* (the double charge laid on me of *con-* 10.
trariety to *antiquity*, and other *aſſerters* of *Epiſcopacy*) is only this, that the *authors* of them are ill pleaſed, that I uſe any other *arguments*, or *anſwers* but what they were willing to *aſſign* me: otherwiſe if there had been *leſs*, not *more truth*, or *evidence* in my way of *defending* the cauſe, they would have had the greater *advantage* againſt me, and I doubt not, have been, in the ſpace of three years, at leiſure to have *obſerved* it.

SECT. V.

Inconveniencies objected, and anſwer'd. Of more Biſhops in one City. No Presbyters in the Apoſtles dayes. The no Divine right of the Order of Presbyters.

BUT they are, in the *third* place, pleaſed to object ſome *inconveniences which the defending of* *Numb.* 1.
theſe Paradoxes muſt neceſſarily bring upon me; And to theſe I ſhall more diligently attend.

Firſt, ſay they, *he that will defend theſe Paradoxes muſt of neceſſity be forced to grant that there were* 2.
more Biſhops *than one in a City in the* Apoſtles *dayes, which is to betray the cauſe of Epiſcopacy, and to bring down a* Biſhop *to the rank of a* Presbyter.

To this I reply by abſolute *denying* of this *conſequence* (for ſuppoſing the *Scripture-Biſhop* to be al- 3.
ways a *Biſhop*, and ſo the *Scripture Elder* alſo, how can it follow from thence that there are more ſuch *Biſhops* in any *one City?*) 'Tis moſt evident that this is no way inferr'd upon either, or both of my *aſſertions*; nor is here one word added to prove it is, to which I might accommodate any *anſwer*. Tis on the contrary moſt manifeſt, that whenſoever I find mention of *Biſhops* or *Elders* in the *plural*, as *Act.* 20. *Phil.* 1. *&c.* I interpret them of the *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, and the *Biſhops* of *Macedonia*, *Biſhops* of *Judæa*, &c. (and render my reaſons of doing ſo) and conſequently affirm them to be the *Biſhops* of divers (ſure that is not of *one*) Cities.

The ſecond inconvenience is, *that I muſt be forced to grant that there were no* Biſhops *over* Presbyters 4.
in the Apoſtles *dayes, for if there were no* Presbyters, *there could be no* Biſhops *over* Presbyters.

Here is an evident miſtake; for I no where ſay, that there were no *Presbyters* in the *Apoſtles* dayes, 5.
but only that in the *Apoſtles writings* the word. [*Biſhops*] always ſignifies *Biſhops*, and the word [*Elders*]

[*Elders*] either never, or but rarely, *Presbyters*; Now beſides that it is poſſible for thoſe to be in the *time* of the *Apoſtles* writing, which yet for want of occaſion are not mentioned in thoſe writings (and I that love not negative arguments *à teſtimonio*, ſhould never have thought fit to conclude there were no *Presbyters* within the time wherein the ſeveral Books of Scripture were written, upon that one argument, becauſe I could not find them mentioned there) beſides this, I ſay, Tis certain that the *Apoſtles* times are ſomewhat a larger period than the time of the *Apoſtles* writings, and therefore that what is ſpoken only of the latter, was not meant to be extended to the former.

6. For Firſt the *Apoſtles* continued alive ſome time after writing their *Epiſtles*, and Secondly, ſome of the *Apoſtles* ſurvived others; *John*, of whom *Chriſts* will was intimated, that he ſhould *tarry*, and not *die* till after the *coming* of *Chriſt*, and that *Kingdom* of his, commenced in the *deſtruction* of the *Jews*, did accordingly live till *Trajans* time, and by that time I think it probable that the number of *believers* daily increaſing, there were, as the wants of the *Church* required, *Presbyters* ordained in many *Churches*: And accordingly in the *Diſſert.* p. 229. when I ſpeak of this matter, I expreſly except S. *John*, and *p.* 211. I make uſe of a teſtimony of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, on purpoſe to conclude that this *Apoſtle* ordain'd *Presbyters* in *Aſia*, after his return from the *Iſland*, to which he was baniſhed, ὅπου μὲν ὁπουδήπως καλαστήσων, ὅπου δ' ὅλας ἐκκλησίας ἀεμόσων, &c. and to the ſame mat-
* *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 19. Sect. 4, 5. ter I * elſewhere apply that of *Epiphanius*, out of the *profoundeſt*, i. e. *antienteſt Records*, that as *Moſes* and *Aaron* took to them firſt the *Princes* of the *people*, and at length the *Sanhedrim* of the *ſeventy Elders*, ſo the *Apoſtles firſt conſtituted Biſhops*, and in proceſs of time *Presbyters* alſo, when occaſion required, as the *Biſhops Aſſiſtants*, and *Council*, and that upon account of this *Analogy* with the *Sanhedrim*, they were ſtiled πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*.

7. And *Ignatius* making mention of *Presbyters*, as of a *middle* degree in the *Church* betwixt *Biſhops* and *Deacons* in his, *i. e.* in *Trajan's* time, and that in his *Epiſtles* to ſeveral of thoſe *Aſian* Churches, *Smyrna*, *Epheſus*, *Magneſia*, *Philadelphia*, *Trallis*, I think the argument of great validity to conclude, that in that *Province* that *Apoſtle* had in his life time inſtituted this *middle* order. And therefore I that had ſo carefully *prevented*, was not to be charged with this *crime* of *affirming* there were no *Presbyters*, or *Biſhops* over *Presbyters* (which certainly there were, if there were *Presbyters* under them) in the *Apoſtles* days.

8. A *third* inconvenience they add, that *by conſequence I muſt affirm that* Ordo Presbyteratus *is not* Jure Divino.

9. But that is no more *conſequent* to my *aſſertion*, than it was my *aſſertion*, that there were no *Preſbyters* in the Apoſtles days, and therefore I that am guiltleſs of the *aſſertion*, cannot be charged with the conſequents of it; *John* I know was an *Apoſtle*, and *John*, I believe, ordained *Presbyters*, and thence I doubt not to conclude the *Apoſtolical inſtitution*, i. e. in effect, the *Divine right* of the *order* of *Presbyters*, though not of the *government* of the *Church* by *Presbytery*; and ſo I am ſtill clear from the *guilt* of that *crime* which the *worſt of Papiſts would abominate*, which they are reſolved I muſt have layen under, if I had queſtioned the *Divine Right* of *Presbyters*, though they can more than *queſtion* the *Divine Right* of *Biſhops*, and never have *remorſe* or *compunction*, or dread any *charge* or ſentence for it.

SECT. VI.

A firſt confeſſion objected and vindicated. Of the Epheſine Presbyters *being all the* Prelates *of* Aſia; Elders, Aldermanni.

Numb. 1. After theſe *inconveniences* briefly touched (and almoſt as briefly by me averted) they proceed to take notice in the fourth place, of ſome *confeſſions* of mine, *which the juſtification of my opinion have forced from me.* By this method thinking (as at length they ſay) *to render Epiſcopacy*, that is thus maintained, or elſe my way of maintaining it, *odious and contemptible to all ſober, and godly, and moderate Chriſtians*, i. e. to all thoſe, who for the attaining of thoſe titles, good *opinion*, and good *words* from them, ſhall be invited to *contemn*, or *hate* thoſe, whom they are yet pleaſed to call their *brethren*. And this I confeſs is the moſt compendious way of *confuting* that which would not otherwiſe be *confuted*.

2. What thoſe *confeſſions* of mine are, which are like to render my *aſſertions* ſo *odious*, I muſt next take a view, and conſider with what *juſtice* this is ſaid by them.

3. The firſt is, *that the Epheſine* Presbyters, *whom* Paul *ſent for to* Miletus, *were all the* Prelates *of Aſia*.

4. To ſay that the *Epheſine Presbyters*, in their ſenſe of the phraſe, are *Prelates* of *Aſia*, were, I confeſs, a *ridiculous*, and ſo, if they pleaſe, a *contemptible confeſſion*; but I have yet been under no ſuch *torture* from their *arguments*, as ſhould conſtrain ſuch *confeſſion* from me. What I ſay, is ſufficiently known to be my free *opinion*, (and no *forced confeſſion*, ſuch as the *neceſſity* of a *deſperate* enterpriſe might extort from me) that the πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *Elders of the Church*, who by ſummons ſent to *Epheſus*, the *chief Metropolis* of all *Aſia* (and by that convenient way communicated to other Cities) were aſſembled to *Paul* at *Miletus*, *Act.* 20. 17. were, as *Irenæus* aſſures me, the *Biſhops* of the other Cities in thoſe parts, and not only of the one City of *Epheſus*.

5. What harſhneſs there can be in this *aſſertion*, to be rejected as *odious* at the firſt hearing, I confeſs I divine not; That thoſe Cities had *Biſhops*, as well as *Epheſus*, cannot be ſtrange, or that *Paul* deſired to ſpeak with them before his *final* parting. And that the *Biſhops* may be called *Elders*, will be as little *ſtrange*, if it be but remembred, what is at large ſhewed in the *Diſſertations*, that the word *Elder* had in the *Old Teſtament* denoted *dignity* and *Prefecture* in *ſingle* perſons, as when *Eleezer Abraham's Oeconomus*, who was *ſet over* his *ſervants*, is ſtyled πρεσβύτερος τῆς οἰκίας αὐτῦ, ὁ ἄρχων πάντων τῶν αὐτῦ, *the Elder of his houſe, and Ruler of all that was his* (by *Elder* and *Ruler* ſignifying the ſame

ſame thing) and ſo the *Elders* πρεσβύτεροι, of the *Moabites*, Num. 22. 7. are the *Princes* of *Moab*, *v.* 8. and the *Elders* of *Iſrael* are the heads, or *Prefects* of the *principal Families* of *Iſrael*, Exod. 6. 14. the *Rulers of the people*, c. 16. 22. the *Elders* of the *Tribes*, Deut. 31. 28. and all this, and much more, before they were called into a *Council*, or *Senate*, to aſſiſt *Moſes*, as appears *Num.* 11. 16.

And proportionable to this, hath been the uſe of the word among all Nations, ὁ πρεσβύτερος ἀεὶ τῶν ἡγεμονίαν ἔχει, καὶ τούτῳ πάντες πείθονται, *the Elder always hath the Rule, and all obey him*, ſaith * Diodorus Siculus, and ſo *Seniors*] in all languages is a *title* of *honour* and *dignity*. 6. * *L.* 2.

And peculiarly among us, as when *Æthelſtane* the *half King* (as he was called) of the *Eaſt Angles*, was ſaluted by the title of † *Aldermannus*, i. e. Πρεσβύτερος, *Elder of all England*, and ſo *Æthelwod* and *Ælwin*, ſo in King *Ælfred*'s Laws, *c.* 34. there is mention *Regis Aldermanni* and *Presbyteri Regis*; And accordingly, *Mat.* 20. 25. thoſe words of the *Princes of the Nations exerciſing dominion over them*, are by the *Saxons* interpreted Ealdormen pealdaþ þira ðeoda, *Elders have dominion over their Nations*, and *Luke* 9. 22. the *Elders and chief of the Prieſts* are by them rendred Ealdrum and Ealdormannum. All taking the word *Elder* for a title of *Dignity* and *prefecture* (and from that notion of it the *Preſbyterians* are not obſerved to decline.) 7. † *Vid. Autho. lib. Rameſ.* Sect. 4. and 33. and Sir *Henry Spelmans Gloſſary*, p. 28, 29.

And then finally, that the addition of τῆς ἐκκλησίας the *Church*, though in the *ſingular*, cannot make it unfit for theſe *Elders* to denote the *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, or near *Epheſus* under that *Metropolis*, hath been already accounted for at large. And ſo ſtill I hope they, and all *godly and moderate brethren* need neither *hate*, nor *contemn Epiſcopacy*, nor the defenders of it, upon pretence of this (ſo far from *incommodious* or *inconvenient*) *confeſſion*. 8.

SECT. VII.

A ſecond confeſſion of the Biſhops, Phil. 1. 1. *being* Biſhops *of that whole Province*, Philippi *a* Metropolis, *and a Colony*.

Like unto this firſt, is the ſecond which they take notice of, *That the* Biſhops *of* Philippi, *whom* St Paul *ſalutes* Ch. 1. *were not the* Biſhops *of that City only, but of the whole Province, whereas* Theophylact *ſaith that* Philippi *was* μικρὰ πόλις ὑπὸ μητροπόλεως Θεσσαλονίκης τελοῦσα, *a little City ſubject to the* Metropolis *of* Theſſalonica. *Numb.* 1.

That the word Ἐπίσκοποι *Biſhops*, Phil. 1. 1. denotes the *Biſhops* of the Cities of *Macedonia*, which were under this πρώτη πόλις, chief City, or *Metropolis*, as S. *Luke* calls it, *Acts* 16. 12. is already evidenced to be no ſtrange or violent (I hope as little odious) *confeſſion*. I need not farther repeat, or inlarge on that, but bear in good part, whatſoever fate is decreed by them to attend that *Confeſſion*. 2.

As for the *Objection* which is here ſubjoined, and to which they were directed by *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 10. *Sect.* 12. they might, if they had been ſo pleaſed, have taken the *antidote* with the *poyſon*, obſerved, and tendred to the Reader the *anſwer*, which in the five following Sections is ſolemnly rendred to it, and confuted that *anſwer*, if they had diſcern'd any *infirm* part in it. 3.

Firſt then, the *anſwer* is, that that *deſcription* of *Philippi* in the *argument* prefixt to *Theophylact*'s notes on that *Epiſtle*, was taken out of an *antient Geographer*, and belonged to that *City*, as it was built by *Philip*, having been formerly called Κρηνίδες, then Δάτος, not to the *later* times, under the *Roman Empire*; and that it is no new, or ſtrange thing, that under the *Romans* thoſe Cities ſhould become *Metropoles*, which formerly had not been ſuch; to which agrees that of the *Council of* Chalcedon, Can. 12. which mentions, πόλεις διὰ γραμμάτων βασιλικῶν τῇ τῆς μητροπόλεως ὀνόματι τιμηθείσας, *Cities honoured by the imperial Letters with the name* and dignity *of Metropoles*. 4.

And indeed the ſaying of * *Strabo* is of evident truth, ordinarily experimented, that *Provinces* were often confounded διὰ τὸ τὰς Ρωμαίους μὴ κατὰ φῦλα διελεῖν αὐτὰς, ἀλλ' ἕτερον τρόπον διαλαξαι διοικήσεις, ἐν αἷς ἀγοραίους ποιοῦνται, *by cauſe of the* Romans *diſtributing them not according* to the diſtributions of Regions or *Nations* (ſuch as the *Geographers antiently* had made uſe of) *but after another manner, according to the* Cities, *in which they kept their Courts* or *Aſſiſes*, as before was ſaid of the Cities of *Aſia*. 5. * *Geogr.* l. 13.

Accordingly when St. *Paul* firſt comes to *Philippi*, St. *Luke* mentions it under the title of the *prime City* of the *Province* of *Macedonia*; and is not that more to be heeded, ſpeaking ſo expreſly of that *City* at that time, than that *Geographers* deſcription, which no way diſcovers to what time it belongs, and cannot belong to this time of the *planting* the *faith* at *Philippi*, if St. *Luke* may be believed? 6.

Secondly, The ſame St. *Luke* ſaith of it at that time, that it was κολωνία a *Colony* of, *i. e.* a *City* repleniſhed by the *Inhabitation* of the *Romans*; And of thoſe *Colonies* in chief Cities, there is no queſtion but they were eſpecially choſen to be places of their Aſſiſes, whither the *Neighbouring* Cities reſorted for *Juſtice*, and ſo were *Metropoles* in the *civil accounts*. 7.

Thirdly, Of this City of *Philippi* 'tis as evident, that it was the firſt *converted* of all *Macedonia*, and that from thence he went after to *Theſſalonica*; And ſo the right of *Primogeniture*, which ordinarily gave claim to the *Metropolitical* dignity in the *Eccleſiaſtical* account (as in the caſe of *Antioch* and *Jeruſalem* appears) belonging to *Philippi*, over and above the foremention'd precedence thereof in *civil account*, there is no reaſon to doubt, but this was a *Metropolitical Church*, an Elder *Siſter* to *Theſſalonica*, and each a *Mother* to the *Churches* of leſſer Cities of *Macedonia* that belonged to them. 8.

According to which it is, that *Polycarp* in his *Epiſtle*, mentions St. *Pauls* Epiſtles in the *plural*, written to theſe *Philippians*, which learned men interpret of the Epiſtles to the *Theſſalonians*, and it cannot commodiouſly be underſtood any other way. 9.

SECT.

SECT. VIII.

A third Confeſſion, of Timothies *being an Archbiſhop. Of the qualifications,* 1 Tim. 3. 2. *belonging to* Biſhops. *Of the* Biſhops *being worthy of double honour, though he never preach. Of* the word, and Doctrine. *Of the* Presbytery, 1 *Tim.* 4. *Of Rebuking and receiving accuſation againſt an* Elder.

Numb. 1. THE third *Confeſſion* is, that *Timothy was* Archbiſhop *of* Epheſus, *that when* Paul *ſets down the qualifications of* Biſhops, *though he mention none but ſuch as are common to a* Presbyter *with a* Biſhop, *yet he is to be underſtood to ſpeak of* Biſhops *in a Prelatical ſenſe, and not at all of* Presbyters; *And when he ſaith the* Elders *that Rule well are worthy of double honour* ---, *this is, ſaith this Author, the* Biſhops *that Rule well* — *thereby holding out this great errour, that a* Biſhop *that Ruleth well is worthy of double honour, though he never preacheth; And when St.* Paul *bids* Timothy *not neglect the gift that was given him by the laying on the hands of the* Presbytery, *that is, ſaith he, of Epiſcopacy; And when the Apoſtle chargeth him not to rebuke an* Elder,--- *and not to receive an accuſation againſt an* Elder, --- *this is to be underſtood of* Biſhops, *ſaith he, and not of meer* Presbyters.

2. To this *accumilative* crime affirmed to be *confeſt* by me in ſo many particulars, I *anſwer* by avowing my *Confeſſion* thus far, firſt, that I take *Timothy* to have been *Biſhop* of *Epheſus*, and conclude it from 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. then that *Epheſus* was a *prime Metropolis* of *Aſia*, from the teſtimonies of *Pliny* and *Ulpian*, and generally the *Antient Church*-Writers: And from thoſe two put together, I hope I may gain liberty to *confeſs*, that *Timothy* was *Archbiſhop* of *Epheſus*.

3. Secondly, That *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2. ſpeaking of *Epiſcopacy*, as of a *good work* or office, and the *qualifications* required in the perſon to be promoted to it, ſpeaks of a *Biſhop* in the *Prelatical* ſenſe; ſo I am ſure *Chryſoſtom* doth underſtand him, and the *teſtimony* was lately cited out of him; and *Theodoret*, that underſtands it otherwiſe, yet applies it firſt to *Biſhops*, and ſaith on that occaſion, that their degree in the *Church* is *ſuperior* to that of *Presbyters*. And if no higher qualifications be required of a *Biſhop*, than are fit to be required of a *Presbyter* (which yet I no where ſay, and the argument taken from the *no-other qualifications* here ſpecified, than only for the *Biſhop* and the *Deacon*, are of no force to induce it, both becauſe it is a *negative argument*, and there is another reaſon for the omitting *Presbyters*, becauſe in this *infancy* of the *Church* there was not any ſuch need of them, the *Biſhop* with his *Deacon*, one or more, were ſufficient in every *City*; and beſides, the *qualifications* aſſigned the *Deacon*, may be common to him with the *Presbyter*, as well as thoſe aſſign'd the *Biſhop*) yet that is no *prejudice* to the *ſuperiority* of the *office*, or to my interpreting that *Text* of the *Biſhop*; For ſure I may as conveniently ſay, that the *Biſhop* is named without the *Presbyter*, at a time when there were *Biſhops*, but as yet no *Presbyters* in the *Church*, and that when there were *Presbyters* inſtituted, their *qualifications* were to be regulated by the *rules* given of *Biſhops*, as it can be imagined to be fitly ſaid by them, that the place is meant of *Presbyters* (when the *Apoſtle* names *Biſhops* expreſly, and when by many other evidences we know, that then there were *Biſhops*, but by no footſteps can diſcern that then there were *Presbyters*) upon no other reaſon, but that the *qualifications* are common to *Presbyters*.

4. Thirdly, For the mention of the *Elders* that *rule well*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. I doubt not but it may very *commodiouſly* be interpreted of the *Biſhops* through all his *Province*; for as there the ſtyle is *πρεσβύτες*, *preſide* or *rule*, ſo 'tis certain, that in the uſe of the *Church*, this was the title of the *Biſhops*, as hath formerly been ſhewed out of *Juſtin Martyr* and others, and the *διπλὴ τιμὴ double honor* פי שנים the *priviledge* of *Primogeniture*, being aſſigned as his *portion*, is an evidence thereof.

5. And the *inconvenience* that is here urged againſt that *interpretation*, is perfectly of no force. For firſt, if from hence it might be concluded that a *Biſhop* is worthy of *double honour*, though he *never preacheth*, then from their interpreting it of the *Presbyter*, it will as much follow to be their *opinion*, that the *Presbyter* is *worthy of double honour* though he *never preach*.

6. But then ſecondly the truth is, that neither of theſe *concluſions* follow either the one or the other *interpretation*; for the firſt phraſe of *labouring in the word*, and the other of *labouring in the doctrine* (which by theſe are confounded, and ſo expreſt *undiſtinctly* by *preaching*) denote *two* ſeveral things; the *former*, the *planting* of the *faith* where it is not yet *received*, which is conſtantly expreſt by *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι*, *κηρύσσειν*, and *λόγῳ*, *preaching* the *Goſpel*, and the *word*; the *latter* ſignifies taking *pains* in a *Church* already gathered, for the *confirming* and farther *inſtructing* of *believers*. And then, as he that doth one of theſe, may yet poſſibly not do both, occaſion not requiring, and ſo not be ſo eminently *worthy* of the *double honour*, as he that actually doth both; ſo certainly, he that *rules well* in any *Church*, and beſide the care belonging to *rule*, undergoes that other *double* hard *travel* (ſo *κοπιῶν* ſignifies) of *preaching* the *faith* to *Infidels*, and *confirming*, and *inſtructing believers*, doth very highly deſerve the *double honour* and *alimony*; And this as it is the exact meaning of that *Text*, ſo it utterly ſuperſedes all force of this *objection* or *exception* againſt our underſtanding it of the *Preſidents* or *Biſhops* in the *Prelatical* ſenſe.

7. Fourthly, For the word *Presbytery*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. by which they ſay, I underſtand *Epiſcopacy*, I anſwer, that I interpret it of ſome *combination* either of *Apoſtles* or *Apoſtolical* perſons and *Biſhops*, *τῶν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς χάριτος ἀξιωμάτων* in *Theodoret*'s phraſe, *ſuch as were vouchſafed the Apoſtolical grace, i. e.* of *Paul* aſſuredly, 1 *Tim.* 2. 6. and perhaps of *Barnabas*, perhaps of ſome other *Apoſtolical* perſon with him, in like manner as both *Peter* and *John* ſtyle themſelves *πρεσβύτεροι Elders*, and * *Ignatius* ſtyles the *Apoſtles πρεσβυτέριον ἐκκλησίας* the *Presbytery* or *Elderſhip of the Church*, and as of *Ignatius* himſelf St. *Chryſoſtome* affirms, *μακαρίων Ἀποστόλων χείρας*, that the *hands* of more *Apoſtles* than one were *laid* on him, in his *ordination* to the *Biſhoprick* of *Antioch*.

* *Ep. ad Philad.*

8. To which matter the *Scholion* of *Chryſoſtome* is expreſs, *ὃ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων φήσι ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἐπισκόπων,*

κόπων, *he ſpeaks not here of Presbyters but Biſhops*, adding the reaſon, becauſe *Presbyters* did not *ordain Biſhops*; and ſo *Theophylact* and *Oecumenius*.

Laſtly for the other two places of *not-rebuking* and *receiving an accuſation againſt an Elder*, though in thoſe places it were clearly for my intereſt to interpret πρεσβύτερος a *Presbyter* in our modern ſenſe, for then as † *Epiphanius* ſaith, there is an evidence of proof that the *Biſhop hath power over the Presbyter* (ὅτι ὁ πρεσβύτερον ἐξουσίαν ἔχει) *Timothy over the Elder*, ſaith he, *but never the Elder over Timothy*: Yet I confeſs my ſelf inclined by other conſiderations to forego that *advantageous* ſenſe of the place. 9. † *Cont. Hær. l.* 3. *t.* 1.

Becauſe *Timothy* being placed in the *prime Metropolis* had power over the *Biſhops* of leſſer *Cities*, and that, as hath oft been ſhewed, κρίσιν as well as χειροτονίαν, power of *judging* as well as of *ordaining Biſhops*, which is * elſewhere evidenced to be the opinion of S. *Chryſoſtome*, in order to the underſtanding of this place. And ſo ſtill the crime is not very great or reproachful, which I am ſaid to have *confeſt*, it amounts no higher than the former *confeſſion* had done, that *Timothy* was *Archbiſhop* of *Epheſus*; and yet this you ſee without any neceſſity to extort it from me, ſave that of ſpeaking *freely* what I conceived moſt *probable*; For otherwiſe nothing could be more for the advantage of the main cauſe I defend, than that πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* ſhould ſignifie *Presbyters* in theſe *two* places. 10. * *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 19. *Sect.* 11, 12.

SECT. IX.

A fourth confeſſion of Titus *being Archbiſhop of* Creet.

THeir *fourth* charge is, that I am *forced to confeſs that* Titus *was* Archbiſhop *of* Creet, *and that he received no commiſſion from* S^t^ Paul *to ordain ſingle Elders, but only for ordaining Biſhops in every City. It ſeems*, ſay they, *this Author ſlights the Poſtſcript, where* Titus *is called the firſt Biſhop of* Creet, *and ſlights all thoſe antient Fathers that are cited by his own party, to prove that he was* Biſhop *of* Creet: *But he muſt be an* Archbiſhop, *and ſo muſt* Timothy *alſo, or elſe theſe aſſertions of his will fall to the ground. Now that they were neither* Biſhops *nor* Archbiſhops *hath been ſufficiently proved (as we conceive) in the former diſcourſe.* *Numb.* 1.

That *Titus* was *Archbiſhop* of *Creet*, I confeſs again that I cannot but believe, till I am ſhewed how the contrary were poſſible, *i. e.* how he that was faſtned in (and, as * *Euſebius* ſaith, had ἐπισκοπὴν the *Epiſcopacy* of) a whole *Iſland*, which had an *hundred Cities* in it, and was there placed, that he might *ordain Biſhops* under him in each of thoſe *Cities*, *Tit.* 1. 5. 7. and, as the *antients* add, exerciſe *juriſdiction* over them, ſhould be other than an *Archbiſhop*. 2. * *Lib.* 3. *c.* 4.

That this was his condition, hath been ſhewed already; And for the *inconveniences* that it is preſt with, they will prove very *ſupportable*. For I ſhall not at all be obliged thereby to *ſlight* either *Poſtſcript* or *Fathers*, but give the diſputers example to pay them all *reverence*, being very well able to diſcern the *Biſhop* through the *Archbiſhop*, and having never imagined that the ſtyling *Michael* an *Archangel*, was denying him to be an *Angel*. He certainly was an *Angel*, and that of an *higher* degree, or elſe could never have been juſtly called an *Archangel*; and 'tis juſt ſo with *Titus*, if I had not thought him a *Biſhop*, I could never have affirmed him an *Archbiſhop*, and they that in common ſpeech give him the title of *Biſhop*, do no way intimate their thoughts to be *contrary* to mine, for every *Archbiſhop* is certainly a *Biſhop*, though every *Biſhop* be not an *Archbiſhop*. 3.

And therefore if all the danger of my *aſſertions* falling to the ground, be conſequent to this of *Titus* or *Timothies* proving to be no *Archbiſhop* I ſhall deem them competently ſafe, for each of them were unavoidably ſuch, *Timothy Archbiſhop* of *Epheſus*, the *prime Metropolis* of all *Aſia*, and *Titus* of the *whole Iſland* of *Creet*, and accordingly to thoſe two, peculiarly as ſuch, *directions* are given for the *ordaining Biſhops* and *Deacons* in every *City*. 4.

And the proofs which were offered to the *contrary*, have I ſuppoſe already been anſwered, and being not here thought fit to be recited, the *replies* ſhall not be ſo impertinent, as to appear without their *antagoniſts*. Only becauſe it is here inſerted as part of my *inconvenient confeſſion*, that *Titus* received no *Commiſſion* from Saint *Paul* to *ordain* ſingle *Elders* (which I believe I no where ſay, any otherwiſe than that the *Commiſſion*, cap. 1. 5. was to *create Biſhops* in *every City*) I ſhall freely tell them my opinion of that, *viz.* that a *greater* power may very fitly be ſaid to comprehend under it the *leſſer* of the ſame kind, and conſequently that both *Timothy* and he, which had *Commiſſions* to ordain *Biſhops* in every *City*, had alſo by the ſame *commiſſion*, power to ordain *ſingle Presbyters*, where thoſe were uſeful to be *ordained*, as is evident by the *qualification* of *Deacons* and *Widows* after-mentioned in one certainly, and, as I conceive, in both *Epiſtles*, for that ſuppoſeth their *Commiſſion* to extend to the *ordaining* of thoſe, who yet had not been named in them, if we may gueſs by that of *Titus*, cap. 1. 5. And ſo much alſo of that part of my *confeſſion*, which is as *free* and *unforced*, as the former had been, and I believe as ſafe to the *affirmer*. 5.

SECT. X.

A fifth charge of contrariety to Scripture *anſwered. Of viſitation of the ſick, belonging to Elders,* James 5.

BUT the *fifth* and *laſt* charge is more ſevere than any of the former, that theſe *Paradoxes*, as they ſtile them, *are contrary to the very letter of the Scripture, as we have made it evident in our arguments againſt the* Jus Divinum *of Epiſcopacy, and would farther manifeſt it, if we thought it neceſſary.* *Numb.* 1.

This

2. This I confeſs of *contrariety to the very letter of the Scripture* (rightly underſtood) I lookt upon as ſo high a *charge*, that I verily expected ſomewhat *extraordinary* to bind it on me, and I ſuddenly reſolved (as I read the firſt words of that *Section*) to examin thoſe *Scriptures* that ſhould now be produced, *ponderingly* and *exactly*, and either confeſs my own *conviction*, or give competent reaſons why I was not *convinced* by them.

3. But I ſoon found my *expectations* fruſtrated; for as here is no one ſuch *Scripture* mentioned, ſo for their *arguments againſt the* Jus Divinum *of Epiſcopacy*, I know not where to ſeek them, and never heard (and verily believe there is no ſuch thing) that they had formerly written any ſuch *Book* againſt *Biſhops*, wherein the *Diſſertations* or any *aſſertions* of mine therein, were ſo much as *arraign'd* by them, much leſs *evidenced* to be *contrary to the very letter of Scripture*: If I had, I aſſure them I ſhould then have been as ready to have made my *reply*, as now I have been to attend them thus far.

4. And for their evidencing this in any *tract* publiſht by them before the *Diſſertations* were written, by which notwithſtanding the *Diſſertations* were to be concluded, I have no reaſon to think that to be their meaning, becauſe theſe *aſſertions* of mine are by them affirmed to be *Paradoxes*, contrary to all *that have ever written in defence of Epiſcopacy*, and therefore could not, unleſs it were by *divination*, be taken notice of, and prevented by them.

5. After they had expreſt their *opinion* that it was not *neceſſary* for them farther to *manifeſt* the *contrariety* of *my Paradoxes* to the *very letter* of the *Scripture*, they yet farther proceed in theſe words,

For when the Apoſtle ſaith, James 5. 14. *Is any man ſick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church — who is there that can be perſwaded to believe that all theſe Elders were Biſhops (in the ſenſe that Biſhops are taken in in our days) Is this the proper work of Biſhops to viſit the ſick? And beſides, if the Apoſtle by Elders had meant Biſhops in that ſenſe, he would have ſaid, let him call for the Elders of the Churches, not of the Church, unleſs our brethren will ſay that there were divers Biſhops in every Church in the Apoſtles days, in which there were many ſick perſons.*

6. What the [*For*] in the *front* here ſignifies, I ſhall not go about to conjecture, The *antecedents* would incline me to believe that it pretends to introduce a *reaſon*, which might make it *evident* that my *aſſertions* are contrary to the *very letter* of *Scripture*: But that ſure it doth not any way attempt or appear to do, unleſs the πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* of the *Church* be ſuppoſed here to ſignify *Preſbyters* in our modern Notion of the word: But then that is ſo far from being *granted*, that it is known to be the only ζητούμενον, the matter of *queſtion* betwixt us all this while, and ſo was to be *proved* not *ſuppoſed* or *preſumed* in this matter.

7. But bating them this *begging* of the *Queſtion*, I ſhall proceed to ſatisfy their *wonderment*, that I ſhould *go about to perſwade* any, that πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, in this place of S. *James*, were *Biſhops* in that ſenſe that we now underſtand and uſe the word.

8. And Firſt, I ſhall not doubt to avow, that for all that ſpace, that in any *Church* there were no other *officers* ordained, but only the *Biſhop* and *Deacon*, it muſt of neceſſity be reſolved the proper work of *Biſhops* to *viſit the ſick*. That there was at the firſt, when the *Faith* was but thin planted, ſuch a time, hath already been evidenced out of *Clemens Romanus*, and the *profoundeſt antiquities* that *Epiphanius* could meet with, And that then this *office* muſt either be neglected, or performed by either *Biſhop* or *Deacon*, will not need any farther proof.

9. As for the *Deacons*, in their *inſtitution*, we find not that to be any part of their *Office*, and indeed the ſuitableneſs of *abſolution* to that ſtate of dangerous *ſickneſs*, and the mention of κἂν ἁμαρτίας ᾖ πεποιηκώς, his *having committed ſins*, and the command of giving it (in caſe he be qualified for it) ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ, *abſolvetur ei*, *abſolution ſhall be* given him, doth render the *Deacon* incompetent for that work, and ſo, where there are no *Preſbyters*, muſt needs devolve it on the *Biſhop*.

10. And this account hath more than probability, no leſs than perfect evidence in it, if we only ſuppoſe what hath been ſo oft cleared from the *Antients*, to be matter of *fact*, that where the number of *believers* was ſmall, and none qualified for the Office of *Preſbyters*, there the *Apoſtles* conſtituted no more but a *Biſhop* and a *Deacon* in each City. For whilſt this was the ſtate of that City, I ſhall ſuppoſe a man *ſick*, and by the force of S. *James*'s exhortation, deſirous of *Abſolution*, &c. Who is there ſuppoſeable in that City to give it him but the *Biſhop*? And whom elſe can he *call* to him for this purpoſe? And then, who can doubt but this is the work, in it ſelf very *agreeable*, and in this ſuppoſed caſe *peculiar* and proper to the *Biſhop*? ſo that unleſs this ſuppoſition be *falſe*, nay *impoſſible* to be true, I may ſafely ſay, this was or might be the *Biſhops* work, to *viſit the ſick*, &c.

11. And indeed, if it were not, how could it be by the *Biſhop*, when other parts of his *Office* became his fuller employment, *committed* to the *Preſbyter*? For firſt he could not commit this to others, if he firſt had it not in *himſelf*; and Secondly, this was the only reaſon of *ordaining* inferiour Officers in the *Church*, that part of the *Biſhop*'s task might be performed by them (as when the whole burthen, which was too heavy for *Moſes*, was diſtributed among other men) which in this particular could not be, if before this aſſignation of *aſſiſtants*, it were not *originally* the ἔργον *work* or *proper* task of the *Biſhop*.

12. To this may be farther added the real *dignity*, becauſe neceſſary *charity* of this performance of *viſiting* the *ſick*, &c. and this ariſing both from the intimation of *Gods* own *finger*, pointing out this a moſt agreeable ſeaſon for all *ſpiritual* admonition and *comfort*, a *molle tempus fandi*, wherein a word *ſeaſonably* ſpoken, may moſt probably find the due *reception*, and wherein the *prayers* and *bleſſing* of the moſt *Apoſtolical* perſon, or the moſt *highly* and juſtly dignified in the *Church*, and in the favour of *God*, may come in moſt *opportunely*, and in this reſpect we ſee in that place, that the *prayers* of the great *Prophet Elias* are made uſe of by S. *James*, to exemplify the practice, which in this particular he recommended to the *Church*.

13. And I muſt needs tell the *Objectors*, that as mean an opinion as they ſeem to have of this work of *viſiting the ſick*, I cannot but *affirm* on the contrary, that if it were duely and advantageouſly managed it were *extreamly* uſeful and beneficial to the good of *Souls*, and as proper for a *Biſhop perſonally* to perform, when his other publick *neceſſary* tasks (wherein many more are concern'd, and wherein he hath

hath no *proxies* to ſupply his place) permit, as any one part of his *divine office*, differing from the reſt only in this, (and in that reſpect yielding the *precedence* to them) that other parts of his *office* are, or may be at the ſame time *extenſive* to *many*, whilſt each act of this is terminated in ſome *one*, whoſe *ſoul* yet ought to be more *pretious* in his eyes, than all other *acquiſitions* in the world.

Accordingly it is in the * *Diſſertations* evidenced out of *Polycarp*'s *Epiſtle* (who was ſomewhat after the time of *James* the *author* of this *Epiſtle*) that part of the *Biſhop*'s *office* it was then eſteemed to be, ἐπισκέπτεσθαι πάντας ἀσθενεῖς, *to viſit all the ſick*, in like manner as in *Juſtin Martyr* he is made the *Curator of all that are in want*, the grand *diſtributer* of all the *liberalities* of the *Church*. 14. * *Diſſert.* 4. 21, 22.

As for the only *objection* that is here tendered againſt this *interpretation* of the place, from the *ſingular* [ἐκκλησίας *of the Church*] not of the *Churches*, the *anſwer* is obvious, that this *Epiſtle* of *James* being written to all the *Jewes* in *diſperſion*, *Jam.* 1. 1. theſe could not make up any one *particular Church* of any ſingle *denomination*, but yet all conjoin very fitly in that one *Univerſal* ſtyle of ἐκκλησία, *the Church*. In this reſpect we know 'tis called the *Catholick Epiſtle* of *James*, becauſe written to the whole *Church* of the *Jews*, all the *believers* of that nation, whereſoever *diſperſt* out of their *Countrey*. 15.

Now theſe inhabiting in *divers* Cities, it is as certain there were divers *Biſhops* in this *circuit*, and ſo the πρεσβύτεροι τῆς ἐκκλησίας, *the Elders of the Church*, are moſt commodiouſly ſet to expreſs theſe ſeveral *Biſhops*, belonging to this *complex* body, the *Church* of the *diſperſion*. 16.

Not that there were more of theſe in *one City*, for that conſideration would never have cauſed the *plural* expreſſion, becauſe were there never ſo *many*, the *ſick perſon* needed not have called *more* at once (and upon that ſcore I ſhall demand of them that argue from the *number*, was every *ſick* man in their opinion, to call for the whole *Preſbytery?*) nor again, becauſe there were not as many *Churches* as *Elders*, but only becauſe theſe many *particular Churches*, of which there was an *equal* number of *Elders*, were very fitly comprehended under the one *general* ἐκκλησία, the *Church* in the ſingular number. 17.

SECT. XI.

A laſt objection from Act. 21. 18. *and* 14. 3. *and* 11. 30. *anſwered.*
Elders *for* Rulers *or* Biſhops.

THere yet remains one ſort of *Objections* more againſt theſe *Paradoxes*, in theſe words. *Numb.* 1.

Beſides, when it is ſaid, Act. 21. 18. Paul *went in with us unto* James, *and all the Elders were preſent. It is ſuppoſed by our Epiſcopal men, that* James *was at this time Biſhop of* Jeruſalem. *Now we demand, who were theſe Elders? were theſe alſo Biſhops of* Jeruſalem? *will this anſwer conſiſt with our brethrens judgment? ſo likewiſe when it is ſaid,* Act. 15. 4. *And when they were come to* Jeruſalem, *they were received of the Church, and of the Apoſtles and Elders, we demand, what is meant by the Church? Is it not meant the Church of* Jeruſalem, *to which place they are ſaid to come? And if ſo, then we ask farther, what is meant by the Elders? Muſt it not be anſwered, that by Elders are meant the Elders of* Jeruſalem? *And then let any man tell us, how theſe Elders can be ſaid to be Biſhops in a Prelatical ſenſe, eſpecially according to the ſenſe of our brethren, who make* James *to be at this time the only Biſhop of* Jeruſalem. *Add farther, It is ſaid,* Act. 14. 3. *When* Paul *and* Barnabas *had ordained them Elders in every Church,* Act. 11. 30. *They ſent relief to the Elders,* &c. *Can any imagine that this relief was ſent only to Biſhops, and that* Paul *and* Barnabas *ordained no Presbyters in any Church, but only Biſhops? Is not this to offer manifeſt violence to the Scriptures? and inſtead of upholding of Epiſcopacy, is not this ſufficient to render it odious and contemptible to all ſober, and godly, and moderate Chriſtians? But we forbear.*

It ſeems we have ſtill remaining another heap of *inconvenient Confeſſions* that we labour under; And upon them, *more Socratico*, they make their demands; And although I might juſtly wonder why they which have read the *Diſſertations*, and know what *anſwer* I give to every of their *demands*, ſhould be at the trouble to ask them again; yet becauſe I am reſolved not to be weary of *attending* them, I ſhall *anſwer* them as punctually as they could wiſh, and patiently ſupport all the *odium* that will reſult from thence, among all *ſober, and godly, and moderate Chriſtians*. 2.

Here only I deſire two things may be remembred, which have already been evidenced, firſt, that the word πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, in the ſtyle of the *Old Teſtament*, in the continued uſe of all *languages*, being an expreſſion of *power* and *dignity*, is in the *New Teſtament* upon all reaſonable accounts as properly applicable to the *Rulers* and *Governours Eccleſiaſtical*, as the word *Apoſtles*, or *Biſhops*, or *Preſidents*, or *Rulers*, or any the like would be thought to be, and withal very fit to expreſs *ſingle Rulers* in each particular *Church* (in caſe any ſuch may otherwiſe appear to be mentioned in *Scripture*) there being no propriety in the *word*, or peculiarity in the *uſage* of it, to incline it to *joint* power of *Collegues* ruling in *common*. 3.

Accordingly, evidences have been produced in the *Diſſertations* to ſhew the continuance of this uſage among Authors after the *Scripture*-time, that it long remained in the *language* of the Antients, *Polycarp*, *Papias*, *Irenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Tertullian*, many of which are known and by the *adverſaries* acknowledged to aſſert *Epiſcopacy* in our modern ſenſe, and yet uſe the word Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, to denote ſometimes the *Apoſtles*, ſometimes the *ſingular Biſhops* in *each Church*. 4.

And therefore the affirming this one thing, ſo atteſted and confirmed, *viz.* that the word Πρεσβύτεροι may very conveniently be interpreted *Biſhops*, as oft as the circumſtances of the *Text* will bear it, will not, I hope, ſtill be ſo *unfortunate* as to fall under the *cenſure* of *Paradox* and *odious*, being indeed a plain obvious obſervation, which hath nothing of difficulty or *harſhneſs* in it. 5.

Having premiſed this, I ſhall only add, that the *Apoſtles* being by all *Prelatiſts* (I hope convincingly) affirmed and proved to have *ordained Biſhops* in every *City* of *Converts* and *Proſelytes* to the *Faith*, and there being many ſuch *Cities* in *Judæa*, beſides *Jeruſalem*, and conſequently many *Biſhops* in thoſe 6.

Cities, one in each, it can be no new thing to conclude, that when we read of *Biſhops* in the *plural* within that pale of *Judæa*, theſe are the *Biſhops* of *Judæa*; and ſo in like manner, when we find the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem* mentioned ſeparately, and then thoſe others with him, (expreſt by any title which ſignifies *Biſhops*, be it Ἐπίσκοποι or Πρεσβύτεροι it matters not) and withal, theſe never expreſt to be Πρεσβύτεροι ἐκκλησίας Ἱερουσαλὴμ, *Elders of the Church of Jeruſalem*, but either *Elders* ſimply, or elſe ἐν or εἰς *in* or *at Jeruſalem*, denoting only the *place*, where, at that time, they were *preſent*, it will be as little harſh to infer, that at ſuch time there were *aſſembled* or met together at *Jeruſalem*, *James* the *Biſhop* of that *Metropolis*, and the other *Biſhops* of the whole *Region*, the *Biſhops* of *Judæa* with him.

7. From hence there will now be no difficulty to make a brief *anſwer* to each of their demands, firſt, that *Act.* 21. 18. the *Elders* which were preſent with *James* the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, were the *Biſhops* of *Judæa* which were then, upon the emergent affairs of the *Church*, preſent at *Jeruſalem*, whether all of them aſſembled in *Councel*, to receive an account of Saint *Pauls* tranſactions and ſucceſſes among the *Gentiles*, v. 19. or many of them on any other *Eccleſiaſtical* concernment.

8. But that which puts it out of queſtion, that it was *all* of them in *Councel*, is, what follows, *v.* 25. where they refer to the *decrees* which had been *conciliarly* delivered, *v.* 15. by them, who are now there preſent, *we have written and concluded*. And what *Paradox* can there be in this, that all the *Biſhops* of *Judæa* ſhould be in *Councel* at *Hieruſalem*, and S^t *Peter* and St. *John* with them, and that St. *Paul* ſhould come and give an account of his *travails* and actions in their preſence?

9. The ſame anſwer certainly belongs to the place next mentioned, *c.* 15. 4. where after mention of their *Reception* by the *Church*, follows [*and of the Apoſtles and Elders*] by the *Church* is meant the *Believers* that were at *Jeruſalem*, whether *inhabiting* there continually, or now occaſionally *preſent* there. By the *Apoſtles*, *James* the *Brother* of the *Lord*, the then *Biſhop* of the *Metropolis*, together with *Peter* and *John* the known *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, this *James* by them ſet over that *Church*, ſaith * *Clemens* and † *Hegeſippus*, and by St. *Paul* himſelf reckoned among the *Apoſtles*, *Gal.* 1. 19. and ſo in the title of his *Epiſtle*, and named before *Peter* and *John* the two *prime Apoſtles*, as being in this his See, *Gal.* 2. 9. and expreſt to pronounce the *decree* in the *Councel*, Ἐγὼ κρίνω, *I judge*, Act. 15. 19. and this confirm'd by the *teſtimonies* of thoſe *Antients* that the *Preſbyterians* make the moſt frequent uſe of, *Theodoret* and * St. *Hierome*; the former expreſly affirming of thoſe times, that they which were after ſtyled *Biſhops*, were then called *Apoſtles*, and the latter ſtyling this *James* particularly, *Apoſtolum decimum tertium*, the thirteenth *Apoſtle*.

* Τῶν ἀποστ. l. 6. † Τῶν μνημ. ε.

* *Commen. in Iſa.*

10. And then what can be more agreeable to the *Context* (to make the *Councel* compleat, a *Councel* for the *Churches* of *Syria*, &c. to appeal to) than to render the *Elders* the *Biſhops* of all *Judæa*, which were certainly fitter for the turn to join in the *Councel*, and give *Law* to other *Cities*, than the bare *Presbyters* of the *one* City of *Jeruſalem* could have been eſteemed, if any ſuch there had been in the *Church* ſo early?

11. For though of the *Apoſtles*, who had an *univerſal* juriſdiction, and of the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem* (as that was the *prime Metropolis* not only of *Judæa*, but *Syria* alſo) with the *Biſhops* of the whole *Province* in *Councel* with him, ſome reaſonable account may be given, why they ſhould be *conſulted* by the *Church* of *Antioch*, and give binding *decrees* in that matter, to all that were ſubject to that *Metropolis*; yet ſuppoſing the *Church* of *Jeruſalem* to be governed by *Preſbyters*, and that (as theſe ſay) the *Elders* mentioned in the *Councel* were none but the *Preſbyters* of that particular *Church*, there could no reaſonable account be given, why they ſhould join with the *Apoſtles* in this work, wherein not *Jeruſalem*, of which alone they were *Preſbyters*, but *Antioch* and other *Cities* of *Syria* and *Cilicia* were immediately concerned, and concluded by the *ſentence* of *James*, that muſt be, (according to their opinion) of one of the *Presbyters* of *Jeruſalem*.

12. In the next place what is ſaid of *Act.* 14. 23. and *Act.* 11. 30. is ſomewhat unhappily put together, and yet not rectified in the *Errata*. For firſt, the *ordaining* Elders *in every Church* to which *Act.* 11. 30. is affixt, is not mentioned there, but *Act.* 14. 23. and the *ſending relief*, which in the *Syntaxes* muſt be affixt to *Act.* 14. 23. is not to be met with there, but *Act.* 11. 30. But this were imputable to ſome haſte either of *Scribe* or *Compoſitor*, were there not a ſecond incongruity interweaved in it, *viz.* that when *Paul* and *Barnabas* had *ordained* them *Elders*, &c. (which was not done till *Act.* 14. 23.) *They ſent relief to the Elders*, (which was done, *Act.* 11. 30.) which is an evident πρωθύστερον, which I cannot diſcern how it was uſeful for them to be guilty of.

13. As for their *Quæres* raiſed on theſe two *Texts*, the *Anſwers* are obvious, and here to be tranſlated out of the *Diſſertations* as formerly, that the πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, *Act.* 11. 30. are the *Biſhops* of the ſeveral *Cities* of *Judæa*, not the *Preſbyters* of that one *City Jeruſalem*.

14. For firſt the *famine* that occaſioned this charity of the *Antiochians*, was ἐφ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην, not upon *Jeruſalem alone*, but *all the World*, i. e. in the *Scripture*-ſtile, *Lu.* 21. 26. *Rom.* 10. 18. over the *whole Land* of *Judæa*, according to the manner of the *ſeptuagint*, who oft render הָאָרֶץ *the Earth* or the *Land*, when it ſignifies the *Land* of *Judæa*, by οἰκουμένη the *World*, As *Iſa.* 10. 23. and 13. 5. 9. and 24. 1. and accordingly *Joſephus* ſaith of this time of *Claudius*'s Reign, μέγαν λιμὸν κατὰ τὴν Ἰουδαίαν γενέσθαι, *that there was a great famine over* Judæa.

15. Secondly, The charity is diſtinctly ſaid to be deſigned by the *Donors*, τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν ἐν Ἰουδαίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς, *to the brethren that dwelt in* Judæa, in no wiſe confined to *Jeruſalem*, nor conſequently can the *Elders* to whom it was ſent, and in whoſe hands it was put, be any others than the *Elders*, i. e. ſay we, *Biſhops* of all *Judæa*.

16. Thirdly, It is very agreeable to the *office* of *Biſhops*, as we find the practice in the *Primitive Church*, to be the *receivers*, and *ſtewards*, and *diſpenſers* of the wealth of any ſort, which was brought in to the *Church*, whether by the *offertory* of the *faithful* in the *Sacrament*, or by the *liberality* of other *Churches*, inlarged to thoſe that were in want. It being *Juſtin Martyr*'s affirmation of the firſt times, that all the *offerings* were brought to the Προεστὼς or *Preſident*, and that he was thereby made κηδεμὼν *the Curator of all that were in want*.

17. And when what is ſent to the *Biſhop*, is ſuppoſed to be ſent to him, as the *Oeconomus* or *ſteward* of the

the *Church*, not for the inriching himſelf, but to *provide* for thoſe that *wanted*; I cannot imagine why this may not be as conveniently ſuppoſed, as that it ſhould be ſent to the *Preſbyters* only.

So in like manner the Πρεσβύτεροι, *Act.* 14. 23. are *Biſhops* again, and ſuch and only ſuch (as far as 18.
we have any footſteps of it) were at that time *ordained* in the *Churches*, one in every City where the *Goſpel* was received, with one or more *Deacons* to attend him.

And to this as the words ſo often mentioned out of *Clemens Romanus* are moſt evident, that *the* 19.
Apoſtles of Chriſt *preaching through* Cities *and* Regions, *conſtituted their firſt-fruits* εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους *for Biſhops and Deacons*, ſo the *context* in this place of the *Acts* is very agreeable: For here when *Paul* and *Barnabas* had *preacht* and converted a competent number at *Derbe*, v. 12. and returned to the *Cities* of *Lyſtra*, *Iconium* and *Antioch*, v. 22. *confirming the ſouls of the brethren*, i. e. the *faithful*, there it follows, before their parting, that they *ordained Elders* κατ' ἐκκλησίαν *in every Church*, that ſure is, in every of the *Churches* here named, not many in *each*, but *Elders* in all, *one Biſhop* in *every Church*; which again is no news for me or any *Prelatiſt* to affirm, when in the *Epiſtle* to *Titus*, S^t *Paul's* direction is conformable to his *practice*, appointing him to *ordain Elders* κατὰ πόλιν, *City by City*, or *in every City*, c. 1. 5. and preſently calling the *Elder* ſo to be *ordained*, *Biſhop*, as in the *Epiſtle* to *Timothy* he is alſo called.

Thus much pains I ſhall not grudge to have taken, if it be but to reſcue a ſmall *Book*, very inno- 20.
cently meant, from the charge of two ſuch *Paradoxes*, as they are called by thoſe, who have not thought fit to *believe* them, and are as unwilling that others ſhould, and therefore conclude their diſcourſe againſt them with *tragical expreſſions of offering manifeſt violence to the Scriptures*, of being *ſufficient*, *inſtead of upholding Epiſcopacy*, *to render it odious and contemptible*, &c. And when they have ſaid ſo much with ſo little weight of reaſon to juſtifie it, they will then part with all *meekneſs* and perfect *temper* [*but we forbear*] i. e. *abſtain* to add more, when they had ſaid as much ill as could be. I am ſorry there was ſtill any *more bitterneſs* within, to be *ſuppreſt*, when there was ſo much *vented*. However it is, we are now at end of a *ſecond poſt*, and ſo have time to breath a while after ſome *laſſitude*.

CHAP. III.

Concerning the Opinion of Antiquity in this Queſtion.

SECT. I.

The Teſtimonies of Clemens Romanus. Biſhops *and* Deacons *the only offices at the firſt*. Corinth *Metropolis of* Achaia. *What* χώρα *ſignifies*. *The* Apoſtles *care to prevent contentions about Epiſcopacy*. Hegeſippus's *teſtimony of the contentions at* Corinth. Clement *a* Biſhop.

SOme things there are yet behind in their *Appendix*, wherein I diſcern my ſelf to be concern'd, in *Numb.* 1.
ſome *directly* and immediately, in others by *remoter* obligation; as when ſome of thoſe *teſtimonies* of *Antiquity*, which are in the *Diſſertations* manifeſted to be perfectly *reconcileable* with our pretenſions, and ſome of them evident *confirmations* of them, are yet by theſe Writers crudely taken up, and made uſe of, as *Teſtimonies* on their ſide, without ever taking notice of that which is ſaid in the *Diſſertations* to clear the contrary.

Of the former ſort, wherein I am more *immediately* pointed at, there are *four things*. Firſt, Con- 2.
cerning one *teſtimony* of St. *Hierome*. Secondly, Concerning *Ignatius* his *Epiſtles* in general, and the *appeals* that I make to his *authority*, which they will not allow to have force with them. Thirdly, Concerning one *teſtimony* cited by them out of St. *Ambroſe* on *Epheſ.* 4. and *anſwered* by me, but that *anſwer* diſliked and rejected by them. Fourthly, Concerning the *Chorepiſcopi*. Of the ſecond ſort, are the *teſtimonies* out of *Clemens Romanus*, *Polycarp*, *Irenæus*, and *Tertullian*, eſpecially the two former of them.

I ſhall therefore briefly ſurvey every one of theſe, and I ſuppoſe I have pitcht on the moſt conve- 3.
nient Method (and that which will give the Reader the *cleareſt* view both of the *judgment* of *Antiquity* concerning *Epiſcopacy* in general (to which their *Appendix* profeſſeth wholly to be deſigned) and more particularly of the truth of thoſe *two* propoſitions which have been accuſed as *Paradoxes* in me, but will now appear not to be ſuch) by taking theſe *teſtimonies*, as they lie in the order of *time*, wherein the *Authors* lived, and then that of S^t *Hierome*, which happens to be firſt mentioned by them, *p.* 102. will fall to be one of the *laſt* to which we ſhall make reply.

Firſt then for *Clemens*, they thus begin, *ſure we are that* Clemens, *who lived in the firſt Century*, [illegible] 4.
his famous Epiſtle *to the* Corinthians (*an undoubted piece of Antiquity*) *makes but two Orders of Miniſtery*, Biſhops *and* Deacons. And having ſet down the place which teſtifies this, * Καὶα χωρὰς οὖν καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες, καθίσανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν, and rendered it thus, *Chriſt Jeſus ſent his* Apoſtles *through* Countries *and* Cities, *in which they preached and conſtituted the firſt-fruits* (*approving them by the ſpirit*) *for* Biſhops *and* Deacons *to thoſe who ſhould afterwards believe*. From hence they obſerve, *p.* 105. *That* Biſhops *and* Deacons *were the only orders of Miniſtery in the firſt* Primitive Church. *And that the* Apoſtles *appointed but two Officers* (*that is* Biſhops *and* Deacons) *to bring men to believe*, *becauſe when he had reckon'd up three Orders appointed by God amongſt the* Jews, High-Prieſt, Prieſts, *and* Levites: *coming to recite Orders appointed by the* Apoſtles *under the Goſpel*, *he doth mention only* Biſhops *and* Deacons. *p.* 104. * *Clem. ad Corinth. p.* 54.

And here one would think were little for the *Preſbyterians* advantage, even no more than one of 5.

my *Paradoxes* would have afforded them, which, from this very *teſtimony* and ſome other, concluded that which was then ſo *ſtrange* for them to hear (yet now can be confeſt by them) that the *Apoſtles* at their *firſt plantations* contented themſelves with *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, *one* of each, or perhaps *more* of the latter in *every City*.

6. But when theſe men thus grant the *concluſion* from this place, which I inferr'd, I have yet no reaſon to boaſt of their *liberality*, becauſe I ſuppoſe it their meaning, that by *Biſhops Clement* meant *Preſbyters*, though this they do not ſo much as ſay in twice repeating of their *concluſion*.

7. And yet certainly it needed more than *ſaying*, *proving* by ſome evidence or argument, that Ἐπίσκοποι *Biſhops* in that place ſignifies any thing elſe but *Biſhops*. All that they offer towards a *reaſon* for this, muſt be contained in theſe words of theirs that follow in the former place.

8. *The occaſion of that Epiſtle ſeems to be a new ſedition raiſed by the* Corinthians *againſt their* Presbyters, *p.* 57. 58. Clemens *to remove their preſent ſedition tells them how God hath always appointed ſeveral orders in his* Church, *which muſt not be confounded*; *in the* Jewiſh Church *he appointed High-Prieſt*, Prieſts *and* Levites, *And then tells them for the time of the Goſpel that* Chriſt Jeſus *ſent his* Apoſtles, as before citing the words of *Clement* already ſet down.

9. But certainly this doth not prove *Biſhops* in that *Epiſtle* to be no more than *Preſbyters*, but may as fitly be argumentative for me, that Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* in that *Epiſtle* ſignify *Biſhops*. The only imaginable *medium* of proof, which can be uſeful for their turn, I ſhall ſuppoſe to be this, that *Corinth* was but *one* City, and therefore Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* at, and of *Corinth*, muſt needs be *Preſbyters*, becauſe according to our opinion there were not *more Biſhops* in one City.

10. But to this I anſwer, Firſt, That what *Clemens* ſaith in the *teſtimony* now produced, he ſpeaks not of *Corinth* peculiarly, but of the Cities, and Regions in general, which the *Apoſtles* converted, and of them in the *plural* number, κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις, *through Regions and Cities*, and then in thoſe *many Cities*, there may well be *many Biſhops*, and yet certainly no more than *one* in *one City*.

11. Secondly, that this *Epiſtle* of *Clemens* to the *Corinthians* was not to the *Chriſtians* of that *one City*, but to the whole *Province* of *Achaia*, of which *Corinth* was the *Metropolis*, and wherein the *Proconſul* of *Achaia* reſided, and kept his Courts, *Act.* 18. 12. 15. So the *Title* of the *Epiſtle* inclines, being inſcribed to the Church παροικοῦσαν Κόρινθον, which denotes the whole *Province*, then called παροικίαν, as when in *Polycarps Epiſtle*, the Church παροικοῦσα Φιλίππους [is not only that of the City *Philippi*, but of the *Province* belonging to it, and in the other part of the *title* of this *Epiſtle*, Ἐκκλησία θεοῦ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην, *the Church of God dwelling about Rome*,] in the Church of *Rome*, and all that belonged to that *Metropolis*, called by *Ignatius* τόπος χωρίου Ῥωμαίων, *the place of the Region of the* Romans, *i. e.* the City, and the whole *Region* about it; And ſo when *Euſebius* mentions *Dionyſius* the famous *Biſhop* of *Corinth*, he calls him *Biſhop* τῆς ἐν Κορίνθῳ παροικίας, *of the Province of*, or *about* Corinth. *v.* 4. *c.* 23.

12. And that this is the *truth* of it, and *no conjecture* of mine, may appear by one *Character* in the *Epiſtle*; He tells them that they had formerly received *Epiſtles* from S. *Paul*: This directs to reſolve, that theſe to whom this *Epiſtle* was addreſt, were the ſame to whom S. *Paul*'s were formerly ſent; And it is evident, that thoſe were the *Saints* or *Chriſtians* in *all Achaia*, 2. Cor. 1. 1. And the ſame is doubtleſs implied by the phraſe *in every place*, 1 Cor. 1. 2. not *in every place* ſimply of the *World* (for it was no *Catholick Epiſtle*, but a particular admonition for particular faults, *inceſt*, &c.) but in that *whole Province* or *Region* of *Achaia*. So that which *Apollos* is ſaid to have done among them (*Apollos hath watered*) 1 Cor. 3. 6. appears by the *ſtory*, Act. 18. 27. to have belonged to *all Achaia*. And ſo what the *Apoſtle* writes to them of ſending their *offertory* to *Judæa*, 1 Cor. 6. 1. 2 Cor. 8. and 9. doth appear by *Rom.* 15. 26. to appertain to *all Achaia*; *Macedonia*, ſaith he, *and* Achaia *have pleaſed to make a contribution*, and 2 Cor. 9. 2. *I know your forwardneſs, that* Achaia *hath been ready above a year ago*. Where the [ὑμῶν *you*] and [*Achaia*] muſt needs be of the ſame *latitude*, and ſo again it is c. 11. 9. comparred with *v.* 18. And ſo thoſe of S. *Paul*, and conſequently this of *Clement* was not to the City of *Corinth* alone, but to all the Churches of *Achaia*; and if among them there were more *Biſhops* than one, there will certainly be no news in that, and if thoſe *Biſhops* (according both to the nature of the word, and the uſe of it in thoſe days, before and after *Clement*) were ſtyled ſometimes ἐπίσκοποι ſometimes πρεσβύτεροι alſo, then all is very agreeable to all that we contend for, that there was *one Biſhop*, not a College of *Preſbyters* in *Clements* days in every City.

13. And this is directly the importance of *Clements* words, as they lie in the *Epiſtle*, ἐξεπέμφθη, ſaith he, ὁ Χριστὸς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ, *Chriſt was ſent out from God, and the Apoſtles from* Chriſt (*As my Father ſent me, ſo ſend I you*) and then to ſhew that the *Biſhops* were in the ſame manner ſent, *i. e. commiſſionated* by them, he adds, that they, *i. e.* the *Apoſtles* ἐξῆλθον εὐαγγελιζόμενοι *went out Preaching* κατὰ χώρας καὶ πόλεις, &c. *therefore Preaching through* Regions *and* Cities *they conſtituted their firſt-fruits—for* Biſhops *and* Deacons; Cities *and* Regions in the *Plural*, and *Biſhops* and *Deacons* proportionable thereto.

14. And when he adds, that they were thus made of their *firſt-fruits*, i. e. of thoſe that were firſt converted by them, and to this end, that they might be *officers* of thoſe which ſhould *after believe* (ſuppoſing that there were not *many* now that did ſo) this is directly a *deſcription* of thoſe times, of which *Epiphanius* ſpeaks, ſaying, that when the *Goſpel began to be Preacht*, *there was yet no need of* Presbyters, *but* Biſhops *and* Deacons *ſerved the turn*.

15. And accordingly *Deacons* in thoſe dayes were immediately made *Biſhops*, as is ſufficiently known of *Clement* the *Writer* of this *Epiſtle*, who was S^t *Peters Deacon*, and *Biſhop* after him, as is cleared in *Diſſert.* 5. c. 1. Sect. 11. And ſo much for that *firſt teſtimony*.

16. One thing only more frome hence they are deſirous to conclude, that *in the firſt and pureſt times the cuſtom was to chuſe* Biſhops *in Villages*, *as well as in great* Cities, grounded upon this, that here *the Apoſtles are ſaid to have appointed Biſhops* κατὰ χώρας, *as well as* κατὰ πόλεις.

17. But there is no ground of this *concluſion* in this *teſtimony*; For firſt, here is no mention of *villages*, χῶραι is not *Greek* for them, but κῶμαι, and 'tis the former, not the latter which here we find. It is evident what is meant by χῶραι, when it is joined with πόλεις *Cities*, viz. *Provinces*, which have each of them *many Cities* in them, and when it is joined with κῶμαι *Villages*, it fitly *denotes Regions*, in which there are *many Villages*.

So

So ſaith * *Strabo* of *Aſia*, Ῥωμαῖοι ἐπαρχίαν ἀπέδειξαν τὴν χώραν, *the Romans made that Region a Province*; and ſo in the *Eccleſiaſtical* writings χώρα is a *Province* made up of *many Cities*, each of which had a *Biſhop* over them; as when in the † *Council in Trullo*, Κυπριανὸς Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Ἀφρων χώρας, *Cyprian* is ſaid to be *Archbiſhop of the Region of the* Africans, *Region* there ſignifying the *whole Province* under that *Metropolitane*, and ſo * *Cyprian* himſelf makes it his obſervation, *Jampridem per omnes provincias & ſingulas urbes inſtituti ſunt Epiſcopi. Antiently through all the Provinces and each of the Cities, Biſhops were inſtituted.* Where the *Biſhops* in the ſeveral *Provinces*, as thoſe differ from the *Biſhops* in each *City*, are undoubtedly *Archbiſhops*. 18. * *Geo. lib.* 13. † *Can.* 2. * *Ep.* 52.

And if that place, ſo very agreeable to this of *Clemens*, may be allowed to give us the meaning of it, we ſee what it will be, and how diſtant from theſe mens *concluſion*, that the *Apoſtles inſtituted Biſhops* in every *City*, and in each *Region* or *Province*, and in the *Metropolis* or *chief City* of it, a *Metropolitane* or *Archbiſhop*. 19.

But then ſecondly, if χώρα ſhould ſignifie, as they would have it, a *company* of *villages* or little *towns* lying near together, ſo as to be here uſed in *oppoſition* to the *Cities*, yet could it not be from hence concluded, that the *Apoſtles* conſtituted *Biſhops* in thoſe *villages*. The words are, *they preached through Regions and Cities, and conſtituted their firſt-fruits* (earlyeſt converts) *into Biſhops and Deacons*, which will be perfectly true, though all the *Biſhops* and *Deacons* conſtituted by them, had their *fixt* ſeats of *reſidence* in the *Cities*; For that they conſtituted *Biſhops* in the *Regions*, is not here affirmed. 20.

Much more might be ſaid in this matter, to ſhew that the utmoſt *conceſſions* that the *adverſaries* could demand from hence, would no way hinder or diſadvantage our *pretenſions*, but only give the *Chorepiſcopi* a greater *Antiquity* in the *Church*, than either they or we have reaſon to think they had, of which whole matter the Reader may ſee a full diſcourſe, *Diſſert.* 3. c. 8. Sect. 25, *&c.* and of it ſomewhat we ſhall anon have occaſion to *repeat* from thence. 21.

The *ſecond Teſtimony* of *Clemens* is ſet down by them in theſe words, *That the Apoſtles knowing by Jeſus Chriſt, that there would a contention ariſe, περὶ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, about the name of Biſhop, and being indued with perfect foreknowledge, they appointed the aforeſaid* (*that is, the aforeſaid orders of Biſhops and Deacons*) &c. Here they require *two things to be noted*, *Firſt, That by name is not meant the bare name of Biſhop, but the honour and dignity, as it is taken*, Phil. 2. 9. Epheſ. 1. 21. Heb. 1. 4. Rev. 11. *So that ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι, is ἐπὶ ἀξιώματι ἐπισκοπῆς, The controverſie among the Corinthians was not about the name, but dignity of Epiſcopacy; for it was about the depoſition of their godly Presbyters*, pag. 57, 58. *Secondly, That the only remedy appointed by the Apoſtles for the cure of all contentions ariſing about Epiſcopacy, is, by committing the care of the Church to Biſhops and Deacons: Afterwards the Church found out another way, by ſetting up one Biſhop over another; But* Clemens *tells us, that the Apoſtles indued with perfect foreknowledge of things ordained only Biſhops and Deacons for a remedy of Schiſms.* 22. Pag. 57.

To this they add (to ſuperſede farther *citations* out of this *Epiſtle*) *It would be too long to recite all that is ſaid in this Epiſtle for the juſtification of our propoſition, let the Reader peruſe* pag. 57. 62. 69. 72. *and take notice that thoſe which are called Biſhops in one place, are called Presbyters in another, and that they are ἰσοδυναμοῦντα throughout the whole Epiſtle.* 23.

What this *whole Epiſtle* will yield toward the proof of their *propoſition*, which is, [*That after* Chriſts Aſcenſion *the* Church *of* God *for a certain ſpace of time, was governed by a Common Council of* Presbyters *without* Biſhops.] I think it reaſonable for any that hath not read it, to *conjecture* by theſe two *teſtimonies*, which theſe, who *aſſert* the *propoſition*, and here undertake to *prove* it, have thought fit to *cull* out of it, having withal nothing more to *collect* for their turn from the reſt of the *Epiſtle*, particularly from the *comparing* thoſe *four pages*, 57. 62. 69. 72. but only this, that they which are called *Biſhops* in one place, are called πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* in another. 24.

Now this laſt they know is the very thing that I contend (as from the *Scripture*, ſo) from this and other *antient* writings, that Ἐπίσκοπος and Πρεσβύτερος, [*Biſhop* and *Elder*] are words of the ſame *importance*; all the queſtion is, whether at the firſt *both* imported *Biſhops*, or both *Preſbyters*, in our *modern* notion. That there is no one circumſtance ſo much as offered by them to conſideration, which may incline it their way, is evident by their own words, neither of their *two notes* pretending to it, only their *concluſion* affirming, that they are ἰσοδυναμοῦντα, *words* of the ſame *importance*. The whole matter therefore will ſtill devolve to this one *Quare*, whether, when *Clement* ſaith of the *Apoſtles* that they *conſtituted* none but *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, by *Biſhops* a *College* of *Presbyters* in *every City* be to be underſtood, or rather *one Biſhop*, with his *Deacon* or *Deacons* in *every City*. 25.

For the clearing of this one difficulty (for this being evinced, all that their *two notes* affirm, is directly on our ſide againſt them) I ſhall here intirely ſet down the whole place laſt produced, of which they have left out one half. It is thus, Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς: διὰ ταύτην οὖν αἰτίαν, πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους (ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν) καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσι, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν. *Our Apoſtles knew by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt* (that muſt be by *revelation* from him) *that there would contention ariſe upon the name* or *dignity of Epiſcopacy* (*i. e.* about the *authority* of *Biſhops* in the *Church*, ſome *oppoſing* it, and caſting them out of their *Offices*, as here in the *Church* of the *Corinthians*, and through all *Achaia*, was actually come to paſs at this time, and occaſioned this *Epiſtle* to them) *For which cauſe therefore the* Apoſtles *having received perfect foreknowledge* (that there would be ſuch *contentions* on this occaſion) *did* (for the *preventing* of them) *conſtitute the forementioned* (Biſhops *and* Deacons *of thoſe which ſhould come in to the Faith* in their *new plantations*) *and after them* (ſo μεταξὺ ſignifies in *Barnabas*'s *Epiſtle*, Sect. 10. λαὸς ὁ μεταξὺ, *the people that ſhould be after*, and εἰς τὸ μεταξὺ, *Act.* 13. 42. that which ſhould *follow*, the *next after*) *gave a Series* or *Catalogue*, or *manner of ſucceſſion* (*i. e.* ſet down a *note* of them which in *each Church* ſhould *ſucceed* the *preſent Incumbent*) *that when they died, other approved men might ſucceed to their office or miniſtery.* 26.

What can be more manifeſt, than that the *dignity*, which the *Apoſtles* conferred on the *Biſhops* in *each City* and *Province*, which in the former *Teſtimony* hath been cleared to belong to *ſingle Biſhops*, not to any *College* of *Presbyters*, was by them *foreſeen*, that it would be matter of *Contention*, occaſion 27.

of

of *Sedition* in the *Church*: for the prevention of which, they uſed the probableſt means imaginable, named *ſucceſſors* to the preſent *Biſhops* in every *Church*, who ſhould ſupply the *vacant* places, as ſoon as they fell, and ſo prevent *ſuing* and *contending* for them, and were by the ſpecial *ſpirit* of *God* directed, who thoſe *ſucceſſors* ſhould be; ſo that the *oppoſing* their *ſucceſſion*, or caſting them out afterwards, muſt be a great *ſin*, even of *reſiſting* the *ſpirit of God*, who had *deſigned* them to this *inheritance*. Which, next to *Chriſt*'s *bearing* them in his *right hand*, Rev. 1. 20. is the greateſt *character* of *dignity*, and evidence of *Chriſt*'s *approving* of the *Order*, and care of *continuing* it, as the *original* of *union* (not *diviſion*) in the *Church*.

28. There is not by theſe men one word of *objection* offered againſt this *concluſion*, thus formerly deduced in the *Diſſertations*, and therefore I need add no more for the *vindicating* this *teſtimony*; yet will it not be amiſs here to interpoſe the words of *Hegeſippus*, one that was *preſent* at the time of that *ſedition*, and gives an account of it in * *Euſebius*, ἐπέμψεν, ſaith he, ἐν τῷ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἡ Κορινθίων μεχρὶ Πείμου ἐπισκοπεύοντος ἐν Κορίνθῳ, *The Church of the* Corinthians *continued in the right, until* Primus *was* Biſhop *of* Corinth. Which is a *teſtimony* as antient as that of *Clement*, and tells us what *Biſhops* they were which *Clement* ſpeaks of, ſuch as *Primus* was at *Corinth*, i. e. one *ſingular Governour* in a *City*.

* L. 4. c. 22.

29. The ſame will be yet more manifeſt, if we conſider what by all *Authors* is affirmed of *Clemens* himſelf, the *writer*, at the time of writing this *Epiſtle*, that having been Saint *Paul*'s *Fellow-labourer*, Phil. 4. 3. *Saint* Peter's *Deacon* (*Ignat. in Ep. ad Trall.*) he was now *Biſhop* of *Rome*, by the joint ſuffrage of *Irenæus* and all the *Antients*, even of Saint *Jerome* himſelf in his *Catalogue*, and by him ſtyled an *Apoſtolical* perſon, on *Iſa.* 52. a *companion* of the *Apoſtles* (*in Interp. Com. Orig. in Rom.*) and by *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Strom.* lib. 4. an *Apoſtle* in the ſenſe that *Theodoret* ſaith, thoſe whom in his time they called *Biſhops*, had been at firſt called *Apoſtles*.

30. Accordingly of him, ſaith *Irenæus* in his *Catalogue* of the *ſucceſſive Governours* of the *Church*, τέτῳ τόπῳ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων τὸν ἐπισκοπὴν κληροῦται Κλήμης, *in the third place from the* Apoſtles Clemens *came to the* Biſhoprick; Which how it is eaſily to be accorded with thoſe who truly make him *Peters immediate ſucceſſor*, ſee *Diſſert.* 5. c. 1. Sect. 6. *&c.*

31. Other *teſtimonies* there are producible from this *Epiſtle* of *Clement*, which are all to the ſame purpoſe with the former; As when he finds an *image* of the *Eccleſiaſtical ſtate* under *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, in the *prophecy* of *Iſaiah*, cap. 60. 17. where in the *Greek* tranſlation, then in uſe, he had read καταστήσω ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει, *I will conſtitute their Biſhops in righteouſneſs, and their Deacons in faithfulneſs*, ſpeaking of the *Judges* and their *Miniſters* and *officers* in every *City*.

32. And ſo again when he exhorts them to give *due honour to the Elders* among them, talks of their *ſedition* againſt their *Elders*, and caſting them out of their *Epiſcopacy*, in one place (ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλλειν) and removing them from that *honoured office* (τελειμεθύμης λειτουργίας μεταγαγεῖν) in another, and the like; All of the *ſame* importance, and to be interpreted by the former.

SECT. II.

The Teſtimony of Polycarp. *That he was himſelf a Biſhop. His mention of* Ignatius's Epiſtles, *fit to give authority to them, being ſo confirmed as it is by a ſeries of the Antients.*

Numb. 1. IN the next place follows their *teſtimony* out of *Polycarp*, introduced in this manner.

The like Record we have of Polycarp *that famous Diſciple of* John *the Apoſtle, who lived alſo within the firſt Century, and wrote an Epiſtle to the* Philippians, *in which he makes alſo but two Orders of Miniſtery, Biſhops and Deacons, and perſwades the* Philippians *to be ſubject to their Presbyters and Deacons, as to God and Chriſt.*

2. To this *Teſtimony* from *Polycarp* there is no reaſon I ſhould deny any part of my *aſſent*, being ſo perfectly ſuch, as the cauſe which I defend requires; If there be with him but *two orders* of *Miniſtery*, *Biſhops and Deacons*, and he perſwades the *Philippians* (*i. e.* that whole *Province*, the ſame to which Saint *Paul* had written, conſiſting of *many Churches*, all under that *Metropolis* of *Philippi*) to be ſubject to their πρεσβύτεροι and διάκονοι, *Elders* and *Deacons*, and ſets the *former* of them, in the *compariſon*, to anſwer *God* the *Father* the *ſupream Monarch* of *Heaven*, and the latter to be the parallel to *Chriſt* who came out from *Heaven* upon his *Fathers* Meſſages; then what reaſon have I to doubt, but that theſe *Elders* and *Deacons* are the very ſame which Saint *Paul* had called *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, Phil. 1. 1. which that it belonged to the ſeveral *Biſhops* of that *Province* of *Macedonia*, hath before been ſufficiently vindicated.

3. And therefore without farther debating this *Teſtimony*, I ſhall add ſome few things concerning this *Polycarp*, which will help conveniently to clear the whole matter.

4. Firſt, That as it is moſt true, that is here ſaid of him, that he was a *famous Diſciple* of *John* the *Apoſtle*, ſo this is added to his titles by the *authentick Epiſtle* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, Οὗτος γέγονεν ὁ θαυμασιώτατος ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνοις, διδάσκαλος Ἀποστολικὸς καὶ προφητικὸς γενόμενος. *This was the moſt wonderful perſon in our times, being an Apoſtolical and Prophetical Doctor*, and that he was a moſt *glorious Martyr*, is the deſigned matter of that whole *Epiſtle*.

5. Secondly, That this *famous, moſt admirable Apoſtolical Doctor* and *Martyr*, was the *Biſhop* of *Smyrna*, and ſo conſtituted by the *Apoſtles*, as will appear by three *Teſtimonies*, each of them irrefragable. Firſt, By the *Epiſtle* of that *Church* of *Smyrna*, written on purpoſe concerning his *Martyrdome*, a *reverend* piece of *Antiquity*, fit to compare with any that remains in the *Church*. And there we find in the

the cloſe of his *titles*, Ἐπίσκοπος τῆς τῶν ἁγίων Σμύρνῃ καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας, that he was *Biſhop of the Catholick Church, which is in Smyrna*, i. e. both of *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Chriſtians* there.

So *Polycrates* (the *eighth Biſhop* of *Epheſus*, born within a while after Saint *John*'s Death) in his 6.
Epiſtle to *Victor*, Πολύκαρπος ὁ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ἐπίσκοπος καὶ μάρτυς. *Polycarp the Biſhop of Smyrna and Martyr.*

So *Irenæus*, lib. 3. cap. 3. ſpeaking of him, ſaith, ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων καταστὰς εἰς τὸν Ἀσίαν ἐν τῇ 7.
Σμύρνῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ Ἐπίσκοπος, that he was *conſtituted by the Apoſtles Biſhop of the Church of Smyrna in Aſia.*

And then what poſſibility can there be, that he being thus a *Biſhop*, nay *Metropolitane* himſelf, (as 8.
hath formerly been ſhewed) writing to another *Metropolis*, and commanding to *obey* the Πρεσβύτεροι and *Deacons*, ſhould mean any thing elſe but *Biſhops* by Πρεσβύτεροι?

Thirdly, That this *Polycarp*, as in this *Epiſtle* he acknowledgeth to have received an *Epiſtle* from 9.
Ignatius (Ἐγράψατέ μοι καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ Ἰγνάτιος, *You wrote to me, and* [*to*] *Ignatius* alſo) ſo he tells them that he had ſent them a *collection* of the ſame *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*. Τὰς ἐπιστολὰς Ἰγνατίου πεμφθείσας ἡμῖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἄλλους ὅσους εἴχομεν παρ' ἡμῖν, ἐπέμψαμεν ὑμῖν καθὼς ἐπεστείλασθε, αἵτινες ὑποτεταγμέναι εἰσὶ τῇ ἐπιστολῇ ταύτῃ, ἐξ ὧν μεγάλα ὠφεληθήσεσθε —— *The Epiſtles of* Ignatius, *ſent to us by him, and as many others as we had by us, we have ſent to you, as you required, which are ſubjoined to this Epiſtle, by which you may receive great benefit.*

By this paſſage it is clear, that as *Ignatius* wrote one *Epiſtle* to *Polycarp*, another to the *Church* 10.
of *Smyrna*, whereof *Polycarp* was *Biſhop*, both contain'd under the phraſe πεμφθεῖσας ἡμῖν, *ſent to us*, (as it is explain'd by *Euſebius* in theſe words, Διὰ γραφῆς ὁμιλεῖ Ἰγνατίος τῇ Σμυρναίων ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἰδίως δὲ τῷ ταύτης προηγουμένῳ Πολυκάρπῳ, Ignatius *wrote to the Church of* Smyrna, *and ſeverally to* Polycarp *the Ruler thereof*) ſo he wrote divers others alſo, which at that time, before *Ignatius*'s death, were by the *Philippians* deſired from *Polycarp*, and by *Polycarp* tranſmitted to them, and ſo cannot with any ſenſe be affirmed to be forged, and affixt to his name after his death.

How theſe *Epiſtles* were from *Polycarp* brought down to the hands of *Irenæus*, who lived in *Poly-* 11.
carp's time, and ſaw him an *old* man, and ſo teſtifies in his *Epiſtle* to *Florinus*, and cites a notable paſſage out of *Ignatius*, which we now have in his *Epiſtle* to the *Romans*: How, ſoon after *Irenæus*, * *Origen* cites them again, calling him *Martyr* and *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, the *ſecond* after *Peter*, and ſetting down the very words which we now have in the *Epiſtle* to the *Epheſians*; How, after *Origen*, † *Euſebius* ſets down the whole ſtory of writing them, together with a diſtinct *Catalogue* of *ſeven*, to *Epheſus*, to *Magneſia*, to the *Trallians*, to the *Romans*, to the *Philadelphians*, to the *Smyrnæans*, and to *Polycarp*: And in like manner *Athanaſius*, citing from *Ignatius*, words which we now find in his *Epiſtle* to the *Epheſians*, and *Theodoret* in many paſſages out of that to the *Epheſians*, to the *Trallians*, to the *Smyrnæans*; And at laſt S^t *Hierome* (on whoſe authority the *Presbyterians* ſo much depend) according exactly with *Euſebius*, to give theſe ſeven Epiſtles of *Ignatius* a full authority with all; All this I ſay hath been at large deduced and evidenced in the *Diſſertations*: And this, one would think, might have been ſufficient to have given *Ignatius* ſome place among their *Teſtimonies* for the *opinion* of *antiquity* in this matter; eſpecially when that very Epiſtle of *Polycarp*, which for the bare name of Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* uſed by him, they cite, and give him his *juſt* honour, doth give teſtimony to the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, as clear, and as univerſally, and fully confirmed by others, as any, by which that Epiſtle of *Polycarp* or *Clemens*, or any other antient writing ſtands in the *Church*.

* In Luc. Hom. 6.

† L. 3. c. 35, 36.

Catal. Script. & ad Helvid. c. 9. *Diſſert.* 2. c. 24.

But all this, it ſeems, is of no weight with them; and therefore after the two teſtimonies of *Cle-* 12.
mens, and one of *Polycarp*, backt with the like number of *three* more, a ſaying of *Biſhop Bilſon* (very unlikely to be to the *prejudice* of *Biſhops*, if it were here ſeaſonable to examine it) and the like of *Gratian*, and the third of the Lord *Digby*, They are then at leiſure to remember what out of *Ignatius* is objected againſt them; Had he by any poſſible colour of any paſſage in him, been capable of doing them any ſervice, he might then, as his Epiſtles were written before *Polycarps*, have alſo been called out and cited before him; But all thoſe Epiſtles being ſo *diametrically* contrary to their pretenſions, as every man knows they are, he is now to be lookt on and anſwered, as *temptations* are wont to be, to be mentioned only, that he may be rejected by them.

SECT.

SECT. III.

A vindication of Ignatius's Epiſtles, Voſſius's *Edition of them, and the* Archbiſhop's *of* Armagh. *Some Teſtimonies out of them. The cauſe of his ſo inculcating obedience to* Biſhops. *Mr.* Caſaubon's *Teſtimony conſidered, and the Allegations from the* Archbiſhop *of* Armagh. *Three Reaſons againſt theſe* Epiſtles *anſwered. (No Marriage without the* Biſhop.) *Of the Reformed Churches. Of the Church of* Scotland *after the firſt converſion.*

Numb. 1. THus therefore they proceed, *p.* 107. *Againſt all that hath been ſaid in this propoſition, it is objected, that the bleſſed S.* Ignatius, *who lived in the firſt century, hath in his* Epiſtles *clearly and fully aſſerted Epiſcopal Government, as it is diſtinct from* Presbyterial, *and that therefore there was no ſpace of time, wherein the* Church *of* Chriſt *was governed by the Common Council of* Presbyters *without* Biſhops *properly ſo called.*

I do not conceive that they have ſaid any thing of any avail, for the proving their *Propoſition*, and preſume that neither from *Clement* nor *Polycarp* it hath appeared that they have gained any thing; And therefore againſt all that they have ſaid, there is no need that I ſhould make any *Objection*. But in a far larger ſtyle, I think it were no inſolence to ſay, that againſt all that was ever imagined by any to be producible out of *Antiquity* in behalf of *Preſbytery*, the bare teſtimonies of this one *Apoſtolical Martyr*, *Ignatius*, will be abundantly ſufficient, being put in the other Scale, to weigh them all down, and decide the *Controverſy* on the *Prelatiſts* ſide.

2. It were here unreaſonable at large to recite all theſe *teſtimonies*, being already ſet down particularly *Diſſert.* 2. c. 25. and the notoriety of the *fact* being ſuch, that a ſpecial *Objection* againſt the Epiſtles is, that he every where aſſerts *Epiſcopacy*. And therefore the only way that could be invented for the ſupporting the *Presbyterians* intereſt againſt ſuch direct *Teſtimonies*, ſo (every where) inculcated, and ſo impoſſible to be reconciled with their aſſertions, is this which they give us, *p.* 108. in theſe words.

3. *In anſwer to this we muſt intreat the Reader to take notice that in the Primitive Times there were abundance of ſpurious and ſuppoſititious works put forth under the Names of the* Apoſtles *and bleſſed* Martyrs, *which were none of theirs*, &c. *The like fraud hath been uſed in* Ignatius's *works*, &c.

4 Here firſt 'tis a little *ſtrange* that the *ſpurious* and *ſuppoſititious works* of the *Apoſtles* and *Martyrs* ſhould be ſaid to be put forth in the *Primitive* Times, unleſs that phraſe *Primitive*, be taken in a very great *Latitude*; I had thought that it had been in *after*-times, when *errors* were gotten in, and ſought *patronage* and covert from the *Primitive Fathers*, that theſe *ſpurious brats* were born, and affixt to great Names; And by this means indeed they are generally deſcryed, by their *impudent* mentioning of ſome matters of *fact*, which fell out in thoſe *latter* times, and ſo diſcovered the *impoſture*.

5. But this miſtake importeth not much to our preſent *controverſy*; If what is here confidently *affirmed*, [*The like fraud was uſed* in *Ignatius*'s *works*] can be any way *proved* to have *truth* in it, either in reſpect of the *Primitive* or *after*-times, I ſhall not quarrel upon ſuch *niceties*. I ſhall therefore examine their proofs, which follow.

6. And *firſt*, ſay they, *it is certain the* Epiſtle *of the bleſſed Virgin* Mary *to* Ignatius, *and of* Ignatius *to the bleſſed Virgin, and two other* Epiſtles *of* Ignatius *to* John *the* Apoſtle *are ſpurious and counterfeit.*

7. To this I moſt willingly yield, that the Epiſtles under *Ignatius*'s name to the *bleſſed Virgin* and S. *John*, may very probably be deemed none of his; and ſo they are generally rejected by thoſe who maintain *our*, as well as *their* intereſts. I ſhall only add, that there is no one word in them concerning *Biſhops*, nor were they ever produced by any *Prelatiſt* in defence of them.

8. Next then, ſay they, *As for his other twelve* Epiſtles, *five of them are by invincible arguments, as we conceive, proved by* Vedelius *to be written by a* Pſeudo-Ignatius. Euſebius *and* Hierom *make mention but of ſeven.*

9. Here alſo will eaſily be granted by us whatſoever is demanded; For though *Vedelius* a *Divine* of *Geneva* ſince the caſting out of their *Biſhop*, and ſetting up of the *new government*, might well be lookt on as a *partial* arguer or *Judge* concerning *Ignatius*'s writings, yet it being true, and by me formerly acknowledged, that *Euſebius* and S. *Hierom* mention but ſeven Epiſtles of his, I ſhall alſo be ready to yield to the utmoſt that *Vedelius* contended, that there be no more than *ſeven Genuine Epiſtles* of *Ignatius*; not that every of the other *five* can be proved to be *ſuppoſititious*, but becauſe the antient teſtifications of the *Church* do not make it ſo evident, that thoſe other *five* are all his, as of the other *ſeven* they do.

10. According to this conceſſion it is, that in the *Diſſertations*, all the *Teſtimonies* which are produced in defence of *Epiſcopacy*, are taken out of thoſe ſeven Epiſtles which S. *Hierom*, the *Presbyter*, and only truſted friend of the *Presbyterians*, doth acknowledge to be his.

11. But of theſe *ſeven* alſo they have ſomewhat to ſay, in theſe words: *And for theſe ſeven, though with* Scultetus, Vedelius *and* Rivetus, *we do not renounce them as none of his, yet ſure we are, they are ſo much adulterated and corrupted, that no man can ground any ſolid Aſſertion about Epiſcopacy from* Ignatius's *works.*

12. I hope I ſhall not now be lookt on, as an *intemperate aſſerter* of *Epiſcopacy*, if in this third *ſtep* alſo I go ſo far with the *Presbyterians* as to yield that I ſhall reſt contented even, with thoſe *parcels* of thoſe ſeven Epiſtles, which theſe moſt rigid *cenſors*, even *Vedelius* himſelf, which publiſhed him at *Geneva*, is content to acknowledge for his. If this be allowed me I ſhall need demand no more; The matter is evident, any man may conſult *Vedelius*'s *edition*, and find *teſtimonies* as clear for our turn, as could be wiſht, in thoſe parts of thoſe Epiſtles which he allows of.

13. But for the purging of *Ignatius*, as of all other *Antients*, I ſuppoſe the Method, which *Vedelius* uſed, proceeding for the moſt part, by his own *conjecture* and fancy, is not likely to be the beſt;

The

The one courſe which any *Judicious* Man would require or depend on, hath been uſed in this matter, ſince *Vedelius* had done his beſt; I mean the moſt *antient copies* in *Europe* have been conſulted, and *God*'s *Providence* hath been *eminently* diſcernable in the *reſult* of that *inquiry*.

14. *Iſaac Voſſius*, a known *learned* Man of that part of the *Reformed Church*, which is governed by *Presbyters*, hath met with an *Antient Manuſcript* in the *Medicæan library*, which hath none of the *ſuſpected Epiſtles*, and is perfectly free from thoſe paſſages, which were formerly among *ſober* Men made matter of *ſuſpicion* againſt the *Epiſtles*; And as in them we find thoſe very paſſages intire, which the *Antients* have cited out of them, ſo from them again all the *Teſtimonies* are fetcht, which we deſire to make uſe of in this matter.

15. So that if ever *Ignatius* wrote thoſe *Epiſtles*, which from *Polycarp* downward the *Antients* generally agree that he wrote, I have no reaſon to fear or doubt but his *authority*, and the *Teſtimonies* I have brought from him, will be of full value and force in this matter.

16. When this *Copy* out of the *Medicæan Library* was firſt tranſcribed by *Voſſius*, the greateſt Enemies of *Epiſcopacy* were much taken with it; *D. Blondel* confeſſes that he preſently got a *Tranſcript* of it, compared it with the *Teſtimonies*, which the *Fathers* (*Polycarp*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, *Hierom*, *Chryſoſtome*, &c.) had cited out of *Ignatius*, and finding them all to agree with this *copy*, confeſſeth of himſelf that he was *glad for this age of ours*, that we had now *gotten that very copy that thirteen hundred years ago*, Euſebius *had uſed*, *and expected great light* from thence. But at length this proved not for his turn, the *Author* ſpake ſo much of *Biſhops* ἀκαίρως, εὐκαίρως, *in ſeaſon* and *out of ſeaſon*, that he ſet himſelf to form *arguments* againſt it, which are anſwer'd at large in the *Diſſertations*.

17. But beſide this *Greek Copy* of *Voſſius*'s *Edition*, it fell out very opportunely, that the moſt *Reverend Archbiſhop* of *Armagh* about the ſame time met with ſome *antient Latine Copies* in *England*, which he thought fit to publiſh, although the *Tranſlation* were *rude* and *barbarous*; and that *Latine Edition* of his was found every where agreeable to that *Greek* of *Voſſius*, freed, as that, from all *interpolations*; and by this concurrence of theſe *Providences*, there is all reaſon to think that we have at laſt the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, as purely ſet out as either that of *Clemens*, or *Polycarp*, or any other *antient* writing.

18. And in this *purity* it is, that we now appeal to it, and have the *three orders* in the *Church*, *Biſhops*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and the *Obedience* and *reſpects* due to them, as evidently and irrefragably aſſerted in very many places, as any truth of *Scripture* can be expected to be.

19. After all this, moſt diſtinctly deduced in the *Diſſertations*, they yet proceed, *we will not*, ſay they, *for our parts trouble the Reader with a large diſcourſe about this ſubject. If he pleaſe he may read what the* Archbiſhop *of* Armagh, *what* Rivet, Vedelius, *and* Cooke *in his* Cenſura Patrum, *and what* Salmaſius *and D.* Blondel *ſay about it, who all of them bring divers arguments to evince the invalidity of theſe* Epiſtles. *There is a--Doctor that hath undertaken to anſwer the Objections of the two laſt; But this Doctor ſhould do well to anſwer alſo what the* Archbiſhop *of* Armagh, *hath written about theſe* Epiſtles, *who proves at large that ſix of them are* nothæ, *the other ſix* mixtæ, *and none of them to be accounted* omni ex parte ſinceræ & genuinæ, *who alſo tells us out of* Caſaubon, *that among all the Eccleſiaſtical Monuments there are none in which the* Papiſts *put more confidence, than in* Ignatius's Epiſtles.

20. This being the ſum of their charge on me in this place, that having *anſwer'd* all the Arguments of *Blondell* and *Salmaſius* (I hope ſatisfactorily, or elſe they were very unkind not to expreſs their diſlikes of ſome one *anſwer*) I have not yet *anſwer'd* the Arguments of the *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh* againſt theſe Epiſtles; I ſhall hope, that when either I have done that, or given competent *reaſon*, why I need not do it, I ſhall not need to travail any farther in this Argument; yet to omit no pains which they can but think of preſcribing me, I ſhall take the whole matter of this their laſt *Section* before me, and conſider every part of it.

21. And firſt, For *Rivet*, *Vedelius* and *Cooke* in *Cenſura Patrum*, 'tis evident, that their *exceptions* and *cenſures* belong to the *former Printed* Copies of *Ignatius*, that eſpecially which had been ſet out by *Maſtræus* a *Papiſt*, againſt whom *Vedelius* his *Edition* and *Exercitations* were chiefly deſigned.

22. But then *Vedelius* having called this *volume* to a very ſtrict examination, 'tis evident that that *Copy*, which he had thus purged, cannot be ſtill lyable to his and the like *exceptions*, which before were made againſt the former *Copies*.

23. As for *Salmaſius* and *Blondell*, their exceptions have, as is here confeſt, been already examined, and I need ſay no more of them, till thoſe *anſwers* be ſome way attempted to be *invalidated*, which here they are not, but inſtead of it, I am called to anſwer the *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh* his Arguments. Laſtly therefore, for the *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh*, it is firſt ſomewhat unexpected, that what he had ſaid, as the *ground* and *occaſion* of making a new *Edition*, ſetting out this very *antient Copy*, and by it *purging Ignatius*, who had before been ſo *corrupted* in his opinion, ſhould now be propoſed to me to be anſwered, who uſe that very *Copy*, which that *Archbiſhop* ſet out, and acknowledge it was formerly as *corruptly* ſet forth, as he conceived it to be.

24. Is it not viſible, that the *Archbiſhop*'s whole deſign in two impreſſions of thoſe Epiſtles, was to ſet them out free from all corruptions, and mixtures, and interpolations, which they had before been under? And that all his diſcourſes in his *Prolegomena*, were to prove the *former* Editions to have been *corrupt*, and ſo that there was great need of ſeeking out *better* Copies, and that he verily thought he had now found ſuch? And then what can be required of me to *anſwer* in his writings, who am directly of his *opinion* in all the *ſubſtantial* parts of the whole matter?

25. As for *leſſer* doubts, as whether that one to *Polycarp* be among the *genuine* or no, though with *Euſebius* and S^t *Hierom* I believe it is, and have given the reaſons of my opinion, yet I need not *controvert* this with any, becauſe the other *ſix* will ſtill ſerve my turn abundantly, and the *Teſtimonies* out of the moſt purged *Geneva*, or *Amſtelodam*-Editions of thoſe *ſix*, will ſufficiently vindicate *Epiſcopacy*, in our preſent notion of it, to be then received, and of the *Apoſtles* erecting in the *Church*.

26. A few of theſe *Teſtimonies* I ſhall here ſet down πρὸς δεῖξιν, that the *Reader* may know the *unqueſtionable*

onable opinion of *Ignatius*, and how far I am from neceſſity of uſing any *corrupted Copy* of thoſe Epiſtles. Firſt, then in his Epiſtle to the *Smyrneans*, we have the *three Orders* ſet down diſtinctly, ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτερίῳ, διακόνοις, and again ἀσπάζομαι τὸν ἀξιόθεον ἐπίσκοπον καὶ θεοπρεπεστάτον πρεσβυτέριον, καὶ τοὺς συνδούλους μου διακόνους, the like in three places to the *Epheſians*, in three to the *Magneſians*, in four to the *Philadelphians*, in four to the *Trallians*. So Secondly we have their particular *Biſhops* mentioned, as ſuch, *Polycarp* of *Smyrna*, in the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*, *Oneſimus* of *Epheſus* in his Congratulation to the *Epheſians*, τοιοῦτον ἐπίσκοπον κεκτῆσθαι, *that they had ſuch a Biſhop*, adding *Burrhus* his *Deacon*: *Damas* of the *Magneſians*, together with the names of two of their *Preſbyters*, *Baſſus* and *Apollonius*, and *Sotion* the *Deacon*, all in the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*. *Polybius* of the *Trallians*, in the Epiſtle to them. Thirdly we have his affirmation concerning *Biſhops* through the *whole World*, that they are *conſtituted as*, or *by the mind of Chriſt*, i. e. *ſent* by him, as he by his *Father*, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ παλαιᾷ * γνώμῃ, οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι κατὰ τὰ πέρατα ὁρισθέντες Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώμῃ εἰσί. *Jeſus Chriſt is the mind*, or *by*, or *according* to the mind *of the Father* (*ſent* and *Commiſſionated* by him *to reveal* his will to us) *and ſo the* Biſhops *conſtituted through the World*, *are the mind*, or *by the mind of Chriſt*. Fourthly, he tells us that *all* in the *Church*, particularly *Preſbyters*, muſt *yield obedience* to the *Biſhop*, Πάντες ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, *all follow the Biſhop*, in the Epiſtle to the *Smyrneans*; ἵνα ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ κατὰ πάντα, ἦτε ἁγιασμένοι, *that being ſubject to the Biſhop ye may be ſanctified in all things*, *in* Ep. ad. Eph. πρέπει πάσαν ἐντροπὴν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀπονέμειν, *ye ought to pay all reverence to the Biſhop*, adding, καθὼς ἔγνων καὶ τοὺς ἁγίους πρεσβυτέρους, as he had *obſerved their pious* Presbyters *to do*, though their *Biſhop* were *young*, in Ep. *Magneſ.* and again ὑπολάγητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, *be ſubject to the Biſhop*; ſo τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, *give heed to the Biſhop*, in Ep. ad *Philad.* τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεσθε, & ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑποτάσσεσθαι, *be ſubject*, and *it is neceſſary to be ſubject to the Biſhop*, and Ἔρρωσθε ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ. *Farewel ye that obey the Biſhop*, in Ep. ad *Trall.* Fifthly, he oft adds, that nothing ought to be done in the *Church* without *licence* of the *Biſhop*, Μηδὲν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *Let none without the Biſhop do any of the things that belong to the Church*, inſtancing in *Baptiſm* and the other *Sacrament*, in Ep. ad *Smyr.* and ſo in the *Epiſtles* to the *Philadelphians* and *Trallians*. Sixthly, that a convenient *reverence* and *reſpect* is alſo due to the *Presbyters*, and to the *Deacons*, as is every where taken notice of by him, almoſt in every *Epiſtle*.

* Perhaps ἑνώμῃ in both places.

27. And all this and much more we have in the *Copies*, which are now come, moſt *uncorrupt*, unto us; And there is no imaginable way to avoid the force of theſe *Teſtimonies*, and the *authority* of that holy *Martyr* for *Epiſcopacy*, but the *una litura*, *expunging* or *caſting* away the whole *Volume* of *Epiſtles*.

28. For the truth is, his whole deſigne, before his departure from the world, being this one of *Divine* Charity, to fortify the ſeveral *Flocks*, to which he wrote, againſt the poyſon of *Hereticks*, the *Gnoſticks*, ſo early creeping in, and deſpiſing the *Governors* of the *Church*, (as they had done the *Apoſtles* themſelves) and the *Doctrine* of the *Apoſtles* being by him known to be depoſited with the *Biſhops* in each *Church*, and having particular *aſſurance* of the *ſanctity*, and ſound *faith* of the *preſent Governors* of theſe *Churches*, to which he writes, He thinks fit to make uſe of this one moſt *compendious* courſe, moſt immediately tending to his *end*, to keep them all in *obedience* to their *Biſhops* and *Officers* under them, and to make the contrary (as it was indeed) the ſure mark of *Hereticks*, whom they were to avoid.

29. And ſo this is it which hath ſo fill'd all the *Epiſtles* (except that one to the *Romans*) with continual diſcourſe of the *Biſhops*, &c. And it is evident that in that preſent *conjuncture* of affairs, nothing could with more *reaſon* and fitneſs have been inſiſted on.

30. Mean while that I may return to the place from which I have a while *diverted*, It is ſo certain and evident of the *learned Archbiſhop* of *Armagh*, that he never diſputed againſt the *validity* and *authority* of theſe *Epiſtles* thus purged, that it cannot be unknown to them that thus diſpute, what *arguments* he hath urged for the *authority* of them, and in like manner what and how ſatisfactory *anſwers* he hath given to the ſpecial exceptions of others; which very thing occaſioned a particular *Letter* of *reply* to him from Dr *Blondell*, which by that *Archbiſhops* favour I received, and made my rejoinder to it in the * *Diſſertations*.

* Diſſ. 2. c. 9. Sect. 6. &c.

31. This I hope may be ſufficient to have ſaid in this matter, inſtead of undertaking ſo unreaſonable a task of *anſwering* any thing aſſerted by that *Archbiſhop*.

32. As for that which follows out of him and Mr. *Caſaubon*, of *Baronius* and the *Papiſts* making ſuch uſe, and placing ſuch confidence in theſe *Epiſtles* above all other *Eccleſiaſtical Monuments*, It is ſpeedily anſwered alſo out of what is already ſaid, that they were the *former* corrupt editions, which were abroad in *Baronius*'s time, with all thoſe *ſuppoſititious additions* and *interpolations*, which the *Papiſts* are either by Mr. *Caſaubon*, or that *Archbiſhop* ſaid to have made uſe of; there being no one word or period in this *Volume*, to which my appeal is made, which yieldeth any advantage to the *Papiſts* in any point, nor is it, nor can it be pretended by any that it doth, unleſs by thoſe in whoſe *opinion* the maintaining of *Biſhops* is reputed for ſuch. And therefore that very *learned* man, Mr. *Caſaubon*, is ſo far from *rejecting all* theſe *Epiſtles*, that he diſtinctly *promiſeth nonnullarum ex illis antiquitatem ſe novis rationibus tuiturum*, *that he will*, *if God permit*, *defend the antiquity of ſome of them*, *by reaſons which others had not taken notice of*: *Exerc.* 16. *Cont. Baron.* Sect. 150. And this *promiſe* of his is cited by the *Archbiſhop*, *Diſſert. de Epiſt. Ign.* pag. 136. ſo far is it from all *appearance* of truth, which is cited as the *opinion* of theſe two *learned* men.

33. After all this, *three Reaſons* they will *briefly offer*, *why they cannot build their judgment concerning the Doctrine of the Primitive Church*, *about Epiſcopacy*, *upon* Ignatius's *Epiſtles*.

1. *Becauſe there are divers things quoted out of his Epiſtles by* Athanaſius, Gelaſius, *and* Theodoret, *which are either not to be found in theſe Epiſtles*, *or to be found altered and changed*, *and not according as they are quoted*. *This is* Rivets *argument*, *and purſued at large by the Archbiſhop*, *to whom we refer the Reader*.

34. Being among their other *Readers* referr'd to the *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh* for the *validity* and *purſuit* of this *firſt reaſon*, I ſhall to him very ſecurely make my *appeal*, what force there is in it, againſt the *Volume* of *Epiſtles* now twice in ſeveral forms publiſhed by him. And in the *Prolegomena* to the former

mer of them, *pag.* 15, 16, &c. this is moſt evident, that the *paſſages* cited by *Athanaſius*, *Gelaſius*, and *Theodoret*, which were not indeed to be found in the former printed *Greek* Copies, are exactly diſcerned and evidenced by him to be in the *old latine Interpreter*, which he therefore thought fit to publiſh both out of *Caius College* and *Biſhop Montacutes Library*. The ſame hath he farther ſhewn, *cap.* 4. *pag.* 19. *&c.* out of the ſame and other of the *Antients*, *Euſebius*, *Hierom*, &c. and ſet down the places in *columns*, by way of *parallel*, to demonſtrate the *agreement* of this *Copy* with the *genuine Ignatius*.

And is it not a little ſtrange, that I ſhould be now referred to that *Archbiſhop* for the *purſuit* of this 35.
argument, which he hath ſo diſtinctly proved to be of no force againſt the *Copy* which now I uſe, but to concur in *demonſtrating* the *purity* of it?

Their *ſecond Reaſon* they draw from his *over-much extolling himſelf in his Epiſtle to the* Trallians, 36.
where he ſaith that he had attained to ſuch a meaſure of knowledge, that he underſtood heavenly things, the orders of Angels, the differences of Archangels, and of the heavenly hoſt, the differences between powers and dominations, the diſtances of thrones and powers, the Magnificencies or Magnitudes of Æons or Principalities, the ſublimity of the Spirit, the excellencies of Cherubims *and* Seraphims, *the Kingdom of the Lord, and the incomparable Divinity of the Lord God Almighty. All theſe things I know, and yet am not perfect*, &c. *Now who is there that can believe that ſuch arrogant boaſting can proceed from ſuch an holy man, and humble Saint, as* Ignatius *was?*

And who would believe that the writer of this *Appendix*, which had cited the *Archbiſhop* of *Ar-* 37.
magh in his *Prolegomena* to his *Edition* of *Ignatius*, and ſo could not but be able to have conſulted that *Edition*, ſhould thus think to defame, and blaſt the whole *volume* of *Epiſtles*, for one ſuch periods ſake, which is not to be diſcerned in this, or that *Archbiſhops latter*, or in *Voſſius*'s *Edition* of them, to which only he muſt know we make our *appeal* for *Epiſcopacy?*

In theſe *Copies* the words are quite diſtant from what is here cited, and in effect, directly *contrary* 38.
to them, evidences of the greateſt *humility*, now when he was ſo near the *honour* of *Martyrdome*, Καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ὁ καθότι δέδεμαι ἠδυνάμην τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ τὰς τοποθεσίας τὰς ἀγγελικὰς, καὶ τὰς συστάσεις τὰς ἀρχοντικὰς, ὁρατὰ τε καὶ ἀόρατα πρὸς τοῦτο ἤδη καὶ μαθητὴς εἰμι, *For I am not, becauſe* (or *in that*) *I am in bond, able alſo to underſtand heavenly things, the* Poſitions *of* Angels, *their* Aſſemblies *of* Principalities (or of the *Rulers* of them) *both things viſible and inviſible. Beſides this, I am yet alſo a Diſciple*, &c. What *arrogance*, I pray, or *boaſting* is there in this? and yet he adds no more in that place but only, πολλὰ γὰρ ἡμῖν λείπει, ἵνα θεοῦ μὴ λειπώμεθα, *For many things are wanting to us, that we may not be left behind by God*, thinking himſelf utterly *unworthy* of the *honour* (and fearing he may yet *miſs* of it) to ſuffer *Martyrdome* for him. And ſo much for the *ſecond Reaſon*.

The *third* (*which*, ſay they, *is moſt for our purpoſe*) *is from his over-eager and over-anxious defence of* 39.
the Epiſcopal *Hierarchy, which he doth with ſuch ſtrange and Hyperbolical expreſſions* (*as if all Chriſtianity were loſt, if Prelacy were not upheld*) *and with ſuch multiplied repetitions*, ad nauſeam uſque, *that we may confidently ſay as one doth*, Certo certius eſt has Epiſtolas vel ſuppoſititias eſſe, vel fœdè corruptas, *Coci cenſuras*
and that they do neither agree with thoſe times wherein he wrote, nor with ſuch an holy and humble Martyr as he was. We will inſtance in ſome few of them.

What *reaſons* and *deſign Ignatius* had to exhort the *Chriſtians*, to whom he writes, to *obedience* to 40.
their *Governors*, in the *Church*, hath already been ſaid at large, this being the only expedient, that, at that time, could be thought on, to keep out moſt *dangerous hereſies* out of the *Church*. And therefore what that *holy Martyr* did in that kind, when he was carryed from his own *Church*, never to return to it again, cannot be lookt on, as the ſeeking any *great things* for *himſelf*, and ſo contrary to either his *piety* or *humility*, but as a deſire full of both thoſe, that the *Church* of *God* might enjoy *truth* and *peace*, after the *beaſts* had *devoured* him.

As for the *ſtrange* and *hyperbolical expreſſions*, mentioned in the *objection*, and exemplified in the two 41.
following pages, the *Reader* muſt again be told, that what they had done moſt *unreaſonably* before, is here *practiſed* again at large, ſeveral places brought out of the *former corrupt Editions* of *Ignatius*, of which no one word is to be found in the *new Editions* out of the moſt *antient Copies Greek* and *Latine*, from which alone it is evident that we produce all our *teſtimonies* for *Epiſcopacy*, and ſo have produced very few of thoſe, which they are thus pleaſed to find *fault* with.

The places which they urge, are *eight*, I ſhall not need to ſet them down, but give the *Reader* a 42.
much ſhorter, and yet as *ſatisfactory* an account of them. *Two* are cited from the *Epiſtle* to the *Trallians*, and neither of them are in any part to be found in our *Editions*. *Two* are cited from the *Epiſtle* to the *Magneſians*, and the firſt is not at all in our *Editions*, nor the *ſecond* any farther than thus, ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ Κύριος ἀνευ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησε ἑωυτοῦ ὤν, ὅτε δι' ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτε δι' Ἀποστόλων, οὕτως μήτε ὑμεῖς ἀνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μηδὲν πειράσητε εὔλογόν τι φαίνεσθαι ἰδίᾳ ὑμῖν. *As Chriſt being one with his Father did nothing without him, either by himſelf or by his Apoſtles, ſo neither do ye act any thing without the Biſhop and the Preſbyters, nor endeavour that any thing ſhould appear reaſonable to you which is private*, or of your *own* deviſing. A ſpeech in every *ſyllable* of it, very well becoming that *Holy Martyr*, written by him at a time, when the *truth* being by the *Apoſtles depoſited* with the *Biſhops*, all *private* devices of their own were moſt juſtly to be *ſuſpected*.

The *fifth* is in the *Epiſtle* to *Polycarp*, and is in our *Copies* thus, Πρέπει τοῖς γαμοῦσι καὶ ταῖς γαμουμέναις μετὰ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου τὴν ἕνωσιν ποιεῖσθαι. *It becomes the men that marry, and the women that are married, to conſummate their union with the conſent of the Biſhop.* And I wonder what age of the *Church* 43.
there hath been from that time to this, which hath not been of the *ſame* opinion. For what is by *Biſhops* committed to *Presbyters*, that is not done ἀνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπου, *without the mind of the Biſhop* (as elſewhere in thoſe *Epiſtles* appears of *Baptiſm* and the *Lords Supper*, neither of which, ſaith he, are to be *medled* with, without the *conſent* of the *Biſhop*; and many *teſtimonies* out of *Antiquity* are * elſe- * See *Num.* 5.
where produced in perfect *conformity* therewith.) And conſequently, if in the *Chriſtian Church*, *marriage* hath always been conſummated by the *Prieſt* or *Presbyter*, then cannot this ſpeech of *Ignatius* have any blame in it.

And that thus it hath been through all ages, there is little matter of *queſtion* (and no word here 44.

* *Ad Uxor.* l. 2. c. *ult.* † *De Pudic.* c. 4.

produced by the *Objector* to the *contrary*) * *Tertullian* will be a good competent *testimony* for the *next Century*, speaking of the *felicity* of the *Christian Marriage*, *quod Ecclesia conciliat, & confirmat oblatio, & obsignat benedictio, Angeli renuntiant*, &c. *Which the Church makes, the Sacrament of the Lords Supper confirms, the benediction of the Priest seals, and the Angels pronounce valid.* And in † another place, *Penes nos occultæ conjunctiones*, i. e. *non prius apud Ecclesiam professæ, juxta mœchiam & fornicationem judicari periclitantur, Marriages that are not done publickly before the Church, are in danger with us, to go for adultery and fornication.*

45. The same is every where to be found in the *Decretal Epistles* of *Euaristus*, about *Ignatius*'s time (which makes it a *tradition* from the *Apostles* and their *Successors*) of *Soter* not above fifty years after, of *Callistus* near fifty years after him, of *Silvester* an hundred years after him, of *Siricius* seventy years after *Silvester*, of *Hormisdas* a hundred and thirty years after *Siricius:* And though some of these be by D. *Blondel* thought to be of later dates than the *titles* of them would pretend, yet the *authority* of most of them is unquestioned, as to this matter.

46. And the *antient* piece lately published by *Sirmund*, concerning the *Heresie* of the *Predestinati*, written, saith he, twelve hundred years since, speaks of it, as a *known custom* and *Canon* of the *Church*, over all the world, For, saith that *antient author*, *If marriage be unlawful, Emendate ergo Ecclesiæ regulam, damnate qui in toto orbe sunt, sacerdotes, Nuptiarum initia benedicentes, consecrantes, & in Dei mysteriis sociantes. Amend then the rule of the Church, and condemn the Priests which are in all the world, who bless the beginnings of Marriage, consecrate, and join the parties together with the Holy Sacrament.*

47. And the *fourth Council* of *Carthage*, before the year 400. hath these words, *Sponsus & sponsa cum benedicendi sunt à sacerdote--When the Bridegroom and the Bride are to be blest by the Priest*, *Can.* 13. And for latter ages the matter is out of *Question*.

48. And so it will be much more *reasonable*, from this passage in *Ignatius*, being found so perfectly *concordant* with other passages of the times so near him, to resolve the *rule* of the *Church* concerning *sacerdotal benediction* in *marriage*, to be received from the *Apostles* and their *Successors*, than from finding this speech in one of *Ignatius*'s *Epistles*, to cast away the whole *volume*.

49. As for that which is added at the end of this *testimony* from the *Epistle* to *Polycarp*, *My soul for theirs, that obey the* Bishop, *Presbyters and* Deacons, there can be no fault in that, supposing as hath been said, that the *Bishops* at that time, and the *Presbyters* and *Deacons* living regularly and in *union* with them, had the *true* safe way among them, wherein any man might walk *confidently*, all danger being from the *Heresies* that crept in, and brake men off from that *unity* of the *faith*.

50. The *sixth* place from the *Epistle* to the *Philadelphians*, of the *Princes* and *Emperours* obeying the *Bishop*, is certainly inserted by forgery in the *former*, for not one word of it, or like it, is to be found in *our Editions*.

51. So likewise for both parts of the *seventh* place out of the *Epistle* to the *Smyrnæans*, they are not to be found in our *Editions*.

52. The *last* only is to be met with there, but that in a much more *moderate* strain, than the former, in *words* and *sense* very agreeable to *wholsome doctrine*, and the *exigencies* of those times, wherein there was no *visible* way to keep out the *tares* of *false teachers*, but by requiring all to be kept to the managery of the true *Husbandman*. And accordingly I have cited this very speech out of *Ignatius* for the asserting of *Prelacy* (and if there were no such, the *Epistles* might pass well enough with these, as with all other men, they would have needed no *vindication*, having no *adversary*) The words are these, Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις, τοὺς δὲ διακόνους ἐντρέπεσθε ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολήν —— *All of you follow the Bishop as Christ Jesus did his Father* (*i. e.* as elsewhere appears by the like expression, with [ὡσαυτῶς ὢν] added to it, be at perfect *unity* or *doctrine*, &c. with the *Bishop*, as *Christ* was with *God* the *Father*) *and the* Presbytery *as the* Apostles, *and reverence the* Deacons *as* those that are *appointed by God*, (viz. *mediately* by the *Apostles*.)

53. Where it may be *observable*, that the *objectors* which find such fault with this speech of *Ignatius* in their *quarrelling* with it, leave out this latter part of *Presbytery* and *Deacons*; they cannot find in their hearts to quarrel, or accuse him for bidding them *follow the* Presbytery *as the* Apostles, the only crime was to bid them *follow the Bishop* (not, *as Christ* in the *dative*, i. e. *as they follow Christ*, but) *as Christ follows his Father*, the only piacular offence, to recommend *unity* with, and *obedience* to the *Bishop*. But that by the way.

54. It follows in the place, Μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω, *Let no Man without the* Bishop *do ought which belongs to the* Church, *Let that be accounted a firm* Eucharist, *which is done by the* Bishop, *or him whom the* Bishop *shall permit. Where the* Bishop *appears, there let the multitude be, as where* Christ *is, there is the Catholick Church. It is not lawful without the Bishop* (*i. e.*) as before, without *Commission* from him) *either to Baptize, or Administer the* Eucharist, *but what he approves of* (thus in these *publick Ministrations*) *that is well pleasing to God, that it may be safe and firm whatsoever is done; It doth well that men know God and the Bishop* (as their *Ruler* under *God*, with whom his *truth* is by the *Apostles deposited*) *he that honours the* Bishop, *is honoured by God, he that doth any thing clancularly without him, serves the Devil* (performs a very *acceptable service* to him; For so in a very *eminent* manner the Hereticks of that Age, the Gnosticks did, which secretly infused their *devilish* Leaven, and deadly *poyson* into mens hearts, by which they took them quite from *Christ*, but could not have done so *successfully*, if this *Holy Martyr*'s Counsel here had been taken.)

55. What *inconvenience* can be imagined consequent to our affirming that *Ignatius* was the *author* of these words, I confess not to comprehend; Of this there is no *question*, but that it is the ordinary *Language* of the *antient Church*, and accounted necessary in an *eminent* degree, to preserve *unity* and *truth* in the *Church*, and to hold up the *authority* of *Governours* among all, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ διάκονοι ἀνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν θεραπευέτωσαν, *The* Presbyters *and* Deacons *must do nothing without the mind of the* Bishop, *Can. Apost.* 40. and the reason is added αὐτὸς γὰρ δεῖ πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τοῦ Κυρίου, *for he is intrusted with the people of the Lord*; So in the 56. *Canon* of *Laodicæa*, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους μηδὲν πράττειν ἀνευ γνώμης τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, *The* Presbyters *must do nothing without the mind of the* Bishop; and so in the *Council*

of

of *Arles*, Can. 19. *The* Presbyters *muſt do nothing in any Dioceſs* ſine Epiſcopi ſententia, *without the* Biſhops *mind*, *and* ſine authoritate literarum ejus, *without authority of his Letters.*

All that is here offer'd by them to make the like words in *Ignatius* a competent *charge*, upon which to throw away the whole *Volume* of Epiſtles, is only this, *If this be true Doctrine, what ſhall become of all the* Reformed Churches, *eſpecially the Church of* Scotland, *which (as* John Major *ſaith* lib. 2. Hiſtor. de Geſtis Scotorum, c. 2.) *was after it's firſt converſion to the Chriſtian faith, above* 230. *years without Epiſcopal Government?* 56.

To this double queſtion I might well be allowed to render no anſwer, It being certainly very *extrinſecal* to the *Queſtion* in hand, (which is only this, whether *Ignatius* wrote or wrote not thoſe Epiſtles) to examine what ſhall become of the *Reformed Churches*, &c. It were much more reaſonable for me to demand of the *Objectors*, who ſuppoſe their *Presbyterial platform*, as that is oppoſed to *Epiſcopal*, to be ſetled in the *Church* by *Divine Right*, If this *Doctrine* be *true*, what did become of all thoſe *Primitive Churches* all the *World* over, which they confeſs departed from this *model*, and ſet up the *contrary*, and ſo of all the ſucceding ages of the *Church* for ſo many hundred years, till the *Reformation*, and ſince that alſo, of all the other *Churches*, which do not thus far imitate Mr. *Calvin*, caſting out the *Government* by *Biſhops?* 57.

Is it not as reaſonable that they ſhould be required to give a fair and juſtifiable account of their dealing with (and *judging*, *poſt factum*, of) all theſe; as I ſhould be obliged to *reconcile Ignatius* his ſpeech concerning his *preſent* age, with the *conveniencies* of the *Reformed Churches*, which he could neither ſee, nor be deemed to ſpeak of, nor conſequently to paſs judgment on them by *divination?* 58.

What they were guilty of, which ſecretly infuſed their *poyſon* into Men and Women in *his age*, and would not let the *Biſhop*, the *Governour* of the *Church*, be the *Judge* of their *Doctrines* and *practices*, he here tells us, *viz.* That they performed *ſervice to the Devil*, in ſtealing Mens hearts from *Chriſt*; But what crime it was in thoſe of *Corinth*, and through all *Achaia*, to turn their *Biſhops* out of their places ἀπβάλλειν ἐπισκοπῆς and λειτυργίας, *to caſt them out of their Epiſcopacy*, their *Office* and *Miniſtration*, this he tells them not in that place, *Clemens Romanus* had done it competently in his *Epiſtle.* 59.

As for the *particular* caſe of thoſe *Reformed Churches*, which have done more than ſo, not only caſt out their *preſent Governors*, but over and above, utterly *caſt off* the *Government* it ſelf, there had been I confeſs, a great deal ſaid, both in this and other places of *Ignatius*, and many other *Antient* Writers, who yet never *foretold* theſe *days*, abundantly ſufficient to have reſtrained them from ſo *diſorderly* proceedings, if they would have pleaſed to have *hearkned* to ſuch *moderate counſels*. But having not done ſo, *Ignatius* hath gone no farther, he is only a witneſs againſt them, he undertook not the *Office* of a *Judge* ſo far beyond his *Province*, hath pronounced no *ſentence* upon them. 60.

And to proceed one degree farther, to the *ſucceſſors* of thoſe in the *Reformed Churches* (as many as are juſtly blameable for treading in their Leaders ſteps) though I may truly ſay they have as little taken that *Holy Martyrs* advice, and more than ſo, that they have retained a *conſiderable corruption* in their *Churches*, and that they ſhould do well, if now they know how, to reſtore themſelves to that *model*, which they find every where *exemplified* in *Ignatius*; yet till they ſhall have done ſo, I know not that they are *exactly* capable of being *concern'd* in any part of theſe words, laſt cited from *Ignatius.* 61.

For they that have no *Biſhop* at all, cannot be required to *do nothing without conſulting with the Biſhop*; They are juſtly to be *blamed*, as far as they are guilty that they have no *Biſhop*; but then, that is their *crime* (and they are to *reform* it as ſoon as they pleaſe) but that being ſuppoſed, this of not *conſulting* the *Biſhop*, while they have *none*, is no *new* crime, nor liable of it ſelf to the *cenſure* of διαβόλῳ λαλεύειν here, which was affixt to thoſe that had *Biſhops*, and would not have their *Doctrines* examined by that *Standard*, of which they were the *Depoſitaries*. And this is as much as is needful to be ſaid in this place for that firſt *inconvenience* affixt to *Ignatius*'s words. 62.

As for the other, the *Church* of *Scotland* in it's *firſt converſion*, the matter again is ſo remote from the task we have now in hand, for the *vindicating* the *Authority* of *Ignatius*'s *volume* of Epiſtles, and withal ſo *uncertainly* ſet down by *Authors*, that it would be *unſeaſonable* to engage far in ſo *dark* a part of *Hiſtory* ſo impertinently. In brief therefore, though I have not *John Major* by me to conſult, yet I conceive I ſhall not gueſs amiſs at the grounds and conſequently at the truth and weight of his aſſertion. 63.

Joannes Jordanus was of opinion that * *Paſchaſius* a *Sicilian*, *prima Chriſtianæ pietatis rudimenta mandante P. Victore in* Scotia *nuntiavit*, *firſt preacht the Chriſtian Faith in* Scotland *by the command of Pope Victor*. And this was about the year 203. And † *Bede* ſaith that in the *eight* year of *Theodoſius Junior*, that is about the year 431, *Palladius ad* Scotos *in Chriſtum credentes à Pontifice Romanæ Eccleſiæ Cœlſtino primus mittitur Epiſcopus*, Palladius *was by* Celeſtine *Biſhop of* Rome *ſent firſt Biſhop to the* Scots *that believed*. And the diſtance betwixt theſe two terms being 228. years, this I conceive the *groundwork* of *John Major*'s *affirmation* here cited, of the 230. years, wherein that *Church* after it's *firſt converſion* remained without *Epiſcopal Government.* 64.

* *Demſter. Appar. ad Hiſt. Scot.* l. 1. c. 6.
† *Eccl. Hiſt.* l. 1. c. 13.

But firſt it is to be noted here, that the ſaying of *Jordanus*, of *Paſchaſius* in *Victor*'s days, is no more than this, that he *preached* the *Goſpel* there, *prima rudimenta nuntiavit*, *declared the firſt rudiments there*, and, as it follows in *Demſter*, *tyrocinia fidei fecit*, *laid the grounds of Chriſtianity* among them; And that might be done, and ſoon molder away again, and never come to ſo much *maturity*, as either to have *Biſhops* or *Presbyters* conſtituted among them. And Secondly, though *Bede* ſay that *Palladius* was ſent to them *Epiſcopus primus*, their *firſt Biſhop*, yet neither he, nor any other affirms that they were formerly ruled by a *Presbytery*, or ſo much as that they had any *Presbyter* among them. Nay Thirdly, *Demſter* reports it from *Jordanus* but ſlightly *Joh. Jordanus putavit*, *it was the conceit* or *opinion* of that *author*. And that which * *Bozius* tells us, will take off much from the *creditableneſs* of that *Opinion*, *Traditur in Scotiâ*, *quæ tunc erat Hibernia*, *Chriſti cultum diſſeminatum eodem tempore quo in Britanniâ*, *ſub annum Chriſti* 203. *Victore ſedente*. *They ſay that the faith of Chriſt was diſſeminated in* Scotland, *which was then* Ireland, *at the ſame time that it was in* Britanny, *about the year* 203. *in the time of* Victors *Papacy.* 65.

* *Lib.* 8. *de ſignis Eccl.* c. 1.

By

66. By this it appears that the conceit of *Jordanus* belonged to *Ireland*, not to *Scotland*, *Ireland* being † *Li. 2. c. 4.* * *L. 3. c.* *antiently* called *Scotia* (as in † *Bede* we find *Scotorum qui Hiberniam inſulam Britanniæ proximam incolunt*, *the* Scots *which inhabit* Ireland, *and* * *Gentes Scotorum quæ Auſtralibus Hiberniæ partibus morabantur*, *the* Scots *which inhabited the Southern parts of Ireland*) and that which is now *Scotland*, was then †See *Baron. Annal. Tom. 5. Anno 429. Sect. 2.* ſtyled *Nova Scotia*, to diſtinguiſh it from the *other*. And it is worth remembring that *Marianus* the *Scotch Antiquary* had no knowledge of this *converſion* of *Scotland* under *Victor*, nor is there any ſhew of it in *Bede*, who tells us of the latter.

67. Nay it is yet more evident * by *Proſper*, that 'twas a *converſion* from *barbarous* to *Chriſtian*, which * *Adv. Collat. in fine.* is ſpoken of in *Cœleſtines* time, and that the *Faith* was planted, and the *Biſhop* conſtituted there together, *Venerabilis memoriæ Pontifex ab hoc eodem morbo Britannias liberavit, & ordinato* Scotis *Epiſcopo, dum Romanam inſulam ſtudet ſervare Catholicam, fecit etiam barbaram Chriſtianam*; *Pope* Cœleſtine *freed* Britain *from* Pelagianiſm, *and ordained a Biſhop for the* Scots, *and ſo while he indeavoured to keep a* Roman *Iſland within the bounds of the Catholick Faith, he alſo made a barbarous Iſland Chriſtian.* Which as it differs ſomewhat from *Bedes* expreſſion of *Palladius*'s being ſent *ad credentes*, to *believers*, ſo it gives us occaſion to propoſe that which may reconcile theſe ſeeming *differences*, viz. Firſt, That *Chriſtianity* was planted in *Scotland* before *Cœleſtine*'s time, derived to them moſt probably from their Neighbours † See *Bede* l. 2. c. 4. *Scotos nihil diſcrepare à Britonibus in eorum converſatione didicimus*, and c. 19. & l. 3. c. 3. the *Britains* here, with whom they are † known to have agreed in the *keeping* of *Eaſter*, contrary to the cuſtom of the *Roman Church*, and ſo cannot be deemed to have received the firſt *Rudiments* of their *converſion* from *Rome*: Then ſecondly, that this *Plantation* was very *imperfect*, differing little from *Barbariſm*, and ſo reputed by *Proſper*, till the coming of *Biſhop Palladius* among them. Thirdly, That even after that, they retain'd the *uſage* of *Eaſter*, contrary to the *Roman cuſtom*, which ſtill refers to ſome *rude converſion* of theirs before *Palladius*.

Hoc enim ordine ſeptentrionalis Scotorum Provincia & omnis natio Pictorum Paſcha Dominicum celebrabat.

68. By all this it is cleared to us, what is to be thought of *John Major*'s affirmation, which hath now very little appearance of truth in it; and if it had, would be little for the *Presbyterian* intereſt to inſiſt on it, when after all that time of the ſuppoſed *government* of that *Church* by *Presbyters*, it was found directly *barbarous*, and to be planted with *Chriſtianity* anew, at *Palladius*'s coming.

69. Some uncertainty we ſee there is of the *time* and means of *planting Chriſtianity* in *Scotland*, but as to this matter of the 230. years under *Presbytery*, there can be no ground to affirm it; For if the *converſion* of it be dated from *Victor*'s time, as that opinion would have it, yet even by that account 'twas after the ſpace, wherein the *Preſbyterians* themſelves acknowledge *Epiſcopacy* to have prevailed over *all the World*; and then, upon that account, it muſt be granted, that whenſoever their firſt *converſion* was, 'twas certainly derived to them by thoſe who had *Epiſcopal Government* among them, and then they having ſent them *Presbyters* to inſtruct and *officiate* (as *Presbyters* not as *Biſhops*) among them, thoſe *Presbyters* muſt be ſuppoſed to have continued under thoſe *Biſhops* by whom they were ſent, whether from *Rome*, or nearer home from the *Britiſh*, ſo far at leaſt, as that when they failed, their number was ſupplied from the ſame *Fountain* from which they firſt *ſprang*, (in the ſame manner as our own *experience* tells us of *Virginia*, which ſince the firſt *Plantation* continued to receive *Presbyters* from hence) and ſo continued to be, until they had *Biſhops* ordained and *planted* among them. And ſo much for that ſecond ſuppoſed inconvenience alſo.

SECT. IV.

Of Salmaſius's *conceit that theſe Epiſtles were written at the time of Epiſcopacy firſt entring the Church.*

Numb. 1. THat which follows of the *Juſtice* of the *Reverend Presbyterian Divines cenſure* of theſe Epiſtles, and of *Salmaſius*'s belief, that they were written by a *Pſeudo-Ignatius*, will not require any anſwer from me, who cannot be moved by the *concluſion* made by thoſe Divines, any farther than the Premiſſes here *produced* and *anſwer'd*, have appeared to have *force* in them, and who have more largely examined *Salmaſius* his exceptions heretofore, and was even now by them acknowledged ſo to have done, and nothing yet replied to my *anſwers*, and therefore muſt not for ever *turn* the ſame *ſtone*, begin the ſame task again.

2. But for the conceit which is here cited from *Salmaſius*, which I confeſs I conſidered not ſo much before, as to make any reply to it, *viz.* That *theſe* Epiſtles *were written when Epiſcopacy, properly ſo called, came into the* Church, *and that proved from hence, becauſe in all his* Epiſtles *he ſpeaks highly in honour of* Presbytery *as well as of Epiſcopacy, that ſo the people, that had been accuſtomed to the* Presbyterian Government, *might the more willingly and eaſily receive this new Government by Epiſcopacy, and not be offended at the novelty of it:* It is evident how eaſily this may be retorted, and the *argument* as firmly formed to conclude, that *Presbyters* were then *newly* come into the *Church*, and therefore to make the people *inclinable* to give them a willing *Reception*, without being *offended* at the *novelty* of them, he ſtill ſpeaks *highly* in honour of *Epiſcopacy*.

3. Such *Arguments* as theſe you will gueſs from hence, how *incompetent* they are to conclude matters of *fact*, done ſo many *hundred* years ago, (ſuch is the *queſtion*, whether *Ignatius* wrote theſe Epiſtles or no) It is much more probable that they wanted Arguments of any *real* validity, who are fain to fly to ſuch Succors as theſe.

4. Yet one farther *miſadventure* there is, in forming or making uſe of this *conceit*; For what is ſaid in thoſe *Epiſtles* concerning the *honour* due to *Presbyters* or the *Presbytery*, is far from looking favourably on the *Presbyterian Government*; for certainly as long as there is a *Biſhop*, properly ſo called, ſet *over* the *Presbyters*, as they know there is in all thoſe Epiſtles, and as long as the *Presbyters* are to do *nothing* without *commiſſion* from him (as they knew alſo (and even now *quarrell'd* at it) that by him

they

they are required to do) there is little *ſhew* of the *Presbyterian model* diſcernible, no whit more, than there was in *England* long before they *covenanted* to caſt the *Biſhops* out of the *Church*, it being certain that no *community* or *equality* of *Presbyters* taken into *councel* with the *Biſhop*, doth conſtitute the *Government Presbyterian*, as long as there be any *Biſhops* to have *power* over *Presbyters*; Elſe had the *Convocation* of *Deans*, *Arch-Deacons* and *Clerks*, fourteen years ago, been the *platform* of *Presbyterian Government* in *England*. [1640.]

This is, I conceive, a full *anſwer* to every the moſt *minute* part or appearance of *Argument* here produced againſt theſe Epiſtles, and is all that was proper here to be ſaid concerning *Ignatius*, whoſe Epiſtles as long as they have any *authority* with us, let it be in the moſt *Reformed*, *purified* Edition that ever was, or can be hoped for, there is *evidence* enough for the *Apoſtolical Inſtitution* of *Biſhops* in the *modern* notion of the word; And if after all this they muſt have no *authority*, for no other *crime*, but becauſe they are ſuch punctual Aſſerters of this *Doctrine*; 'Tis to little purpoſe farther to examine or inquire, what *Antiquity* hath affirmed or practiſed in this matter. 5.

SECT. V.

Teſtimonies of Irenæus, *The uſe of* Presbyteri *for* Biſhops.

YET becauſe their Method leads us forward to conſider ſome other of the Antient Writers, and I have promiſed ſo far to comply with them, I ſhall now in the next place attend them to the view of two of thoſe, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, p. 114, 115. where having acknowledged of them that they ſay that Apoſtles *made* Biſhops *in* Churches, Polycarp *in* Smyrna, Clemens *at* Rome, *&c.* all that they require of us to prove, is, that by the word *Biſhop* is meant a *Biſhop* as *diſtinct* from *Preſbyters*; and the reaſon why they think this needs *proving*, is, becauſe *both thoſe Authors uſe the words* Ἐπίσκοποι *Biſhops*, and Πρεσβύτεροι, *Presbyteri*, *Seniores*, *for the ſame thing*, *the one calling* Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, Teleſphorus, Xyſtus, Presbyters *of the Church of* Rome *in his Epiſtle to* Victor; *the other calling the Preſidents of the Churches* Seniores *in his Apology*, *and ſome other places* are produced to the ſame purpoſe. *Numb.* 1.

To this therefore I ſhall now briefly give anſwer, Firſt, By *conceſſion* that the ſame perſons, who by theſe two Authors are called *Biſhops*, are promiſcuouſly called *Presbyteri* and *Seniores* alſo; And therefore ſecondly, that this *queſtion* being thus far (as to the *Names*) *equally* balanced between us, they ſaying that *Biſhops*] ſignifies *Presbyters* in the *modern* notion, we that *Presbyters*] ſignifies *Biſhops* in the *modern* notion, ſome other *Indications*, beſide this of the *Names*, muſt be made uſe of on either ſide, toward the deciſion of it. 2.

Of this ſort there is no one offered to us by them, and ſo as they have nothing to incline the *balance* their way, ſo we have nothing to make *anſwer* to in that particular. I ſhall therefore (as the only thing left for me to do) render ſome few Reaſons, why the words *Biſhop* and *Elders* in theſe Authors muſt needs ſignifie *Biſhops* in our *Modern* ſenſe. 3.

And the firſt *proof*, as far as concerns *Irenæus*, is, becauſe *Irenæus*, who uſeth theſe words *promiſcuouſly*, was himſelf a *Biſhop* in our *modern* notion, and yet is by others in his own dayes call'd *Elder* of the *Church* of *Lyons*, at that very time, when he is acknowledged to be *Biſhop* of it, in our *modern* ſenſe of the word; This I thus manifeſt in each part. 4.

And firſt, That *Irenæus* was *Biſhop* of *Lyons*, in ſuch a ſenſe, as we now uſe *Biſhop*, appears by what * *Euſebius* ſaith of him, importing that he was *Primate* of all *France*, Ἐν καὶ Γαλλίαν παροικίαις, ἃς Εἰρηναῖος ἐπεσκόπει, ſaith he, he *was* Biſhop *of the Provinces through France*: Now this, we know, cannot be affirm'd of a *modern Presbyter*, who pretends not to any ſuch *wide* and *ſingular juriſdiction*; And this needs no farther proof, it being by D. *Blondell* in his *Apology* for St. *Hierom* confeſt, that 140. years after *Chriſt*, *i. e.* nigh forty years before this time, the *Government* of the *Church* was in the hands of *Biſhops* over all the *World*, *one* in every *Church* ſet over all the reſt of the *Church*. 5. * *L.* 5. *c.* 23.

For the ſecond part then, that at that time, when he is thus an acknowledged *Biſhop* and *Archbiſhop*, he is yet called πρεσβύτερος ἐκκλησίας, *Elder of the* Church, I appeal to the *Teſtimony* of the *Gallicane* Church, at that time, as it lies recorded in † *Euſebius*, where in an Embaſſy performed by him in the name of the *Martyrs* of *Lyons* to *Eleutherius* the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, we have theſe words concerning him, Ταῦτά σοι τὰ γράμματα πεπέμφαμεν τὸν ἀδελφὸν ἡμῶν, καὶ κοινωνὸν Εἰρηναῖον ποιήσαι, Πάτερ Ἐλεύθερε, ἵνα πολλοῦ ἔχων σε αὐτὸν ἐν παῤῥησίᾳ ξυλαλοῦντα ὑπὲρ τῆς διαθήκης τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Εἰ γάρ ἤθελεν τόπον τινὶ δικαιοσύνῃ περιποιεῖν, ὡς Πρεσβύτερον ἐκκλησίας, ἅπερ ἐστὶν καὶ αὐτὸν ἐν πρώτοις ἂν τιθείμεθα. *We have intreated our Brother and partaker* Irenæus *to bear theſe Letters to you*, *O Father* Eleutherius, *and we beſeech you to prize him as one very zealous of* Chriſt's *Covenant*; *If we thought that place would purchaſe juſtice to any*, *we had commended him in a principal manner*, *as* Elder *of the* Church, *for ſo he is*. 6. † *L.* 5. *c.* 4.

Here *nine* years after he had been *Biſhop* and *Archbiſhop* of *Lyons*, about the *year* of *Chriſt* 177. he is ſtyled by thoſe *Letters*, *Elder* of the *Church*; by which it appears, that in his time *Elder* was the title of *Biſhop*, in our *Modern* ſenſe, and conſequently ſo it may fitly ſignifie in his *own* writings, and ſo muſt needs do there, when 'tis applied to thoſe, who were acknowledged *Biſhops* at that time, when by the *Presbyterians* acknowledgment *Epiſcopacy* was come in, in that notion, wherein we now underſtand it. 7.

A ſecond proof of this, is, that what in one place out of *Papias* he ſaith of all the *Seniores* or *Elders*, which in *Aſia converſt* with S. *John*; that *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who lived in the ſame time, affirms of the *Biſhops* or *Elders* of *Aſia*; meaning by both of them the *Biſhops* in our notion of the word. 8.

Clemens Alexandrinus wrote his *Stromata* about the year 192. which is *five* years before *Irenæus*'s *Martyrdome*, in the fifth of *Severus*. Now of this *Clemens*, it is certain, Firſt, That he acknowledged 9.

the

the three Orders in the Church, which he calls τὰς χ͞ν τῶν ἐκκλησίαν περκοπὰς, ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, the three *degrees* or *promotions in the Church, of* Biſhops, Presbyters, Deacons; and conſequently muſt by the word ἐπίσκοπ& underſtand *Biſhops* in our *modern* ſenſe.

Strom. 6.

10. Secondly, that when he makes the Relation of *John's* meeting with the *Biſhops* of *Aſia* (which is the ſame matter which *Irenæus* produceth out of *Papias*) he calls them in the ſame period both *Elders* and *Biſhops* indifferently; For ſpeaking of S. *John*, he hath this paſſage, Ἐλθὼν ἔν τισι τῶν ἐγγὺς πόλεων — ὃν πᾶσι τῷ καθεστῶτι πρεσβυτέρ& ἐπισκόπῳ, νεανίσκον ἰδὼν, τοῦτον, ἔφη, σοὶ παρακατατίθεμαι —— ὁ δὲ πρεσβύτερ& ἀναλαβὼν οἶκαδε — *Coming to a City not far off — and looking on the* Biſhop, *which was conſtituted over all, ſeeing a young man, he ſaid, This perſon I commit to thee — And the Elder took him home, brought him up, baptized, and at laſt gave him confirmation.*

11. Here it is evident, this *Elder* of *Aſia*, one of thoſe which, in *Irenæus*, converſed with S. *John*, is ἐπίσκοπ& ὃν πᾶσι καθεστῶς, a *Biſhop conſtituted over all* in that *City*; and agreeably, when S. *John* comes back that way again, he calls to him by that title, Ὦ ἐπίσκοπε, τῷ παρακαταθήκῳ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ& ἡμῖν, ᾧ ἐγώτε κ) ὁ χριστός σοι παρακατεθέμεθα ὃν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧς προκαθέζη μάρτυρες, *O* Biſhop, *render us the* depoſitum, *which both I and Chriſt delivered to thee in the preſence of the* Church, *over which thou art ſet.* Where again he that is called *Elder* both by him and *Irenæus*, is alſo by him called ἐπίσκοπ& ἐκκλησίας προκαθεζόμεν&, the *Biſhop ſet over the Church.* And ſo that is a ſecond evidence of it.

12. *Thirdly*, In his *Epiſtle* to *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, he ſpeaks of his *Predeceſſors* thus, Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι οἱ πρὸ σοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἧς νῦν ἀφηγῇ, Ἀνικήτ&, Πί&, Τγίν& τε, κ) Τελέσφορος——*The* Elders *which were ſet over the* Church *which thou ruleſt*, Anicetus, Pius, Hyginus, *and* Teleſphorus, and lib. 3. cap. 3. Θεμελιώσαντες κ) οἰκοδομήσαντες οἱ μακάριοι Ἀπόστολοι ἐκκλησίαν, Λίνῳ τῷ ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρησαν — *The bleſſed* Apoſtles *having founded and built the* Church *of* Rome, *put the* Epiſcopal *office into the hands of* Linus, Anacletus *ſucceeded him*, Clemens Anacletus, Evareſtus Clemens, Alexander Evareſtus, *then* Xyſtus *the ſixth from the* Apoſtles, *after him* Teleſphorus, *then* Hyginus, *then* Pius, *after him* Anicetus, *after* Anicetus, Soter; νῦν δωδεκάτῳ τόπῳ, τ῀ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων κλῆρον ἔχει κλῆρον Ἐλεύθερος, *Now in the twelfth place*, Eleutherus *poſſeſſes the* Biſhoprick *from the* Apoſtles.

13. Here Firſt, it is evident that every one firſt named as *Elders* are yet *ſingle perſons*, one *ſucceeding* another, προϊστάμενοι ἐκκλησίας *ſet over*, or *ruling the Church* of *Rome*: Secondly, That for *twelve ſucceſſions* together, they are by *Irenæus* lookt upon *all*, as of the ſame *rank*, ſucceeding one another, and the *firſt* as well as the *laſt*, called *Biſhop*; which muſt conclude it to be underſtood by him in ſuch a *notion*, as is equally competible to *all*, and ſo muſt be in our *Modern* notion, if the great *Aſſerters* of the *Presbyterian* cauſe ſay true, that about the year 140. *i. e.* certainly before *Eleutherius* was *Biſhop* of *Rome*, there were *Biſhops* over *Presbyters* all the *world* over.

14. *Laſtly*, * *Irenæus*, ſpeaking of ſome unworthy *voluptuous Elders*, expreſſeth their faults in ſuch a manner, as cannot fitly belong to any but *Biſhops*, *Principalis conſeſſionis tumore elati ſunt, they are puft up with the pride of the principal place*, the πρωτοκαθεδρία the *princial chair*, which, as *Biſhops*, belonged to them. For though it is as poſſible that *Preſbyters* ſhould be guilty of the *pride*, the *tumor* and *elation*, as that *Biſhops* ſhould be guilty of the ſame, yet the *occaſion* of it there mentioned, the *principalis conſeſſio*, the *chief place* of *dignity*, is peculiar to the *one*, and not reconcileable with the ἰσότιμία or *equality* of the *other*.

* L. 4. c. 44.

15. Theſe evidences have readily offered themſelves to ſhew what *Irenæus* means by *Preſbyteri*, when he uſeth that and *Biſhops* promiſcuouſly, viz. by both, *Biſhops* in our *modern* notion; and he that ſhall read over that *Author* diligently, and compare his *dialect* with *Polycarp* and *Papias*, with whom he accords, the former uſing Πρεσβύτεροι for *Biſhops* (as hath largely been inſiſted on) and the latter for *Apoſtles* and *Biſhops*, *ſingle Governours* of each *Church*, (* πρεσβύτεροι Ἀνδρέας, Πέτρ&, Ἀριστίων, Ἰωάννης, and elſewhere, πρεσβύτερ& Μάρκ&. *Andrew, Peter, Ariſtion, John, Mark*, all *Elders*) will doutleſs find many more proofs that thus he uſed the word, and (I ſhall adventure to undertake) meet with no one *indication* to the contrary.

* *Euſeb.* l. 3. c. 39.

SECT. VI.

Teſtimonies of Tertullian. Seniores, & Majores natu *for Biſhops, ſo in* Firmilian.

Numb. 1. *D. Blondel. Apol. pag.* 38.

AS for *Tertullian* I ſhall need ſay no more, but that it is the *confeſſion* of the great *Patron* of *Presbyterians*, that he doth *apertè tueri communi uſu receptam ordinis in Epiſcopos, Presbyteros, & Diaconos, diſtinctionem, Openly defend the received common diſtinction of the Eccleſiaſtick order into* Biſhops, Presbyters *and* Deacons; and he that can yet doubt of it, let him examine his *citations*, *de Præſcript.* cap. 41. *de Baptiſm* cap. 17. *de Monogam.* cap. 11. *de Fuga* c. 11. And that *de Baptiſmo*, as high and clear, as that which was moſt quarrell'd with in *Ignatius*. *Dandi Baptiſmum jus habet ſummus ſacerdos, qui eſt Epiſcopus, dein Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen ſine Epiſcopi authoritate, propter honorem Eccleſiæ, quo ſalvo ſalva pax eſt. The Biſhop hath the right of giving Baptiſm, after him the Presbyters and Deacons, yet not without the authority of the Biſhop, for the honour of the Church, which being preſerved, peace is preſerved.*

2. So that of him it is as clear, as of *Irenæus* or *Clemens*, that he muſt underſtand *Biſhop* in our *Modern* notion: And yet even by him, theſe of this *uppermoſt* degree are called *Seniores*, and *Majores natu*, Elders; *Præſident probati quique Seniores, the Elders præſide, Apol.* c. 39. and of the *Biſhops* of *Rome*, the *ſeries* of whom he had brought down to *Anicetus*, lib. 3. *contr. Marcion.* cap. 9. he expreſſes them by *Majores natu, ſucceſſors* of *the Apoſtles*, in his Book, written in *verſe*, againſt *Marcion.*

3. And there will be leſs wonder in this, when it is remembred that after this, in S. *Cyprian's* times (who hath been ſufficiently evidenced to ſpeak of *Biſhops* in our *Modern* notion of them) *Firmilian Biſhop* of *Cæſarea* in *Cappadocia*, in vulgar ſtyle calls them *Seniores*, and *Præpoſiti*, *Elders*, and *Provoſts*, in his *Epiſtle* to *Cyprian*; and again, *Præſident Majores natu*, &c. *the Elders præſide*, evidently meaning the *Biſhops* by thoſe *titles*.

And

And ſo much be ſpoken in return to what they have objected from theſe two *Antients*, *Irenæus* and *Tertullian*, ſuppoſing that I have competently performed the task by them impoſed on the *Prelatiſts*, ſhewed that the *Biſhops* ſpoken of by them, were *Biſhops* over *Preſbyters*, and by them underſtood to be ſo. 4.

SECT. VII.

Saint Jerom's *Teſtimony of* Biſhops, *&c. By Apoſtolical Tradition.* Conſuetudo *oppoſed to* Dominica diſpoſitio. *Saint* Jerom's *meaning evidenced by many other* Teſtimonies *to be, that* Biſhops *were inſtituted by the* Apoſtles. *So by* Panormitan *alſo. The* Teſtimonies *of* Iſidore, *&c. the Council of* Aquen, *and of* Leo *vindicated. Of* Iſchyras's *Ordination. The teſtimony of the* Synod ad Quercum, *and of the Fourth Council of* Carthage.

IN the next place I am to proceed to that of Saint *Hierome* in his 85. *Epiſtle ad Euagrium*, the *unanſwerableneſs* of which, I am affirmed to make matter of *Triumph* over D. *Blondel* and *Walo Maſſalinus*, *ſeeming to ſay, that it never can be anſwered, whereas ſay they, if I had been pleaſed to caſt an eye upon the vindication --- written by* Smectymnuus, *I ſhould have found this anſwer* --- *Numb.* 1.

What this *anſwer* is, we ſhall ſee anon; In the mean it will be neceſſary to give a brief account, what it was, which is called a *triumphing* over theſe *two learned* men. 2.

And firſt it is ſufficiently known, what advantages the *defenders* of *Presbytery* conceive themſelves to have from that *one Antient* writer, the *Presbyter* Saint *Hierome*: From him they have the *interpretation* of thoſe *Scriptures*, which they think to be for their uſe, as that the word *Biſhop* and *Preſbyter* are all one in ſeveral *texts* of *Scripture*, and both ſignifie *Presbyters*, and that the *Apoſtles* at firſt deſigned, *ut communi Presbyterorum concilio Eccleſiæ gubernarentur, that the* Churches *ſhould be governed by the common Council of* Presbyters; and that it ſo continued till upon the *diſſentions*, which by this means aroſe in the *Church*, it was judged more *prudent* and uſeful to the preſerving of *unity*, *ut unus ſuperponeretur reliquis, that one ſhould be ſet over the reſt, and all the care of the Church belong to him.* And this, ſaith *Hierome*, *in toto Orbe decretum*, *decreed* and executed *over the whole world.* 3.

By whom this was conceived by him to be thus *decreed*, he gives us not to underſtand in that place, nor in what *point* of time he thought it was done, but leaves us to *collect* both from ſome few *circumſtances*; As firſt, That it was after *Schiſms* entred into the *Church*, and one ſaid *I am of Paul, I of Apollos*, &c. And if it were *immediately* after that, then the *Presbyterians* will gain but little by this *Patron*: For his whole meaning will be, that the *Apoſtles* firſt put the *Government* of *each Church* into the hands of *many*, but ſoon ſaw the *inconvenience* of doing ſo, and the *Schiſm* and *ruptures* conſequent to it, and changed it *themſelves*, and ſetled one *ſingular Biſhop* in the whole power of *Government* in every *Church*; to which very fitly *coheres* what *Clement* had ſaid, that *leſt new contentions ſhould ariſe about this ſingular dignity and authority*, who ſhould *ſucceed* to it, they made a *Roll* or *Catalogue* of thoſe, which in *vacancies* ſhould *ſucceed* in each *Church*. 4.

That this was not, in *Hierome*'s opinion, done thus early in the *Apoſtles* time, the *Preſbyterians* think they may conclude from what he ſaith on *Tit.* 1. *Epiſcopi noverint ſe magis conſuetudine quam diſpoſitionis Dominicæ veritate Preſbyteris eſſe Majores, Let Biſhops know that their greatneſs and ſuperiority over Presbyters is held rather by cuſtom, than by Chriſts having diſpoſed it ſo.* But it is very poſſible that this may not prove the *concluſion*, which is thought to be inferred by it. For here *Conſuetudo*, *Cuſtom*, as oppoſed to *Chriſts diſpoſition*, may well ſignifie the *Practice* of the *Church* in the *later* part of the *Apoſtles* times, and ever ſince to S. *Hierome*'s days, and that may well be ſevered from all *command*, or *inſtitution* of *Chriſts*; and ſo *Jerom*'s opinion may well be this, that *Chriſt* did not *ordain* this *ſuperiority* of one *above* another, but left all in *common* in the *Apoſtles* hands, who within a while, to avoid *Schiſm*, put the power in each *Church* in the hands of ſome *one ſingular perſon*. 5.

And that this was *Hierome*'s meaning, I thought my ſelf, in *charity* to him, obliged to think, both becauſe in this ſenſe his words would better agree with the *univerſal affirmation* of all *Orthodox Chriſtians*, that before him (and after him too, unleſs thoſe *few* that took it on his *credit*) ſpeak of this matter; and alſo, becauſe if this be not his ſenſe, he muſt needs be found to *contradict* himſelf, having elſewhere affirmed that the *three degrees* of *Biſhops*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the *Church*, were of *Apoſtolical tradition*, i. e. by the *Apoſtles* themſelves *delivered* to the *Church*. 6.

And now before I proceed, I deſire the *ingenuous Reader*, who is *contrary* minded, to conſider, what he can *object* to this *concluſion* of mine thus inferr'd concerning S. *Hierome*'s *opinion*, and conſequently what probability there is, that the *Presbyterians* cauſe ſhould be ſuperſtructed on any *Teſtimony* of S. *Hierome*, ſuppoſing what I am next to demonſtrate, that the *three orders* are by him acknowledged to be *delivered* from the *Apoſtles*. 7.

And this is evident in his *Epiſtle* to *Euagrius*, where having again delivered the *ſubſtance* of what hath been now cited from his *notes* on *Tit.* 1. he yet *concludes*, *Et ut ſciamus traditiones Apoſtolicas ſumptas de veteri teſtamento, Quod Aaron & filii ejus atq; Levitæ in templo fuerunt, hoc ſibi Epiſcopi & Presbyteri & Diaconi in Eccleſiâ vendicent. That we may know that the* Apoſtles traditions *are taken out of the* Old Teſtament, *we have this inſtance, that what* Aaron, *and his* Sons, *and the* Levites *were in the* Temple, *the ſame the* Biſhops, *and* Presbyters *and* Deacons *challenge to themſelves in the* Church. Where theſe *three degrees* (and ſo the *ſuperiority* of *Biſhops* over *Presbyters*) are by him affirmed to be *traditions* of the *Apoſtles*. 8.

On occaſion therefore of inquiring into *Hierom*'s meaning (and becauſe this place ſo readily offered it ſelf to expedite it) it was ſure very *reaſonable* to examine, and obſerve, what they which made moſt advantage of *Hierom*'s *authority*, ſhould be found to ſay to this *teſtimony* of his, for the *Apoſtolical tradition* of *three orders*. And among theſe, three principal perſons offered themſelves to 9.

our *conſideration*, D. *Blondel*, *Walo Meſſalinus*, or *Salmaſius*, and *Lud. Capellus*, every of them having newly written on this ſubject, and collected eſpecially what *Jerome* had ſaid of it.

10. Of theſe three, the laſt was ſoon diſcerned to have dealt moſt *prudently*, ſetting down the other *teſtimonies* out of him, but wholly omitting this; The other two having not been ſo *wary*, made uſe of another *dexterity*, ſet down the words, but deferr'd their obſervations on them, till ſome *fitter ſeaſon*; D. *Blondel* put it off to his *ſixth Section*; whereas upon examination, he hath but *three* in his whole *book*, and ſo is certainly never likely to ſpeak of it, nor can be juſtly believed to have, in earneſt, deſigned any ſuch thing: The other ſaith, he *expects more and better notes on it from* Salmaſius (*i. e.* from himſelf) *in another book*, viz. *De Eccleſiaſtico Ordine*, and after a great *volume* come out of that *ſubject* eight or nine years ſince, he yet never takes this place, or his own *promiſe* into conſideration.

11. This was all that my ſearch produced, and the taking notice of theſe *plain* matters of *fact*, the behaviours of theſe men in that, which ſo much concern'd the whole *cauſe* to be taken notice of, and laid to *heart*, is all that was done by me, and which is ſtyled by theſe a *triumphing over* thoſe *learned Men*. And I hope there was little of *hard* meaſure, and as little of *inſolence* in this.

12. Now becauſe what theſe *learned* Men thus averted the doing, is yet here ſaid to be done by *Smectymnuus*, and that *if I had caſt an eye on the vindication — I ſhould there have found that place of* Hierome's *anſwered*, I am now in the laſt place to obey their directions, and conſider the *anſwer*, which from *Smectymnuus* they have ſet down for me.

13. And it is *twofold*, the firſt is a *civil denial* that there is any *truth* in the words, *For*, ſay they, *It is hard to conceive how this imparity can be properly called an Apoſtolical Tradition, when* Jerome, *having mentioned* John *the laſt of the* Apoſtles, *ſaith it was* poſtea, *that one was ſet over the reſt*.

14. But is this the way of *anſwering* the place, or ſalving the *difficulty? Hierome* ſaith, *Biſhops*, *Preſbyters*, and *Deacons* in the *Church* (that ſure is this *imparity*) are an *Apoſtolical Tradition*; and they *anſwer*, *It is hard to conceive how it can be properly ſo called*. What is this but to make *Hierom*'s words (as ſoon as ever he ſaith any thing which accords not with their *intereſt*) as *unreconcileable* with truth, as with his *own* former *words*, which they had cited from him? And then how much kinder to *Hierome* was I than they, who thought it neceſſary to affix a *commodious* meaning to his former words, and *interpret conſuetudo*] the *cuſtom* of the *Church* begun in the *Apoſtles* dayes, that ſo in thus ſaying, he might be *reconcileable* with himſelf, when he called *Epiſcopacy* a *tradition Apoſtolical?*

15. As for the *reaſon*, which makes this ſo *hard* for them to *conceive* from *Hierome*'s words, I believe it hath no *force* in it; For though after the mention of S^t^ *John*'s words in his ſecond and third Epiſtle, he ſaith that [*poſtea*, *afterwards*] this *imparity* was introduced, yet this proves not his opinion to be, that it was not *Apoſtolical tradition*; It might be done *after* the *writing* of thoſe Epiſtles, and yet in S^t^ *John*'s time, *i. e.* before his *death*. And though I believe S^t^ *Hierome* was miſtaken, in thinking there were no *Biſhops* till then (it would have had more *truth* in it, if he had ſaid there were no *Presbyters* till then) yet for all that, I cannot doubt but this was his *opinion*, becauſe as he no where ſaith any thing which is *contrary* to this, ſo here he ſaith *expreſly* that it was *Apoſtolical tradition*, which in his *opinion* it could not be, if it were not in the *Church*, in his *opinion*, before S^t^ *John*'s death. And ſo there is but little appearance of *validity* in their firſt *Anſwer*.

16. And for their *ſecond*, that is ſomewhat like the former, *viz.* that *with* Hierome *Apoſtolical tradition and Eccleſiaſtical cuſtom are the ſame*.

17. If this be true, then certainly I did not amiſs in thinking that when *Hierome* uſed *conſuetudo cuſtom* in oppoſition to *Dominica diſpoſitio*, Chriſt's *appointment* or *inſtitution*, I ought to interpret *cuſtom* in that place, by *Apoſtolical Tradition* in the other. For how *Eccleſiaſtical cuſtom* with him, and *Apoſtolical Tradition* ſhould be the ſame, and yet *Eccleſiaſtical cuſtom* may not be interpreted by *Apoſtolical tradition*, eſpecially when the ſame man *affirms* them both of the ſame thing, I confeſs I cannot apprehend.

18. But then ſecondly, becauſe I muſt ſuppoſe, that by making them the *ſame*, *they* muſt mean to bring down *Apoſtolical tradition* to ſignify *Eccleſiaſtical cuſtom*, not to advance *cuſtom* to ſignify *Apoſtolical tradition* (in the ſame manner as when they make *Biſhop* and *Elder* the ſame, they bring down *Biſhop* to ſignifie *Presbyter*, but will not allow *Elder* to ſignifie *Biſhop*) that alſo will be worth *examining* a while.

19. And firſt, Can there be any reaſon to imagine, that *Hierom* or any man ſhould ſet down that for an *inſtance* of *Apoſtolical tradition*, which the ſame perſon doth not believe to be *delivered* by the *Apoſtles*, but to be of a *later* date? That which is *delivered* by the *Apoſtles*, and *received*, and *practiſed* by the *Church*, may fitly be called a *cuſtom of the Church*, without adding or ſpecifying, that we mean the *Apoſtolical Church*; becauſe the *Apoſtles*, while they lived, were a *part* of the *Church*, and the following Age was a *part* of the *Church* alſo. But can it be truly ſaid, that that was delivered by the *Apoſtles*, which was only *accuſtomed* in the *ſubſequent Church*, and not ſo much as introduced under the *Apoſtles?*

20. This certainly is another ſtrange way of *interpreting* words or phraſes quite contrary to all *Lexicons*, or to the *uſe* of ſuch *words* or *phraſes*, which unleſs they be *changed*, it is as much as to ſay, he that ſaid *Tradition Apoſtolical*, did not mean *Tradition Apoſtolical*; And this ſure will bring little credit to S^t^ *Hierome*, on whoſe *authority* they ſo much depend in this matter.

21. As for their *proof* of what they ſay, *viz.* becauſe *the obſervation of Lent*, *which he ſaith*, ad Marcellum, *is* Apoſtolica traditio, *is* contra Luciferianos, *ſaid by him to be* Eccleſiæ conſuetudo,] that ſure is not of *force* to conclude what they would have it; for it may be (or by him be deemed to be) both, an *Apoſtolical tradition* and a *cuſtom* of the *Church* too; it being very *ordinary* and *reaſonable*, that what the *Apoſtles delivered*, the *Church* ſhould alſo *accuſtome*, and *practiſe*. But could *both* theſe be ſaid by him of that which he thought were but *one* of theſe? That is again to make him *teſtifie* againſt his *conſcience*, to ſay *Lent* was an *Apoſtolical tradition*, and to *believe* it was not an *Apoſtolical tradition*.

22. Here I ſhall not need *debate* whether the *obſervation* of *Lent* were *Apoſtolical*, or no; All that is neceſſary to inſiſt on, is, whether Saint *Hierome*, that *ſaid* it was ſuch, *believed* it to be ſuch; And if he

be

be *mistaken* in his *belief*, then he may be as well mistaken in the meaning of those passages, which he *interprets* so, as is *useful* to, and in favour of the *Presbyterians*, as that πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, *Act.* 20. were the *Presbyters* of the *Church* of *Ephesus*; that the Ἐπίσκοποι *Bishops*, *Phil.* 1. are *Presbyters* of that one *Church* or *City*, and the like. For either of those is but his *belief* or *perswasion* too, and the more *fallible* they find him in *other* things, the less *weight* they ought to lay on his *opinion* in this, and the less *blame* on us, for departing from his *opinion*.

But having said this πρὸς ὕπαθον, for the *repelling* all force of their *objection*, I shall now add some other *testimonies* out of Saint *Hierome*, and after them, *one argument*, *ad homines* undeniable, to *demonstrate*, that it was indeed and without *question* S. *Hierome*'s opinion, that *Bishops* in our *modern* notion were *instituted* by the *Apostles* themselves. 23.

1. In his 54. *Epistle* he sets down this difference among others, between the *Catholicks* and the *Montanist Hereticks*, *Apud nos Apostolorum locum tenent Episcopi*, *apud eos Episcopus tertius est*, *Among the* Catholicks *the* Bishops (such as were in S. *Hierome*'s time, *i. e.* certainly such as in ours, not *meer Presbyters*) *hold the place of the* Apostles (*i. e.* the *uppermost* place in the *Church* of *Christ*, and *succeed* the *Apostles* in it) *and among those* Hereticks *the* Bishop *is the third*; which it seems was one *character* of their being *Hereticks*, and so a *deviation* from an *Apostolical* truth. 24.

2. In his *Book*, *de script. Eccles.* he saith of *James* the *brother* of the *Lord*, *Jacobus ab Apostolis statim post ascensionem Domini Hierosolymorum Episcopus ordinatus, suscepit Ecclesiam Hierosolymæ. Timotheus à Paulo Ephesiorum Episcopus ordinatus, Titus Cretæ. Polycarpus à Johanne Smyrnæ Episcopus Ordinatus*, James *presently after Christs Ascension, was ordained Bishop of* Hierusalem, *and undertook* (i. e. *ruled*, as to *receive the Congregation*, Psal. 75. is to *rule* it) *the Church of* Hierusalem, Timothy *was ordained Bishop of the* Ephesians *by* Paul, Titus *of* Crete. Polycarp *was by* John *ordained Bishop of* Smyrna. Where, as it is evident, and by the *Presbyterians* acknowledged, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were *singular rulers* (which therefore they are wont to excuse by saying they are *extraordinary officers* or *Evangelists*) and yet by him said to be *Bishops* of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, and so constituted by the *Apostles*, so it is consequent that *James* and *Polycarp* were by him deemed *singular rulers* also (and not *Collegues* in a *Presbytery*) and those so *constituted* by the *Apostles* also; and accordingly of this *James* he saith, *ad Gal.* 2. *Jacobus primus ei Ecclesiæ præfuit --- Episcopus Hierosolymorum primus fuit*, James *was the first that was set over that Church --- was the first Bishop of* Hierusalem. And in consequence thereto, in his *comments* on *Isa. lib.* 5. *cap.* 17. he calls this *James Decimum tertium Apostolum*, *the thirteenth Apostle*. 25.

3. In like manner * *Epist. ad Euagrium*, speaking of *Mark* (who dying in the eighth of *Nero*, what was done by him, must be resolved to have been in the *Apostles* times, and agreeable to their *practice*) he saith, *Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelistâ ad Heraclam & Dionysium Episcopos Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori super Presbyteros gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant, quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faceret. At* Alexandria *from the time of* Mark *the Evangelist, to the time of* Heraclas *and* Dionysius *Bishops, the Presbyters always named one chosen from among themselves, and placed in an higher degree above Presbyters, their Bishop, as if an army should chuse their General.* That what is said of the *Presbyters chusing* their *Bishop*, belongs not to *Presbyters imposing hands* on him, is † elsewhere largely evidenced. And so, by the way, appeareth the *falseness* of the citation out of *Hierome*, *Appen. p.* 142. that *in Alexandria for a long time the Presbyters ordained* (it should have been said *elected*) *their Bishop*. That which I here infer from the *testimony* is manifest, *viz.* that in Saint *Marks* time, and from the *first* planting of the *Church* at *Alexandria*, one *Bishop* or *singular Ruler* was *constituted* among them, as that signifies an *higher degree* than that of *Presbyters*. 26. * *Pag.* 85. † *Dissert.* 3. *cap.* 10.

4. More places there are in him, which evidence his opinion, that *Bishops*, as they differ from *Presbyters*, are *successors* of the *Apostles*: In his *Comment* on *Psal.* 45. *Nunc quia Apostoli à mundo recesserunt, habes pro his Episcopos filios, sunt & hi patres tui, quia ab ipsis regeris. Now* (in S. *Hierome*'s time) *because the* Apostles *are parted from the world, you have in their steads* Bishops *their* Sons; *They also are thy* Fathers, *because thou art governed by them.* Where the *Bishops* that *then* ruled (those are confest to be *single* persons, not *Presbyteries*) are the *successors* of the *Apostles* in his opinion. And *Ep.* 1. *ad Heliodorum*, of not *undertaking* the *office* of *Bishop*. *Non est facile stare loco Pauli, tenere gradum Petri*; *'tis not easie to stand in* Pauls *place, to hold the degree of* Peter. Where *Episcopacy* is the *place* and *degree* of those *Apostles*. And so *Ep.* 13. *ad Paulinum*, *Episcopi & Presbyteri habeant in exemplum Apostolos & Apostolicos viros, quorum honorem possidentes habere nitantur & meritum, Bishops and Presbyters must have for their Examples the Apostles and Apostolical men, whose honour they possess, and therefore ought to endeavour to imitate their merit.* 27.

5. I shall add a *Cumulus* of other passages much to the same purpose with the former, and fit to be taken in conjunction with them, to give us the full understanding of S. *Hierome*'s opinion in this matter. *Ad Nepotian. Ep.* 2. *Esto subjectus Pontifici tuo, & quasi animæ parentem suscipe*; *quod Aaron & filios ejus, hoc Episcopum & Presbyteros esse noverimus. Be subject to the* Bishop, *and receive him as the Parent of thy* Soul; *what* Aaron *and his Sons were, that we must know the* Bishop *and* Presbyters *to be.* And on *Tit.* 1. speaking of S. *Paul*'s directions for the making a *Bishop*, *Apostolus*, saith he, *Ecclesiæ Principem formans, the Apostle forming the Prince* or *Ruler of the Church*, and so again in the same words on *Psal.* 45. deciphering a *single ruler* by that *Bishop*, which the *Apostle* there meant to *form.* So on that 45. *Psal. Constituit Christus in omnibus finibus mundi Principes Ecclesiæ Episcopos, Christ in all parts of the world constituted Princes of the Church, the Bishops*, just the same as hath been cited from *Ignatius*, that *all the world over the Bishops were ordained by the Apostles according to the mind of Christ.* In his *Dial. adv. Luciferian. Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exors quædam & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiis officientur Schismata quot sacerdotes*; and, *Si quæris quare in Ecclesia baptizatus, nisi per manus Episcopi non accipiat spiritum sanctum --- disce hanc observationem ex ea authoritate descendere, quod Spiritus sanctus ad Apostolos descendit. The safety of the Church depends on the dignity of the chief Priest* (or *Bishop*) *to whom if a peculiar power be not given above all that others have, there will be as many Schisms as Priests in the Churches. --- If you demand why he that hath been baptized in the Church, may not receive the Holy Ghost but by the hands of the Bishop, learn that this observance descends* 28.

from that Authority, in that the holy ſpirit deſcended on the Apoſtles. Which *Teſtimony*, as it ſhews the neceſſity of a *ſingular Biſhop* to avoid *Schiſms* in the *Church*, and ſo muſt affix the *inſtitution* of them on the *Apoſtles*, who made *proviſion* againſt that danger (and that I ſuppoſe is his meaning in * that place which the *Preſbyterians* make moſt uſe of) ſo it *directly* derives the *authority*, by which *Biſhops* ſtand in the *Church*, *diſtinct* from *Preſbyters*, and *above* them, from the *deſcent* of the *Holy Ghoſt* on the *Apoſtles*. Laſtly, *adv. Jovinan. l.* 1. *Epiſcopus & Presbyter & Diaconus non ſunt meritorum nomina ſed officiorum, Nec dicitur, ſi quis Epiſcopatum deſiderat——The Biſhop and Presbyter and Deacon, are names of offices, neither is it ſaid, If any man deſire a Biſhoprick* — applying thoſe *Texts* of S. *Paul*, concerning the *qualifications* of *Biſhops* to the *Biſhop*, as in his time he ſtood, *diſtinct* from *Preſbyters*.

* *In toto orbe decretum ut unus de Presbyteris electus ſuperponeretur cæteris, ad quem omnis Eccleſiæ cura pertineret, ut ſchiſmatum ſemina tollerentur*, and *Paulatim ut diſſenſionum ſemina tollerentur, ad unum omnis ſollicitudo delata eſt.* Com. ad Tit.

29. All this I ſuppoſe may ſuffice to give *authority* to my *collection* and *concluſion* from *plain* words of S. *Hierom*, that his meaning was as *plain* and undubitable, that *Epiſcopacy* was *delivered* down and *inſtituted* in the *Church* by the *Apoſtles* themſelves. And I cannot conceive what can be invented to avoid the *evidence* of theſe *teſtimonies*; yet becauſe I promiſed it, I ſhall now add that *one argument (ex abundanti*, and much more than is *neceſſary*) to the ſame purpoſe, (*viz.* to prove that this was *Hierom*'s meaning, which I pretend it to be.) And that ſuch, as by theſe *objectors* cannot with *juſtice* be denyed, to have a full irrefragable force in it, having themſelves made uſe of it *againſt* us, which they ought not to have done, if by *themſelves* it ſhall now be *denyed* when it is *produced* by us.

30. In the cloſe of their *Appendix*, they have ſet down ſeveral *propoſitions declaring the judgment and practice of the Antient Church about ordination of Miniſters*, and their *firſt propoſition*, being this, that *in the firſt and pureſt times — there was ordination of Presbyters without Biſhops over Presbyters*, their *proof* is this, *For theſe Biſhops came in* poſtea *and* paulatim, *afterward, and by little and little, as* Hierom *ſaith. And* Panormitan, *lib.* 1. *Decretal. de Conſuetud.* cap. 4. *ſaith, Olim Presbyteri in communi regebant Eccleſiam & ordinabant ſacerdotes, & pariter conferebant omnia ſacramenta. Of old the Elders ruled the Church in common, and ordained Prieſts, and joyntly conferred all the Sacraments.*

31. Theſe two *teſtimonies* of *Hierom* and *Panormitan*, being brought to prove the ſame *propoſition* concerning *ordination* by *Presbyters*, and the time of *Biſhops coming* in to the *Church*, It muſt ſure be reaſonable to reſolve that what *Panormitan* hath defined in this matter, that was S. *Hieroms* ſenſe alſo; Now what that is, will be diſcerned by ſetting down *Panormitan*'s words at large, as they lie in the place cited by them.

32. The buſineſs he hath there in hand is to *prove*, that *cuſtom* is not of *force* ſo far, as to *preſcribe* that an *Ordinary Clerk* as *Presbyter* ſhould *perform* an *Epiſcopal act*, *Ea quæ ſunt ordinis Epiſcopalis non poſſunt acquiri per ordinem inferiorem ex conſuetudine quantumcunque vetuſtiſſimâ, Thoſe things that are of Epiſcopal order, cannot by any cuſtom, how antient ſoever, be acquired by any Inferiour order:* The reaſon is, *quia conſuetudo non facit quem capacem, becauſe cuſtom doth make no man capable* — Then he makes this *obſervation*, that *Ritus Apoſtolorum circa ſacramenta habent impedire characteris impreſſionem; The rites*, or *practice*, or *Inſtitutions of the Apoſtles about the Sacraments, have power to hinder the impreſſion of the Character, nam immediatè poſt mortem Chriſti omnes Presbyteri in communi regebaat eccleſiam, non fuerant inter ipſos Epiſcopi, ſed idem Presbyter quod Epiſcopus, & pariter conferebant omnia ſacramenta, ſed poſtmodum ad Schiſmata ſedanda fecerunt ſeu ordinaverunt Apoſtoli, ut crearentur Epiſcopi & certa ſacramenta iis reſervarunt, illa interdicendo ſimplicibus Presbyteris — For immediately after the death of Chriſt, all the Elders in common ruled the Church, and ſo there were no Biſhops among them, but a Presbyter was the ſame that a Biſhop, and they joyntly conferred all the Sacraments. But after a while for the appeaſing of Schiſms, the Apoſtles cauſed or ordained that* Biſhops *ſhould be created, and reſerved to them ſome Sacraments (or holy Rites) forbidding ſingle* Presbyters *to meddle with them: and he concludes*, Et vides hic quod talis ordinatio habet impedire etiam impreſſionem Characteris, quia ſi Preſbyteri illa de facto conferunt, nihil conferunt, *And here you ſee, that ſuch an Ordination is able to hinder the impreſſion of the Character, becauſe if* Presbyters *do* de facto *confer them, they confer nothing.*

33. Where, as *Panormitan* cited by them to prove *Ordination* without *Biſhops* (and ſpecious words pickt out of him to that purpoſe) doth yet diſtinctly *affirm* that *Presbyters*, which *confer Orders* without a *Biſhop*, *confer nothing*, all their *Ordinations* are meer *nullities* (and what could have been ſaid more *ſeverely* againſt their *practice*, and their *deſign* in citing him, than this?) ſo he plainly interprets S. *Hieroms* aſſertion of the *occaſion* and time of *Biſhops* being ſet over the *Presbyters*, that it was done by the appointment of the *Apoſtles* themſelves, and ſo that *conſuetudo, cuſtome* in *Hierom*, oppoſed to *Dominica diſpoſitio Chriſt*'s *diſpoſal*, is no more than [*poſtmodum ordinaverunt Apoſtoli, after a while the* Apoſtles *ordained*] oppoſed to [*immediatè poſt mortem Chriſti, immediately after the death of Chriſt.*]

34. And then by the way, as the *Reader* may hence diſcern what force there is, in this *Teſtimony* of *Panormitan* to ſupport their *firſt propoſition* concerning *the Ordination* of *Presbyters without* Biſhops *over* Presbyters (for which, beſides S. *Hieroms poſtea* and *paulatim*, and part of this *teſtimony* of *Panormitan*, they produce no other) and as by what was formerly ſaid of the *Teſtimonies* of *Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, their chief ſupports for their * *Second Propoſition*, have already been utterly demoliſhed, ſo alſo the *Teſtimonies* of *Iſidore Hiſpalenſis* and the *Council* of *Aquen* produced for the proof of their † *third Propoſition*, concerning the *Presbyters* having an *intrinſick* power to ordain Miniſters, will immediately vaniſh in like manner. For as it is evident that that place in that *Council* of *Aquen* is for nine Chapters together tranſcribed out of *Iſidore*, and conſequently the *Teſtimonies* out of *him* and that *Council* are but *one* and the ſame thing, twice repeated, to increaſe the *number*; ſo 'tis as evident that what is by them ſaid, is taken from S. *Hierom*, and can no farther be extended either in reſpect of the *authority* or the *matter* of the *Teſtimony*, than in S. *Hierom* it hath appeared to extend. And therefore as the * words cited by theſe men out of them, are no more than theſe, that *ſolum propter authoritatem Clericorum ordinatio & conſecratio reſervata eſt ſummo ſacerdoti, That Presbyters have many things common with* Biſhops, *only in reſpect of authority* (or for the preſerving it intire, and

* *Append.* p. 129.

† *Append.* p. 131.

* *Append.* p. 132.

and the *unity* of each *Church*, which depended on that, in St. *Hierom*'s opinion) *the Ordination and conſecration of* Clerks (*i. e.* of all *Presbyters* and *Deacons*) *was reſerved to the chief Prieſt*, i. e. the *Biſhop*; ſo how far this is from *concluding* what it was brought to *prove*, the *intrinſick* power of *Preſbyters* to *ordain Miniſters*, I leave to any *Reader* to paſs judgment. And yet truly this doth it as well as their *one* other *antient Teſtimony*, that of *Leo*, ſet out in their front, out of his 88. *Epiſtle*, concerning the *Conſecration* of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*, and ſome other things, *Quæ omnia ſolis deberi Pontificibus authoritate canonum præcipitur*, *All which that they ſhould be due to the* Biſhops *and to none elſe, it is commanded by the authority of the Canons.* Who would ever have thought fit, from ſuch words as theſe, which *affirm* this *priviledge* to be *reſerved peculiarly* to the *Biſhops*, and that the *authority* of the *Canons* ſo requires, to conclude that the *Presbyters* had this *intrinſick power?* As if all that the *Canons* deny *Presbyters*, were infallibly their *due* to enjoy, and the *Argument demonſtrative*, that it *was* their *Original* and *intrinſick due*, becauſe the *Canons deny* it.

What they add of *Iſchyras* Prop. 6. that *being depoſed from being a* Presbyter, *becauſe made by* Colluthus *who was but a* Presbyter *himſelf, and not a* Biſhop, *this was done, not becauſe the act of* Colluthus *was againſt the* Canon *of Scripture, but only becauſe it was againſt the* Canons *of ſome councils.*] is ſomewhat of the ſame nature with the *former*, and will be beſt judged of by the relation of the *Fact*, which in the *ſtory* of thoſe times is thus made by *Socrates*, Πρᾶγμα ὑπέδυ πολλῶν θανάτων ἄξιον, ὑδεπώ ποτε γὰρ ἱερωσύνης τυχὼν, τὸ τῶ πρεσβυτέρω ὄνομα ἑαυτῶ περιθέμενος τὰ ἱερέως πράττειν ἐτόλμησεν, *He adventured on a thing worthy of many Deaths, for being never admitted to the* Prieſthood, *and aſſuming to himſelf the name of an* Elder, *he dared to do the things belonging to a* Prieſt. A *cenſure* which certainly ſets the fault ſomewhat higher than the *tranſgreſſing* of the Canons of ſome Councils. 35. P. 143. L. 1. c. 20.

Two *Teſtimonies* more I ſhall touch on, before I return to the purſuit of my propoſed Method, and then I ſhall render the reaſon of this *Excurſion*. 36.

For the confirmation of their *ſecond Propoſition* concerning *Ordination*, one *Teſtimony* they produce from the *Synod ad Quercum* Ann. 403. *where it was brought as an accuſation againſt Chryſoſtome*, ὅτι πολλὰς ἀμαρτύρως ἐχειροτόνησεν, ὅτι ἄνευ συνεδρείου καὶ παρὰ γνώμην τῆ κλήρω ἐποίησε τὰς χειροτονίας, *That he made Ordinations without the company and ſentence of the Clergy.* Another from the *council* of *Carthage*, Can. 20. *Ut Epiſcopus ſine Concilio Clericorum ſuorum non ordinet*, *That a* Biſhop *ordain not* Clerks *without the Council of his own* Clerks; and *Can.* 2. Cum ordinatur *Presbyter*, Epiſcopo eum benedicente, & manum ſuper caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes *Presbyteri* qui præſentes ſunt manus ſuas juxta manum Epiſcopi ſuper caput illius teneant. *When a* Presbyter *is Ordained, as the* Biſhop *bleſſeth him and layes his hand on his head, let all the* Presbyters *alſo that are preſent lay their hands on his Head by the Hand of the Biſhop.* And the concluſion deduced from theſe *Teſtimonies* (and the forementioned of *Cyprian* and *Fermilian*) is this, that *Ordination by* Biſhops *without the aſſiſtance of his* Presbyters *was always forbidden and oppoſed.* How truly this is inferred from the *Premiſſes* will ſoon be judged by a view of the *Teſtimonies*. 37.

For the firſt, this is the truth of the Story; *Theophilus* a guilty perſon, and as ſuch, cited to anſwer, what was *objected* againſt him, making uſe of the *envy*, under which *Chryſoſtome* then laboured, ſhifted the *Scene*, and became his *Judge*, nay, as *Photius* tells us, he and the reſt of that *Conventicle*, οἱ τὰ μάλιστα δυσμενῶς ἔχοντες πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα, *that were* Chryſoſtom's *greateſt Enemies*, ἅμα πάντα καὶ κεῖται, καὶ κατήγοροι, καὶ μάρτυρες ἦσαν, *were at once Judges, and Accuſers, and Witneſſes of all that was charged againſt him.* And therefore we already ſee, what heed is to be given to the *accuſation* of thoſe *Fathers ad quercum*, and how *valid* an argument can be deduced from it; And we ſhall the better gueſs at it, if we conſider alſo, what other *particulars* were, in the ſame manner that this was, *charged* againſt him, ſet down by *Photius* in his *Bibliotheca*. The 23. charge was, ὅτι ἑαυτῶ μόνῳ λουτρὸν ἐποκαίεται --- *that the Bath was heated for him alone, and that after he had bathed*, Serapion *ſhuts the paſſage into the Bath, that no body elſe might bathe: The* 25. ὅτι μόνος ἐδίει, --- *that he eat alone, living like one of the Cyclopes*; and betwixt theſe two new found crimes, comes in this, in the midſt, being the 24. ὅτι πολλὰς ἀμαξύρυς ἐχειροτόνησεν, *that he ordained many that had no Teſtimonials*; which being ſet down by *Photius*, as the ſum of that *charge*, refers us indeed to the *ground*, on which their *charge* was built, of his *ordaining without a Council*, and *againſt the mind of his Clergy*, (thoſe *teſtimonials*, and ſo the *approbation* of the perſon by the *Clergy*, being generally a good *preparation* to the receiving Orders) but doth not at all *prove* that a *Biſhop* might not *ordain* without *aſſiſtance* of his *Presbyters*, or that it was *always forbidden*, any more than it proves that *eating* or *bathing alone* was *always forbidden* alſo. 38.

As for that of the 4. *Council* of *Carthage* Can. 20. They have ſet down but *half* the *Canon*; the *whole* runs thus, *Ut Epiſcopus ſine concilio Clericorum non ordinet, ita ut civium conniventiam & Teſtimonium quærat*, *That the* Biſhop *ordain not without his council of* Clergy, *ſo that he ſeeks the liking and teſtimonial of the Inhabitants.* Which again only ſerves to ſhew, the uſe of the *aſſiſtant Presbyters*, to help the *Biſhop* to a due *knowledge* of the perſon to be *ordained* (and this they know we *Prelatiſts* aſſent to and approve of) but is no argument of the *unlawfulneſs* of *ſole ordination*, or of any *power* that the *Presbyters* have in the *conferring* of *Orders*. 39.

So likewiſe that from *Can.* 2. is only a *Teſtimony* for the *fitneſs* and *uſefulneſs* of that *cuſtom* (ſtill retain'd and uſed in our *Church* in all *Ordinations* of *Presbyters* and *Deacons*) that the *Presbyters* there *preſent* ſhould *lay* on their *hands* by the *hand* of the *Biſhop*, and ſo join in the *Prayer* or *Benediction*, but no proof that a *Presbyter* might not be *ordained* by a *Biſhop* without the *preſence* of ſuch *Presbyters*. 40.

I have for a while gone aſide from the conſideration of S. *Hierom*'s *teſtimony* (the deſigned matter of this *Section*) and allowed my ſelf *ſcope* to take in all the *teſtimonies* of *Antiquity*, which are made uſe of by theſe *Aſſemblers*, for the juſtifying their *Ordination* of *Miniſters*; And I have done it on purpoſe (though a little contrary to my deſigned Method and brevity) becauſe after the publiſhing of the *Diſſertations* againſt *Blondel*, I remember I was once told, that though it was not *neceſſary*, yet I might do well to add ſome *Appendix*, by way of *Anſwer* to that one head of *diſcourſe* concerning *Presbyterial Ordination*, and the inſtances which were objected by him. For which reaſon I have now, as near as I can, taken in all, in this place, which are in their *Appendix* produced on that head, and do not elſewhere in this *brief* reply, fall in my way to be anſwered by me. For ſome others, mentioned 41.

tioned by D. *Blondel*, I refer the *Reader* to the learned pains of the *Biſhop* of *Derry*, in his vindication of the Church of *England* from the aſperſion of *Schiſm*, p. 270. *&c.*

42. And ſo being at laſt returned into my rode again, This may, I hope, ſuffice to have ſaid in the juſtification of what was done in the *Diſſertations* concerning St. *Hierom*, both to clear his ſenſe, and for the ſetting the *ballance* aright betwixt his authority on the one ſide, and the authority of *Ignatius* on the other, betwixt ſome doubtful ſayings of the former, which ſeemed to *prejudice* the *Doctrine* of the *Apoſtles* inſtituting *imparity*, which yet elſewhere he *affirms* to be Apoſtolical tradition, and the many clear and *uncontradicted*, conſtant ſaying of the latter, which are acknowledged to aſſert it. Which one thing, if it be not in the *Diſſertations* ſo done, as may ſatisfie any *impartial Judge*, that *Ignatius*, in full concord with all, is to be heeded on our ſide, more than St. *Hierom*, in ſome *few* of his many Teſtimonies, can be juſtly *produced* againſt us, I ſhall then confeſs my ſelf guilty of overmuch *confidence*; but if therein I have not erred, it is moſt evident that I need not undertake any farther *travail* in this whole matter.

SECT. VIII.

The Teſtimonies of Ambroſe *and* Auſtin. Conſignare *uſed for conſecrating the* Euchariſt, *and that belonged to the* Biſhop *when preſent.*

Numb. 1. THere now follows in the next place the paſſage cited by them, *p.* 133. out of *Ambroſe* on *Eph.* 4. where to prove that even *during the prevalency of Epiſcopacy 'twas not held unlawful for a* Presbyter *to ordain without a* Biſhop, they urge out of St. *Ambroſe* theſe words, *Apud Ægyptum* Presbyteri *conſignant, ſi præſens non ſit Epiſcopus, In* Ægypt *the* Presbyters *conſigne, if the* Biſhop *be not preſent.* And the like out of *Auſtin* (or whoſoever was the *Author*) *in Quæſt. ex utroq; Teſtam. Qu.* 101. *In* Alexandria *& per totam* Ægyptum, *ſi deſit Epiſcopus, conſecrat* Presbyter, *In* Alexandria *and through all* Ægypt, *if the* Biſhop *be wanting, the* Presbyter *conſecrates.* And having done ſo, they add, *which words cannot be underſtood (as a--- defender of Prelacy would have them) of the Conſecration of the* Euchariſt; *For this might be done by the* Presbyter, *præſente Epiſcopo, the* Biſhop *being preſent, but it muſt be underſtood either of confirmation, or (which is more likely) of ordination, becauſe* Ambroſe *in that place is ſpeaking of Ordination.*

2. To this I ſhall briefly reply, Firſt, That it is ſure enough, and granted by the moſt *eminent Preſbyterians*, that theſe two Books, whence theſe *Teſtimonies* are cited, were not written either by *Ambroſe* or *Auſtin*, but by ſome other (*Hilarius Sardus*, ſaith *Blondel*) and unjuſtly inſerted among their *works*; and then the authority of ſuch *ſuppoſititious* pieces will not be great to over-rule any *practice* otherwiſe *acknowledged* in the *Church* of *God.*

3. Secondly, That the miſtakes of *Blondel* and *Salmaſius*, concerning the meaning of the former of theſe places, were ſo evidently diſcovered by the *ſecond* of them (the *conſignant* in the one, interpreted by *conſecrat* in the other) that I conceived it ſufficient, but to name them; For can there be any thing more *unqueſtionable* than this, that *conſecrare* in *antient* writers ſignifies the *Conſecration* of the *Euchariſt?* And then if *conſignare* be a more *obſcure* phraſe, is there any doubt, but it muſt be *interpreted* by that which is ſo much more *vulgar* and *plain?* and all the *circumſtances* beſides being exactly the ſame in both places, what doubt can there be, but in both, the words are to be underſtood of the *Euchariſt?*

4. Yet becauſe ſome advantage was by this their miſunderſtanding ſought to the *Presbyterians* cauſe, they now reſolve, and inſiſt, that it muſt not be *rectified*, though they know not which to apply it to, *Confirmation* or *Ordination*, and pretend not to produce any *Teſtimony*, where *conſecrare* is ever uſed for the *latter*, or *conſignare* for either of them. And indeed * *Blondel* and † *Salmaſius* were yet more *uncertain*, for they thought it might alſo belong to the *benediction* of *Penitents*, and that as *probable* as either of the two former; And when the truth is rejected, thus it is wont to be.

* *Apol.* p. 57.
† *Appar. ad lib. de Prim.*

5. As for the only *reaſon* which inclines them to confine it to *Ordination*, *becauſe* Ambroſe *in that place is ſpeaking of Ordination*, if the place be review'd, it will not be found to have *truth* in it; He ſpeaks immediately before, of the ſeveral *Miniſterial Acts*, *Preaching* and *Baptizing*, adding indeed that *Scripta Apoſtoli non per omnia conveniunt Ordinationi, quæ nunc in Eccleſia eſt, The writings of the Apoſtle do not in all things agree to the Order, which is now in the Church.* There is mention of *Ordinatio* indeed, but that ſignifies not *Ordination*, as we now uſe it for *ordaining* of *Miniſters*, but manifeſtly the διατάξις, the *rule*, or *order* uſed in the *Church*, in ſeveral reſpects, ſaith he, different from what it was in the *writings* of the *Apoſtle.*

6. And for their *objection* againſt my *interpretation*, that it cannot be underſtood of *conſecrating* the *Euchariſt*, [*becauſe this the* Presbyter *might do when the* Biſhop *was preſent*] If they would have taken notice of the many evidences brought by me in that place out of the *Antients*, the Canons of the *Apoſtles*, *Ignatius ad Magneſ.* the 56. Canon of the *council* of *Laodicæa*, and *Tertullian*, that the *Preſbyter* might not *adminiſter* either *Sacrament* without the *Biſhops appointment*; and diſtinctly of this *Sacrament*, *Non de aliorum quam de Præſidentium manu Euchariſtiam ſumimus, we receive it not from the hands of any but the Preſidents*, i. e. (in his ſtyle) the *Biſhops*, *Tertull. de Cor. Mil.* they could never have thought this a *reaſonable Objection*, It being evidently the ſenſe of the Antient Canons, (to which the *deſcription* of the *practice* in *Juſtin Martyr* doth perfectly agree, *Apol.* 2.) that only the *Biſhop* had power to *conſecrate* the *Euchariſt*, and in his *abſence* only, the *Presbyter*, to whom he gave that power.

7. Had they been pleaſed to have taken notice of theſe *Canons* and *antient Records*, punctually ſet down by me in that place, it muſt certainly have prevented this their exception, and utterly robbed them of thoſe two *Teſtimonies* to that *Propoſition.* And as to that of the *Alexandrian Biſhops* out of *Hierom*,

Hierom, that is alſo largely anſwered by me, *Diſſert.* 3. *c.* 10. but that again they were reſolved not to take notice of.

SECT. IX.

Of the Chorepiſcopi.

THere ſtill remains one mention of me, upon occaſion of the *Chorepiſcopi* or *Regionary Biſhops*; *Append.* p. 138. Of that ſubject they are ſomewhat *large*, and ſo D. *Blondel* had been before them, and in *anſwering* him, all their *pretenſions* from thence, and that whole argument (by them purſued, *P.* 135, 136, 137, 138.) is punctually anſwered, before it was produced, *Diſſert.* 3. *c.* 8. *Numb.* 1.

And yet they go on roundly, as if there were no ſuch thing; only in the *cloſe* they add, *There is another whom we forbear to name, that ſaith that the Chorepiſcopi were* Biſhops. *But he adds, though they were* Biſhops, *yet they were made but by one* Biſhop, *and* Biſhops *meerly titular and* ſine Cathedrâ, *which is all one as if he ſhould ſay, they were not properly Biſhops.* 2.

That which is ſaid of the *Chorepiſcopi* in the *Diſſertations*, is too long to be here ſo impertinently repeated; If the *Reader* pleaſe to conſult the place, I have no *fear* that he will return unſatisfied in any thing that is by theſe men *objected* againſt *Prelacy* from that head. A *Dilemma* is there uſed, which, whether they were *Biſhops* or no, will certainly *ſecure* us. 3.

As to their *preſent argument* againſt me, I *anſwer*, that what I ſay of thoſe *Chorepiſcopi*, is, not that they were *Biſhops meerly titular*, but that they were *Proxies* or *Vicarii* of the *Biſhop* of the *City*, acting by *Commiſſion* from him in the *Region* or *Country*, and were under the *Biſhop* of the *City* and *Ordained* by him, and ſo were true *Biſhops*, but not of the *Cities*, had *Ordination* as other *Biſhops* had, though *three Biſhops* were not by the *Canon* required to the *ordaining* of ſuch, but only that one *Biſhop* of the *City*, whoſe *Proxy* or *Vicarius* the *Chorepiſcopus* was: *Biſhops* in caſes of *neceſſity*, *ordained* ſine titulo, *without a title* or *City* to which they were *affixt*, and for ſome time allowed to *ordain Presbyters* and *Deacons* in the Country, and to do ſome other things in the *Biſhop*'s ſtead. 4.

All which is ſo largely ſet down in the *Diſſertations*, and vindicated ſo abſolutely from ſerving the *Presbyterians* intereſt that I muſt not for ever do the ſame thing again, *tranſcribe* what is there ſaid abundantly, and nothing here *objected* againſt it, but that what I *affirm* of them, makes them to be not properly *Biſhops*. Where if by properly *Biſhops* they mean *Biſhops* of *Cities*, they ſay very true, for I affirm them to be, as their title aſſures me they were, *Regionary Biſhops*, *Vicarii* and *Proxies* to the *City Biſhop*. 5.

But that they were *meer Presbyters*, and no more, and by their being *Presbyters* had the *Power* to *Ordain* other *Presbyters* (which alone is the *Presbyterians* task to make good, if they will have it uſeful to the proof of their *concluſion*, their * 4. *Propoſition*, *That* Presbyters, *during the Prevalency of* Epiſcopacy, *had not only an inherent power of Ordination, but in ſome caſes did actually ordain)* this they do not undertake to make good againſt the diſcourſe in the *Diſſertations*; And therefore I have no *excuſe* to make any larger *reply* to them. 6. * *Append.* p. 133.

The CONCLUSION.

I Have now gone through every part of my deſigned Method, *and not omitted one* intimation *of theirs, wherein I could think my ſelf concerned*; *And that it may appear that I ſhould not have* choſen *this, as a* ſeaſon, *to begin any* debate *concerning a* ſubject *ſo forgotten in men's minds as* Epiſcopacy *is*, *I ſhall thus conclude the* Readers *trouble, without examining what elſe they ſay on this* ſubject; *having, I hope, competently* ſecured *my ſelf from the Opinion of having formerly* attempted *to ſeduce any, ſo little either to his or my own* advantage.

AN

AN ANSWER TO THE ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE DISSERTATIONS TOUCHING *IGNATIUS*'s EPISTLES, AND THE EPISCOPACY In them Asserted.

The Introduction.

I HAD thought I had concluded the *Readers* trouble and mine own, when I had gotten to an end of the *Assemblers* Exceptions, but by that time I had transmitted those debates to the *Printer*, and from him received one Sheet of the *Impression*, I found my self called out anew by a *Preface* (to a Book of a very *distant* subject, *The Saints Perseverance*) wherein is inserted, a *Discourse touching the Epistles of* Ignatius, *and the Episcopacy in them asserted, and some Animadversions on Dr.* H. H. *his Dissertations on that subject*: And this *Preface* (and these contents of it) lest it might be less discernable, thought fit to be *expresst* in the *Title* Page, and subscribed by *John Owen, servant of* Jesus *Christ in the work of the Gospel.* Number 1.

And although the speedy return of such tasks is not over-grateful to me, yet because 1. I conceive it is his pleasure that we should enter this *commerce*: And 2. because the *work of the Gospel* is so glorious an employment, that I cannot be averse or slow to the giving all possible *satisfaction* to any which *professeth* to *labour* in it: And 3. because, if the *Reader* so consent, this discourse may be annext to the former debates with the *Provincial Assembly*, being likely to be on the same *heads*, which are there spoken to; I shall not doubt thus speedily to undertake the *labour* of it; and if his *Animadversions* prove any way *useful* to me, I shall acknowledge by whom I have *profited*, retract most readily what he shall give me cause to *retract*, and never multiply any *debates*, which may be thus more *compendiously* ended, being confident that no *miscarriage* of mine (of which yet I am not *conscious* to have committed any in the Book of *Dissert.*) will be able to prejudice the *main* truth which is there defended, the *Institution* of *Bishops* by the *Apostles.* 2.

CHAP. I.

Of the Apoſtolical Canons.

SECT. I.

The Controverſie about them. The Codex Canonum. *What is meant by Apocryphal, and ſo by Genuine Canons. The two miſtakes of the Prefacer, which produceth his Animadverſion. What is meant by the title, Apoſtolical Canons. The Prefacers ungrounded ſuggeſtion againſt the writings of the firſt times.*

1. TO ſet out then, with all ſpeed that may be, on this *new* Stage, not knowing of what *length* it may prove, the firſt *Animadverſion* I find my ſelf concern'd in, is in * theſe words.

* *Præf. p.6.*

"The firſt Writings that are impoſed on us after the Canonical Scriptures, are the eight Books of "*Clement*, commonly called, The Apoſtles Conſtitutions, being pretended to be written by him "at their appointment, with the Canons aſcribed to the ſame perſons. Theſe we ſhall but ſalute; "for beſides that they are but faintly defended by any of the Papiſts, diſavowed and diſclaimed as "Apocryphal by the moſt learned of them, as *Bellarmine de Script. Eccleſ. in Clem.* who approves "only of fifty Canons of eighty five. *Baronius*, *An. Dom.* 102. 14. who adds thirty more, and *Bi-*"*nius* with a little inlargement of Canons in *Tit. Can. T.* 1. *Con.* p. 17. and have been throughly "diſproved and decried by all Proteſtant writers that have had any occaſion to deal with them; "their folly, and falſity, their impoſtures and triflings have of late been ſo fully manifeſted by *Dal-*"*laus de Pſeudepigraphis Apoſt.* that nothing need be added thereunto. Of him may Dr. *H. H.* learn "the truth of that inſinuation of his, *Diſſert.* 2. c. 6. ſect. 3. *Canone Apoſtolico ſecundo* (*ſemper inter* "*genninos habito*) but of the confidence of this Author in his aſſertions afterward.

2. I am not here much ſurpriſed 1. with this charge of *untruth*; and 2. this promiſe, that my confidence in aſſerting ſhall be diſcovered, knowing that it was one of *Ariſtotles* inſinuations in his *Elenchs*, at the beginning of a Diſpute to endeavour to put the *Reſpondent* in *paſſion*, and then he might eaſily have fallacies impoſed on him, ὀργίζοντες γὰρ οὐ δύνανται φυλάττεσθαι τὰ πάντα. If this were his deſign, I have more reaſons than that one, to hope his pardon, if I do not thus gratifie him. And although there be not one word ſaid in this place, to prove either of theſe charges, but I am appointed to learn one from Mr. *Daillé*, whoſe book I have not been ſo curious as to ſee, and to expect the other afterwards from the *Prefacer*; yet being concerned to know that *veracity* and *humility* are my *duties*, as I am a *Chriſtian*, and that I ought not to live one minute under the ſcandal of having offended againſt either of them, and having yet no motive to retract that expreſſion in the *Diſſert.* I am obliged to render an account of my uſing it. And it is this.

3. In the *ſecond Canon* of the *Council in Trullo*, *Ann.* 681. I find a *conciliary* confirmation of eighty five *Canons* under the title of Τῶν ἁγίων καὶ ἐνδόξων Ἀποστόλων, the *Canons of the holy and honourable Apoſtles before us*. And what was there confirmed, is farther ratified by the *ſecond Council* of *Nice*, *Ann.* 787. which cites the 53*d.* of thoſe *Canons*. And this I take for a teſtimony of the *Eaſtern Churches* reception of that number of 85. *Apoſtolical Canons* at that time. Whereas in the *Weſtern Churches*, both before, and after this time, although the *Canons* of the *Apoſtles* were by the *Eaſtern* communicated to them, yet that number was not received, but in a *Council* of ſeventy *Biſhops* at *Rome*, under *Pope Gelaſius*, ſomewhat before 500. years after *CHRIST*, the *Book* of the *Apoſtles Canons*, was defined to be *Apocryphal*. By *Apocryphal* here, I conceive to be meant ſuch as are not obligatory, which are not ſo owned, or received by the *Church*, as to be entered into their *Codex*, ordinarily known by the name of *Corpus Canonum*, Συνοδικῶν Κανόνων ἄθροισμα, in * *Photius* his ſtile, *The body of Synodical Canons*, their ‖ τάξις νόμιμος in *Juſtinian*; their Rule of Diſcipline, in like manner as the Books of *Canonical Scripture* (to which * *Juſtinian* added the δόγματα, or *definitions* of the *four firſt General Councils*) made up their Rule of Doctrines: That there was ſuch a *Codex*, we find in the *fourth General Council* (that of *Chalcedon*) when the *Book* of *Canons*, as well as the *Bible*, was ſolemnly brought in at the opening of the *Council*, and ‖ call'd for to be read before them as occaſion required. And 'tis ſufficiently known what *Juſtellus* obſerves, That the *Chriſtian Church* was ruled of old by a *double Law*, *Divine*, the Books of the *Canonical Scripture*, and *Canonical*, the *Codex* of *Canons*: And thoſe *Canons* that were not received into that *Codex*, though they might hold the authority due to ancient pieces, be eſteemed worthy the reading and obſerving, were yet ſtiled *Apocryphal*, i. e. *uſeful*, though not *obligatory*, reverenced for their *Antiquity*, but not allowed the power, or title of *Laws*, as the body of the *Canons* is known to be, ὡς νόμοις φυλάττομεν, *we obſerve them as Laws*, ſaith *Juſtinian*, and they are thence called *Nomocanon*, and *Canon Law*.

* *Bibl.* Num. 112.
‖ *Novel. Conſt.* 131.
* Πεφειρημένων ἁγίων σωμάτων πανάρων τὰ δόγματα. *Nov.* 131.
‖ See *Anton. Auguſtin.* l. 1. *de emend. Gratiani, Dial.* 11.

4. That this is the meaning of the word *Apocryphal*, I ſhall conclude from the ſtory of the fact; for ſoon after this ſentence of that *Council* of *Rome*, within very few years, we know that they were ſet up and received in that very place, where they had been thus lookt on as *Apocryphal*: For *Dionyſius Exiguus* about the year 527. made a collection of *Canons*, *ex Græcis exemplaribus Canones Eccleſiaſticos --- compoſuit, quos hujus uſu celeberrimo Eccleſia Romana complectitur, out of the Greek copies he compoſed Eccleſiaſtical Canons, which at this day the Church of* Rome *embraceth, and uſeth moſt honourably*, as *Caſſiodore* his contemporary and conſort ſaith of him, *Divin. Lect.* c. 23. In this

collection

collection he ſet *fifty* of theſe in the *front*, under the title of *Apoſtolical Canons*, *prefacing* this concerning them, *In principio Canones qui dicuntur Apoſtolorum de Græco tranſtulimus, quibus quia plurimi conſenſum non præbuere facilem, hoc ipſum ignorare veſtram noluimus ſanctitatem, quamvis poſtea quædam conſtituta Pontificum ex ipſis Canonibus aſſumpta eſſe videantur: In the beginning we have tranſlated out of Greek the Canons, which are ſaid to be the Apoſtles, to which becauſe very many have been hard to give aſſent, we have thought fit to mention ſo much to you, though afterwards ſome conſtitutions of Biſhops ſeem to have been taken out of theſe very Canons.* Here it is evident, 1. that what was a few years ſince lookt on as *Apocryphal*, is within a while received into their *Codex*, *celeberrimo uſu*, ſaid *Caſſiodore* at that very time. And 2. whilſt it was not in the *Codex*, yet *Conſtitutions* of the *Biſhops* were taken out of them, which argues to me, that they were not ſo rejected, as to be diſliked, but only ſo, as not to be obligatory, any farther than as ſome new Decrees of the Church ſhould give them their authority. So again in *Iſidore Mercator's Collection*, he prefaceth thus, *Propter eorum authoritatem cæteris conciliis præpoſuimus Canones, qui dicuntur Apoſtolorum, licèt à quibuſdam Apocrypha dicantur, quoniam plures eos recipiunt, & ſancti Patres eorum ſententias Synodali authoritate roboraverunt, & inter Canonicas poſuerunt conſtitutiones. In reſpect of their authority we have before the reſt of the Councils firſt ſet down the Canons of the Apoſtles, ſo called, though by ſome they are ſaid to be Apocryphal, becauſe more receive them, and the holy Fathers have confirmed them by authority of Council, and placed them among Canonical Conſtitutions.* Where the oppoſition is clear, betwixt *Apocryphal* on one ſide, and confirmed by *Councils*, and placed among *Canonical Conſtitutions* on the other ſide.

5. One thing only I can foreſee to be by Mr. *Daillé* or any man objected againſt this, *viz.* the Cenſure that * *Iſidore Hiſpalenſis* hath paſt upon the *Apoſtolick Canons*, in theſe words (which I ſee are thought by ſome learned men to refer to that Council at *Rome* under *Gelaſius*, but whether by Mr. *Daillé*, I know not) *Eadem nec ſedes Apoſtolica recepit, nec ſancti patres illis aſſenſum præbuerunt, pro eo quod ab hæreticis ſub nomine Apoſtolorum compoſiti dignoſcuntur: The Apoſtolick See received them not, and the holy Fathers have not allowed them their aſſent, becauſe they are diſcerned to be framed by hereticks under the name of the Apoſtles.* Here I ſhall offer my conjecture (and ſubmit it to better judgments) that *Iſidore* ſpeaks not of the firſt fifty Canons, which were certainly before his time (who was a member of the Council of *Toledo* in *Spain*, *Ann.* 633.) received into the *Roman Codex*, as hath already appeared; nor conſequently, refers to the *Synod* under *Gelaſius* (which, upon other reaſons I acknowledge, ſpake even of thoſe *fifty*) but of the whole number of 85. for in thoſe latter 35. it is, and not in the firſt *fifty*, that the Apoſtles are pretended to be the Authors of them, *viz.* *Can.* 82. where they call *Philemon's* ſervant ὁ ἡμέτερος Ὀνήσιμος, *our Oneſimus*, and *Can.* 85. Πράξεις ἡμῶν τῶν Ἀποστόλων, *the Acts*, or *Canons of us the Apoſtles*, whereas no ſuch thing is ſo much as intimated in the firſt *fifty*: For as for thoſe words in the *fiftieth Canon* which refer to the Apoſtles, Καλὰ τῷ Κυρίῳ γνώμην, καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐν πνεύματι τὴν διάταξιν, *according to the ſentence of Chriſt, and our conſtitution by the ſpirit*, 'tis evident that they are in *Turrian's* Edition, inſerted, and added to that Canon, after the words, with which *Dionyſius Exiguus* his old collection and tranſlation ended. And ſo in the former part of the Canon [ὃ γὰρ εἶπεν ἡμῖν, *for he ſaid not unto us*] (as if the Writers were the Apoſtles) 'tis certain that the [ἡμῖν *to us*] is inſerted: And accordingly in *Balſamon's Text* and *Comment*, which I have before me, the Canon is intire without either of thoſe inſertions. To all which I may add, that the matter of all thoſe firſt fifty Canons, and the very form of words, is ſuch, as gives not the leaſt occaſion to think them compoſed by hereticks (certainly not put under the Apoſtles names by thoſe hereticks) as *Iſidore* affirms of thoſe of which he ſpeaks.

* *In Præf. ad Concil.* Tolet. See *Gratian d.* 16. c. 1. & *Anton. Auguſtin. de emend. Gratian. l.* 1. *dial.* 6. *p.* 47. *edit. Par.* 1607.

6. This is to my underſtanding the meaning of the Controverſie concerning the number and authority of theſe Canons, which were to be accounted *Apocryphal*, and which not, and ſo likewiſe which *Genuine*, and which not, and to this Controverſie it is, that my inſinuation and my words refer, and the ſecond Canon being one of thoſe former 50. which though they have been counted *Apocryphal* in one ſence, were yet *Genuine* in another, *i. e.* none of the latter addition of 35. which are called by learned men *novitii* and *adulterate*, I thought I had reaſon (and cannot but ſtill think it) to ſay that that ſecond Canon was *ſemper inter genuinos habitus, always accounted genuine*, i. e. received and acknowledged among the Canons of the Ancient Church by thoſe who controverted, and rejected the other 35.

7. Thus much may perhaps ſuffice to remove the two miſtakes, which by ſome indications I conceive to have produced this *Animadverſion*: For 1. when in the words immediately precedent, he ſaith, they are diſavowed and diſclaimed by the moſt learned *Papiſts* as *Apocryphal*, this I ſuppoſe muſt be his meaning, either that by that *Synod* at *Rome* under *Pope Gelaſius*, they were defined to be *Apocryphal* (and then as there is truth in that, ſo I may be permitted to have told him what I conceive meant by *Apocryphal* in that place, thoſe that were not yet received into their *Codex*) or elſe that the reſt beſides the firſt 50. are diſclaimed by the moſt learned *Papiſts*, ſo I learn from my *Lord Primate*, that they are by *Humbert* in his Anſwer to *Nicetas*, *Sancti Patres Canones Apoſtolorum numeraverunt inter Apocrypha, exceptis capitulis quinquaginta, quæ decreverunt regulis Orthodoxiæ adjungenda. The Holy Fathers have numbred the Canons of the Apoſtles among Apocryphal writings, except only fifty Canons, which they have decreed to be annext to the rules of the true doctrine*, i. e. to the Book of Canons received by them: (Where again, by the way, the notion of *Apocryphal* is evident, as oppoſed to thoſe which are received into the *Codex*, *Regulis Orthodoxiæ adjungenda*) And ſo by *Bellarmine*, whom he names in the front of thoſe moſt *learned Papiſts*, and of him ſaith expreſſly and truly, that he approves only of 50. Canons of 85. (*de ſcript. Eccleſ. in Clem.*) And then again, I have now minded him of that which was before evident, that the ſecond Canon, which was cited by me, was one of thoſe *fifty*, and ſo not diſproved by that *learned Papiſt*. As for the other two, *Baronius* and *Binius*, whom he names to the ſame purpoſe as thoſe who have diſavowed and diſclaimed them as *Apocryphal*, I ſhall not accuſe his confidence, but muſt think he was in ſome haſte, that he could do ſo, *Baronius* being by him acknowledged to add 30. more, and *Binius* to have made a little inlargement of Canons, which ſure doth not intimate that they diſavowed or diſclaimed the *fifty*.

8. So when he ſaith of them, that they are *faintly defended by any of the Papiſts*, I ſhall deſire to know among many others, *Bovius*, *Lamb. Gruterus*, *Stapleton*, *Haloander*, &c.) what he thinks of *Turrian*, whether he were a *Papiſt* or no, and whether he were a *faint defender* of them; nay, whether *Monſieur Daillé* take no notice of his *zeal* for them? If he do *not*, I ſhall very much *wonder* at it: If he do, I ſhall have the more reaſon for my *queſtion*, how he that ſends me to be *taught* by *Mr. Daillé*, had not learned ſo much from him, that there was ſome *Papiſt*, by whom they were not *faintly defended?* So again when he ſaith that they have been *throughly diſproved and decried by all Proteſtant writers that have had any occaſion to deal with them*, I might certainly mind him of more *Proteſtants* than one that have been far from *decrying* them. I ſhall not mention, as I might, the *ſeveral Biſhops* of our *Church*, ſince the *Reformation*, and our *Divines* in their writings, that make their *Appeals* to them *frequently*, and with as *pompous* forms of *citations*, as I have done [*ſemper inter genuinos habito*] I ſhall not add the learned *Hugo Grotius*, becauſe I know not whether any, or all of theſe may not be deemed by him to be no *Proteſtants*. Only what doth he think of *Frigevillæus Gautius?* He certainly *Anno* 1593. in his *ſecond* part of *his Palma Chriſtiana* (dedicated to *Queen Elizabeth*) c. 1. & 2. was far from *diſavowing*, and *decrying* thoſe *Canons*: How little ſhort he came of *Turrian* himſelf, I ſhall not now tell him, leſt he be diſavowed as no *Proteſtant*, for ſo doing, but leave him at his leiſure to inquire, whether *one* ſuch *example* might not have taken off from the *generality* of the *affirmation* [*decried by all Proteſtants*] or indeed whether D. *Blondel*'s *vouching* them in the *manner* which I ſhall by and by ſet down, might not have had ſome *force* in it, if he had taken *notice* of ſuch things. But all this by the *way*, as an *Eſſay*, that ſome *other* men, as well as *H. H.* may be *confident* in *aſſerting*.

9. *Secondly*, When immediately after his *Animadverſion* on my words, he mentions his *Exceptions* to the *Books* of *Apoſtolical Conſtitutions* and *Canons* taken out of *Daillé*, and the *learned Uſher*, 'tis apparent that theſe all belong to the *Books* under *Clement*'s *name*, called the *Apoſtles Conſtitutions*: But then it muſt be remembred, that that Book of Διαλάξεις, or *Conſtitutions* is another thing, clearly diſtinct from the *Book* called the *Apoſtles Canons*, and there is but one way imaginable to involve the *latter* under the *cenſure* that belongs *juſtly* to the *former*, and it is this, That in ſome *Copies* the *Conſtitutions* and *Canons* are put together into one *Volume* (and that in * *Photius* his time) and that in the end of the *Canons*, there is a ſolemn *confirmation* of the *Conſtitutions*. But then it muſt be remembred again, that theſe are later *Copies*, which ſo confound them, and I take not them to be *genuine*, and that *Canon* is the *eighty fifth* of that *Book*, and ſo no part of the firſt *fifty*, which I ſuppoſe to be the only *genuine Canons*, and conſequently that none of the *ridiculous* things in the *Conſtitutions*, is imputable to that former *Collection*, but indeed, on the contrary, that one *expreſſion* in that *eighty fifth Canon*, which preſcribes the *keeping* them ‖ *cloſe*, becauſe of ſome *myſterious* paſſages in them, is juſtly thought by *learned* men to betray them both (the latter 35 *Canons*, and the *Conſtitutions* ſo magnified by them) to be of a much later *Edition*, than that which they pretend to.

* Ἐν ᾧ (*i. e. in the volume of* Clements *Conſtitutions*) οἱ διὰ Ἀποστόλων κάνονες παρείσφρυσαν. *Numb.* 112.

‖ ὃ χρὴ δημοσιεύειν διὰ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς μυστικά.

10. And thus I hope I have vindicated my ſelf, and given the *grounds* of my *Aſſertion*; And for the *confidence*, I did not, I confeſs, expect to be charged with any *immoderate* degree of it from any, nor do I yet diſcern how thoſe few words in the *Parentheſis* (*ſemper inter genuinos habito*) could be deem'd ſo criminouſly guilty of it, or that he that undertook to be my *Monitor*, having in ſo ſhort a time proved ſo much more guilty of it, ſhould in any reaſon think himſelf the moſt competent for that office.

11. To help him to any appearance of reaſon, and ſo to qualifie him thus to charge me, ſome want of *obſervation* of *vulgar* ſtile muſt be neceſſary, either in not adverting what is ordinarily meant by their title of *Apoſtolick Canons*, or ſome other the like. That he takes the meaning of that *title* to be their *pretenſion* to be written by the *Apoſtles*, or by *Clement* at their *appointment*, I conclude from the words with which he *begins* that *Paragraph* [*The firſt writings, that are impoſed on us after the Canonical Scriptures, are the eight Books of* Clement, *commonly called the Apoſtles Conſtitutions, being pretended to be written by him at their appointment, with the Canons aſcribed to the ſame perſons*] and if according to this his *notion*, he conceive me by the word *genuine* to affirm that they are rightly ſo *aſcribed*, he is miſtaken.

12. That thoſe *Canons*, whether to the number of 85. or but of 50. were written by the *Apoſtles*, I never meant; but neither is that the meaning of thoſe that cite them, and call them as I have done, by the vulgar name of *Apoſtolick Canons*: If there be any doubt of this, I ſhall prove it by competent *teſtimonies*, whether among *Papiſts* or *Proteſtants*. Of the former, inſtead of many, I inſtance only in that account, which *Gabriel Albiſpine* in his *Obſervations* rendreth of it, that ſome of theſe *Canons* (the *fifty* he means) being made by the *Succeſſors* of the *Apoſtles* (the *Biſhops* of the *Ancient Church*) who were called (ſaith *Tertullian de Præſcript.*) *Apoſtolici viri*, *Apoſtolical men*, *Apoſtolicorum primum Canones*, *dein nonnullorum Latinorum ignorantia*, *aliquot literarum detractione*, *Apoſtolorum dicti ſunt*, *They were firſt call'd the Canons of the Apoſtolicks*, *after by the ignorance of ſome Latin Writers*, *and by the taking away of a few Letters*, *they were called the Canons of the Apoſtles.*

Lib. 1.

13. Among *Proteſtants* I might inſtance in the *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh*, here cited under the name of the *learned Uſher*, who by ſtiling the *fifty*, *Veteres Canones Eccleſiaſticos ob antiquitatem Apoſtolicos dictos*, *The old Eccleſiaſtical Canons for their Antiquity ſtiled Apoſtolical*, and diſtinguiſhing them from the thirty five *nova Capitula* & *novitii Canones*, *new Chapters*, and *novice Canons*, clearly juſtifies all that I have ſaid: But I have no reaſon to go any farther than *Da. Blondel* himſelf, with whom I had then to do, and I am ſure 'tis *ordinary* with him to cite theſe *Canons* under the title of *Apoſtolick*, and ſo to yield them their *authority* (yet I ſuppoſe, is not thought by his *Colleague* Mr. *Daillé*, to have made the *Apoſtles* themſelves the *Authors* of them) you may ſee it twice together in *two* lines, *Apol. pro ſent. Hieron.* pag. 96. *Anno Dom.* 363. *Laodicæno Canone* 56. *ſecundum Apoſtolicum* 38. *cautum fuit*, *Care was taken by the Council of* Laodicæa, *Can.* 56. *according to the* 38. *Apoſtolical Canon*, calling it firſt an *Apoſtolick Canon*, and then affirming it the *rule* by which the *Laodicæan Canon* was made, and ſo clearly giving it a *greater Antiquity* than that *Council*: And immediately again, *Apoſtolico* 33. (*longè antequam Ancyræ conveniret Synodus*) *in the* 33. *Apoſtolick Canon*, *long before the Synod met at Ancyra*, which we know was in the year 314. and what was acknowledged to be *long before* that, muſt be of a *pretty antiquity*, although it were not written by the *Apoſtles*.

'Tis

'Tis true indeed some have thought fit to use greater *exactness* of speech, as the *Council* of *Paris*, *Anno* 580. calling them * *Canones quasi Apostolicos*, *the Canons as it were Apostolick*; and *Dionysius Exiguus*, and *Isidorus Mercator*, *Canones qui dicuntur Apostolicorum*, *the Canons said to be the Apostles*: And *Hincmarus Rhemensis* saith, they were *A primis temporibus traditione viritim Apostolicorum virorum*, *mentibus commendati*; *From the first times by tradition of Apostolical persons commended to the minds of men*, *from man to man*, and *a devotis quibusque collecti*, *collected by all devout men*. See *Concil. Gallic.* l. 2. p. 473, 474. And as for those which pretend the *whole* 85. as well as the *Constitutions* to have been penn'd by *Clemens*, there is little *doubt* but they did, by so doing, endeavour to impose *false* ware upon the *Church*; but still this *prejudgeth* not my *affirmation* of the *former fifty*, that they were always accounted *genuine*. Not meaning thereby that they were written by the *Apostles*, or at their appointment by *Clemens* (I say not a word, that so much as insinuates either of those to be my sence, and I can justly affirm it was not) but *genuine*, i. e. *truly*, and without *contradiction* (as γνησίως and ἀναμφιςόλως are taken for *Synonyma's* in this matter) what they were by the Church generally taken to be, *i. e.* Canons of ancient Bishops (before the times of the General Councils) of *Apostolical* persons, successors of the *Apostles*, in Churches, where they presided, called *Apostolical Churches*. 14. * *Gregor. Turonens. Hist. Fran. lib.* 5. *c.* 18.

I add no more of a matter so clear; yet before I proceed, I shall desire the *Author* of this *Animadversion*, to consider how unjustly his Censure hath fallen (in the *page* immediately precedent) on the *Writings* of the *first times*, *immediately after the Apostles fell asleep*. His words are these, *I must be forced to preface the nomination of them* (the *first* Writers) *with some consideration: The first is that known passage of* Hegesippus *in* Euseb. Eccl. Hist. *l.* 26. Ὡς ἄρα μεχρὶ τ τότε χρόνων παρθένω καθαρὰ κ ἀδιάφθορ ἔμεινεν ἡ ἐκκλησία, ὡς δὲ ὁ ἱερ Ἀποςόλων χόρ διάφορον εἴληφε τὸ βίᾳ τέλ, παρειληλύθεισ ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη τ αὐταῖς ἀκοαῖς τ ἔνθεν σοφίας ἐπακῦσαι κατηξιωμένων, τ ἀθέω πλάνης τ ἀρχὴν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ σύςασις, διὰ τ τ ἑτεροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτης, οἱ κ ἄτε μηδένω ἔτι τ Ἀποςόλων λειπομένω, γυμνῇ λοιπὸν ἤδη τῇ κεφαλῇ τῷ τ ἀληθείας κηρύγματι τ Ψευδώνυμον γνῶσιν ἀντικηρύττειν ἐπεχείρουν. *Setting out the corruption of the Church as to Doctrine*, *immediately after the Apostles fell asleep*, *whereof whosoever will impartially*, *and with disengaged judgments search into the writings that of those days do remain*, *will perhaps find more cause than is commonly imagined with him to complain*. 15.

Here is a sad jealousie raised against all Antiquity, even of the *purest* times next the *Apostles*, and indefinitely without any limitation, on the *writings of those days that remain*, τὰ σωζόμενα, i.e. all that are extant, in one common mass, and yet (besides that one saying of *Hegesippus*) no one word added to found it on (but only dubious, suspicious expressions [*will perhaps find more cause than is commonly imagined*] to warn all how they give any trust to the *purest Antiquity*. Whereas all that *Hegesippus* there saith, is only this (which they that pay most reverence to Antiquity, take as much notice of as he could wish) *viz.* that the poison of the *Heretical*, or *Apostatical*, or *Atheistical Gnosticks*, in express words, the Ψευδώνυμ γνῶσις, the Sect of the *Gnosticks*, *falsely so called* (the same that had been mentioned by S. *Paul* to *Timothy*) and ἀθε πλάνη, the *Atheistical seducers* did openly set up against the truth of Christ, as soon as ever the *Apostles* were dead. Which being by *Hegesippus* terminated in the known despisers and persecuters of the true *Church* and *Orthodox professors*, the grievous Wolves that worried the flock, and those constantly resisted, and combated with, preacht against, and written against by the *Fathers* and ancient Writers, and never observ'd by any man to have gain'd on them, or infused any the least degree of their poison into them, or their Writings, which are come to us (which to undertake to make good against any opposer, is no high pitch of confidence, again to be censured in me) It is a sad condition that the *just* and the *unjust*, the *false Teachers* and the *Orthodox Professors* should fall under the same envy, be involved under the same black censure, those that watched over the flock as *Shepherds*, and oft *laid down their lives* for the *Sheep*, be again defamed and martyred by us their unkind posterity, under pretence, forsooth, that they were in the Conspiracy of the Wolves also. I leave this to his, and the *Readers* consideration, and so proceed to the next charge. 16.

CHAP. II.

Of Ignatius's *Epistles*.

SECT. I.

The comparison betwixt them and the Epistles of Clement, *and* Polycarp. *Of* Salmasius *and* Blondel *being the first that rejected them. Of the* Vir doctissimus, *answered by* Vedelius. *Of Bishop* Mountague's *censure of* Vedelius. Εἰς Κενότηλα ἐλπίδ: *Of* Salmasius's *Contumely*, *Title of Learned Grammarian*. *Illecebræ*. Νεωτερικὴ τάξις. *Consulting Authors to serve our own turns*.

THE next charge I find in the *eighth page* of this *Preface*, in these words. 1.

"A late learned Doctor in his Dissertations about Episcopacy, or Dispute for it against *Sal-*
"*masius* and *Blondellus*, tells us, that we may take a taste of his confidence in asserting, *Dissert.* 2. *cap.* 23. 1. That *Salmasius* and *Blondellus*, *mortalium omnium primi*, thought these Epistles to be feigned
"or counterfeit. And with more words, *cap.* 24. he would make us believe that these Epistles of *Ig-*
"*natius* were always of the same esteem with that of *Clemens* from *Rome* to the *Corinthians*, or that of
"*Polycarpus* to the *Philippians*, which we have in *Eusebius*, and then he adds, in the judgment of *Sal-*
"*masius* and *Blondellus*, *Solus* Ignatius ὀλίγεται, *cujus tamen Epistola pari semper cum illis per universam*
"*ab* sect. 3. *Unicum D. Blondellum aut alterum fortasse inter omnes mortales Wallonem Mesalinum*, c. 23.

" *ab omni ævo patrum noſtrorum memoriam reverentiâ excipiebantur: nec prius à mortalium quovis in Ju-*
" *dicium vocabantur* (*multò minus ut in re certâ, & extra dubium poſita inter planè ἀδόκιμα & κεκριμένα*
" rejiciebantur) *quam Presbyteri Anglicani patribus ſuis contumeliam facere cœpiſſent, iiſque aut ſuppe-*
" *rias ferre, aut rem gratam facere* (*quibus illecebris adducti neſcio*) *hi duo non ignobiles Presbyteranæ*
" *cauſæ hyperaſpiſtæ in ſeipſos recipiſſent.* Of his two learned Antagoniſts one is dead, and the other
" almoſt blind, or probably they would have dealt not much more gently with the Doctor for his
" Parentheſis (*quibus illecebris adducti neſcio*) than one of them formerly did (*Salmaſius de ſubſcriben-*
" *dis & ſignandis Teſtamentis, ſeu ſpecimen Conſul. Animad. Heraldi, cap.* 1. *p.* 19. *Nuper quidam*
" *etiam nebulo in Angliâ, Capellanus, ut audio, Regis,* Hammondus *nomine, libro quem edidit de Po-*
" *teſtate Clavium,* Salmaſio *iratus, quod aliam quam ipſe ſententiam probet ac defendat, haud potuit ma-*
" *jus convicium, quod ei diceret, invenire, quam ſi Grammaticum appellaret*) for his terming him a
" Grammarian, yet indeed of him (ſuch was the hard entertainment he found on all hands) it was
" by many ſuppoſed that he was *illecebris adductus* (and they ſtick not to name the bait he was caught
" withal) wrought over in a manner to deſtroy the faith of that which he had before ſet up and eſta-
" bliſhed.

" For the thing it ſelf affirmed by the Doctor, I cannot enough admire with what oſcitancy or con-
" tempt he conſiders his Readers (of which manner of proceeding this is far from being the only in-
" ſtance) that he ſhould confidently impoſe ſuch things upon them. He that hath written ſo much
" about *Ignatius*, and doth ſo triumph in his authority, ought doubtleſs to have conſidered theſe
" concernments of his Author, which are obvious to every ordinary Inquirer: *Vedelius* his Edition
" of *Ignatius* at *Geneva* came forth with his Notes in the year 1623. long before either *Salmaſius* or
" *Blondellus* had written any thing about the ſuppoſititiouſneſs of theſe Epiſtles; in the Apology of
" *Ignatius* whereto prefixed, he is forced to labour and ſweat in the Anſwer of one, whom he deſer-
" vedly ſtiles *virum Doctiſſimum*; (arguing not contemptibly) that *Ignatius* never wrote any ſuch
" Epiſtles, and that all thoſe which were carried about in his name, were falſe and counterfeit.

" But perhaps the Doctor had taken caution of one of the Fathers of his Church, that *à Genevenſi-*
" *bus iſtis Typographis præter fraudes & fucos & præſtigias non eſt quod quicquam expectemus* (*Montac.*
" *Appar.* l. 5. ſect. 46. p. 19.) and ſo thought not fit to look into any thing that comes from them.

" Eſpecially may this be ſuppoſed to have ſome influence upon him, conſidering the gentle cenſure
" added in the next words by that Reverend Father of his Church, concerning the endeavour of *Vede-*
" *lius*, in his Notes on that Edition. *Neque audax ille & importunus* Ignatii *Cenſor quicquam attulit*
" *ad paginas ſuas implendas præter inſcitiam, & incuriam & impudentiam ſingularem* (*ne ſævi magne ſa-*
" *cerdos*) *dum ad ſuum Genevatiſmum antiquitatem detorquet invitiſſimam, non antem, quod opportuit,*
" *Calviniſmum amuſſitat ad antiquitatem.* And what I pray you is the reaſon of his Epiſcopal cen-
" ſure? That he ſhould deal with poor *Vedelius* in that language wherewith men of his order and au-
" thority were wont to deal with preaching Miniſters at their Viſitations? why this poor man in that
" paſſage which you have in the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians* (in that Edition p. 56.) where treating of
" the Ancient Fathers expectations of the coming of Chriſt, retains the common reading of εἰς κενότη-
" τα ἐλπίδος ἦλθον, referring the word to their expectation of ſeeing him come in the fleſh, which
" upon the teſtimony of our Saviour himſelf, they deſired to ſee, and ſaw it not, not correcting it by
" a change of κενότητα into κοινότητα ἐλπίδος, ſo referring it to their faith in Chriſt, and ſalvation by
" him, as in his judgment he ought to have done. Ἰδοὺ ὀλίγον πῦρ μέγιστον ὕλην ἀνάπτει, A little thing
" would provoke the indignation of a Prelate againſt any thing that came from *Geneva.*

" I ſay I would ſuppoſe that this might divert our Doctor from caſting his eye upon *Vedelius*,
" whoſe defenſative would have informed him that theſe Epiſtles had been oppoſed as falſe and coun-
" terfeit, before ever *Salmaſius* or *Blondellus* had taken them into conſideration; but that I finding
" him ſometimes inſiſting on that *Geneva* Edition.

" For whereas *Cap.* 2. *Sect.* 2. he tells you that he intends to abide only upon the Edition of *Iſaac*
" *Voſſius* in Greek, publiſhed from the Archives of the Library of *Laurence di Medices*, and the La-
" tine Edition publiſhed by Biſhop *Uſher* out of our Library here at *Oxford*, yet *cap.* 8. being preſſed
" with the teſtimony of the writers of the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians*, calling Epiſcopacy νεωτερικὴν
" τάξιν plainly intimating a comparative Novelty in that order to others in the Churches, and fear-
" ing (as well he might) that his tranſlation of νεωτερικὴ τάξις into the ordination of a young man,
" would ſcarce be received by the men of his own prejudice (for ſurely he never ſuppoſed that he
" ſhould impoſe on any other, by ſuch groſs figments) he prefers the *Vedelian* Edition (where theſe
" words are not ſo uſed) before it, and informs us, that *ſic legendum* (as it is in the *Geneva* Edition)
" *ſuadet tota Epiſtolæ ſeries.* Now this truly is marvellous to me (if the Doctor conſulteth Authors
" any farther, than meerly to ſerve his preſent turn) how he could ever adviſe with that Edition of
" *Vedelius*, and yet ſo confidently affirm, that *Salmaſius* and *Blondellus* were the firſt that rejected
" theſe Epiſtles as feigned and counterfeit.

2. The ſumm of this charge is, 1. that I would *make men believe that* Ignatius *his Epiſtles were always of the ſame eſteem with that of* Clement, *and of* Polycarp. 2. That I ſay that *Salmaſius* and *Blondel* were the firſt that *thought theſe Epiſtles* (of *Ignatius*) *to be feigned and counterfeit.* 3. That this is in me a confidence in aſſerting, an admirable piece of oſcitancy and contempt of the Reader, confidently to impoſe upon him, and all this againſt expreſs evidence; when 4. long before either of theſe, *Vedelius* was fain to anſwer a *vir doctiſſimus, arguing that* Ignatius *never wrote ſuch Epiſtles*; and this the more to be admired, becauſe 5. it appears that I had adviſed with that *Edition* of *Vedelius*, where thoſe arguments are propounded, and anſwered, and yet ſay that *Salmaſius* and *Blondel were the firſt that rejected theſe Epiſtles.* To theſe five branches of the original and grand charge are added incidentally theſe other paſſages. 1. That if *Salmaſius* were not dead, and *Blondel* almoſt blind, they would probably have called me *knave* for uſing this *Parentheſis* (*quibus illecebris adducti neſcio, I know not by what invitations they were brought to do what they did*) adding of the former, that *indeed it is by many ſuppoſed that he was illecebris adductus.* 2. That *Biſhop Montacute* inveighs bitterly

bitterly againſt the *Geneva* Writers, and particularly againſt *Vedelius* his *Cenſures* on *Ignatius*.
3. That my interpretation of Νεωτερικὴ τάξις, by the *ordination of a young man*, is a *groſs figment*.
4. That it is doubtful whether I do *conſult Authors any farther than is for my own turn*.

To theſe particulars, which will ſoon be found to be of no very weighty importance, yet ſuch as they are, I ſhall punctually make my reply. 3.

For the firſt, I ſhall not need labour for proofs to balance the eſtimation of *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*, either with that of *Clemens*, or *Polycarp*: For, beſide that here is not a word objected againſt it, nor ſo much as the ordinary charge of confident aſſerting affixed to this part of my ſpeech, but my words are barely repeated without any exception to them; The thing may be manifeſt to any that ſhall, for *Clemens*, peruſe the *Teſtimonies* out of ancient Writers, concerning his firſt Epiſtle, that to the *Corinthians*, ſet down to his hand by Mr. *Patrick Yong*, before his *Edition* of that *Epiſtle*, and then compare them with thoſe concerning *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles* prefixt by the *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh* to his former Edition of *Ignatius*, and to that, add but this one place of *Euſebius*, *Eccl. Hiſt.* l. 3. c. λζ. where ſpeaking of thoſe Writings reſerved to his time, wherein the *Apoſtolick doctrine* was δι' ὑπομνημάτων, by way of *Records*, delivered to them, he inſtanceth in *Ignatius* (ἐν αἷς καλελέξαμεν ἐπιστολαῖς, in the *Collection* of *Epiſtles* which he had formerly mentioned from *Polycarp*) *and in* Clement's *Epiſtle, which in the name of the Church of the* Romans *he ſent to the Church of the* Corinthians, *and was* ἀνομολογημένη παρὰ πᾶσιν, received and confeſt by all, which paſſage doth directly aſſert this exactneſs of parallel betwixt them two, as equal in conveying *Apoſtolick Doctrine* to us. 4.

To which I may add, that the prejudices our preſent volume of *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles* are under, are not greater than thoſe which lye againſt the *Epiſtle* of *Clement*, ſet forth from *Tecla*'s *Copy*. I ſhall inſtance in four: 1. Among the *examples* of *generous Chriſtian ſufferers* of that *Age*, propoſed to be treated of (ἔλθωμεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔγγιστα γινομένους ἀθλήσεις, λάβωμεν τὰ γενναῖα ὑποδείγματα. *Let us come to the eminent perſons which are neareſt us, let us take the generous copies of our age*) immediately after *Peter* and *Paul*, and thoſe that came in to them, are mentioned Δαναΐδες καὶ Δίρκη, *the Daughters of Danaus and Dirce*, of whom it is ſaid, that *having ſuffered ſore, or cruel contumelies, or puniſhments, they came to the conſtant courſe of Faith, and being weak in body, received a generous reward*. 5. Pag. 7.

This is ſo unfit for the place wherein it is found in *Tecla*'s copy (and we have no better, or other to mend it by) that Mr. *Yong* hath ſet a mark upon it, as that which he cannot allow to be *genuine Clemens*. 6.

Secondly, Speaking of the Sea, he hath theſe words, Ὠκεανὸς ἀνθρώποις * ἀπέρατός, καὶ οἱ μετ' αὐτὸν κόσμοι, *the Ocean unbounded to men*, or, *which men cannot paſs over, and the worlds that are beyond it*. 7. Pag. 28. * ισ. ἀπέρατος καὶ Patric. Junius.

Thirdly, Speaking of the *Reſurrection*, he not only offers to *contemplation*, the *Reſurrection* which every day brings us, κοιμᾶται ἡ νύξ, ἀνίσταται ἡμέρα, *the night lies down to ſleep, the day riſes again*; but alſo the παράδοξον σημεῖον, *the wonderful ſign which is in* Arabia, *the Phœnix, which being* μονόγενες, *but one of the ſpecies, lives five hundred years, then drawing near to death, makes a neſt of Frankincenſe and Myrrh, and other Spices, and goes into it, and dies; then out of the corruption of the fleſh grows a Worm, which being fed with the moiſture of the dead creature, grows to perfection and wings, then carries the neſt where the former bird was entombed* (and *embalmed* as it were) *from* Arabia *to* Ægypt, *to* Heliopolis, *and in the day-time in the preſence of all men, lays it upon the Altar of the Sun, and returns again. And the Prieſts looking into their Records, and keeping exact calculation of the time, find that at the end of five hundred years this is done.* And all this, ſaith he, afforded us by GOD, who δι' ἑρμέου δείκνυσιν ἡμῖν τὸ μεγαλεῖον τῆς ἐπαγγελίας αὐτοῦ, *by this bird ſhews the magnificent greatneſs of his promiſe*. 8. Pag. 34.

Theſe two latter are the objections of *Photius* himſelf * αἰτιάσαιτο δ' ἄν τις ἐν αὐταῖς, ſaith he, *one may find fault with him in theſe*; adding alſo another (the fourth which I propoſed to mention) that as the *ſecond Epiſtle* under his *name* (which ‖ elſewhere he ſaith ὡς νόθῳ ἀποδοκιμάζεται, *is rejected as ſuppoſititious*) ῥητὰ τινὰ ὡς ἀπὸ τῆς θείας γραφῆς ξενίζουσα παρεισάγει, *inſerts ſome paſſages as from Scripture, which are ſtrangers to it*, ſo * this *firſt Epiſtle is not perfectly free in this matter*. 9. * *Biblioth.* n. 126. ‖ N. 113. * ὧν καὶ ἡ πρώτη φαίνεται ὡσαύτως ἀπόλακτος. N. 126.

Theſe four prejudices notwithſtanding (and a fifth alſo by him mentioned) 'tis the ſame *Photius* his judgment, that it is ἀξιόλογος ἐπιστολή, *an Epiſtle worthily eſteemed*, ἥτις παρὰ πολλοῖς ἀποδοχῆς ἠξιώθη ὡς καὶ δημοσίᾳ ἀναγινώσκεσθαι, *thought by many worthy of ſuch reception as to be read publickly*. 10. *Biblioth.* n. 113.

And ſo it hath among all men generally been entertained, and Mr. *Yong*'s *Edition* of it, juſtly lookt on by this *Prefacer*, as a *genuine piece, abundantly teſtified to of old, a writing full of ancient ſimplicity, humility and zeal*; and teſtimony ſolemnly fetcht from it, to prove the *but two Orders* in the *Church*, and the power of the People in Eccleſiaſtical affairs. 11.

Now, as on one ſide all theſe objections may, I ſuppoſe, have very competent Anſwers adapted to them, and I think for the firſt three, Mr. *Yong*'s *Notes* may be ſufficient, that the *Danaides* and *Dirce* was an inſertion of ſome Scribe taken in from the Margent into the Text, that the Ocean was the *Britiſh Sea*, and the Worlds beyond it theſe Iſlands, that the Story of the *Phœnix* is no Fable, but vouched by very great and ancient Authors, though perhaps *fabuloſis aucta* (and Mr. *Blondel*, I hear, hath written a *Diſſertation* in defence of it) ſo I am to think that all the objections againſt *Ignatius*, as far as our Copy, which we adhere to, is concern'd, are anſwered alſo. 12.

And ſo ſtill the parallel remains compleat betwixt *Clement*'s one Epiſtle ſet out from the King's Library, and *Ignatius*'s ſeven ſet out from the *Medicæan Greek*, and our old *Latin* Copies. 13.

And for *Polycarp* and him, the compariſon will be more eaſie, by viewing the teſtimonies by the *Lord Primate* produced out of the Ancients concerning each of them, prefixt before the one common volume of both their Epiſtles: And indeed of them two, the advantage is clearly on *Ignatius*'s ſide, becauſe as generally they that make mention of the one, joyn the other with him, with the ſame reverence, only giving the precedence to *Ignatius* (* S. *Hierom ad Helvidium* may ſtand for many; *Can I not*, ſaith he, *ſummon the whole Catalogue of ancient Writers*, Ignatius, Polycarp ---) So *Polycarp* himſelf in his Epiſtle gives his teſtimony and commendations of *Ignatius* and his *Epiſtles*, and from him it is, that originally we fetch our collection, and juſt eſteem of them. I hope I ſhall not need to add more to juſtifie my confidence in that matter. 14. * *Nunquid non poſſum tibi totam veterum Scriptorum ſeriem commovere, Ignatium, Polycarpum,*

15. *Secondly*; For my affirming that *Salmaſius* and *Blondel* were the *firſt* that thought theſe *Epiſtles of* Ignatius *to be feigned and counterfeit* (which is the one thing that muſt bear all the weight of my *accuſation* for *confidence in aſſerting*, *confidence* in *impoſing* upon *Readers*, *oſcitancy*, or *contempt* in *conſidering* them) my account will be ſoon given, by viewing my *periods*, on which this charge is laid, and they are *three*; two ſet down in his *Text*, one in his *Margent*: The two *former* are fully and truly cited by him: That in the *Margent* is ſet down *imperfectly*, and lyes thus in the *Diſſert.* (it ſhould be) c. 23. ſect. 3. *In his quippe (Rebus in Eccleſiâ primævâ geſtis, ut an Ignatius Epiſtolas ſcripſerit) unicum D. Blondellum, aut alterum fortaſſis inter omnes mortales Walonem Meſſalinum rectius judicare, quam patres univerſos: This is to conclude, that in matters of fact done in the firſt Ages of the Church, one* Blondel, *or perhaps his ſecond*, Salmaſius, *paſs a righter judgment than all the Fathers.*

16. The plain ſenſe and drift of theſe words is this, that when there was a *Copy* of *Ignatius* produced, which had in it the ſeveral ſentences, which the *Fathers* * (*all*, without exception of *one*) cited from *Ignatius*, by which it appears that thoſe *Fathers* univerſally gave credit to theſe *Epiſtles* in this form, in which *D. Blondel*, and *Salmaſius* reject them; and when this was taken notice of by *Blondel* as an *objection* againſt his diſcourſe [*his ipſis Epiſtolis Patres fidem adhibuiſſe, That the Fathers gave credit to theſe very Epiſtles*] and that anſwered by *Blondel*, with a *Quid tum? Quam multa* * *minimè ſuſpicaces ac imparatos & ſefellerunt ſemper, & quotidie fallunt? What matter for that? How many things both have alwaies deceived, and do daily deceive perſons, that are not ſuſpicious, and upon their guard?* From this anſwer of *Blondels* I conclude, that if he hath reaſon on his ſide in it, then the *judgment* of *one* or *two* Modern *Writers*, *Blondel* and *Salmaſius*, is to be *preferred* before all the * *Fathers*, and that in a matter of *ſtory*, a *narration* of things done in the *Primitive* times, wherein the *Fathers* lived, and from whence theſe others are ſo many *hundred* years diſtant.

* So *Albertin*, *Blondels* Colleague, confeſſeth in his late book *de Euchariſtia*, with *Blondels* Preface in the front of it, p. 283. where ſpeaking of *Voſſius*'s and Biſhop *Uſher*'s edition, he ſaith, *Cum in illis loca omnia à veteribus memorata reperiantur, & fere careant aſſumentis ſupra notatis, & jam conſtare videatur eſſe eas quas vidit antiquitas, & Ignatii genuinas exiſtimavit.*

* *Albertin, circa medium ſecundi ſeculi compoſitæ ſunt, ac incautè & abſque examine à veteribus receptæ. De Euchar.* 284.

* This is far from the Judgment of *Blondel* ſince diſcovered in his Preface to *Albertine de Euchar.* pag. penult: where are theſe words, *Nemo ergo noſtrûm Patres deſeret, ne Deo, qui eos lumine ſuo perfundens, minimè deſeruit ingrati; ipſis, qui lampada nobis tradiderunt, injurii; nobiſmet ipſis, unica eorum conſanguinitate nobilitatis, infeſti videamur. Noſtra ab eorum cauſa ſejungi non poteſt; nec ſi ſejunctam velimus, impune à poſteris feremus, quibus non minus neglectui erimus, quam priores nobis.*

17. This *concluſion* of mine, as it is moſt undeniably deduced from *Blondel*'s words, and is, I think, a competent *evidence* of the unreaſonableneſs of his *proceedings* (for it is obvious to all men, Who are the moſt *competent Judges* or *Witneſſes* of matters of *fact*, ſure they which are *neereſt* the times, and have the moſt uniform *conſent* of others that ſpeak of it; not they that are but *ſingular* Affirmers, and at a vaſt diſtance from it:) ſo it is a full *interpretation* of my meaning, not that *Blondel* and *Salmaſius* were the *firſt of men*, which ever oppoſed any *Volume* of *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*, or that thought them (I mean again, any that go under that *name*, or any *volume* of ſuch, ſet out by any) *feigned or counterfeit*, but that *they* were the *firſt* which *rejected* thoſe more *emendate Copies*, found upon tryal to accord with all that the *Fathers* cite from them, and ſo, which are by themſelves confeſt to be the very *Epiſtles*, which the *Fathers* uſed, and own'd as *Ignatius*'s.

18. An evidence of the *truth* of this I ſhall produce from *Blondel*'s own words in his *Preface*, p. 40. where mentioning how *greedily he laid hold of the Laurentian Copy*, lent him by *Voſſius* in *Manuſcript*, how he *tranſcribed it with his own hand, collated it diligently* with the places *cited* from theſe *Epiſtles* by the *Antients* (and if it were done *ſtudioſè diligently*, thoſe *Antients* muſt be, *Polycarp*, *Irenæus*, *Origen*, *Euſebius*, *Athanaſius*, *Hierome*, *Chryſoſtome*, *Theodoret*, &c.) at length he confeſſes *ſe gratulatum ſeculo noſtro, quod illud ipſum exemplar quo ante* 1300 *annos uſus erat* Euſebius, *novam ipſi propediem affulſuram lucem ſponderet*; That he *congratulated our age, that that very Copy, which* Euſebius *uſed* 1300 *years ago, promiſed now to beſtow new light upon the Age.*

19. Here it appears, that in his *diſpaſſionate*, *impartial* judgment (founded on *prudent* conſideration, and his having uſed the beſt means of *judging*) this *Copy*, which *Blondel rejected*, was the *Copy* that the *Antients* own'd, particularly *Euſebius*: And of his *rejecting this Copy* (not any other, formerly publiſhed among us) it is moſt evident that I ſpeak in *all* the places of the *Diſſertations*; and conſequently that unleſs ſome other man can now be named, which rejected this *Copy* (the *Laurentian* I mean, ſet out by *Voſſius*, to which the old *Latine* one *publiſht* by the *Lord Primate*, is anſwerable, though a *barbarous tranſlation*) or the *Copy* which *Euſebius* and the *Fathers* uſed, before *Blondel* and *Salmaſius* rejected it, I have affirmed that which is exactly the truth, and am guilty neither of *confidence*, nor *impoſing*, nor *oſcitancy*, nor *contempt of the Reader.*

20. And then, I pray, how was I concerned in the *negations* and *arguments* of the *Vir doctiſſimus*, which *Vedelius* anſwered, which muſt needs belong to the *Epiſtles* then extant, and carried about in *Ignatius*'s name, and could not, by *divination*, be confronted to this *Edition* of *Voſſius*, or to the *Laurentian*, or our old *Latine Manuſcripts*, which may well be preſumed to have never been heard of by him, or *Vedelius* either, and yet are the only *volume* of *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles* there ſpoken of by me, and of which my *affirmation* proceeds. As for this *vir doctiſſimus*, I have now been able to conſult *Vedelius*, and * there I firſt find that he hath neither *Name* nor *Book* delivered to us, and that in all *probability* he never *publiſht* any word to that *purpoſe*. And for what hath paſt betwixt *private* men in more *private Letters*, I know not that I was obliged to take any *notice*, if I had remembred that *Anonymus ineditus vir doctiſſimus*. 2 That this *unus quidem vir doctiſſimus* is mentioned as the only perſon (and oppoſed to the *alii*, *others*, that expreſt their *doubts* and *ſcruples* only) which *extra omne dubium ponit*, affirms *poſitively*, and *without doubting*, *ſuppoſitionem harum Epiſtolarum*, that theſe *Epiſtles* were *ſuppoſititious*, or that *Ignatius never wrote ſuch Epiſtles*, whence by the way I am ſecured from the other *inſtances* which are by the *Prefacer* after brought to ſay the ſame thing which that *vir doctiſſimus* had done; for *Vedelius* was as ignorant as I, *an plures ejus mentis fuerint, whether there were any more of that mind with him.* Laſtly, that this *vir doctiſſimus* durſt ſay, that *Ignatius never wrote any Epiſtles*

* *Apol. pro Ignat. cap.* 4.

at

at all, which is to me an assurance, that as *learned* as he was, he never knew any thing of *Polycarp*'s *collection*, or of the *antient* Writers *citations* out of them (which if he had, he might as well have said, that *Polycarp* and the rest of those *antients* never wrote neither) and *consequently*, that his *ignorance* secured him from being *guilty* of that which I charge on *Blondel* and *Salmasius*, viz. rejecting all the *Fathers* with a [*Quid tum?*] and these *Epistles* in despight of all the *authority* which the *Fathers* were acknowledged to have *given* them. This ought to have been adverted by my *Monitor*, and then he might certainly have spared himself, and the *Reader*, and me the several *gainless* pains that his *sharp Animadversion* hath, in several kinds cost *each* of us.

As for his *amplifications*, backward and forward, on this head of discourse, that perhaps I had received *caution* never to *look into any thing that comes from* Geneva, and yet that that could not be the *truth*, because I had *occasionally* insisted on that *Edition* of *Vedelius*; though now it be far from needing *reply*, yet I shall be willing to oblige him, by telling him the whole *truth*, and making him my *Confessor* in this matter. That 'tis now near thirty years since, that I read over diligently that whole volume of *Vedelius*, with all his *Exercitations* annext to it, that I did it in my *entrance* on the *study* of *Divinity*, beginning with him as the first *Ecclesiastical* Writer then extant; for *Clement*'s *Epistle* was by Mr. *Young* seven or eight years after published. This vindicates me from his *jealousie*, that perhaps I took caution from *Bishop Montague*, never to look into *Book that came from* Geneva. 21.

For although I began not that study so, as to fall under *Bishop Abbot*'s *censure* (in the top of the tenth page produced) that *Calvin had holpen me to a mouth to speak* (any more than it is true of me, that I am *still opening my mouth against* Calvin) yet truly my first *Author*, used in my search of the opinions of the *Antient Church*, was delivered me by *Vedelius* from *Geneva*, and so from *Geneva* it self I first learned the *three Orders* of men in the *Church* to be of *Apostolick* institution, which, as far as concerns the second of them (by him and ever since call'd *Presbyters*) the *Scripture* had not taught me. 22.

If this be not enough, I next acknowledge, that when this *Prefacer* told me of the *vir doctissimus*, that *Vedelius* was fain to answer, I had not any such thing in *memory*, and though *I am sure* I formerly *read* it, because I now see it is in that *Book*, yet 'tis due to his *Animadversions*, that I had not utterly lost it: From this *occasion* I shall not have temptation to *lose* time in bemoaning my self, that my *memory* is so frail, both because, of the many *thousand* things which I have read, and heard, and utterly forgotten, this was as fit to be *one*, and as easie to be spared as any, and if it had been *explicitely* in my *memory*, it had been perfectly useless to me in this matter, I could not reasonably have interposed any mention of him, or added his name with any truth to those two of *Blondel* and *Salmasius* (the two men which peculiarly rejected the *Laurentian* (or *Eusebian*) Copy, *Blondel* having a *transcript* from *Vossius*, and *Salmasius* a sight of it from *Blondel*) and also because I see other mens *memories* are as *frail* as mine, and that in things both of *present* use, and *fresh* observation: Witness my *Monitor* himself, who, whilst he is a *chiding*, or *admiring* me for *oscitancy*, and *contempt* of my *Reader*, &c. tells me that *Bishop Usher* published his *Latine Edition* of *Ignatius* out of the *Oxford Library*; whereas that *Arch-Bishop*, that best knew, professes * it was from *two Manuscripts*, one belonging to *Caius Col-* * *Pag.* 16. *ledge* in *Cambridge*, the other to *Bishop Montague*! This were too mean a σφάλμα to mention, but that, besides that it is an *example*, that men that are the *severest* on others no-slips, may themselves be *guilty* of as great, as they *judge* in others; It is also a way of giving some account of that speech of *Bishop Montagues*, which fell so tartly on *Vedelius*, and is here thought fit to be brought in, in the *Prefacers digression*. For bating the *asperity* of the language, which I do as little *commend* in either *Father*, or *Son* of the *Church*, as any; the *Copy* which he had by him of so venerable *Antiquity*, might by him very *reasonably* be thought a more *Scholarlike*, and less *deceivable* way of correcting *Ignatius*'s *Epistles*, than *Vedelius*'s single conjectures, and *prejudices*, which made him, as that *Bishop* thought, willing to conform *Antiquity* to the *Doctrines* then received at *Geneva*. 23.

And this will appear yet more reasonable in the *particular*, which is here said to have occasioned that *bitter* speech of that *Bishop*, where, in *Vedelius*'s reading, it is said of the *Fathers* of the *Old Testament*, that they came εἰς κενότητα ἐλπίδος, *ad vacuam spem*, saith *Vedelius*, *to a frustration of their hope*, but the *Bishop*'s *Latine Copy* reads, *in novitatem spei*, *to the newness of hope*, evidencing the reading to be with an easie change εἰς καινότητα, *to the newness*, and so it is in the *Laurentian Greek* which is now *extant*. Now as again καινότητα might be an easie change for κοινότητα (which that *Bishop* it seems liked best) and either of those readings might well pass, either that they *joyned* with us *Christians* in the same *common hope Evangelical*, or came to the *newness of hope*, i. e. *hoped* for mercy on the same terms of *new Evangelical obedience*, on which we now hope for it, and so set on *purifying* as St *John* saith he will do, that *hath this hope in him*, so truly the other of [εἰς κενότητα] would hardly be kept from being *blasphemy*, cannot possibly be *salved*, as this *Prefacer* would salve it, by *referring it to their expectation of Christs coming in the flesh*, which, saith he, upon the *testimony* of our *Saviour* himself, *they desired to see, and saw it not*. But 1. I pray where doth our *Saviour testifie* this, that *they desired to see it, and saw it not?* I suppose in those words of *Luk.* 10. 24. *For I tell you that many Prophets and Kings have desired to see those things which you see, and have not seen them.* But will this justifie or maintain the κενότητα ἐλπίδος, the *frustration* of their *hope*, or at all prove, that they had such *hope* of *seeing Christ come in the flesh?* Men may *desire* that which they do not *hope*; the *goodness* of the thing once apprehended, is enough to raise *desire*, but *hope* must be founded in some *promise*, or else it is but either *wish*, on one side, or on the other, *presumption*. 24.

But then *secondly*, to justifie *Vedelius* in his retaining of κενότητα there is more *necessary*, viz to consider the *Context* as it lyes in the *Epistle* published by him, and then the whole passage will be found to be this, Εἰ οὖν οἱ παλαιοῖς γράμμασιν ἀναστρεφόμενοι εἰς κενότητα ἐλπίδος ἦλθον, ἐκδεχόμενοι Χριστὸν, (ὡς ὁ Κύριος διδάσκει λέγων, εἰ ἐπιστεύετε Μωσεῖ, ἐπιστεύσατε ἂν ἐμοὶ, περὶ γὰρ ἐμοῦ ἐκεῖνος ἔγραψε. καὶ Ἀβραὰμ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἠγαλλιάσατο ἵνα ἴδῃ τὴν ἡμέραν τὴν ἐμὴν, καὶ εἶδεν καὶ ἐχάρη. πρὶν γὰρ Ἀβραὰμ γενέσθαι ἐγὼ εἰμι--) πῶς ἡμεῖς--- *If therefore they who conversed in the antient writings came to a frustration of hope, expecting Christ (as the Lord teacheth, saying If ye believed* Moses, *ye would have believed me; for he wrote of me: and* Abraham *your Father was exceeding glad that he might see my day, and he saw it and rejoyced; for before* Abraham *was I am) how shall we---* By this *Context* 'tis now evident, 1. how impossible it is, that the *Vedelian* 25.

reading of κενότηλα can ſtand; for *Abraham*, who is the inſtance, did not *miſs* of his *hope*; what he *hoped* for, he *obtained*, he had *promiſe* that he ſhould *ſee Chriſt's day*, viz. *ſee* it ἐν πνεύματι, *in the ſpirit*, not *carnally* in the *fleſh*, ſee it *in deſtinatione divinâ*, *in God's deſtination*; And that *promiſe* ἵνα ἴδῃ, *that he ſhould ſee it*, put him in an ἀγαλλίασις, an *exultation* of joy, and neither *hope* nor *joy* were *fruſtrated*; for it follows, *he ſaw, and was glad. Secondly*; how *ſeaſonably* the *teſtimony* of *Chriſt* was here produced by this *Prefacer*, in theſe words of his [*referring to their expectation of Chriſts coming in the fleſh, which, upon the teſtimony of our Saviour himſelf, they deſired to ſee, and ſaw it not*] I demand, Doth the *Vedelian* Edition ſo refer to any ſuch *teſtimony* of *Chriſt*, which ends with [*ſaw it not?*] doth it not quite *contrariwiſe* produce the *teſtimony* of *Chriſt* concerning *Abraham*, affirming of him that [*he ſaw it?*] which is competently *diſtant* from the *Prefacers Text* of, *they ſaw it not*. Again, are not theſe words of our *Saviour* concerning *Abraham's ſeeing* (*in ſpirit*) and *ſatisfying* himſelf, and *rejoycing at that ſight*, perfectly agreeable to the *general* purport of the *Goſpel*? Is it not in the *Doctrine* thereof frequently expreſt, that *Chriſt* was known by the *Fathers* of the former ages, by the title of [ἐρχόμενος, *he that was to come*] and that till the *fulneſs* of *time* was come, though they did (as the *Vedelian Copy* adds) ἐκδέχεσθαι Χριστὸν, *expect* to ſee *Chriſt*, yet not ſo as to ſee him *come in the fleſh*, but *lived by Faith*, as *Abraham ſojourned*, aſſuring themſelves, that he would be really *exhibited* to their *poſterity*, being for themſelves content to *ſee* him ἐν πνεύματι, *in the ſpirit*, and by no other *eye* but that of *Faith*? And then, can it be ſaid, that they were *fruſtrated* in their *hope*? that what they *hoped*, they *received* not; or *hoped* for that, which they did not *receive*? *Simeon* indeed had it *revealed* to him, that he *ſhould not ſee death before he had ſeen the Lord's Chriſt*, *Luk.* 2. 26. but this was about the *time* of the deſigned *exhibition* of him, and accordingly he *did ſee* him, and *embraced* him, and was not *fruſtrated* of his *hope*: But this *promiſe* was never made to *Father Abraham*, and thoſe of the former ages, nor to thoſe *Prophets* and *Kings*, *Luk.* 10. and ſo having no *promiſe* of this, they entertained not themſelves with *hopes* of it (though they might with *deſires*, ſubmitted to *Gods* wiſer choice) and conſequently, never *came* thus εἰς κενότηλα ἐλπίδος, *to the emptineſs*, or *caſſation*, or *fruſtration of hope*. So that to maintain the *Vedelian* reading of εἰς κενότηλα, 'tis evident that the following words muſt be, not εἶδεν, *he ſaw*, but οὐκ εἶδεν, *he ſaw not*, the direct *contradictory* to the words as they were ſpoken by *Chriſt*. My *Lord Primate* tells us from a *Manuſcript* in *Baliol-Colledge Library*, that rather than the *Scribe* there would adventure (ſo near *blaſphemy*, as) to write *ad vacuam ſpem*, the *interpretation* of εἰς κενότηλα ἐλπίδος *to a void*, or *caſſate hope*, he choſe to inſert a [*not*] in that *Latine Copy*, and wrote *ad non vacuam ſpem*, *to a hope not void*: This again ſhews how intolerable that reading is of εἰς κενότηλα, whereas the other εἰς καινότηλα, which our *Laurentian Copy* gives us (being retain'd, and not changed into κοινόληα) is perfect clear ſenſe, and elegantly agreeable to the *Context*, οἱ θειότατοι προφῆται, ſaith he, κατὰ Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔζησαν---*the moſt divine Prophets lived according to Jeſus Chriſt*---and then ſoon follows, εἰ οὖν ἐν παλαιοῖς πράγμασιν ἀναστραφέντες εἰς καινότηλα ἐλπίδος ἦλυθον---*If therefore they that converſed in thoſe old things*, (i. e. lived under the *Law* of the *Jews*) *came*, or *advanced to the newneſs of hope* (i. e. as before, *lived according to Chriſt*, *an Evangelical*, *Chriſtian life*) &c. πῶς ἡμεῖς δυνησόμεθα ζῆσαι χωρὶς αὐτοῦ, ὃ καὶ οἱ προφῆται μαθηταὶ ὄντες τῷ πνεύματι ὡς διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν προσεδόκων, *how ſhall we live without him, whoſe diſciples in ſpirit the Prophets were, and expected him as their Maſter* (but ſure by ſo doing were not *fruſtrated* in their *expectation*.)

26. All this hath been ſaid to render it reaſonable for my *Monitor* to be leſs *ſevere* to the writings of *others*, and from hence to obſerve, that one *digreſſion* doth *unneceſſarily*, and *unluckily* ſometimes, beget another, and therefore that 'tis the *ſafeſt* courſe to keep cloſe to the *matter* we have before us, which yet I am not permitted to do, having ſtill three parts of this *branch* of *digreſſion* more, which I am *obliged* to give account of.

27. In the next place then, for the *probability* that my *two* adverſaries *Salmaſius* and *Blondel*, if they had not been one *dead*, the other *almoſt blind*, *would have dealt not much more gently with me for my Parentheſis* (*quibus illecebris adducti neſcio*) *than one of them did* (calling me *knave*) *for my terming him Grammarian*, I am able alſo to give him ſome *Anſwer*, and an account, I think, *ſatisfactory* to that whole matter. 1 By aſſuring him that I knew how *Salmaſius* had dealt with me in that paſſage to *Heraldus*, before my ſetting about the *Diſſertations*; that this was ſo far from *imbittering* my ſtile againſt him, that I did the more carefully watch over my *pen*, not to ſay any reproachful thing of him, but rather to commend his *ſecond* thoughts in the mattter of *Presbytery*, which he was willing to *teſtifie* in ſome paſſages of his *Defenſio Regia*; and truly this was it, which I ſhall not ſay I learnt from *Ignatius*, though I confeſs it looks very *lovely* in his *divine* expreſſions. Πρὸς τὰς ὀργὰς αὐτῶν ὑμεῖς πραεῖς, πρὸς τὰς μεγαλορρημοσύνας αὐτῶν ὑμεῖς ταπεινόφρονες, πρὸς τὸ ἄγριον αὐτῶν ὑμεῖς ἥμεροι, μὴ σπουδάζοντες ἀντιμιμήσασθαι αὐτούς. *To their anger do ye return meekneſs, to their ſpeaking big be ye humble, to their fierceneſs be ye tame, not deſiring, or attempting to imitate them. Epiſt. ad Epheſ.* 'Twas the leaſt that I thought my ſelf obliged to do, in obedience to our *Saviours* precept, *Mat.* 5. 44. of *bleſſing* and *praying for thoſe that curſe and deſpightfully uſe us*, from whence I muſt conclude, that *contumelies* are our *admonitions* of duty, even that of taking thoſe who pour them upon me into my *ſpecial interceſſions*.

28. *Secondly*; That my terming *Salmaſius* formerly a *Grammarian*, with the addition of *Learned*, was in the *ſincerity* of my heart, meant as a title not of *diminution*, but of *honour* to him; he was a very *learned* man in ſeveral parts of *good literature*, eſpecially skill'd in *Greek* and *Latine words*, and *phraſes*, and *cuſtomes*, and his *Pliniana exercitationes* had long ſince given me that notion of him, as equal thus far to any of his age, and fit to be named with *Scaliger* and *Caſaubon* of the preceding. And knowing 1. that *Grammaticus* was antiently a title of *honour* among learned men, witneſs *Suetonius* his *Book de Illuſtribus Grammaticis*; and 2. that of γραμματικὴ there are three parts, τεχνικὴ, ἐξηγητικὴ, κριτικὴ, (the two latter of which being peculiarly his *excellencies*, were fully comprehended in the *general* title of *Grammarian*) and *laſtly*, that being neither *Divine*, nor *Phyſician*, nor *Lawyer*, by profeſſion, I could not fitly make either of thoſe his *title*, I thought it moſt agreeable to all theſe *reaſons* to ſtile him *learned Grammarian*, eſpecially having ſo little reaſon, as I then had, to commend his *knowledge* in *Theologie*. This it ſeems was ſo repreſented to him from *England*, that having

having no other *reaſon* (that I am conſcious of) to quarrel with my *behaviour* toward him, he was content to *reproach* me, upon that ſtile: And all that I ſhall ſay to it, is, that I had rather be in the *fouleſt* manner *reproacht* without *cauſe*, than to be *commended* for ill doing, or to be juſtly cenſured by any.

Thirdly, when I ſaid of him and *Blondel* (*quibus illecebris adducti neſcio*) I do not think my ſelf to 29.
have wronged them, or uſed them *contumelioufly*: Not *wronged* them, becauſe I verily *believe* there were *motives* properly ſtiled *illecebræ* (I mean not *bribes* from *England*) which brought them to do what they did: And as I did not think fit then to expreſs thoſe *motives*, being 1. matters of *fact*, of which at this diſtance, I could not have *perfect knowledge* or *evidence*, and ſo could truly ſay [*quibus neſcio*] and 2. being *perſonal* matters, which I love not to *publiſh*, farther than the matter it ſelf reveals and *declares* them; ſo I ſhall not *chuſe* now out of ſeaſon, and leſs *pertinently* to inlarge on that matter: I ſhall only add, that *Salmaſius* lived, and *Blondel* ſaw, many *months*, ſome *years*, after the *publiſhing* of the *Diſſertations*, and neither of them thought fit to fall into ſuch *paſſion* ſo *cauſeleſly*, nor, that I ever heard, ſent the *Author* of theſe *Animadverſions* their *Letters* of *Attorney* to do it for them; ſo that I am to acknowledge what he hath done in this, to be an *act* of his own *inclinations*, but have no manner of *like return* to make him for it.

How juſtly the *many* which he mentions, have ſuppoſed that he was *illecebris adductus*, and from 30.
what *evidence* they *name the bait*, or with what *truth* it is ſuggeſted, that he *had ever ſet up and eſtabliſht that faith which his Defenſio Regia endeavoured to deſtroy*, are things ſo far removed from the *ſubject* before us, the *authority* of *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*, and ſo unlikely to be concluded by our diſputes, that I think we may by *conſent* let them alone: Otherwiſe, the then preſent *lowneſs*, and *improſperity* of the cauſe, which he *defended*, would offer it ſelf for a very *competent argument* to infer, the *love* of *truth* more than *expectation* of any *temporal* advantage, to have *perſwaded* the writing of it.

The ſecond *incidental* branch concerning *Biſhop Montague*, and *Geneva*, hath been as *incidentally*, 31.
but more largely diſcharged already.

The Third, concerning my *interpretation* of Νεωτερικὴ τάξις, for the *ordination* of a *young man*, 32.
might ſurely have been ſpared, when it is by him *confeſt*, that rather than I could think fit to *adhere* to it, I choſe to prefer *Vedelius*'s *Edition*, which reads ἡ φαινομένην νεότητα, *the appearing youth of their Biſhop*, before this reading of the *Laurentian* in that place, and that done by me in the *firſt* place, to remove all force of *Salmaſius*'s argument, there preſent before me; all that followed being *ex abundanti*, more than *needed*, and not propoſed, as the *truth* of the matter, but πρὸς ἔνστασιν to *ſuperſede* all poſſible *reply* in it.

But my *Monitor* runs too haſtily into ill *language*, which yet he diſlikes ſo much in *Biſhop Montague* 33.
(*groſs figments* is no very *nice* expreſſion) elſe he might have ſeen enough produced by me, to have *prevented*, or *allaied* the *ſtorm* of his *diſpleaſure*.

Salmaſius to take advantage from thoſe *Epiſtles*, both againſt *Epiſcopacy*, and the *Epiſtles* them- 34.
ſelves, finds in the *Laurentian* Copy νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, ſpoken of *Dama*'s *Epiſcopacy*; hence he infers, that *Epiſcopacy* was there ſtiled a *new Order*, and that the *Epiſtles* were written in a later age, than that of *Ignatius*, and ſo, that *Epiſcopacy* was of that *later inſtitution*. To this purpoſe, ſaith he, the word τάξις cannot belong to his *age*, and νεωτερικὴ ſignifies *new*, and brings 2 *Tim.* 2. 22. where νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας, which we truly render *youthfull luſts*, ſignifie, ſaith he, *novæ aut novarum rerum cupiditates*, *new deſires*, *or deſires of new things*. To this whole way of *arguing*, I confeſs I could not afford the leaſt degree of *conſent*; and ſtill think, that that *learned Grammarian* did never more *paſſionately* δυσεύειν ὑποθέσει than in this heap of *inconcludencies*. To theſe therefore I anſwer'd by *degrees* proportion'd to the ſeveral *ſteps* of his *procedure*: 1. That the *Laurentian* ſeemed not the right *reading*, but the *Vedelian*, not νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, however rendred, but φαινομένην νεότητα, *his appearing youth*: This the whole courſe of the *Epiſtle* exacted, *Damas* then *Biſhop* of the *Magneſians* being a *young man*, and *Ignatius* deſiring his *youth* might not bring *contempt* upon him, and therefore adviſing expreſly, not to *deſpiſe* the age of their *Biſhop*, and this acknowledged by *Salmaſius* himſelf to be the purport of the *Epiſtle*.

Secondly; That if the utmoſt that could be deſired, were granted, both that νεωτερικὴ τάξις, were 35.
the *right reading*, and that it were juſtly rendred a *new order*, yet what was inſtituted by the *Apoſtles*, might paſs for *new* in *Ignatius*'s dayes, who dyed very few years after St. *John*, and both of them in the reign of *Trajan*; or that however, what was in *Ignatius*'s dayes (and to that *Rivet* referr'd it, *novellus ordo*, *ſive* τάξις, *ut loquitur Ignatius*, νεωτερικὴ) even ſo *new* as to be but *juſt* then *inſtituted*, was yet pretty *antient*; very little diſtant from *Apoſtolical* (*Ignatius* himſelf being ſtiled an *Apoſtolical* perſon) and without controverſie long before that famous *Epocha* of 140 years after *Chriſt*, to which *Blondel* affixes the riſe of *Epiſcopacy*.

Thirdly; That (to avoid all the force of his *argument*) I was not *obliged* to affirm, that τάξις be- 36.
longed to *age*, on one ſide, or that νεωτερικὸς ſignified καινὸς on the other. For in caſe that were granted to be the right reading (not *abſolutely*; for that was *prevented*, but *ex hypotheſi*, *if* it were) yet τάξις might more agreeably to the *context*, and the nature of the *word*, ſignifie *Ordination*; and for νεωτερικὸς in that place to *Timothy* by him cited, it evidently ſignified not *new* (for what could the *Apoſtle* mean in forewarning him to *abſtain from new luſts?* were not *antient* as *dangerous?* It was much more reaſonable to think, *young Timothy* was adviſed to beware of ſuch ſins as are met with among *young men* (which was the reaſon that *young men* were not ordinarily made *Biſhops*) and conſequently, as to that again, both the *Context*, referring to the ἡλικία τῆς ἐπισκόπου, *the age*, i. e. the *youth* of *Damas* their *Biſhop*, and the nature of the word being a *denominate* from a *young* man, νεωτερικὴ from νεώτερος, would perſwade rather to render it ſo there alſo; and ſo τάξις νεωτέρου would be the *ordination* of a *young man*; and ſo I am ſure the *learned Primate* renders it, *juvenilem ordinationem*, and *Voſſius*, who retains the *old barbarous Latine*, yet in his *Notes* hath theſe words, *Non debere eos cenſeri*, i. e. *tanquam commodato accipere*, *& ad ſe pertrahere* ἐπισκοπὴν *illam juvenis iſtius Epiſcopi*, which ſure is his *Paraphraſe* of μὴ συγχρᾶσθαι τῇ ἡλικίᾳ τῆς ἐπισκόπου, *&* ὃ προσεπληρώσας ἡ φαινομένην νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, and punctually agrees with my *interpretation* alſo. And the *Analogy* with the *uſe* of the

word νεωτερικὴν (being an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον but once uſed) in *Scripture* would much better agree with this, than the rendring it a *new Order*.

37. And now I ſhall be very well content to be told by the Reader, of what perſwaſion ſoever, what figment, or how groſs it was, that I *endeavoured to impoſe upon him*, when I began firſt with a profeſſion, that I did not aſſent to that reading, and then only added, that I did as little aſſent to *Salmaſius*'s interpretation, but could not be deem'd abſolutely to like the interpretation produced by me, but only *ex hypotheſi*, and in compariſon with that of his affixt to S. *Paul*'s words to *Timothy*, where νεωτερικαὶ was uſed; nay, that rather than I would make uſe of my own, though backt with the concurrent judgment of ſuch learned men, I choſe to forſake the *Laurentian* Copy in that particular, which in others I generally adhered to.

38. There remains one part of the ſuggeſtion ſtill, the doubtfulneſs which the [*if*] importeth, *whether I conſult Authors any further than meerly to ſerve my own turn.* To which I anſwer 1. by profeſſing that I ſeek truth from Authors, and no proofs, or confirmations of any thing, but what I verily believe to be ſuch. 2. That I may well be believed in this profeſſion, becauſe I am of no party, which either hath appeared to want ſuch ſupports, or if it did, could probably tempt any man, with competent rewards, to undertake ſo vile an office, as is writing and conſulting Authors to maintain that, which the conſcience doubts of, or knows to be falſe. Laſtly, That the particular, whereon this ſuggeſtion is founded, can be no juſt cauſe of this ſuggeſtion: For 1. not having *Vedelius*'s Edition of *Ignatius* by me, when I wrote the *Diſſertations*, I had yet the *Lord Primates* firſt Edition of the *Epiſtles*, which is known to contain the *Vedelian* Text of the Epiſtles, but hath not his *Exercitations*, where the *Vir doctiſſimus* was mentioned: And 2. the whole matter concerning that *vir doctiſſimus* being already perfectly cleared, and that if that paſſage, and thoſe arguings of the *vir doctiſſimus* in *Vedelius* had actually occurr'd to my memory, it had not been in the leaſt degree pertinent to the ſubject of my then preſent affirmation, it muſt now be as unſeaſonable for me farther to vindicate my integrity herein, as it will be uncharitable in any, without any new cauſe to doubt of it. This only I muſt obſerve for mine own uſe, both from the beginning, and the end of this *Animadverſion*, that my *Monitor* is one of them whom I am by obligation of Chriſtian Charity, bound to bleſs and pray for; and I ſhall do it, either in my own choice of words, Κύριε μὴ στήσῃς, or in any other form he ſhall preſcribe me. And ſo much for this Section.

SECT. II.

Anſwer to Teſtimonies of Mr. Calvin, *the Centuriators, and Dr.* Whittaker. *Of Lent. The occaſions of* Ignatius's *Epiſtles. His journey from* Antioch *to* Rome.

1. BUT this *Act* is not yet at an end, there is, it ſeems, more of this *Animadverſion* ſtill behind, following in theſe words.

"But yet a little farther: The firſt Edition of theſe Epiſtles in Latin, was *Auguſtæ Vindelicorum*, "*An.* 1529. in Greek at *Baſil* 1566. Before which time I ſuppoſe the Doctor expects not that any "oppoſition ſhould be made to them, conſidering the heaps of filth and dung, that until about that "time were owned for the Off-ſpring of the Ancient Fathers.

"Upon their firſt appearing in the world, what is the entertainment they receive? One who was "dead before either the Doctor, or either of his Antagoniſts were born, and whoſe renown among "the people of God will live when they are all dead, gives them this welcome into the world; *Igna-*"*tium quod obtendunt, ſi velint quicquam habere momenti, probent Apoſtolos legem tuliſſe de quadrageſimâ* "*& ſimilibus corruptelis; nihil næniis iſtis quæ ſub Ignatii nomine editæ ſunt putidius: Quo minus tolera-*"*bilis eſt eorum impudentia, qui talibus larvis ad fallendum ſe inſtruunt, Calv. Inſtit.* lib. 1. c. 13. "ſect. 29.

"Whatever be the judgment of our Doctor concerning this man (as ſome there are, of whom a "learned Biſhop in this Nation long ago complained, that they are ſtill opening their mouths againſt "*Calvin*, who holp them to mouths to ſpeak with: *Abbot. ad Thomſ.*) He will in the judgment "of ſome, be ſo far accounted ſome body, as to take off from them the confident Aſſertion, that "*Salmaſius* and *Blondellus* were *mortalium primi* that rejected theſe Epiſtles.

"The Centuriators of *Magdeburg* were eſteemed to be ſome bodies in their days, and yet they "make bold to call theſe Epiſtles into queſtion, and to tender ſundry arguments to the impairing "their credit and authority. This then they, *Cent.* 2. *cap.* 10. *de Epiſc. Antioch. ac primum de Ig-*"*natio.*

"*Lectori pio & attento conſiderandum relinquimus, quantum ſit illis Epiſtolis tribuendum. Non enim* "*dubitamus quin in lectione earum cuilibet iſta in mentem veniant: primùm quod ferè in omnibus Epiſtolis,* "*licèt ſatis copioſis, occaſio ſcribendi prætermittitur, nec vel divinare licet, quare potiſſimum ad hanc vel* "*illam Eccleſiam literas voluerit mittere. Deinde ipſius peregrinationis ratio non parvum injicit ſcrupu-*"*lum conſiderantibus quod multo rectiore & breviore itinere Romam potuerit navigare, ut teſtatur vel ip-*"*ſius* Pauli *exemplum ---- Expende quam longum ſit iter* Antiochiâ *ad litus* Ægei *pelagi ſe recipere, ibi-*"*que rectâ rurſum verſus ſeptentrionem aſcendere, & præcipuas civitates in litore ſitas uſque ad Troadem* "*perluſtrare, cum tamen Romanum iter ſit deſtinatum verſus occaſum. Tertio res ejuſmodi in iſtas literas* "*inſperſæ ſunt, ut ad eas propemodum obſtupeſcat Lector, &c. Hæc cum alias non ſomnolento Lectori in-*"*cidant, nos exiſtimaverimus, &c.*

"Thus they at the worlds firſt awaking, as to the conſideration of things of this kind.

"To them add the learned *Whittaker, controv. prima de perfect. Script. Quæſt. ſextâ, c.* 12. Where "after he hath diſputed againſt the credit of theſe Epiſtles, joyntly, and ſeverally, with ſundry ar-

"guments,

"guments, at length he concludes, *Sed de his Epiſtolis ſatis multa, & de hoc* Ignatio *quid judicandum "ſit, ſatis ex iis conſtare poteſt quæ diximus. Iſta Papiſtæ non audent tueri*---- To whom ſundry "others might be added, convincing *Salmaſius* and *Blondellus*, not to have been *mortalium primi* that "called them into queſtion.

What is here brought out of *Calvin*, the *Centuriators*, and *Whittaker*, muſt ſtill be remembred to 2.
be by the *Prefacer* produced to prove the falſeneſs, and ungrounded confidence of my aſſertion, that *Salmaſius* and *Blondel* were *mortalium omnium primi*, *the firſt of men* that called them into queſtion: And my anſwer muſt certainly be the ſame, which in the laſt Section it was, that it muſt be remembred what *Copy* of the *Epiſtles* it was which *Salmaſius* and *Blondel* rejected, and of which I ſpake, when I affirmed them to be the *firſt* that did ſo, *viz.* this *Laurentian Manuſcript*-Copy, ſet out after by *Voſſius* (agreeing with our two ancient barbarous tranſlations, which the *Lord Primate* had met with in *England*,) that very Copy which *Blondel* acknowledged to be the ſame which *Euſebius* 1300. years ago (and the other *ancient Fathers*) had uſed, and gave belief unto, and by that means was forced to caſt off the *Fathers* with a [*Quid tum! What then!*] to ſay that they were deceived, and impoſed upon in that belief, and without doing ſo, had no poſſibility of doubting the *genuineneſs* of this *Copy*.

So that the plain reſult and ſumm of my affirmation muſt evidently be this, that the *Laurentian* 3.
Copy of theſe *Epiſtles*, according with all that the ancients cited from the *genuine Epiſtles* of *Ignatius*, and by *Blondel*'s collating them, found to do ſo, *i. e.* in effect the *Euſebian Copy* of *Ignatius*, and as ſuch, acknowledged by *Blondel*, was never rejected by any before *Salmaſius* and *Blondel* rejected it.

Thit being the only true ſetting of the *caſe* between me, and my *Adverſaries*, I ſhall now need 4.
add no more but this one queſtion, whether the *Author* of theſe *Animadverſions* can now think, that this was the *Copy* of *Epiſtles* which either Mr. *Calvin*, or the *Centuriators*, or Dr. *Whittaker rejected*, in the places by him tranſcribed from them? I might make my queſtion a little more difficult to be anſwered by him in the affirmative, whether in caſe ſuch a purged Copy of thoſe *Epiſtles* had been brought to any of them, which they had been forced to acknowledge to be the ſame, or exactly agreeable to that, which the *Fathers* (all that could be conſulted, and gave teſtimony in this matter) received as authentick *Ignatius*, whether, I ſay, on that ſuppoſition, they would in any probability have rejected it, with a *nil naniis iſtis putidius*, and *larvæ*, &c? But the queſtion will be ſooner at an end, if we conſider the matter of fact, as it lies before us, and therefore in that form he muſt apply the anſwer (which he ſhall return either to me, or to his own conſcience) whether Mr. *Calvin* ever ſaw this Copy, or any other the like, of which it may be ſaid, what of this appears, in relation to *Blondel*, that he acknowledged it to be the ſame that *Euſebius* and the *Fathers* uſed and own'd; and if he never did ſee that, or any the like, whether he can be produced as an inſtance againſt my affirmation, an example of thoſe that rejected theſe, *before either I or my Antagoniſts were born?*

Another Copy I acknowledge he rejected, and in compliance with that judgment of his, *Vedelius*, 5.
that long after followed him at *Geneva*, and trod in his footſteps, endeavoured to purge that volume of *Epiſtles*, meaning, I ſuppoſe, to make it ſuch, as if Mr. *Calvin* had lived, he would not have rejected. To which purpoſe it may now be remembred, that *Vedelius* being preſt with *Calvins* authority for the rejecting theſe *Epiſtles*, he anſwers, that they are miſtaken, who think *Calvin* ſpake againſt the *Epiſtles*, and cites *Rivet*'s *Critica ſacra*, c. 1. to prove *Calvinum non in Ignatium, ſed in quiſquilias & nænias depravatorum Ignatii invectum eſſe*, that *Calvin inveighed not againſt* Ignatius, *but againſt the traſh that the depravers of* Ignatius *had impoſed upon him.* This I have recovered by conſulting *Vedelius* about the *vir doctiſſimus*: And this, he that ſent me thither, might have ſeen, if he had pleaſed. But beyond what *Vedelius* could attempt, the providence of God hath favoured this age, and afforded it better commodity to reduce theſe *Epiſtles* to the ancient *genuine form*, and of that only it was that I ſpake, and of that Mr. *Calvin* could not divine to ſpeak, and ſo there is an end of that inſtance.

The ſame anſwer evidently abſolves me from the other two *Inſtances*, of the *Centuriators*, and 6.
Dr. *Whittaker*: for 1. both thoſe, as *Vedelius* ſaith, do not reject, but only doubt of them. 2. They are again the *corrupt copies* (thoſe that by me are acknowledged to be ſuch) of which their doubt is made, *viz.* the *Copies* which were out in their days, long before *Vedelius* undertook to cleanſe the *Augean ſtable*, and much longer, before *Voſſius*, and the *Lord Primate*, more dexterouſly, and ſucceſsfully performed it. And ſo there is nothing behind, which may aſſume to make good the leaſt part of the charge againſt me, whether of confidence, or oſcitancy, or what elſe was thought fit to be laid upon me; I may again be able to look Scholars or ſober men in the face, till I make forfeiture of my credit by ſome future miſcarriage.

Yet becauſe in the *Inſtances* here produced, that of *Calvin*, and of the *Centuriators*, there are 7.
mentioned ſome exceptions to theſe *Epiſtles*, to which our preſent Copy may ſtill ſeem liable, I will not omit to make him my return (though *ex abundanti*, and *extra orbitam*) to thoſe alſo.

And firſt for that of *Calvin*, that they which attribute any thing to *Ignatius*'s *authority*, muſt firſt 8.
prove that the Apoſtles made any law for obſerving Lent: It is eaſily anſwer'd (without entring into any diſpute concerning the antiquity of that *Faſt* in the Church of Chriſt) by obſerving but theſe two things, that the place ordinarily produced to that purpoſe being out of the *Epiſtle* to the *Philippians*, in theſe words, [τὰς ἑορτὰς μὴ ἀτιμάζετε, ἢ τεσσαρακοστὴν μὴ ἐξουθενεῖτε. μίμησιν δὲ περιέχει ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου πολιτείας, *Diſhonour not the Feaſts, deſpiſe not the quadrageſimal Faſt, for it contains an imitation of Chriſts converſation.*] 1. This *Epiſtle* is none of the *ſeven* certainly *genuine*, which we have from *Polycarp*'s *collection*, or which we adhere to in our account or plea for *Ignatius*. 2. That the *Author* of that *Epiſtle* whoſoever he was, doth not make *Lent* to ſtand by any *Law*, or *Inſtitution* of the *Apoſtles*, but only as an act of *imitation* of *Chriſt*, who *faſted forty days in the wilderneſs*.

Nay when the *Book* of *Conſtitutions*, which is thought to bear ſuch *Analogie* with the *Epiſtles* affixt 9.
to *Ignatius*, ſpeaks of the ſame matter, and adds νομοθεσίας, *Legiſlation* [μίμησιν περιέχουσα ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου πολιτείας

πολιτείας καὶ νομοθεσίας, *it contains a commemoration of Chriſts converſation and Law-giving*] I do not believe that this at all refers to any command or inſtitution of *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles* in this matter of obſerving of *Lent*, but that as Chriſts faſting in the *Wilderneſs*, *Mat.* 4. was a preparative to his entring on his *Prophetick office*, *Mat.* 5. where, in that divine Sermon on the Mount, he gave *Evangelical laws* to his *Diſciples*, the *Holy Ghoſt*, having formerly deſcended on him and conſecrated him to it, *Mat.* 3. ſo the *Quadrageſimal Faſt* was obſerved in the Church to commemorate both theſe, the *Laws* that he gave, as well as the *Faſt* that he prepared for them. And ſo no part of the ſuggeſtion from Mr. *Calvin* holds againſt our pretenſions; the *Epiſtle* is not by us reckoned as *Ignat. Epiſt.* nor the *Inſtitution* of *Lent* ſaid by that *ſuppoſititious Epiſt.* to be inſtituted by the *Apoſtles*; and ſo that is ſufficient ſecurity to us from that firſt exception.

10. Next for thoſe exceptions of the *Centuriators*, I ſhall take them in order as they lye. The firſt is, that *almoſt in all the Epiſtles the occaſion of writing them is omitted, nor can any man divine why he ſhould ſend Letters to this or that Church rather than any other.*

11. To this I anſwer, that, to my underſtanding, the occaſions of every of his *Epiſtles* are as evidently legible, and diſcernable in them, as in moſt of the *Apoſtles Epiſtles* they are. In them they are not ſet down by way of *ſyllabus*, at the beginning, nor in any more viſible groſs way of tranſition, but are cloſely coucht in the manner that the *Authors* of them thought fitteſt, and are diſcernable to a careful obſervant reader, and ſo are they here alſo.

12. The firſt, that to the Church of *Smyrna*, is to confirm them in the *Faith* againſt the infuſions of the *Gnoſticks*, which by this time (as appears by S. *John*'s firſt *Epiſtle*) oppugned the reality of Chriſt's birth, and death, and reſurrection; to whom he therefore confronteth the true doctrine vindicated in every branch, and vehemently inculcates the ἀληθῶς and ἐν σαρκὶ, *truly*, and *in the fleſh*, againſt the τὸ δοκεῖν the bare *appearing to ſuffer*, &c. which, ſaith he, ἄπιστοι τινὲς λέγουσιν, *ſome unbelievers* or *unfaithful Apoſtate Chriſtians*, evidently the *Gnoſtick hereticks*, affirmed and taught.

13. And here by the way, appears more fully the injuſtice of that ſuſpicion, which at the beginning of his *view* of *Antiquity*, the *Author* of this *Preface* was willing to infuſe into the *Reader*, as if heretical corrupt doctrine would be found to have crept into the writings of the * *firſt* times, that remain to us, whereas the plain truth is, that thoſe *hereſies*, which ſo early were gotten into the Church, and began γυμνῇ τῇ κεφαλῇ to oppoſe the truth, were by thoſe firſt writers as punctually confuted, as [*reality*] and [*in the fleſh*] can be thought to be oppoſed to the δοκεῖν, the bare appearance.

* See *Chap.* 1. *ſect.* 1. *numb.* 16.

14. To the ſame head of diſcourſe it pertains which follows, that theſe *hereticks* reject the *Euchariſt* upon the ſame grounds, not believing the reality of *Chriſts death*: And that the one *compendious* way of arming the *Orthodox* againſt all their *poiſonous* infuſions, was to adhere to their *Biſhop* and *Officers* of the *Church* under him, and not to do any thing in *Eccleſiaſtical* matters without his direction or commiſſion: It being certain that theſe *Hereticks* attempted to move the *ſetled Faith*, and *practices*, and that the *Governours* of the *Church* were by the *Apoſtles* inſtituted to *preſerve unity*, and *true doctrine*, and had their rules and grounds of *faith* depoſited with, and committed to them.

15. To this he adds things very particular both to him, and to that *Church* of *Smyrna*, that he took notice of their prayers for the Church of *Syria*, that he was now haſtening to his Martyrdom, being at the writing hereof, at *Troas* on his journey to *Rome*; that in his *coming from Antioch*, the whole tempeſt and rage of the perſecutors having fallen upon him, the Churches of *Syria* had now obtain'd their εὐδία, a peaceable enjoyment of the *Chriſtian Aſſemblies*.

16. A thing particularly taken notice of in *Hiſtories*, that whilſt *Trajan* now ſtayed at *Antioch*, to conſult of his affairs, and war with the *Parthians*, upon the Letter of *Tiberianus Preſident* of the *prime Nation* of *Paleſtine*, *Trajan gave order to him*, Παύσασθαι τῆς φονεύειν τὺς χριστιανὺς, *that he ſhould leave off killing the Chriſtians*, ſo ſaith * *Johannes Antiochenus*, adding ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοῖς πανταχοῦ ἄρχουσι τοῦτο ἐκέλευεν, *that he gave the ſame order to all the reſt of the Governours*, and concluding, Καὶ ἐγένετο ἔνδοσις μικρὰ τοῖς χριστιανοῖς, *and the Chriſtians had ſome truce from their perſecutions*. So *Suidas* in the word Τραϊανὸς ὅτι τοῖς χριστιανοῖς ἀναχώχην τινὰ καὶ τιμωρίας παρέσχεν, *Trajan gave the Chriſtians ſome truce, ceſſation of puniſhment*, dating it from the time of *Tiberianus*'s Letter (which was certainly at this time of *Trajans* being at *Antioch*, and *Ignatius* on his journey toward *Rome*, though being already condemned, the mercy extended not to him) ἐντεῦθεν, ſaith he, *from hence forth*, ὁ Τραϊανὸς πᾶσιν ὁμοῦ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἀπηγόρευε τιμωρεῖσθαι τούτους, *Trajan forbad all under him to puniſh the Chriſtians*: So * *Zonaras* in the *ſtory* of that time, takes notice of this *ceſſation*, produced by the *ſuffering* of many, εἶτα τὸ πλῆθος τῶν κλεινομένων μαθόντα τὸν αὐτοκράτορα, δεισάσαι, &c. *The Emperor hearing of the multitude of Chriſtians that had been butchered, gave order for more mercy*, καὶ ὥστε γενέσθαι τὸν διώγμον μετριώτερον, *and ſo the perſecution became more moderate*, which is farther evident by *Trajan*'s *Reſcript* to *Pliny*, and *Tertullian*'s Animadverſions upon it, *Apol.* c. 2.

* *Chron. lib.* 11.

* *Tom.* 2. *p.* 202.

17. And this they, which had prayed for them in time of their perſecutions, were now in all reaſon to acknowledge to God, as an anſwer and gracious return to their prayers; and to *perfect their Chriſtian work* toward them, he now adviſes them to *ſend a ſolemn Meſſenger with an Epiſtle to congratulate with thoſe Churches this bleſſed change*, ἵνα συνδοξάσῃ τὸν κατὰ θεὸν αὐτοῖς γενομένην εὐδίαν, *that together with them he might bleſs God for this tranquillity*, or *fair weather*, *which he had now given them*, καὶ ὅτι λιμένος ἐτύγχανεν τῇ προσευχῇ ὑμῶν, *and that by the benefit of their prayers thoſe others were now landed ſafely at their deſired haven.*

18. Then he mentions the ſalutations of the Church at *Troas*, from whence he wrote, and names *Burrhus*, whom they had ſent along with him, which again is the yet more particular occaſion of his writing to them at that time, at the return of their Meſſenger and Officer, whom he would not diſmiſs without a Letter of kindneſs and Chriſtian care to them, who had ſhewed ſo much of both to him, and the Church committed to his charge: And then ends with as affectionate a *ſalutation*, and as large an *enumeration* of all the ſeveral relations to which he deſired to be kindly mention'd, as any *Chriſtian* heart could do at the time of his laſt farewel to them.

19. And ſo, what could have been more exactly performed, than that which theſe *Objectors* cannot take notice of, to be done at all? What could be more expreſs and viſible, than the occaſion and particular

ticular reaſons of this addreſs? And the like might be as largely, and as evidently deduced in reference to the reſt of the *Epiſtles*; but truly that would be too long a work, and therefore let this ſerve πρὸς δεῖξιν, for an inſtance of the no grounds of that *exception.*

The next exception is the *ipſius peregrinationis ratio, the nature of his journey from Antioch to Rome,* 20.
the ſtages whereof, as they are diſcoverable in theſe *Epiſtles*, are by the *Objectors* obſerved to differ from S. *Paul*'s, and not to be the neareſt way that might have been choſen thither.

But to this the anſwer is obvious, 1. that what in the *Epiſtles* is diſcoverable concerning his jour- 21.
ney, and the ſeveral ſtages of it, is directly agreeable to the relations of his Martyrdom, recorded by the moſt *ancient* and *punctual Hiſtorians*, that have written on that ſubject: The Reader may conſult the *ancient* piece call'd *Martyrium Ignatii*, and he will find this exactly true, without depending on the confidence of my affirmation.

Secondly, For many ſtages of this journey from *Antioch* toward *Rome*, they are here the very ſame 22.
to *Ignatius*, which we find in the *Acts*, in the relation of S. *Paul*'s voyage, firſt from *Aſia*, then after to *Rome*; S. *Paul* went from *Troas* to *Neapolis*, from *Neapolis* to *Philippi*, *Acts* 16. 10. And ſo the *Acts* of *Ignatius* have it exactly, *Illinc* (i. e. *à Troade*) *ductus Neapolim, per Philippenſes pertranſivit Macedoniam pedes: From* Troas *he was carried to* Neapolis, *from thence he went on foot by* Philippi *through* Macedonia. So when *Acts* 28. S. *Paul* comes to *Rhegium*, thence to *Puteoli*, thence to *Rome*, ver. 13, 14. 'Tis in like manner manifeſt by the *Acts* of *Ignatius*, that he was carried the ſame way: And accordingly when he came in ſight of *Puteoli*, 'tis ſaid of him, that he *went haſtily out of the ſhip, ſecundùm veſtigia ambulare volens Pauli Apoſtoli, deſirous to tread in S.* Paul's *ſteps: Mart. Ignat.* pag. 44.

And for the variations in ſome part of the voyage, the account is eaſie alſo: For in the *Acts* of 23.
Ignatius ſet down by *Simeon Metaphraſtes*, as there is an account given why *Trajan* ſentenced him to that kind of death, to fight with, and to be torn aſunder with wild beaſts, * becauſe he *lookt on this as the ſevereſt ſort of death* (and ſo moſt proportionable to his rage againſt him, for his bold anſwers made to him at *Antioch*, telling him that the ‖ *Gods* he worſhipt, were the *Demons of the nations*) and in like manner alſo, why this was not to be done at *Antioch*, but by ſending him to *Rome*, leſt it might more ſtir up the love and admiration of the *people* toward him, when they that *knew* him ſo well already, ſhould now ſee him ſuffer for *Chriſt*'s name ſo miſerably, * whereas at *Rome* he might *dye unknown*, and *unpitied* and *unremembred*; ſo there is alſo as clear a reaſon given, why being carried by ten *ſouldiers* from *Antioch* to *Rome*, the next, or moſt direct way was not conſtantly choſen for him, *viz.* that the *journey* might be the more tedious, and wearyſome to him, (and by that means poſſibly his conſtancy might be broken or leſſen'd) ἔτω δέ, ſaith he, mentioning it as the advice of *Trajan*'s *Counſel*, that were then with him at *Antioch*, τῷ μήκει τ̃ πορείας χαλεπωτέραν ὑφέξει τ̃ κόλασιν, *by the length of his journey he ſhall undergo the ſhrewder puniſhment:* To which purpoſe alſo S. *Chryſoſtom* mentions it as the *artifice* of the *Devil* (in his * *Encomium* *Tom. 5. p. 502.
of *Ignatius*) that *Biſhops* ſhould not be *butchered* in their own *Cities*, but *carried far off to gather their Martyrs Crown*, ὅμα μὲν ἐρήμους τ̃ ἐπιτηδείων ποιεῖν ἐσπούδακεν, ὅμα δὲ ἀσθενεστέρους ἐργάζεσθαι τῷ μύχθῳ τ̃ ὁδοιπορίας ἐλπίζων, *at once endeavouring to deprive them of all conveniences, and withal hoping by this art,* by the *toil* and *laſſitude of the journey to make them more weak*, and unfit for their final *combat*; which if it were the policy and deſign of cruel perſecutors (as in this particular, 1. the *narrations* of the *fact*, ſay it was; and 2. a ſpecial *paſſage* in the *Epiſtles* to the *Smyrnaans* may be ſome *indication* of it, Ἀπὸ Συρίας, ſaith he, μεχρὶ Ῥώμης θηριομαχῶ, *All my journey from* Syria *to* Rome *I fight with wild beaſts*, expreſſing his meaning in the next words, διὰ γῆς καὶ θαλάσσης, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἐνδεδεμένος δέκα λεοπάρδοις, *by land and Sea, night and day chain'd to ten Leopards:* And 3. the *Centuriators* have no objection againſt it:) then ſure there is no cauſe of *wondering*, that the *ten Leopards*, the *Souldiers* that guarded him, did not chuſe out the ſhorteſt cut from *Antioch* to *Rome*, that their *Map* could have directed them to. Nay, S. *Chryſoſtom* is yet more expreſs in it, Ἀπὸ τ̃ ἡμιλέρας πόλεως εἰς τ̃ Ῥωμὴν ἐκάλεσε, μακροτέρους αὐτῷ τιθεὶς τοὺς διαύλους τ̃ δρόμου, *the Devil call'd him from* Antioch *to* Rome, *ſetting him a courſe to be run forward and backward* (that is the meaning of διαυλοδρόμιον, as it is oppoſed to δολιχοδρόμιον, as the *Scholiaſt* on *Pindar* tells us) and that of a very *tedious length*, to this very end, ſaith he, *by the length of the way and the time*, τὸ φρόνημα αὐτ̃ καταδάλλειν προσδοκῶν, *expecting to proſtrate and ſubdue his reſolution, or conſtancy of mind*, to make him renounce the *Faith* of *Chriſt*, on which terms he was to be releaſed by the *decree* of *Trajan*: ſo ſaith *Nicephorus*, δέσμιον ἐκεῖθεν εἰς Ῥώμην ἐκπέμπει, λέουσι παραβληθῆναι βορὰν, μὴ τ̃ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐξομνύμενον πίστιν, *He ſent him from* Antioch *to* Rome *to be caſt to the Lions to be devoured, unleſs he would abjure the Faith of Chriſt.*

* ἔτω γὰρ βαρύτατον θανάτου τρόπον διεσκέφθη τῷ βασιλεῖ.

‖ *Damonia gentium Deos exiſtimans, errans. Mart. Ignat.* Ἐλάσσων ὢν ἀνίας δεισιδαιμονίαν τὰνδρός. *Niceph. l. 3. c. 19.*

* Ῥωμαίοις ἀγνοήμων ὅπως εἴη, καὶ θᾶσσον εἰς τὸ κακίονων ἀναιρεθῆναι δόξειε, καὶ ἧττον μνήμης παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀξιωθήσεται.

Thus unreaſonable is it, in matters of *fact*, the occaſions and motives whereof are not always vi- 24.
ſible to every man, placed at a diſtance from them, to fancy and conjecture, what is probable or improbable, and accordingly to reform the *Records* of *Antiquity* from our own gueſſes; many things being every day done, which are not the moſt probable; and many things being probable and credible enough, when all the cauſes and circumſtances are known, which while we continue in the dark, or ſee them with prejudices, may appear to be in ſome degree, or in ſome other reſpect improbable.

A more particular account of the ſeveral ſtages of his *long wearyſome journey*, perfectly agreeable to 25.
theſe φαινόμενα, and having now nothing of difficulty in it, and withal expreſly vindicated from the contrary conjectures of the *Centuriators*, as alſo from the miſtakes of *Vedelius*, the *Reader* may conſult in the *Lord Primate*'s Notes on *Martyrium Ignatii*, which makes it very impertinent for me farther to inlarge on it. Otherwiſe it were no hard task, by *ſetting* down the whole paſſage in the *Centuriators*, of which only a part is here given us, to ſhew the many miſadventures thoſe learned men were guilty of, in their improvident purſuit of this matter; as when they ſay, he could not *have liberty, longas ambages quærere, to go far out of his way in his journey, quia captivus ducebatur, becauſe he was carried captive* (whereas no man thinks, that he choſe this increaſe of his *torment* and *toil* for himſelf,

himſelf, yet might have it impoſed on him quite contrary to his choice, by the ſeverity of the *Emperors*, or his *Counſels directions*, as hath been ſaid) And again, that *there is no mention of his following the Emperors Army, nor relation in ſtory, that the Emperor fetcht ſuch a circuit in his journey from* Antioch *to* Rome; whereas indeed the matter is clear, that he was committed to a guard of *Souldiers*, commonly call'd by him the *ten Leopards*; and for *Trajan*, it is ſure that he did not at all return to *Rome* after this, but died in *Cilicia*. But this *ex abundanti* again, more than needs to the vindicating of *Ignatius*, who may now be at reſt for a while, till he be ſoon call'd out again to a freſh *combate*.

CHAP. III.

Of the Corruptions in Ignatius's *Epiſtles.*

SECT. I.

The emendate Editions. Their authority equal to the Epiſtle of Clement *or* Polycarp. Ἀβεδδαδδάν. Theodoret's *citation out of* Ignatius *about the Euchariſt.* Jerom's *about Chriſts chuſing the greateſt ſinners, Publicans.*

1. THE *Prefacer* is pleaſed not to diſmiſs *Ignatius* ſo, but beginning with ſome ſhew of more *moderation* and *temper* toward him than he had obſerved in others, he yet ſoon reſolves that it ſhall not be very uſeful to him, or to us, that expect to receive benefit from his *ſuffrages* in the defence of *Epiſcopacy*: Thus then he proceeds,

2. "I have not inſiſted on what hath been ſpoken, as though I were wholly of the mind of them who "utterly condemn thoſe Epiſtles as falſe and counterfeit; though I know no poſſibility of ſtanding "againſt the arguments levied againſt them, notwithſtanding the forementioned Doctors attempt "to that purpoſe, without acknowledging ſo much corruption in them, Additions, and Detractions "from what they were, when firſt written, as will render them not ſo clearly ſerviceable to any end "or purpoſe, whereunto their teſtimony may be required, as other unqueſtionable writings of their "antiquity are juſtly eſteemed to be; That theſe Epiſtles have fallen into the hands of ſuch unworthy Impoſtors, as have filled the latter Ages with labour and travel to diſcover their deceits, the "Doctor himſelf granteth *Diſſert.* 2. *c.* 2. *ſect.* 6. *Nulla* (ſaith he) *quidem nobis incumbit neceſſitas, "ut in tantâ exemplarium & editionum varietate & inconſtantiâ, nihil uſquam Ignatio interpolatum aut "adſutum affirmemus.*

"And indeed the foiſted paſſages in many places are ſo evident, yea ſhameful, that no man who is "not reſolved to ſay any thing, without care of proof or truth, can once appear in any defenſative "about them: Of this ſort are the ſhreds and pieces out of that branded counterfeit piece of *Cle*"*mens*, or the Apoſtles Conſtitutions, which are almoſt in every Epiſtle packed in, in a bungling "manner, oftentimes diſturbing the ſence and coherence of the place: yea ſometimes ſuch things "are thence tranſcribed, as in them are conſiderable arguments of their corruption and falſhood: So "is that period in the Epiſtle to the *Magneſians* taken from *Clemens Conſtit. l.* 6. *c.* 2. Ἀβεδδαδδὰν "ὡσαύτως ἡ κεφαλῆς ἀφαιρεῖται δι' ὁμοίαν αἰτίαν. This *Abedaddan* being mentioned next after *Abſolom*'s "dying by the loſs of his head, is therefore ſuppoſed to be *Sheba* the ſon of *Bickri*, but whence that "counterfeit *Clemens* had that name, is not known: That the counterfeit *Clemens* by *Abedaddan* in"tended *Sheba*, is evident from the words he aſſigns unto him in the place mentioned, *Abedaddan* "ſaid, οὐκ ἐστὶ μοὶ μέρος ἐν Δαβὶδ, οὐδὲ κληρονομία ἐν υἱῷ Ἰέσσαι. And joyns him with *Abſolom* in his re"bellion: Such paſſages as theſe they are ſuppoſed to receive from that vain and fooliſh Impoſtor: "But if it be true which ſome have obſerved, that there is not the leaſt mention made of any of thoſe "fictitious Conſtitutions in the three firſt Ages after Chriſt, and that the διδαχὴ Ἀποστόλων mention'd "by *Euſebius* and *Athanaſius*, as alſo the διατάξις in *Epiphanius*, are quite other things than thoſe "eight books of Conſtitutions we have; it may rather be ſuppoſed that that ſottiſh deceiver rather "raked up ſome of his filth from the corruption of theſe Epiſtles, than that any thing out of him is "crept into them. Other inſtances might be given of ſtuffing theſe Epiſtles with the very garbidge "of that beaſt. Into what hands alſo the Epiſtles have fallen by the way, in their journeying down "towards theſe ends of the world, is evident by theſe citations made out of them by them of old, "which now appear not in them. *Theodoret Dial.* 3. *adver. Hæret.* gives us this ſentence from *Igna*"*tius*, εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσφορᾶς οὐκ ἀποδέχονται διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ "Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν χρηστότης ὁ Πατὴρ ἤγειρεν. Which words you will ſcarcely find "in that Epiſtle to the Church of *Smyrna*, from whence they were taken. *Hierom* alſo *Dial.* 3. *contr.* "*Pelag.* hath this paſſage of him, and from him, *Ignatius vir Apoſtolicus & Martyr ſcribit audaciter, "elegit Dominus Apoſtolos qui ſuper omnes homines peccatores erant*, which words as they are not now "in theſe Epiſtles, ſo as one obſerves, if ever he wrote them, as is pretended, he did it *audaciter* in"deed. But of theſe things our Doctor takes no notice.

3. The things that are here ſaid, I am not ſo nearly concerned in (not ſo ſevere charges prepared and brought in againſt me) as in the former. I am but *thrice* and *incidentally* mention'd: The firſt mention concerns my anſwers to the arguments brought againſt *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*; the ſecond, my confeſſion of the corruptions and interpolations in them; the third, my not taking notice of ſome ſpecial

cial evidences which are by him mention'd againſt them. To theſe I ſhall not need to prepare any large reply. A few words may ſuffice to avert theſe charges.

For the firſt, concerning my anſwers to the arguments brought againſt the *Epiſtles*, which notwithſtanding, ſaith he, there is *no poſſibility of ſtanding againſt the arguments, without acknowledging ſo much corruption in them*, &c. I need but mind the Reader, 1. that *Salmaſius* and *Blondel* being the two men that ſet themſelves expreſly to argue againſt the *Epiſtles*, I applied punctual anſwers to every argument by them produced; and ſo that buſineſs muſt reſt, till either new arguments be produced, or intimation given, wherein any one of thoſe anſwers hath been, or may be diſproved or invalidated by any. 4.

Secondly, That as there is no queſtion made by me, but that former Editions have been corrupted (otherwiſe there had been no uſe of the *Lord Primates*, and *Voſſius*'s diligence, and pains, in preparing, and ſetting out purer Copies) ſo 1. that being now done by them, and 2. the ſucceſs being ſo remarkable, that they have concurr'd in publiſhing a *Latin* and *Greek* Copy from ſeveral Libraries, wherein the places cited from *Ignatius* by the *Fathers*, lye juſt as they are cited by them; and then 3. the number of the *Epiſtles* being reduced to that of *Polycarp*'s *Sylloge* or *collection*; and 4. our appeal to *Ignatius* being made in this form, to this pure Edition of theſe ſo teſtified *Epiſtles*, the ſame that *Blondel* our *Adverſary* acknowledgeth to have been uſed 1300 years ago by *Euſebius*, and which we have no reaſon to doubt but *Euſebius* received from them who received it from *Polycarp*; all this, I ſay, being laid by way of ground-work, there will, I now hope, be no confidence in making the compariſon betwixt theſe, and other unqueſtionable writings, and aſſuming that theſe *Epiſtles* thus produced by us in defence of *Epiſcopacy*, are as fit to give in their teſtimony, and by all reaſonable men to be imbraced, as any writings of the ſame antiquity with them, which are moſt unqueſtionable, as *Clemens* and *Polycarp*, and other the like. 5.

For when many writings are in later times put upon the world under the name of *Clemens Biſhop of Rome*, *Epiſtles*, *Conſtitutions*, &c. And when the writings of the Ancients are found to make mention of his *Epiſtle* to the *Corinthians*, as an undoubted writing of that *holy man*, and to recite many things from thence; and when out of a *Manuſcript* of Reverend Antiquity, this *Epiſtle* of *Clement*, thus concordant with thoſe citations is lately publiſhed to the world, there is no ſober man which reaſonably may, or that I know of, doth appear to oppugn the authority of this *Epiſtle*. And the caſe is the very ſame, and in no particular that I diſcern, unequal, for *Ignatius*, as he is now publiſhed by *Voſſius* and the *Lord Primate*. 6.

The ſame might be ſaid of *Polycarp*, but that I have already ſpoken enough of this parallel betwixt *Ignatius*, and each of them in the firſt Section of the ſecond Chapter. 7.

Then for the ſecond thing, my confeſſion of the Corruptions and Interpolations of the *Epiſtles*, I wonder how it ſhould be thought fit to be taken notice of; it being certain that that confeſſion of mine belongs not at all to the Editions to which I make my appeal, but only to the former *Editions*. And is it impoſſible for any Author that was once corrupted, ever to be reformed, for that to be cleanſed, which was once ſullied? 'Tis true, it may be a matter of labour and travel for Criticks, by their own conjectures, to make diſcoveries of ſuch deceits; and therefore, though *Vedelius* his *Edition* was fit enough for the *Prelatiſts* pretenſions, and withal, that Author not liable to ſuſpicion that he ſhould be partial for *Epiſcopacy* (I might well hope, that what came licenſed from *Geneva*, would not have been diſclaimed by thoſe of the *Genevan* party) yet I wiſht for a ſurer way of reforming *Ignatius*, than his diligence, without the aſſiſtance of old Manuſcript Copies, could afford us: But when this was done by two learned men (one of which, *Iſaacus Voſſius*, had viſibly no intereſts to miſguide him) and the ſevereſt Inquiſition was not able to deprehend any conſiderable objection againſt the *Edition*, and when this was it that I deſired, and offer'd to be tried by, and inſiſted on the juſtneſs of it, at the very time when I made that confeſſion, how can it ſtill be pertinent to argue or infer any thing from my confeſſion, that once theſe *Epiſtles* were ſet out corruptly? 8.

Or how can this *Prefacer* reaſonably proceed to talk of the *foiſted paſſages, ſo evident and ſhameful, that no man, who is not reſolved to ſay any thing, without care of proof or truth, can once appear in any defenſative about them?* Have I ſaid a word in defence of thoſe, that have any of thoſe foiſted paſſages in them? Or may not I be able to appear in defence of the innocent blameleſs creature, though I cannot of the ſhameleſs and proſtitute? Certainly he that had read the *Diſſertations* ſo exactly, as to threaten a yet more ſevere cenſure of the whole Book in a few days or hours, and ſo cannot but have adverted that principal *præcognoſcendum* in it, *viz.* what *Edition* of *Ignatius* it is, which in ſuch variety I appeal to, might well have ſpared vouching of this confeſſion of mine, of the corruptions of former *Editions*, it being ſo viſibly, and ſo perfectly reconcileable with all other my pretenſions. 9.

The third and laſt thing I am to account for, is, my *not taking notice of ſome ſpecial evidences*, which are here mention'd againſt them: The firſt is the mention of *Abeddadan* for *Sheba*, in the *Epiſtle* to the *Magneſians*. 10.

But how can this be ſuggeſted againſt the *Edition* we appeal to, when it is certain there is no ſuch word in it, and when by the *Lord Primate*, that endeavoured to evidence the purity of this, and the corruptneſs of the former *Editions*, this very word Ἀβεδδαδὰν is particularly * produced as an argument, that thoſe things are reformed here, which were vitiated before? And when it is viſible by the whole paſſage here ſet down, that he had conſulted the words of the *Lord Primate* (*Not. in Ep. ad Magneſ. p.* 15.) 'tis not eaſily conceivable how he could ſtill think fit to make this evidence of the incorruptneſs of the Copy, an inſtance of the corruption of it. 11. * *Prolegom. p.* 71.

So again when it is objected in the next place (as an *evidence, what hands theſe Epiſtles have fallen into by the way*) that ſome *citations are made out of them of old, which now appear not in them*, and of this ſort two inſtances are tendred, one a citation from *Theodoret*, the other from *Hierom*: 'Tis hardly imaginable how he could think fit to make ſuch an objection. 12.

The place cited by *Theodoret* is in the very ſame form in the old *Latin* Copy, which the *Lord Primate* ſet out, and ſo in the *Laurentian* publiſhed by *Voſſius*, with very little change: Thus, Εὐχαριςίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν Εὐχαριςίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριςοῦ, 13.

ὑπὲρ τ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθοῦσαν, ἣν τῇ χρηστότητι ὁ Πατὴρ ἤγειρεν, *They depart from the Euchariſt and prayer, becauſe they do not acknowledge the Euchariſt to be the fleſh of Jeſus Chriſt our Saviour, which ſuffered for our ſins, which the Father raiſed up.* All the difference is but this, that where *Theodoret* reads [Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσφορᾶς οὐκ ἀποδέχονται, *they receive not the Euchariſt and Oblations*] Our Copy of the *Epiſtle* to the Church of *Smyrna* reads Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, *they recede from the Euchariſt and the prayer*] (which is to the ſame ſence, which ſoever be the trueſt reading, and greater differences there oft are diſcernable in citation of places of Scripture in the Fathers) and then how could he think fit to add [*which words you will ſcarcely find in that Epiſtle to the Church of* Smyrna, *from whence they were taken*] I cannot yet make any conjecture, what he ſhould aim at in thus affirming, contrary to every mans ſight, which ſhall but read that *Epiſtle*, and therefore I cannot farther apply fit remedy to it.

13. The caſe is evident; Theſe words are wanting in the corrupt Copies of *Ignatius*, and yet are cited by *Theodoret* out of him: This concludes, that there were more perfect Copies in *Theodoret*'s time, than our former had been; and now the Copies lately publiſht, have theſe words in them, which is an evidence of the accord between theſe Copies and that which *Theodoret* uſed; and ſo being an argument for the incorruptneſs of theſe Copies, and the very thing which cauſed the *Lord Primate* to make ſearch in our *Engliſh Libraries* for thoſe Copies, becauſe he found this particular place cited by three ancients of this *Nation*, *Wodeford*, *Robert Lincolnienſis*, and *Tiſſington*, it was not either very reaſonably, or very luckily produced, as an evidence againſt them.

14. The full importance of the ſpeech it ſelf hath been formerly intimated, *viz.* that the *Hereticks*, which denied the reality of *Chriſts death* and *Reſurrection*, did, conſequently to their *hypotheſis* reject the *Euchariſt*, and *prayers*, or *oblations* of the Church, wherein that death of his was ſolemnly *commemorated*, and the *fleſh of the crucified Saviour Sacramentally offered*, and received, and ſo maintained to be by the *Orthodox believers*.

15. The other ſpeech ſaid to be cited from *Ignatius* by S. *Hierom*, may alſo well be his ſaying, though I find it not in theſe *Epiſtles*: Our *Saviour*, we know, ſpake many things which are not written in the *Goſpels*, and ſome of them are recited afterwards by the *Apoſtles* in the *Acts*, and ſome recorded by the Writers that followed the *Apoſtles*: And ſo, well enough may ſome periods, delivered by *Ignatius*, be preſerved to us, not in his own Writings, but in the Writings of other men; and this, far from prejudicing the *Epiſtles*, which have been tranſmitted to us, which may well be *genuine*, though all that was ſuch, be not come down to us. As for the [*audacter*] that it was a bold ſaying in him that ſaid it, I have little reaſon to be diſturbed by that, becauſe if *Ignatius* ſaid it, it is not my intereſt to inquire or examine, how boldly, and if he did not ſay it, then nothing can be inferr'd from his ſaying it: But then after all this, *Chriſt*, we know, call'd and choſe one of his *Diſciples* from the *Toll-booth*, where they that ſate, were proverbially called ſinners, and generally accounted ſuch beyond all other men; their very trade was ἀχρωμ& ἐργασία, *filthy* and *ſordid*, ſaith * *Artemidorus*, and fit to be joyn'd with that of λησαὶ and παραλογίσαι, *thieves* and *cheaters*; and in *Theophraſtus* in his *Characters*, πορνοβοσκῆσαι and τελωνῆσαι, *Whoremongers* and *Publicans*, as in *Scripture*, *Publicans* and *Harlots* go together, and accordingly when ‖ *Theocritus* was asked what was the *cruelleſt beaſt?* he anſwered, *Of thoſe in the Mountains, the Bear and Lion, but of thoſe in the City* τελώναι καὶ συκοφάνται, *Publicans and Sycophants*, and as of them the *Poet* concludes, Πάντες τελῶναι πάντες εἰσιν ἅρπαγες, *they are all, generally all, Robbers*, ſo the *Jews* are wont to cry out of them, that they are all מוכסין *thieves, wicked ſinners:* And then, what boldneſs is there in ſaying of *Chriſt*, who choſe ſuch, that he *choſe thoſe who were ſinners above all other men?* It being no way to the diſhonour of *Chriſt* to have choſen ſuch, who from the chief of ſinners, blaſphemers, and perſecutors, and injurious (as S. *Paul* ſaith of himſelf) converted, and became the moſt zealous ſervants and Diſciples of their Maſter.

* Ὀνειροκρίτ. l. 4. c. 44. 59.

‖ *Muſonius in Stobæus, p.* 31.

SECT. II.

The ſtile, and barbarous words in theſe Epiſtles. Variety of ſtiles. Exuberance of affection. Θεοφόρος. Ignatius's *title, an indication of the language of that age. Compoſitions, and new forms in Scripture. The four Latin words in theſe Epiſtles, paralell'd by* Hegeſippus. *The Church of* Smyrna, *and many more in the New Teſtament.*

1. THE next *objection* againſt theſe *Epiſtles* is taken from the ſtile, and the uſe of barbarous words in *Ignatius*, and it begins thus;

2. "The ſtile of theſe Epiſtles doth not a little weaken the credit of them, being turgent, ſwelling "with uncouth words and phraſes, affected manner and ways of expreſſion, new compoſitions of "words, multiplying titles of honour to men, exceedingly remote and diſtant from the plainneſs "and ſimplicity of the firſt Writers among the Chriſtians, as is evident by comparing theſe with the "Epiſtles of *Clement* before mention'd, that of *Polycarpus* in *Euſebius*, the Churches of *Vienna* and "*Lions* in that ſame Author and others. Inſtances for the confirmation of this obſervation are mul- "tiplied by *Blondellus*, my deſigned work will not allow me to inſiſt on particulars. In many good "words this charge is waved, by affirming that the Author of theſe Epiſtles was a *Syrian*, and near "to Martyrdom, and that in the Scripture there are ſundry words of as hard a compoſition, as "theſe uſed by him, *Ham. Diſſert.* 2. *c.* 3. And as he ſays, from this kind of writing an argument "of ſufficient validity may be drawn to evince him to be the Author of theſe Epiſtles. *Hierom* was "of another mind ſpeaking of *Didymus*, *Imperitus* (ſaith he) *ſermone eſt, & non ſcientia, Apo- "ſtolicum virum ex ipſo ſermone exprimens, tam ſenſuum nomine, quam ſimplicitate verborum*; But "ſeeing *Ignatius* was a *Syrian*, and near to Martyrdom (though he writes his Epiſtles from *Troas*

"and

"and *Smyrna*, which without doubt were not in his way to *Rome* from *Antioch*, and yet every "where he ſaith he is going to *Rome*: *ad Epheſ.* Τὰ δεσμὰ ἀπὸ Συρίας μέχρι Ῥωμῆς περιφέρω, which in "the cloſe he affirms he wrote from *Smyrna*, whither he was had to his Martyrdom) what is it to "any man what ſtile he uſed in his writings, what ſwelling titles he gave to any, or words he "made uſe of. Who ſhall call thoſe writings (eſpecially *Ignatius* being a *Syrian*) into queſti-"on.

"But perhaps ſome farther queſtion may here ariſe (and which hath by ſundry been already ſtar-"ted) about the uſe of divers Latin words in thoſe Epiſtles, which doubtleſs cannot be handſomly "laid on the ſame account of the Author, being a *Syrian*, and nigh to Martyrdom: ἀκκέπλα, δεπόσι-"τα, δεσέξλωρ, ἐξεμπλάριον, are uſually inſtanced: words to which no *Roman* Cuſtoms, Obſervations, "Orders, nor Rules of Government do adminiſter the leaſt occaſion. Of theſe the Doctor tells "you, he wonders only that in ſo many Epiſtles there are no more of this kind. And why ſo? "the Epiſtles are not ſo large a volume, a very few hours will ſerve to read them over; and yet I "am perſwaded that in all that compaſs of reading, in the *Greek* Fathers, which our Doctor owns, "he cannot give ſo many inſtances of words barbarous to their language, no way occaſioned by the "means before mentioned, as have been given in theſe Epiſtles. But he wonders that there are no "more, and ſome wonder that all are not of his mind. But he farther informs us, that a diligent "reader of the Scripture may obſerve many more Latin words in the New Teſtament, than are uſed "in theſe Epiſtles; and for a proof of his diligence and obſervation, reckons up out of the end of "*Paſſor*'s *Lexicon*, ſundry words of that kind made uſe of by the Sacred Writers. I fear unto ſome "men, this will ſcarce be an Apology prevalent to the diſmiſſion of theſe Epiſtles from under the "cenſure of being at leaſt ſo ully corrupted. Of the whole collection of words of that ſort made by "*Paſſor*, among which are thoſe eſpecially cull'd out by our Doctor to confirm his Obſervations, "there is ſcarce one, but either it is expreſſive of ſome *Roman* Office, Cuſtom, Money, Order, or the "like: words of which nature paſs as proper names, (as one of thoſe mentioned by the Doctor is, "and no otherwiſe uſed in the New Teſtament) from one Country and Language to another, or are "indeed of a pure Greek Original, or at leaſt were in common uſe in that age, neither of which can "be ſpoken of the words above mentioned, uſed in the Epiſtles: which were never uſed by any be-"fore or after them, nor is there any occaſion imaginable why they ſhould: *Parvas habent ſpes Epiſto-"la, ſi tales habent*: I would indeed gladly ſee a fair, candid and ingenious defenſative of the ſtile "and manner of writing uſed in thoſe Epiſtles, departing ſo eminently from any thing that was cu-"ſtomary in the writings of the men of thoſe days, or is regular for men in any generation, in Repe-"titions, affected Compoſitions, Barbariſms, Rhyming expreſſions, and the like: for truly not-"withſtanding any thing that hitherto I have been able to obtain for help in this kind, I am forced "to incline to *Vedelius* his anſwers to all the particular inſtances given of this nature; this, and that "place is corrupted, this is from *Clement*'s conſtitutions, this from this or that Tradition, which "alſo would much better free thoſe Epiſtles from the word σιγῆς uſed in the ſence whereunto it was "applied by the *Valentinians* long after the death of *Ignatius*, than any other Apology I have as yet "ſeen, for the ſecuring of its abode in them.

The total of this double objection againſt turgency of ſtile and barbarouſneſs of words, is this, 3.
The objections formerly drawn by *D. Blondel* from thoſe two heads, and punctually anſwered by me *Diſſert.* 2. c. 3. are again call'd up, and ſome general heads of my anſwers ſlightly repeated, and ſcoffed at, and put into as diſadvantageous a dreſs, as he could chuſe for them, and then the old anſwered arguments may ſtand good again, and all muſt be rejected as ſuppoſititious, which hath any of this turgent ſtile, or theſe barbarous words in it.

In full anſwer to this, I, that know beſt the force of my own anſwers, and wherein their ſtrength 4.
lies, ſhall very briefly give the Reader, that is not at leiſure to turn to the *Diſſertations*, a view of them, and vindicate them from any appearance of reply which here is made to them.

Three things are more diſtinctly objected by *Blondel* on this head, *turgency of ſtile*, *new forms of* 5.
compounded words, and a few, *viz. four Latin* words made *Greek*.

To the firſt of theſe my anſwer is, 1. that the ſtiles of men in the ſame age are oft very different, I 6.
add, as different and diſcernable to a curious obſerver, as their hands or characters, or as their countenances, ſeveral lines and features, and airs as it were, ſeveral daſhes and forms viſibly obſervable in them. Accordingly we * read of *Caſar*, that if any paſſage were brought to him for *Cicero*'s, which was not *Cicero*'s, he would conſtantly reject it. And the ſame could ‖ *Servius* do, if any verſe in the name of *Plautus* were recited to him, which was not his. And we know, it is the part of an *Ariſtarchus*, or skilful *Critick*, and the common way of diſcerning ſuch or ſuch a writing, whether it be his, whoſe it pretends to be or not, diligently to obſerve the ſtile or character; which could not be any probable way of judging, if all others, which wrote in the ſame age, wrote the very ſame ſtile: And ſo, that which is here added of comparing *Ignatius* his ſtile with that of *Clement* and *Polycarp*, and the Church of *Vienna*, is a very ſtrange argument, juſt as if one ſhould ſay, he that owns this *Preface* is not the Author of it, and bind him, for the juſtifying that he is, to demonſtrate the agreement of his ſtile with all men that have written in this laſt age in our language.

* *Cicer. fam. Ep. lib. 9. Ep.* 16.
‖ *Ibidem.*

Secondly, When *Blondel* ſaith, that the Author of theſe *Epiſtles* doth *nimis Rhetoricari*, too much 7.
rhetoricate; I anſwer, that it is hard to define the bounds of Eloquence, within which it is obliged to contain it ſelf; *Cicero* in his *Inſtitution* of an *Orator*, commending that plenty, *cui aliquid amputari poſſit*, *where there is ſomewhat to ſpare*, which is an evidence that that Maſter of Eloquence is no way diſpleaſed with all exuberance; And to this particular it was, that peculiarly I added the mention of his being near his Martyrdom, and his flagrant deſire of it, which might enflame his ſoul, and that ſend out thoſe warmer breathings or expreſſions, which might be as much above the ordinary ſimplicity of ſpeech, as he was at that time above the ordinary cold temper of other men. And againſt this there is not the leaſt word here objected by this *Prefacer*.

8. For the ſecond part of the *objection*, the new forms of compounded words, obſervable in theſe *Epiſtles*, my anſwer is, that though *Blondel* ſet down 17. of ſuch words, yet many of them are of the ſame kind, compounded of φέρω, and ἄξιος and θεὸς, and ſo ariſe by the ſame *analogie*, that fewer would do, and conſequently the multitude of them ſignifies no more than a *ſmaller number* of the ſame. And of theſe it is obſervable, that the title, by which *Ignatius* was vulgarly known at that time, was θεοφόρος, one that *carried God*, and when *Trajan* condemned him to death, it was upon this point, and in this form, that he owned that name, *Ignatium præcipimus in ſeipſo dicentem circumferre Crucifixum, vinctum à militibus duci ad magnam Romam*, *My ſentence is that* Ignatius, *that ſays he carries about in himſelf the crucified*, i. e. that calls himſelf *Theophorus*, (as he did in that *anſwer* to *Trajan*'s calling him *Cacodæmon*, *Nullus Theophorum vocat Cacadæmonem*) *ſhall be carried bound to great* Rome, *and caſt in the Theatre to the wild beaſts*, as we find it in the relation of his Martyrdom. Now this being then his ordinary title, the other like words are directly of the ſame compoſition with that; χριστοφόρος, ναοφόρος: and from hence I argued (and I ſtill think, *probably*) that his uſe of ſuch compoſitions, was an argument that he wrote theſe *Epiſtles*, not that he wrote them *not*, it being evident by that one word (ſo vulgarly then uſed to ſignifie him) *Theophorus*, that ſuch compoſitions were then agreeable to the *ears* and *genius* of that Age.

9. And the argument thus uſed by me, was either not apprehended, or very uneffectually anſwered, by oppoſing the words of Saint *Hierom* of *Didymus*, that he *expreſt himſelf an Apoſtolical perſon by the ſimplicity of his language*. So *Didymus* might, and yet the argument conclude probably, that theſe *Epiſtles* were written by *Ignatius*, becauſe as he was vulgarly called θεοφόρος, ſo words of the like nature with that, χριστοφόρος and ναοφόρος, familiarly diſcernable in thoſe *Epiſtles*.

10. As for the other words by *Blondel* objected, which were of other forms of compoſition, πολυαγάπητος, ἀνθρωπόμορφος, ἀνυσέρητος, πολυπληθία, συνδιδασκαλίται, ἀκαυχησία, ἀντίψυχος, πρωτοπαθεία, ἀναπάψισις, My anſwer is, that none of theſe are at all *Monſtrous* in the language of a *Syrian*, that writes *Greek*; and that in the *New Teſtament*, words are to be found, as diſtant from common language, and as extraordinarily compounded as theſe; for inſtance, πολύσπλαγχνος and ῥαδυπλοΐαις, in S. *Luke*, πολυμορφότητος and φιλοπρωτεύων in S. *John*, ἐγκομβώσασθαι, in S. *Peter*, ἀνθρωπάρεσκος, ὀφθαλμοδουλεία, ἐθεριομάχησα, θεομάχοι in S. *Paul*, and ἐλαχιστότερος, a word made on purpoſe by S. *Paul*, without example of the like (not only of the *ſame*) in other *Authors*.

11. To this anſwer of mine, here is no kind of reply, but of ſcoffs only, [*But ſeeing* Ignatius *was a* Syrian, *and near to Martyrdom* (*though he writes his* Epiſtles *from* Troas *and* Smyrna, *which without doubt were not in his way to* Rome *from* Antioch, *and yet every where he ſaith he is going to* Rome ---) *what is that to any man what ſtile he uſed in his writings* ---- and ſo on in the mode of *ſarcaſm*.

12. But I wonder what cauſed this mirth, and in ſadneſs demand, whether I ever rendered it as the reaſon of his uſing thoſe new compoſitions, that he was *near to Martyrdom*; he cannot but know, that that was the plea for the exuberance of his affection, which might render the reaſon of the warmer expreſſions, which *Blondel* had cenſured for too much Rhetorick; and to that it was proper, though not to making of new words, which is the preſent buſineſs.

13. Secondly, Why might not he be a *Syrian*, and write as a *Syro-Gracian* would write, although his *Epiſtles* were dated from *Troas* and *Smyrna*? 'Tis ſure enough that he lived at *Antioch*, and that was the *Metropolis* of *Syria*; and the Souldiers carrying him bound to *Troas* and *Smyrna*, was not likely ſo ſuddenly to change his dialect, or make him write more familiar *Greek*, than in *Antioch* he would have written; and being called vulgarly θεοφόρος at *Antioch*, what wonder is it that he ſhould now write in the ſame *ſtile*, uſe χριστοφόρος and ναοφόρος at *Smyrna*?

14. Thirdly, For his going by *Troas* and *Smyrna* from *Antioch* to *Rome*, all records of his journey, make it certain; and if it were not the neareſt way, the account hath been given of that in the former ſection: And ſo the *Prefacer* might well enough have kept his countenance, and ſpared his *Sarcaſms*. Here was nothing to diſcompoſe him, nothing ridiculous in all this.

15. Laſtly, Therefore, for the *four Latin* words turned into *Greek*, and uſed in thoſe *Epiſtles* produced by *D. Blondel*, ἀκκεπτα, δεπόσιτα, δεσέρτωρ, ἐξεμπλάριον, my anſwer is, 1. that there is nothing ſtrange in that, it might be as great matter of wonder, that in *ſeven Epiſtles* there are no more of that kind.

16. To which here it is replied, 1. that the *Epiſtles are not ſo large a volume, a few hours will ſerve to read them over*, 2. that *no Roman Cuſtoms, Obſervations, Orders, nor rules of Government did adminiſter the leaſt occaſion of the uſe of theſe words*, and 3. that the like number cannot be produced out of all the *Greek Fathers* that I own the reading of.

17. To theſe I anſwer, 1. that as far from large as the *Epiſtles* are, there might as probably have been more ſuch words, as ſo many; *ſeven Epiſtles*, each of them being much longer than ſome of the *Apoſtles* in the *Scripture*, if they had had but one ſuch word a piece (which ſure each might as reaſonably have, as any) this had almoſt doubled the number, which now we find in the *objecters* own *computation*. And indeed, *three* of theſe *four* being all together in the *Epiſtle* to *Polycarp* (which if, with ſome, I ſhould leave out of the *Collection* of the *Genuine*, I ſhould have enough behind to maintain *Epiſcopacy*) in all the other ſix there remains but one, which is no immoderate proportion.

18. Secondly, That as in *Hegeſippus*'s fragments left to us in *Greek*, *Blondel* hath taken notice of διλατορεύειν, as perfect and unexcuſable a *Latiniſm* as any of theſe, ſo in the one *Epiſtle* of the Church of *Smyrna* (of a very moderate length) concerning *Polycarps Martyrdom* (another piece of the ſame Ages production) we have κομφέκτωρ, another parallel inſtance of the uſe of ſuch words at that time.

19. Thirdly, The like words and phraſes in the *New Teſtament* which is alſo no vaſt volume (though not fit to be read *ad clepſidram*, the length of it meaſured by the hour-glaſs) are ſo many more than theſe that are accuſed, and produced from theſe *Epiſtles* (near *thirty* for *four*) that this may well vindicate ſo ſmall a number, and make it more ſtrange that there are no more than *four*, than it ought to be that there are ſo many.

So in the next place for the *four heads* into which he brancheth the cauſes of the uſe of *Latin* words among *Greek* writers, I anſwer 1. that if he hath obſerved *four*, other men may as lawfully obſerve ſome other, and are no way obliged to marſhal all they find of this nature, under one of his four heads. 2. That if there be by him acknowledged four ſuch heads of cauſes, I may reaſonably allow *Ignatius* to have uſed four ſuch words, and render but this one ſingle reaſon for them all, that *Antioch*, being part of the *Roman dominion*, and many that ſpake *Latin* inhabiting there, four *Latin* words might eaſily be transfuſed into common uſe among them, *acceptum*, *depoſitum*, *deſertor*, *exemplar*. 20.

If this ſeem ſtrange, let it be remembred, that if not all, certainly the three latter of theſe very four are in vulgar uſe among us of *England*, derived certainly from the ſame fountain whence *Ignatius* had them, and ſo may well be allow'd them, who had the ſame occaſion, and the ſame liberty. 21.

Thirdly, that three of theſe four, δεσίρτως, δεπόσιτα, ἄκκεπλα, are all Military words; as for the firſt of them, 'tis clear, and for the other two, he might be inform'd from *Halloix*, *When Souldiers went on an expedition*, ſaith he, *in civitatibus peculia ſua caſtrenſia deponebant, quæ reverſi recipiebant, Illa depoſita appellabantur ab eo qui deponebat, accepta ab eo qui accipiebat; confectis ergo bellis illi depoſita repetebant, hi accepta reſtituebant.* And then what was thus taken from the *Militia*, may well be reduced to one of the *Prefacers* heads, the firſt, that of *Roman cuſtoms*, and ſo by his own rules theſe *Latin* words might here be lawfully uſed, in a metaphorical paſſage eſpecially, which was all *Military*. 22.

Laſtly, what need I take the pains to turn over the *Fathers*, to parallel theſe four words, when if I do ſucceed in the attempt, he hath his reſerve [*yea, but they are taken from one of the four heads mentioned by him, Cuſtoms, Obſervations, Orders, or Rules of Government*] (which are prettily comprehenſive indeed, as they may be applied) and when out of the very *Greek Teſtament* (which was written nearer to the time of *Ignatius* than the *Volumes* of the *Greek Fathers* were) I have already produced ſo many more, than are voucht from theſe *Epiſtles*. 23.

But to this it is ſaid, 1. That as a proof of my diligence and obſervation, *I reckon ſundry words of this kind out of the end of* Paſſor's *Lexicon*. 2. That of that whole *collection there is ſcarce one but either is expreſſive of ſome Roman Office, Cuſtom, Money, Order, or the like, or elſe a proper name, as one mentioned by me, or indeed of a pure Greek Original, or that were in common uſe in that age.* 3. That neither of theſe can be ſpoken of thoſe which are uſed in theſe *Epiſtles*. 24.

To all theſe I make my *rejoynder*. To the firſt, 1. That 'tis as good an evidence that there are ſuch words in the *New Teſtament*, if *Paſſor* collected them, as if I, or this *Prefacer* were ſuppoſed to have done it. I was not then contending for commendation of diligence or obſervation, but demonſtrating one truth, and vindicating another; and this might as effectually be done (without my reading over the *New Teſtament* on purpoſe) by any other eaſier method, that could offer it ſelf unto me. 25.

But then ſecondly, if this were ſo accurately done by *Paſſor* before me, my advantage was the greater againſt *Blondel*, who might ſo eaſily have diſcerned ſo many, and yet would take notice but of one in all the *New Teſtament*, viz. δυνάριον. 26.

Thirdly, That the *Prefacer* was not acquainted with me, nor knew ſo much of my ſecrets, as that he can upon knowledge, or with truth affirm, what he doth without any peradventure, that I *reckon them up out of* Paſſor's *Lexicon*. I had not converſt with, nor, that I know of, was ever owner of that *Author* of his, but did, as was neceſſary for me, that knew no more *compendious* way, write them out of my ill memory, and imperfect Notes, taken at leaſt twenty or thirty years before: And accordingly the Catalogue then made by me was but imperfect, and I have ſince found occaſion to increaſe it, and when I meet with *Paſſor*, may perhaps have reaſon farther to inlarge it (and if I do, ſhall be obliged to acknowledge by whom I was directed to him.) 27.

And ſo in the ſecond part of the *reply*, the *Prefacer* hath thought fit to do, having added one head more, that of Money to the four which he had formerly made uſe of, and not only ſo, but left room for more by a large form of Analogy [*and the like*] and yet farther reckon'd up three heads more, to each of which he acknowledges the [*like*] to be equally imputable. 28.

As for the proper name (that, I ſuppoſe, muſt be Ἰυς☉, *Juſtus*) as it is true, that it is ſuch, ſo 'tis certain that that *Latin* proper name is firſt a *Latin common Adjective*, and being ſpoken of, in *Greek*, might as well have been tranſlated into Δίκαι☉, as either *Cephas* is into Πετρὸς, or *Tabitha* into Δόρκας, if there had been any criminous barbarouſneſs in uſing foreign words, or turning them into *Greek*: As for the pure *Greek* Original, that ſome of the words are of, if he mean any of thoſe mentioned by me, I confeſs I know not what he means; If he means thoſe mention'd by *Paſſor*, I have no commodity to know, nor obligation to account for it. 29.

As for the laſt, that they *were of common uſe in that age*, I doubt it not, and ſhall therefore haſten to the laſt particular, and give the like account of that, that I doubt not but the four words in *Ignatius*, were at *Antioch*, where he lived, in frequent and common uſe at that time; and till that be diſproved, we are perfectly agreed upon the account, that it was very lawful for *Ignatius* to uſe them. And this I hope may at laſt be ſufficient to have added to the former competent length of account, concerning the ſtile of theſe *Epiſtles*. 30.

In the cloſe, there is a mention of the word στρῶς, another of *D. Blondel*'s exceptions, but of that I have ſpoken ſo largely, both to *Blondel*'s original objections, and to his *replies* (and there is not one word here ſaid to the confirming of his, or refuting of my pretenſions) that I muſt not ſuperadd one word more of that ſubject. 31.

SECT.

SECT. III.

The immoderate exaltations of Biſhops objected to theſe Epiſtles. But belong not to our Copies, ſave in one teſtimony, and that no way immoderate.

1. THE next charge againſt theſe *Epiſtles* is, the *frequent commendation* of *Biſhops*, &c. Thus it lies;

"It is not a little burthenſom to the thought of ſober and learned men, to conſider how frequent-"ly, cauſeleſly, abſurdly in the midſt of diſcourſes quite of another nature, and tendency, the Au-"thor of thoſe Epiſtles (or ſome body for him) breaks in upon the commendation of Church Offi-"cers, Biſhops and Presbyters, exalting with titles of honour to the greateſt Potentates on earth, "and comparing them to God the Father and Son, whereas none of the ſacred Writers that went "before him, nor any of thoſe good and holy men, who (as is ſuppoſed) followed after him, do "hold the leaſt communion or ſociety with him in that courſe of proceeding, Ἀναγκαῖον ἔν ἐσὶν ὁσάπερ "ποιεῖτε, ἀνεὺ τῦ Ἐπισκόπε μηδὲν πράτ]ειν ὑμᾶς, *Epiſt. ad Trall.* Whereunto is immediately ſubjoyned "that Doctrine concerning Deacons, which will ſcarcely be thought to be exegetical of *Acts* 6. "Δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὺς διακόνες ὄντας μυςηρίων Ἰησῦ Χριςῦ κατὰ πάντα τρόπον ἀρέσκειν, οἳ γὰρ βρωμάτων καὶ πομάτων εἰσὶ διάκονοι, "ἀλλὰ --- And τί γάρ ἐσὶν ἐπίσκοπ@, ἀλλ' ἢ πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξεσίας ἐπέκεινα πάντων κρατῶν. What the Wri-"ter of this paſſage intended to make of a Biſhop, well I know not, but thus he ſpeaks of him, *Epiſt.* "*ad Magneſ.* Πρέπον ἔν ἐσὶ καὶ ὑμᾶς ὑπακύειν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὑμῶν, καὶ κατὰ μηδὲν αὐτῷ ἀντιλέγειν, φοβερὸν γάρ ἐσὶ "(as the Apoſtle ſpeaks concerning God, *Heb.* 6. 10.) τοιύτῳ ἀντιλέγειν. Thus indeed ſome would "have it, who to help the matter, have further framed ſuch an Epiſcopacy, as was never thought "on by any in the days of *Ignatius*, as ſhall afterwards be made evident: And in the ſame Epiſtle "this is ſomewhat uncouth and ſtrange; Ἐνώθητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ὑποτασσόμενοι τῷ θεῷ ὡς αὐτὸς ἐν Χριςῷ, "ὥσπερ ἔν ὁ Κύρι@ ἀνεὺ τῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ποιεῖ, ἃ δύναμαι, καὶ φησὶ, ποιεῖν ἀπ' ἐμαυτῦ οὐδέν, ὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀνεὺ τῦ "ἐπισκόπε μηδὲ πρεσβύτερ@, μὴ Διακόν@, μὴ Λαικὸς, μηδέ τι φαινέτω ὑμῖν ἔυλογον παρὰ ταῦτα γνάμην. "Whether the Lord Chriſt hath bound any ſuch burthen upon the ſhoulders of the Saints, I much "queſtion; nor can I tell what to make of the compariſon, between God the Father, and the Biſhop, "Chriſt, and the reſt of the Church, the whole ſentence in word and matter being moſt remote "from the leaſt countenance from the ſacred writings, *Ep. ad Philadel.* Οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καὶ οἱ διάκονοι, καὶ "ὁ λοιπὸς κληρὸς ἁμὰ πάντι τῷ λαῷ καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις, καὶ τοῖς ἄρχυσι, καὶ τῷ Καίσαρι (well aimed however) "τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ πειθαρχήσαν. The Epiſtle to the Church of *Smyrna* is full of ſuch ſtuff, inſerted with-"out any occaſion, order, coherence, or any colour to induce us to believe that it is part of the "Epiſtle as firſt written. One paſſage I may not omit τίμα, φησὶ, (υἱὲ) τὸν θεὸν καὶ βασιλέα, ἐγὼ δὲ φημὶ "(in the language of our Saviour repudiating the *Phariſees* corrupted gloſſes on the Law) τίμα τὸν θεὸν "ὡς αἴτιον τῦ ὅλων καὶ κύριον, ἐπίσκοπον δὲ ὡς ἀρχιερέα θεῦ εἰκόνα φορῦντα, κατὰ μὲν τὸ ἄρχειν θεῦ, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἱε-"ρατεύειν χριςῦ, καὶ μετὰ τῦτον τιμᾶν χρῆ καὶ βασιλέα. So *Peter*'s miſtake is corrected; his reaſons fol-"low, ὅτε γὰρ τὶς κρείτ]ων θεῦ, ἢ παραπλήσι@ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ἴσιν, ὅτε δὲ ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐπισκόπε τί μεῖζον ἱερωμένε "θεῷ ὑπὲρ τῦ κόσμε, πανὸς σωτηρίας (as was *Jeſus* Chriſt) and it is added, εἰ ὁ βασιλεύειν ἐπεγειρόμεν@ "κολάσεως ἄξι@ δικαίως γενήσεται, ὥς γε παραλύων τὴν Κοινὴν ἐυνομίαν, πόσῳ δοκεῖτε χείρον@ ἀξιωθήσεσθαι τιμω-"ρίας ὁ ἀνεὺ ἐπισκόπε τί ποιεῖν προαιρέμενος --- ἱερωσύνη γάρ ἐσὶ τὸ πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀναδεδειγμένον. How "well this ſuits the doctrine of *Peter* and *Paul*, the Reader will eaſily diſcern; *Caeſar* or the King is "upon all accounts thruſt behind the Biſhop, who is ſaid to be conſecrated to God for the ſalvation "of the world; him he is exhorted to obey, and in expreſs oppoſition to the Holy Ghoſt, the Bi-"ſhops name is thruſt in between God and the King, as in a way of preeminence above the latter, "and to do any thing without the Biſhop, is made a far greater crime than to riſe up againſt the "King. As this ſeems ſcarce to be the language of one, going upon an accuſation to appear before "the Emperor, ſo I am certain, it is moſt remote from the likeneſs of any thing that in this affair "we are inſtructed in from the Scripture. Plainly this language is the ſame with that of the falſe "Impoſtor *Pſeudo-Clemens*, in his pretended Apoſtolical Conſtitutions. At this rate or ſomewhat "beyond it, you have him ranting, *l.* 2. *c.* 2. Ἐπίσκοπον θεῦ τύπον ἔχειν ἐν ἀνθρώποις, τῶν πάντων ἄρχειν ἀν-"θρώπων, ἱερέων, βασιλέων, ἀρχόντων, πατέρων, υἱῶν, διδασκάλων καὶ πάντων ὁμῶ τῶν ὑπηκόων. All Popes, with "all ſorts of perſons whatſoever, Prieſts, Kings and Princes, Fathers, and children, all under the "feet of this exemplar of God, and ruler over men, a paſſage which doubtleſs eminently interprets "and illuſtrates that place of *Peter*, 1 *Epiſt.* c. 5. v. 1, 2, 3. The Elders that are among you I ex-"hort, who am alſo an Elder, and a witneſs of the ſufferings of Chriſt, and alſo a partaker of the "glory that ſhall be revealed, feed the flock of God, which is among you, taking the overſight there-"of not by conſtraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind, neither as being "Lords over Gods heritage, but being examples to the flock: But yet as if the man were ſtark mad "with worldly pride and pomp, he afterwards in the name of the holy Apoſtles of *Jeſus* Chriſt, "commands all the Laity (forſooth) to honour, love, and fear the Biſhop, Ὡς κύριον, ὡς δεσπότην, ὡς "Ἀρχιερέα θεῦ, *lib.* 2. *c.* 20. And that you may ſee whither the man drives, and what he aims at, "after he hath ſet out his Biſhop like an Emperor, or an Eaſtern King in all pomp and glory, he "adds, τὺς Ἐπισκόπες ἀρχόντας ὑμῶν καὶ βασιλέας ἡγεῖσθαι νομίζετε, καὶ δασμὺς ὡς βασιλεῦσι προσφέρετε. The "paying of Tribute to them as Kings, is the iſſue of theſe deſcriptions, that they may have where-"withal to maintain their pomp and greatneſs, according to the inſtitution of our Lord *Jeſus* Chriſt, "and his bleſſed Apoſtles. But I ſhall not rake farther into this dunghil, nor ſhall I add any more "inſtances of this kind out of *Ignatius*, but cloſe into one inſiſted on by our Doctor, for the proof of "his Epiſcopacy, *Diſſert.* 2. *c.* 25. 7. ſaith he, *Quartò*, τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε, ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν. Ἀν-"τίψυχος ἐγὼ τῶν ὑποτασσομένων τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ διακόνοις. *Epiſcopo attendite, ut & vobis*

"*Deus*

" *Deus attendat; ego animam meam libenter eorum loco ſubſtitui cuperem (Quod Anglicè optimè dicimus,* " *my ſoul for theirs) qui Epiſcopo, Presbyteris, & Diaconis obſequuntur.* I hope I may without great " difficulty obtain the Doctors pardon, that I dare not be ſo bold with my ſoul as to jeopard it in " that manner, eſpecially being not my own to diſpoſe of.

I ſhall not need to inquire who thoſe ſober and learned men are, with the mention of whom the *Prefacer* here begins; I queſtion not but that they are he, and thoſe of his perſwaſion; I only hope it is poſſible that they have not the incloſure of that title, and then there may be others as ſober, and as learned, that conſent with me in their opinion of this matter. 2.

What is ſaid here of thoſe ſober and learned men, that *it is not a little burthenſom to their thoughts, that the Author of theſe Epiſtles ſo frequently, cauſeleſly, and abſurdly breaks in upon the commendation of Church-Officers*] may be juſt matter of compaſſion in me; as far as I believe there is any truth in it: For truly I ſhould be ſorry, that any ſober, or learned man's thoughts ſhould be ſo cauſeleſly, and yet ſo heavily burthen'd and diſquieted: And yet if that be the caſe, I may certainly be able to do more than compaſſionate, I may adminiſter comfort alſo: For if that Authors commendations of *Biſhops* be cauſeleſs and abſurd, then their grief and preſſure of thoughts muſt be as cauſeleſs (that I add not, abſurd) who are much diſturbed with them: If the *ſuppoſititious Ignatius* that hath taken that perſon on him, act and perſonate ſo very abſurdly, any ſober, or learned man will be glad, that he hath ſo luckily diſcovered his fraud, that the *Viſor* is fallen off by this means, and the cheat ſo ſpeedily come to an end. 3.

If therefore there be any thing ſerious in this expreſſion (as [*not a little burthenſom to the thought of ſober and learned men*] is a very ſolemn and grave ſtile, that admits no ſuſpicion of Smile or Irony) it muſt to my underſtanding ſignifie, that they that are not friends to *Epiſcopacy*, are not a little burthen'd to think, that *Ignatius*, that *Primitive glorious Saint* and *Martyr*, ſhould ſo frequently (which they muſt be ſuppoſed to think cauſeleſly and abſurdly) commend and exalt *Biſhops:* And though in their doing this, I know they do not expect I ſhould commend them, yet it ſo falls out, that I am very well able to excuſe them, if the paſſages, which are here ſet down by the *Prefacer*, be the only matter of burthen to their thoughts. 4.

For indeed it is a little ſtrange, that he that hath undertaken to write *Animadverſions* on my *Diſſertations*, and knows what *Copies* they are of *Ignatius*, which I defend, as the *genuine Epiſtles*, ſhould produce teſtimonies out of theſe *Epiſtles* to invalidate their authority, and yet never but once conſult theſe *Copies* to which I appeal, but gather up the off-ſcourings of the *corrupt Editions*, which even now he had call'd *the very garbidge of the beaſt*, when, if he had pleaſed, he might have entertained himſelf and the Reader with much wholeſomer diet in the volumes ſet out by *Voſſius* and the *Lord Primate*. 5.

As it is, the task lies more truly burthenſom on me, who muſt now be fain to ſurvey, very unneceſſarily all the teſtimonies here ſet down, and demonſtrate that it is unjuſtly ſuggeſted by the *Prefacer*, that the Author of theſe *Epiſtles* (he ought to mean *thoſe*, which he, with whom he diſputes, takes for his) *exalts Biſhops with titles of honour to the greateſt Potentates on earth.* 6.

For the firſt teſtimony then, taken from the *Epiſtle* to the *Trallians*, he might only have corrected the reading out of the *emendate* Copies, and ſo have read ὥσπερ for ὥσαπερ, and then, as the teſtimony had been more *Grammatical ſence*, not [*whatſoever things you do, do nothing* ---] but [*it is neceſſary, as already you practiſe, to do nothing without the Biſhop*] ſo the reaſonableneſs, and moderation of that ſpeech had been diſcernable enough, being both the ordinary language of the ancient Canons (always thought neceſſary to the unity of the *Church*) and peculiarly uſeful at that time to be inculcated (to keep out the poiſon of the Heretical and Schiſmatical *Gnoſticks*) as hath at large been formerly demonſtrated, both in anſwer to * *Blondel*, and again to the || *London Aſſemblers*, and need not now be repeated here. 7.

* *Diſſert. 3. c. 9.*
|| *Cap. 3. ſect. 3. numb. 54.*

The ſecond teſtimony, which concerns *Deacons*, and is not conceived to be reconcileable with their *inſtitution*, *Acts* 6. is in our Copies, both in words and ſence, different from that which is here cited out of the *corrupt*, and hath nothing of high or ſtrange in it. It is thus, Δεῖ δὲ καὶ τοὺς διακόνους ὄντας μυστηρίων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ μᾶλλον πάντα τρόπον πᾶσιν ἀρέσκειν, οὐ γὰρ βρωμάτων καὶ ποτῶν εἰσὶν διάκονοι, ἀλλ' ἐκκλησίας θεοῦ ὑπηρέται, διὸ ὀφείλουσιν ἄμεμπτοι εἶναι ἀπὸ πάντων, ὡς θεοῦ φυλακὴ οὖσιν καὶ ἐπίσκοποι, ὡς μιμηταὶ θεοῦ ὄντες, καὶ ὅσῳ ἂν ὑμεῖς ὑπακούητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ὡς Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ, ὁμοιοτρόπως καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται ὑμῖν, *The Deacons being Miniſters of the Myſteries of Jeſus Chriſt, ought to pleaſe all men; for they are not diſpenſers of meat and drink (i. e.* not only, or eſpecially ſuch) *but officers of the Church of Chriſt; they ought therefore to keep themſelves from accuſations as from fire.* What is there in this, above the proportion of moderate and ſound doctrine? 8.

But the third teſtimony is an immoderate one indeed, and gives him, I confeſs, a *ſupereminent juriſdiction* in the [πάσης ἀρχῆς καὶ ἐξουσίας, and the πάντων κρατῶν] But by good hap there is not a word of it in our *Editions*, and ſo we are not farther concern'd to vindicate or examine it. 9.

So for the fourth, from the *Epiſtle* to the *Magneſians*, the immoderate height whereof is argued from the φοβερὸν uſed of *God*, *Heb.* (I ſuppoſe it ſhould be) 10. 31. I need ſay no more again, but that there is no part of it in our Copies nor any thing inſtead of it, above this moderate pitch, εἰς τιμὴν ἐκείνου τοῦ θελήσαντος ἡμᾶς πρέπον ἐστὶν ἐπακούειν κατὰ μηδεμίαν ὑπόκρισιν ---- *To the honour of God, whoſe pleaſure it is, it becomes us to obey the Biſhop without any hypocriſie.* 10.

Of the fifth there is only thus much in our Copies by way of caution againſt *Schiſms*, Ἑνώθητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ καὶ τοῖς προκαθημένοις εἰς τύπον καὶ διδαχὴν ἀφθαρσίας, *Be united to your Biſhop, and thoſe that are ſet over you, for a copy and doctrine of incorruption.* Which, by the way, ſets down the plain reaſon of his ſo frequent inculcating obedience to, and union with their *Biſhop* (juſt as in our *Vindication* to the *London Aſſemblers*, and elſewhere, hath oft been ſaid) becauſe the true doctrine being by the *Apoſtles* before their deceaſe depoſited with theſe, as their *ſucceſſors* in every *Church*, and becauſe having particular knowledge of the *Orthodoxalneſs* of *Damas* in this, and the like of other *Biſhops* and *Presbyters* under them in the other Churches, there was no way ſo prudent, and ſo *compendious* to preſerve them from the corruptions of the *Hereticks* (who were then creeping in clancularly) as their keeping themſelves exactly cloſe to the *Biſhop*, and their *Superiours* under him. And according- 11.

ly

ly it follows, *As therefore the Lord being united to his Father did nothing without him, either by himſelf, or by his Apoſtles, ſo neither do ye any thing without the Biſhop, and the Presbyters; nor endeavour to account any thing reaſonable which is private*, or of your own deviſing: Which again differs from the reading that is here offered, and tells us clearly what is meant by the compariſon betwixt God the Father and the Biſhop, Chriſt and the reſt of the Church, even no more than *Chriſt* means when he ſaid, *Learn of me, for I am meek: Chriſt* did all by commiſſion from, and nothing without his *Father*, and ſo betwixt them unity was preſerved: And in like manner the Members of the Church muſt obey, and do nothing without their Governour, and ſo union may among them be preſerved alſo. But of this intire place we have formerly ſpoken in the *Vindication* to the *London Aſſemblers*, c. 3. ſect. 3. n. 42.

12. The ſixth place is of ſome weight indeed, from the *Epiſtle* to the *Philadelphians*, requiring *all*, of what ſort ſoever, not only *Presbyters*, *Deacons*, and the whole *Clergie*, but all the People, Souldiers, Princes, *Cæſar* himſelf to perform obedience to the *Biſhop*. And here, I acknowledge, there is a teſtimony and evidence of the charge of extolling *Biſhops* above the greateſt Potentates; for ſure *Cæſar* was ſuch, and if *Ignatius* had thought fit to uſe ſuch language, and done it at a time when *Cæſar* was Heathen, and he by *Cæſars* ſentence already condemn'd, and within a while to be brought forth to the *Amphitheatre*, I might have juſtly deſerved a ſevere *Animadverſion* for moving tongue or pen in defence of this rebellious extravagant, ſenceleſs doctrine. But I need not take pains to examine the place, my memory, as ill as it is, aſſures me there is no ſuch thing in the *Epiſtles* own'd by us *Prelatiſts*; and upon conſulting the place, I find there are almoſt eight pages together inſerted by ſome *Impoſtor*, of all which there remains not above one page in our *Editions*, which certainly is an evidence, that ſome Reformation was wrought, ſome degree of purity reſtored to theſe *Epiſtles*, by this ſo fiery a purgation: And 'tis very ſtrange that this *Prefacer* could not take notice of it.

13. So again the ſeventh, in the Epiſtle to the *Smyrnæans*, is advanced to the ſame pitch of Inſolence, placing the *Biſhop* betwixt *God* and the *King*, and that by way of correction of the words of Scripture [*My ſon, fear God, and the King*] and all the ſeveral branches of that place here cited, are every word vaniſht out of our volume of *Epiſtles*. And ſo the *Prefacer* hath only had an opportunity to betray his miſtake, in affirming of *Ignatius* at the time of writing that *Epiſtle*, that he was going upon an accuſation to appear before the Emperor, whereas it is certain he had before this, received his condemnation from *Trajan* the Emperor at *Antioch*, and was now carrying to *Rome* for his execution; and that is all he hath gained by producing this teſtimony.

14. And ſo you ſee I have no reaſon to make any further anſwer to what the *Prefacer* here juſtly adds concerning the unreaſonableneſs, and unchriſtianneſs of theſe expreſſions, whether in theſe inſertions publiſhed once under *Ignatius* his name, or the like in the Conſtitutions fathered alſo upon *Clemens*; I am as perfectly of his opinion concerning the impiety of them, as he could wiſh, and am thereby obliged to value our new *Editions* the more, for freeing an innocent *Martyr* and his Reader from ſuch Impoſtures.

15. Only I wonder that over and above all thoſe that are by that Impoſtor appointed to obey the *Biſhop*, the *Prefacer* (as if the other had been too wary) ſhould think fit to make a further inſertion, and to the Catalogue of the *Biſhop*'s ſubjects, add [*All Popes*] when the *Greek* cited by him hath only ἱερέων, which he truly renders *Prieſts* in the words following. What is this but to corrupt the ſink, to help the Garbidge to get a ſtronger ſavour, to go beyond the Artificer at his own weapon, to fancy a command to the *Biſhop* to obey himſelf, to *Pope Clemens* to be ſubject to *Clemens* the *Pope*? If the *ſuppoſititious Clemens* had written at that rate, he had certainly never impoſed on any. But I muſt not adviſe my *Monitor*, elſe he ſhould have rendred the *Greek* in plain *Engliſh*, and ſpared that whether Paraphraſe, or Inſertion [*All Popes.*]

16. The laſt place produced out of the teſtimonies cited in the *Diſſertations*, is indeed to be found in *Voſſius*'s Edition, and the *Mediceun Copy* of our *Epiſtles*. And the producing of that from thence, and mentioning it as produced by me, is an evidence that the *Prefacer* knew the way, if he had pleaſed to make uſe of it, to have cited none but *Genuine Teſtimonies*: For all ſuch, as far as the uncorrupted Copies would afford, were by me ſet down to his hand: But that method was not, it ſeems, for his turn; the Reader could not have been ſo amuzed with a multitude of odious paſſages out of *Ignatius*, if this, as fairer, ſo eaſier courſe had been taken.

17. For this one place then, where the *genuine Ignatius* bids them, or rather exhorts *Polycarp* the *Biſhop* to adviſe them, *to give heed to the Biſhop, that God may attend to them*, and adds, *my ſoul for theirs who obey the Biſhop, Presbyters, and Deacons*] though I cannot wonder that in theſe days there are ſome, who are not well qualified to ſay *Amen* to it; yet being taken as it was meant by that holy man, there is certainly nothing in it to be ſtartled at, or improbable to be written by the Saint *Ignatius*. 'Tis in the *Epiſtle* to *Polycarp*, and it concerns the Church under him. And at that time it appears the *Gnoſtick hereticks* were infuſing their poiſon there, and their firſt artifice of inſinuation was, taking upon them to underſtand or know more than their *Biſhop* or *Teacher* did, though he the moſt famous Doctor of all *Aſia*, διδάσκαλος Ἀποστολικὸς, καὶ προφητικὸς, and διδάσκαλος ἐπίσημος, *an Apoſtolick, and Prophetick, and illuſtrious Doctor*, ſaith the *Epiſtle* of the Church of *Smyrna* concerning him. This is ſet down in the words precedent, ἐὰν καυχήσεταί τις ἀπὸ λιπὸς, καὶ ἐὰν γνωσθῇ παλίον τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, ἐφθάρται, *If a man aſſume and boaſt of his knowledge, take upon him to know more than the Biſhop*, by this you may know that he hath imbibed and ſuckt in that *Gnoſtick poiſon* (that makes him ſo ſwell preſently.) And in oppoſition to theſe it is, and upon perfect knowledge of their *Biſhop*, that he thus proceeds to exhort and conjure them to attend to their *Biſhop*, and not to ſuch aſſuming *Corehs*; and to do it more effectually, offers to jeopard his ſoul for theirs, that they ſhall ſuffer no damage for ſo doing. And ſuppoſing the *Biſhop* to be in the right, *Orthodox* and careful to build them up in the truth, and that the *hereticks* which advanced themſelves above the *Biſhop*, deſign'd that which would be their ruine and perdition, if they ſucceed in their attempt (as it is certain that this muſt, at this time, in this matter, be ſuppoſed) what danger was *Ignatius* in, by venturing his Soul in this manner? This certainly he might do, as far as ἀντίψυχος ἐγὼ reacheth (no more than this, that he durſt or would

be

be content to venture it) though his ſoul (nay more than his life, which he now more than ventured) was not his own to diſpoſe of.

SECT. IV.

Of the three Orders in the Church. Of the Order of Presbyters when it came in. No mention of it in Clemens Romanus, *or* Polycarp, *but in* Ignatius. Lombards *words of the two Orders. The Popiſh Doctrine concerning Biſhops.*

FRom theſe premiſes thus laid, and, I ſuppoſe, by this time, removed out of the way, from being occaſion of ſtumbling to any, he now proceeds to infer his *concluſion*, thus; 1.

"Upon theſe, and many more the like accounts do the Epiſtles ſeem to me to be like the children "that the *Jews* had by their ſtrange wives, *Neh.* 13. who ſpake part the language of *Aſhdod*, and "part the language of the *Jews*. That there are in them many footſteps of a gracious ſpirit, every "way worthy of, and becoming the great and holy perſonage whoſe they are eſteemed, ſo there is "evidently a mixture of the working of that worldly and carnal ſpirit, which in his days was not ſo "let looſe as in after times. For what is there in the Scripture, what is in the genuine Epiſtle "of *Clemens*; that gives countenance to thoſe deſcriptions of Epiſcopacy, Biſhops, and the ſubjecti-"on to them, that are in thoſe Epiſtles (as now we have them) ſo inſiſted on? What Titles are "given to Biſhops? What Soveraignty, Power, Rule, Dominion is aſcribed to them? Is there any "thing of the like nature in the Writings of the Apoſtles? In *Clemens*, the Epiſtle of *Polycarpus*, "&c.? or any unqueſtionable legitimate off-ſpring of any of the firſt Worthies of Chriſtianity? "Whence have they their three Orders of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, upon the diſtinct ob-"ſervation of which, ſo much weight is laid? Is there any one word, iota, tittle, or ſyllable in the "whole Book of God giving countenance to any ſuch diſtinctions? *Eph.* 4. 11. We have Paſtors "and Teachers, *Rom.* 12. 7, 8. Him that teacheth, him that exhorteth, him that ruleth, and him "that ſheweth mercy, *Phil.* 1. 1. We have Biſhops and Deacons; and their Inſtitutions with the or-"der of it, we have at large expreſſed 1 *Tim.* 3. 1, 2. Biſhops and Deacons without the interpoſition "of any other Order whatſoever; Deacons we have appointed *Acts* 7. and Elders *Acts* 14. 23. thoſe "who are Biſhops we find called Presbyters *Tit.* 1. 5, 7. And thoſe who are Presbyters we find called "Biſhops *Acts* 20. 28. So that Deacons we know, and Biſhops who are Presbyters, or Presbyters "who are Biſhops we know, but Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons, as three diſtinct Orders in the "Church, from the Scripture we know not. Neither did *Clemens* in his Epiſtle to the *Corinthians* "know any more than we do, which a few inſtances will manifeſt: Saith he, ſpeaking of the "Apoſtles, Καὶ χώρας δὴ καὶ πόλεις κηρύσσοντες, καθίσανον τὰς ἀπαρχὰς αὐτῶν, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, "εἰς ἐπισκόπους καὶ διακόνους τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν· καὶ τοῦτο οὐ καινῶς, ἐκ γὰρ δὴ πολλῶν χρόνων ἐγέγραπτο περὶ ἐπι-"σκόπων καὶ διακόνων ---- Biſhops and Deacons (as in the Church at *Philippi*) this man knows, but the "third Order he is utterly unacquainted withal. And that the difference of this mans expreſſions "concerning Church Rulers from thoſe in the Epiſtle under conſideration, may the better appear; "and his aſſerting of Biſhops and Presbyters to be one and the ſame, may the more clearly be evi-"denced, I ſhall tranſcribe one other paſſage from him, whoſe length I hope will be excuſed from "the uſefulneſs of it to the purpoſe in hand, *Page* 57, 58. Καὶ οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου "ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἔρις ἔσται περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, διὰ ταύτην οὖν αἰτίαν, πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, "κατέστησαν τοὺς προειρημένους, καὶ μεταξὺ ἐπινομὴν δεδώκασιν, ὅπως, ἐὰν κοιμηθῶσιν, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμέ-"νοι ἄνδρες τὴν λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν, τοὺς ἐν καλοκαθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν συνευδο-"κησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης (for ſo it ſeems, was the manner of the Church in his days, that their Of-"ficers were appointed by the conſent of the whole Church) καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ "Χριστοῦ μετὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης, ἡσύχως, καὶ ἀβασάνιστως μεμαρτυρημένους τὸ πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων, τούτους οὐ δικαί-"ως νομίζομεν ἀποβάλλεσθαι τῆς λειτουργίας. ἁμαρτία γὰρ οὐ μικρὰ ἡμῖν ἔσται ἐὰν τοὺς ἀμέμπτως καὶ ὁσίως προσενέγκαντας "τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποβάλλωμεν. Μακάριοι οἱ προδοιπορήσαντες πρεσβύτεροι (or the Biſhops of whom he "was ſpeaking) ὅτινες ἔγκαρπον καὶ τελείαν ἔσχον τὴν ἀνάλυσιν, &c. And ſundry other diſcoveries are "there in that Epiſtle of the like nature: It is not my deſign nor purpoſe to inſiſt upon the parity of "Biſhops and Presbyters, or rather the Identity of the Office denoted by ſundry appellations from "theſe, and the like places: This work is done to the full by *Blondellus*, that our labour in this "kind (were that the purpoſe in hand) is prevented. He that thinks the arguments of that Learn-"ned man to this purpoſe are indeed anſwered throughly, and removed by D. *H.* in his fourth *Diſ-"ſertation*, where he propoſes them to conſideration, may one day think it needful to be able to di-"ſtinguiſh between words and things. That *Clemens* owns in a Church but two ſorts of Officers, "the firſt whereof he calls ſometimes Biſhops, ſometimes Presbyters, the other Deacons, the Doctor "himſelf doth not deny. That in the judgment of *Clemens* no more were inſtituted in the Church "is no leſs evident. And this carries the conviction of its truth ſo clearly with it, that *Lombard* "himſelf confeſſes, *Hos ſolos miniſtrorum duos ordines Eccleſiam primitivam habuiſſe, & de his ſolis præ-"ceptum Apoſtoli nos habere, lib.* 4. *ſent. D.* 24.

To ſuperſede a *concluſion* not *magiſterially* dictated (that were the confidence quarrell'd at in me) but regularly inferr'd from the premiſes, there can be no more neceſſary than to diſcover the falſe-neſs of the premiſes, or their weakneſs and incompetency to induce that *concluſion*. And this being already done particularly and at large, 'tis impertinent to give any further anſwer to, or account of this 2.

concluſion. I ſhall only lightly paſs through the ſeveral ſteps of it, and acknowledge of his *concluſion*, as much as either here, or from the premiſes I find any reaſon to acknowledge, and briefly touch at the reaſons (before more largely rendred) why other parts of it may not be conſented to.

3. And 1. what he ſaith of theſe *Epiſtles*, that they ſeem like the children of the ſtrange wives, [*ſpeaking part the language of* Aſhdod, *and part the language of the Jews*] hath perfect truth in it, being applied to the former corrupt *Editions* of *Ignatius*; but none at all, nor any appearance of any, as it is applied to that volume, by which we deſired to be judged, in the buſineſs of *Epiſcopacy*.

4. *Secondly*, what is by theſe *Epiſtles*, as they are in our more *emendate Copies*, affirmed of *Biſhops*, is very agreeable to what is by the Scripture, by *Clemens*, by *Polycarp*, ſaid of the ſame ſubject, all which under the name of Ἐπίσκοποι, Ποιμένες, Διδάσκαλοι, Πρεσβύτεροι, Ἡγούμενοι, and the like, deſcribe their office, and require ſubjection and obedience to be paid to them.

5. *Thirdly*, for the *three orders*, particularly for the *ſecond* of thoſe *three*, which anciently, and ſtill (but either rarely, or not at all in the Scripture) are called *Presbyters*, but may moſt diſtinctly be ſtiled *Presbyteri ſecundarii*, or *partiarii*, *Elders* of a *ſecond rank*, admitted to the exerciſe of ſome parts of the *Epiſcopal* office, but not to all, and ſo diſtinguiſht from *Biſhops*, or *Elders* of the firſt rank, theſe the *Prefacer* cannot but know that I do not undertake to find either in the Scripture, or in *Clement*'s, or in *Polycarp*'s *Epiſtle*, and that though I have reaſons to aſſure me, that when the number of believers increaſed ſo far, that there was both need of them, and competent ſtore of fit perſons to undergo that office, then ſuch *Presbyters* were ordained to bear part of the burthen with the *Biſhop*, as the *ſeventy Elders* with *Moſes* (and I have competent reaſons to perſwade me, that this was done, in ſome places, before the departure or deceaſe of all the *quire* of *Apoſtles*, particularly that S. *John* inſtituted ſuch in *Aſia*, when he * did ὅλας ἀεμόζειν ἐκκλησίας) yet this was not ſo univerſally done thus early, as that either the Writers of the Scripture could, or after them *Clement* at *Rome* ſhould be required to make mention of it: And for *Polycarp*, though I ſuppoſe, and doubt not but he lived to ſee ſuch in the Church, yet there was no neceſſity that in that one *Epiſtle* of his, he ſhould mention them, or uſe the word Πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders*, of any others but *Biſhops*; it being certain that after the *ſecundary Presbyters* were inſtituted, the name Πρεσβύτεροι ſtill continued common to *Biſhops*, and was not preſently appropriated to *Presbyters*, as is elſewhere made clear out of *Iræneus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus* and *Tertullian*, *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 22. and in the vindication of them from the exceptions of the *London Miniſters*.

* *Clem.* Ὑποτυπ. *apud Euſeb. l.* 2. *c.* xv.

6. It remains therefore that the *Epiſtles* of *Ignatius* are the beſt records of *Primitive Antiquity*, on which to build this *ſecond Order* of *Secundarie*, or *Partiarie Presbyters*; which if they were inſtituted perſonally by S. *John*, or if they were deſigned by the other *Apoſtles*, and not ordained in their times, only becauſe thus early (νέα ὄντα κηρύγματα and πλήθος μὴ ὄντα, in *Epiphanius*'s ſtile) there was no need of them; their *Inſtitution* will ſtill be *Apoſtolical*, though not mentioned in the *Apoſtles* writings; as in the *Anſwer* to the *London Aſſemblers* hath been ſhewn alſo.

7. *Fourthly*, concerning the title of *Paſtors* and *Doctors*, or *Teachers*, Διδάσκαλοι in Scripture, he cannot but know the account given by me, *viz.* that by all, and each of thoſe, *Biſhops* are to be underſtood, as hath been ſhewed *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 14, 15. and nothing being here ſaid to diſprove it, 'tis but *petitio principii* to ſuppoſe the contrary: So alſo of Ἡγούμενοι *Rulers*, I have ſpoken at large, *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 13. The like of Ἐπίσκοποι, when they have none but *Deacons* joyn'd with them, *Phil.* 1. 1. and 1 *Tim.* 3. All which are perfectly agreeable to my *hypotheſis*, that there are no *ſingle Presbyters*, or *middle order* of *Officers* betwixt *Biſhops* and *Deacons* that I diſcern mention'd in Scripture. So the uſe of Πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders* for *Biſhops*, *Tit.* 1. 5, 7. is by me acknowledged (though not of *Biſhops* for *Presbyters*, which conceit it as largely * elſewhere confuted.

* *Diſſ* 4. *c.* 8. *Vindic.* of *Diſſ. c.* 3 *ſect.* 19. *n.* 27.

8. And for the *two large* and expreſs places here tranſcribed out of *Clemens*, they had before been particularly produced by me, and found perfectly to conſent, and accord with the notions, which out of Scripture I had received, and which by *Epiphanius* were vouched ἐκ βαθυλάτων ἱστορίων, *out of the profoundeſt Records*. And for *Blondel*'s *collection* to the contrary, I ſhall hope that to other men my anſwers will appear more than verbal, and though I have here ſomewhat an unkind character given me of them, *viz.* that they that approve them *may one day think it needful* to diſtinguiſh *between words and things*, yet I am not quite diſcouraged, being competently aſſured, that if he that ſaid ſo, had had any thing elſe to ſay, any more than words to object againſt them, he would not have been ſo reſerved, or ſparing of his pains, as to have denied it place in his *Animadverſions*.

9. *Laſtly*, 'Tis evident (what he ſaith) *that I do not deny* Clement's *owning but two ſorts of Officers in a Church*, *Biſhops* (ſometimes called alſo Πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders*) and *Deacons*: But it is as evident by my words, what I mean, and by *Clement*'s words, that I mean as he doth, *viz.* that at the *Apoſtles* firſt preaching and planting the Faith in Cities and Regions, before any multitude of Believers came in, they conſtituted in each City no more but a *Biſhop*, and one, or more *Deacons*, after the exemplar in *Jeruſalem*, where *James* the *Lord's Brother*, ſoon after our Saviours aſcenſion, was conſtituted *Biſhop* there, and *ſeven Deacons*, *Acts* 6. to attend him, but as yet no *Presbyters* of any middle order between them and him.

10. This I have cleared concerning thoſe firſt times, out of *Epiphanius*, and taken notice of the cauſes of it, intimated both by *Clemens* and him, 1. The paucity of fit men for that office, οὐκ ἐυρέθησαν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρεσβύτεροι καθισταθῆναι, *there were not found among them* men fit *to be conſtituted Presbyters*; and 2. The no need of any more at that time, ἠρκέσθησαν ἐπὶ τῷ κατὰ τόπον μόνῳ ἐπισκόπῳ, *a Biſhop in each City or Region ſerved the turn* (only he could not be without a *Deacon*) which is the more manifeſt, becauſe the *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, which were then inſtituted, were (as in the former of theſe teſtimonies from *Clemens* appears) the ἀπαρχαὶ, the *firſt-fruits* of their *labours*, their *firſt converts*, and the flock aſſigned them, the μέλλοντες πιστεύειν, thoſe that *ſhould afterwards believe*.

11. To this if the words of *Lombard* would agree (as they will, ſo far as here cited, if only by *Eccleſia Primitiva* we underſtand the *firſt age*, or infancy of the Church, at the time of the νέον κήρυγμα, the *firſt preaching* of the *Apoſtles*) then that teſtimony would by me be fully ſubſcribed alſo, meaning by the *duos ordines*, the *Biſhops* truly ſo called (and by him ſtiled *Epiſcopos & Presbyteros*) and *Deacons*, concerning

cerning whom, and whom only, 'tis true, *præceptum Apoſtoli nos habere*, that *we have the precept of the Apoſtle*, viz. S. *Paul* in his *Epiſtles* to *Timothy* and *Titus*. But the truth is, *Lombard*'s words belong to another matter, a nicety that is gotten into their Schools, that *Epiſcopacy* and *Presbytery* are not *diverſi ordines*, but *diverſi gradus*, not *different orders*, but only *different degrees* of the ſame one *order* of *Sacerdotium* or *Prieſthood*, upon a fancy that *Sacerdos* is ſo called from *ſacra do*, *delivering*, or *imparting holy things*; ſo ſaith he expreſly, *Ideo autem etiam Presbyteri ſacerdotes vocantur, quia ſacrum dant*, *Presbyters are alſo called Prieſts*, *becauſe they give holy things*. In which matter as it is of little importance which way the queſtion is decided, as long as the ſuperiority of *Biſhops* over *Presbyters* is agreed on to be ſuch, as hath ſome *Powers* reſerved to the one, which are not common to the other, ſo if *Lombard*'s words ſhould by any be thought farther extenſible, as founded in that opinion, that firſt *Presbyters* ruled in comnion, and that beſide them there were none then but *Deacons*, I muſt then think it as reaſonable for me to be permitted to forſake *Lombard* in this, as the *Prefacer* will deem it for him to depart from him in other matters.

For though it be here ſet down as an argument of the evidence and clear conviction, and ſo of much 12.
more, than of the bare truth of the poſition, that *Lombard himſelf confeſſeth it* (which, I ſuppoſe, is not an acknowledgment that all that *Lombard* ſaith is *true*, but an inſinuation that this of *Biſhops*, as maintained by me, is for the matter a *Popiſh Doctrine*, and yet is in this particular rejected, and the contrary confeſt by *Lombard* an *eminent Popiſh Doctor*) yet I muſt crave leave to interpoſe my exceptions to this way of arguing or concluding.

1. That neither I, nor any true member of the Church of *England*, owe or pay any obſervance to 13.
the bare dictates of *Lombard*, or indeed farther than he hath reaſons or proofs of Scripture or Antiquity to confirm them.

2. That in this point, which muſt be waged by *Teſtimonies*, there are none produced, I ſhall add, 14.
producible by him out of Scripture, to prove that ever there was a time, when there were in the Church none but thoſe two orders of *Presbyters* (in our modern notion) and *Deacons*; I may (without immoderate confidence) aſſume, that all that can be offer'd to this purpoſe, are conſider'd, and anſwer'd in the *Diſſertations*.

3. That the principal *Teſtimonies* of *Antiquity*, on which in this matter ſome *Papiſts* build, being 15.
ſome obſcure words of S. *Hierom* the *Presbyter*, which yet muſt be ſo underſtood, as to be reconciled with his making the *three orders* to be of *Apoſtolical tradition*, the reſult muſt be this, that though they are miſtaken in ſome circumſtances, yet they maintain with us the more ſubſtantial truth, that *Biſhops* are inſtituted by the *Apoſtles*.

So 'tis elſewhere made evident of *Panormitan*, who though he affirm, that *immediately after the* 16.
death of Chriſt, *all the Presbyters in common ruled the Church*, yet *poſtmodum*, ſaith he, *ordinaverunt* *L. 1. Decret. de*
Apoſtoli ut crearentur Epiſcopi, *& certa Sacramenta eis reſervarunt*, *illa interdicendo ſimplicibus Presby-* *Conſuet. c. 4.*
teris, *Within a while the Apoſtles ordain'd that Biſhops ſhould be created*, *and reſerved certain Sacraments to them* (*Confirmation* and *Ordination*) *and forbad them to be medled with by ſimple Presbyters*. And accordingly it is alſo in the forecited place of *Lombard*, in the beginning of that 24 *Diſt. Presbyteri*, *licèt ſint Sacerdotes*, *tamen Pontificatus apicem non habent*, *ſicut Epiſcopi*, *quia ipſi nec chriſmate frontem ſignant*, *nec Paracletum dant*, *quod ſolis deberi Epiſcopis*, *lectio Actorum Apoſtolorum demonſtrat*. *Presbyters though they be Prieſts*, *yet have not that ſuperior part of the Pontificate*, *which the Biſhops have*, *becauſe they neither Confirm nor Ordain*, *which*, *that it belongs to the Biſhop only*, *the reading of the Acts of the Apoſtles demonſtrates*. Where whatever his opinion was concerning that nicety, of diſtinction betwixt Degree and Order, it is evident that he gives the ſuperiority of degree to *Biſhops*, and reſerves to them thoſe two Powers, and foundeth this in the *Apoſtles* times and practice.

4. That though this may ſeem at the firſt, but a ſlight difference in theſe men from that which the 17.
Ancients have more generally taught, *viz.* that the *Apoſtles* firſt inſtituted *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, not *ſimple Presbyters* and *Deacons* (as beſide the plain words of *Clemens* and S. *Paul*, the ſence whereof may poſſibly be controverted, the teſtimony of *Epiphanius*, and of the profoundeſt monuments of Hiſtory irrefragably inforceth) yet their intereſts for the magnifying of the *Papacy*, upon the ſcore of ſucceſſion to S. *Peter*, do clearly diſcover themſelves in this way of deciſion, and ſo make *Papiſts* very incompetent witneſſes in this matter.

For upon this conceit [that there was a time in the firſt plantation of the *Goſpel*, when the power 18.
of *Biſhops* and *Prieſts* lay confuſed, though afterward ſeparated by the *Apoſtles* themſelves] the concluſion aimed at, and, when occaſion requires, deduced by them, is evident, that this later, though *Apoſtolical inſtitution*, may be altered by the *Pope*, out of the ſupereminence of his power, as he is the *Vicar* of *CHRIST*, though they pretend not, that he may lawfully attempt to overthrow the primary and fundamental Sanction. And ſo, though *Prieſthood* may not be taken out of the Church, yet the tenure, by which *Biſhops* hold, is not ſo firm; but muſt ſtand wholly at the pleaſure of the *Pope*.

The defence of which concluſion, being none of the Intereſts of the Cauſe, which I aſſert, I ſhall 19.
no farther be obliged to hearken to the premiſes, as they are here but intimated by *Lombard*, and frequently repeated and built upon by ſundry of that party, than they ſhall be able regularly to prove them: Which being not here attempted, but only the ſpecious (but fallacious) argument propoſed from the confeſſion of *Lombard* himſelf (whoſe confeſſions are no obligations to all other men) I have no more occaſion to inlarge on this particular.

Which if it were ſeaſonable, I might eaſily do, in obſerving other particulars among the *Popiſh* 20.
Writers, wherein they ſhew themſelves far from paſſionate eſpouſers of *Epiſcopacy*. The *Pope*, forſooth, muſt be the fountain of all Eccleſiaſtical authority, and all other *Rivulets* muſt run in a weak ſtream, and then alſo derive all they have from him. And ſo much on occaſion of this teſtimony from *Lombard*, and much more than was neceſſary to have ſaid, if I had lookt no farther than his *Teſtimony*.

CHAP. IV.

Concerning the Power of the People in appointing Biſhops, and Deacons, and other Eccleſiaſtical affairs.

SECT. I.

Clement's *words,* Συνευδοκησάσης πάσης τ ἐκκλησίας, *conſidered, and vindicated.* Συνευδοκεῖν. Πνεύματι δοκιμάζειν. Ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες. *The firſt Biſhops deſigned particularly by God. When this way of deſignation ceaſed.*

1. UPON occaſion of the former citation of ſome words out of *Clemens*, the diſpleaſure is for a while removed from *Ignatius*, and another matter of diſcourſe is ſprung, concerning the power of the People in appointing *Biſhops* and *Deacons* to their office in thoſe days. To this we ſhall now attend, as it follows, in theſe words;

2. "It ſeems moreover that thoſe Biſhops and Deacons in thoſe days (as was obſerved) were appointed to the office by, and with the conſent of the people, or whole body of the Church; no leſs do thoſe words import, συνευδοκησάσης τ ἐκκλησίας πάσης. Our Doctor indeed renders thoſe words, *applaudente aut congratulante Eccleſiâ totâ*, and adds (*ſatis pro imperio*) *nihil hic de acceptatione totius Eccleſiæ, ſine quâ Epiſcopos & Diaconos ab Apoſtolis & Apoſtolicis viris conſtitutos non eſſe, ex hoc loco concludit* Blondellus, *quaſi qui ex Dei juſſu & approbatione conſtituebantur, populi etiam acceptatione indigere putandi eſſent, Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 7, 8, 10. And who dares take that confidence upon him, as to affirm any more, what ſo great a Doctor hath denied? Though the ſcope of the place, the nature of the thing, and firſt moſt common ſence of the word here uſed, being willingly to conſent (as it is alſo uſed in the Scripture for the moſt part, *Acts* 8. 1. 1 *Cor.* 7. 12.) to a thing to be done, or to the doing of it, yet here it muſt be taken to applaud or congratulate, or what elſe our Doctor pleaſes, becauſe he will have it ſo. Ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες alſo muſt be *viri Apoſtolici*, men with Apoſtolical power, when they are only the choice men of the Church where ſuch a Conſtitution of Officers is had, that are intended, becauſe it is our Doctors purpoſe to have the words ſo rendred: *Ex juſſu Dei & approbatione*, is added, as though any particular command or approbation of God were intimated, for the conſtitution of the Biſhops and Deacons mention'd, beyond the inſtitution of the Lord *Jeſus* Chriſt, that Elders ſhould be ordained in every Church, becauſe this would ſeem to be excluſive wholly of the conſent of the people, as any way needful or required to their Conſtitution, which yet, as it is practically falſe, no ſuch thing being mention'd by *Clemens*, who recounteth the way and means whereby Officers were continued in the Church, even after the deceaſe of the Apoſtles, and thoſe firſt ordained by them to that holy employment, ſo alſo it is argumentatively weak and unconcluding. God appointed, deſigned *Saul* to be King, approving of his ſo being, and yet he would have the people come together to chuſe him. So alſo was it in the caſe of *David*. Though the Apoſtles in the name and the authority of God, appointed the Deacons of the Church at *Jeruſalem*, yet they would have the whole Church look out among themſelves the men to be appointed. And that the ordaining of the Elders was with the peoples Election, *Acts* 14. 23. It will ere long be manifeſted, that neither our Doctor, nor any of his Aſſociates have as yet diſproved. This poor thing the people, being the peculiar people of Chriſt, the heritage of God, and holy Temple unto him, *&c.* will one day be found to be another manner of thing, than many of our great Doctors have ſuppoſed. But he informs us, *Cap.* 4. *Sect.* 3. from that teſtimony which we cited before, that the Apoſtles in the appointment of Biſhops and Deacons (for ſo the words expreſly are) are ſaid τῷ πνεύματι δοκιμάσαι, *i. e.* ſaith he, *Revelationibus edoctos eſſe, quibus demùm hæc dignitas communicanda eſſet*, that is, that they appointed thoſe whom God revealed to them in an extraordinary manner to be ſo ordained, and this is the meaning of τῷ πνεύματι δοκιμάζοντες. And why ſo? the holy Ghoſt orders concerning the appointment of Deacons δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, 1 *Tim.* 3. 10. That thoſe, who are to be taken into office and power in the Church, had need firſt to be tried and approved, is granted. And this work the Apoſtles give to the multitude of the Church, *Acts* 6. Where yet after the peoples Election, and the Apoſtles approbation, and the trial of both, one that was choſen, is ſuppoſed to have proved none of the beſt. And yet of him, and them, are the Apoſtles ſaid by *Clemens* that they did τῷ πνεύματι δοκιμάσαι. But how ſhall it be made to appear, that *ſpiritu probantes*, trying or proving by the ſpirit, or ſpiritually proving them, to try whether they were able Miniſters of the New Teſtament, not of the Letter, but of the Spirit, proving them by that Spirit, which was promiſed unto them to lead them into all truth, muſt needs ſignifie, they were taught whom they ſhould appoint by immediate Revelation. To prove by the Spirit, or ſpiritually the perſons that are to be made Miniſters or Biſhops, is to have their names revealed to us. *Stephen* is ſaid to ſpeak ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, *Acts* 6. 10. And *Paul* purpoſed ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, *Acts* 19. 21. and we are ſaid to ſerve God ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, *Gal.* 5. 5. and to make ſupplication ἐν τῷ πνεύματι, *Eph.* 6. 18. with many more expreſſions of the like nature. Does all this relate to immediate Revelation, and are all things done thereby which we are ſaid to do in the ſpirit? Before we were inſtructed in this myſtery, and were informed that δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι did ſignifie to be taught by Revelation, we had thought that the expreſſion of doing any thing τῷ πνεύματι had manifeſted the aſſiſtance, guidance, and direction, which for the doing of it we receive by the holy and bleſſed Spirit of God promiſed unto

"us,

"us, and beſtowed on, in, and through the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Yea, but he adds that it is alſo ſpo-
"ken of the Apoſtles, προγνωσιν *præcognitionem* (*i. e.*) *revelationem* ἐληφότες τελείαν, they appointed
"them Biſhops and Deacons by the helps and preſence of the Spirit with them, the Apoſtles exami-
"ned, tried thoſe who were to be appointed Biſhops, ſo obtaining and receiving a perfect foreknow-
"ledge or knowledge of them before their admiſſion into office. This alſo expreſſes revelation
"(προγνωσιν ἐληφότες) upon trial it was revealed unto them, and ſo muſt any thing elſe be allowed
"to be, that our Doctor will have to be ſo, now he is aſſerting to that purpoſe. But had the ἀλλό-
"γιμοι ἄνδρες, who appointing Biſhops and Deacons after the Apoſtles time, had they alſo this ſpe-
"cial Revelation? Or may they not be ſaid δοκιμάσαι τῷ πνεύματι? If not, how will you look upon
"them under the notion of ἀλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, who neglected ſo great a duty: If they did, let us
"know when this way of conſtituting Church Officers by immediate revelation ceaſed, and what
"was afterwards took up in the room thereof: and who they were that firſt proceeded on another
"account, and on what Authority they did it? There are a generation of men in the world, will
"thank the Doctor for this inſinuation, and will tye knots upon it, that will trouble him to looſe.

I ſhall not here ſuffer my ſelf to be detain'd by the ſcoffs and accuſations of affirming *pro imperio*, 3.
&c. with which I am very liberally treated, but, withal, before this time, ſo familiarly acquainted,
that I can look on them as parts of his ſtile, as *idioms* of his *Dialect*, and nothing elſe. All that can
pertain to me, by way of vindication, is, intirely to ſet down what it is I have ſaid, and then to re-
move whatſoever appearance of *reply*, or *objection* I can here diſcern to be made to it.

Upon theſe words of *Clement* [συνευδοκησάσης ἡ ἐκκλησίας πάσης] delivered about the ordaining or 4.
conſtituting of *Biſhops* by the Apoſtles and other ἀλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες, *D. Blondel* had inferr'd this concluſion [*Epiſcopos & Diaconos Apoſtolis Apoſtoliciſque viris, nunquam niſi totâ acceptante Eccleſiâ conſtitutos eſſe*] *that Biſhops and Deacons were never conſtituted by the Apoſtles or Apoſtolical perſons, unleſs the whole Church accepted them.*] This concluſion he thus crudely inferr'd, without any one ſyllable added to confirm it, leaving it to ſecure and ſuſtain it ſelf by theſe few words of *Clement*'s teſtimony.

The teſtimony, wherein thoſe words were contained, being by me laid down at length, and con- 5.
ſidered as far as was uſeful to the main Queſtion concerning *Epiſcopacy*, I could not fitly take farther
notice of thoſe few words of it, and his concluſion haſtily collected from them, than to ſay that there
was *nothing in it concerning the neceſſity of that acceptation of the Church*, which *Blondel* concluded
thence; And this I choſe to do παρέργως, *in paſſing*, and in a *parentheſis*, not willing to detain the
Reader any longer ſo impertinently, adding only a ſhort reaſon, why I could not conceive that the
Biſhops by them conſtituted, could want the approbation of the Church, *becauſe it had formerly been
ſaid of them by* Clement, *that they were conſtituted by the appointment and approbation of God*, which I
ſuppoſed muſt neceſſarily ſuperſede all want of the Churches approbation. And upon theſe grounds
I rendred the phraſe συνευδοκησάσης ἡ ἐκκλησίας πάσης, not as *D. Blondel* had done, *acceptante ſimul univerſâ Eccleſiâ*, but *applaudente aut congratulante totâ Eccleſiâ, the whole Church applauding or congratulating.*

In this paſſage thus truly related, in every circumſtance, I hope 'tis already clear, that I was not 6.
guilty of any imperious or magiſterial affirming (which I diſlike ſo much in others, that I would be
very ſorry to be found guilty of it) when to a poſitive unconfirm'd concluſion, I made reply by giving my reaſon, why I could not conſent that it was duly inferr'd from thoſe words in *Clement*.

And for the thing it ſelf, the matter of my affirming, being now excited to it, I ſhall give a full 7.
account of it, though there it had been impertinent to do ſo.

And that 1. by conſidering the force of the word συνευδοκησάσης, 2. the poſition of it in that place, 8.
3. the circumſtances of the context, which preclude *Blondel*'s, and inforce my interpretation.

The word εὐδοκεῖν] is known to ſignifie [being *well pleaſed*] ſo συνευδοκεῖν is either ſimply the 9.
ſame, or with the connotation of a relation to ſome other, whether perſons or matter, formerly
ſpoken of. So 1 *Mac.* 1. 57. ὅστις συνευδόκει τῷ νόμῳ, *if any were well pleaſed with the Law*, i. e. *reſolved* to live according to the *Moſaical inſtitution*, ſuch as are there joyn'd with thoſe *with whom was
found the Book of the Teſtament*, they that would not forſake the *Jewiſh* obſervances, upon *Antiochus* his prohibition of them. So again, the ſame ſort of men which would not live according to the *Kings heatheniſh commands*, but kept cloſe to the *Jewiſh laws*, are ſaid μὴ συνευδοκεῖν τῇ μεταθέσει, *not to be well pleaſed with the change*, 1 *Mac.* 11. 24. we render it in both places *conſenting* and *not conſenting*, but ſure it ſignifies not any legal conſent asked of them, at the conſtituting either of the *Law* by *God*, or of the *change* by *Antiochus*, but an *acquieſcence*, or *peaceable*, *willing*, *conſtant ſubmiſſion* and *obedience* to it. Elſewhere we render it being *well pleaſed with*, 2 *Mac.* 11. 35. where yet the matter ſpoken of, makes it a more formal act of conſent, than in either of the former it had been. *Whatſoever* (ſay the *Conſuls*) Lyſias *hath granted*, ᾧ ἡμεῖς συνευδοκήμεν, *therewith we alſo are well pleaſed*, which indeed is a confirmation of *Lyſias*'s act or grant.

Theſe are all the places where the word in that double compoſition is found in the *Greek*, whether 10.
Canonical or *Apocryphal* of the *Old Teſtament*. In the *New* we have it, *Luke* 11. 48. where of the *Jews* it is ſaid, that they did συνευδοκεῖν, *allow*, or *approve* their *Fathers works*, thoſe which they had done long ſince, and wherein their approbation was never asked, *the killing of the Prophets*, *ver.* 47. So *Acts* 8. 1. of *Sauls concurrence* in S. *Stephens* death, ſo far as to keep the cloaths of the Executioners, which ſignified him to have been an active perſon in that murther, to have had a ſpecial liking to it, not again any act of legal conſent; for all was there done without legal proceſs, *judicio zelotarum*, by the (*judgment*, or rather) *popular fury* of *Zelots*. So again *Rom.* 1. 32. συνευδοκοῦσι τοῖς πράσσουσι, *They take pleaſure*, ſay we, *in them that do them.* There I think *Theophylact*'s *Scholion* is very proper, συνηγοροῦσι τῷ κακῷ, they not only do unlawful things themſelves, but *plead for wickedneſs*, are Advocates for thoſe that commit any the fouleſt evil. So again 1 *Cor.* 7. 12. of the Chriſtian man or woman that hath an unbeliever to wife or husband, εἰ συνευδοκεῖ οἰκεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ, if the *unbelieving* man *be pleaſed*, *think good*, *be content to live with* the *Chriſtian*; or if we render it again, *conſent*,

ſent, yet ſure we muſt not mean any *legal conſent*, for that had been formerly given in marriage, and no new act of it, is now needful in the unbeliever, but only a being content to continue to live with her, which is there oppoſed to *departing*, *ver.* 15.

11. By this view of the word in the Scripture, it already appears, how little ground there is for *D. Blondel*'s rendring of συνευδοκησάσης by *acceptante*, and his *concluſion* deduced from thence, of the neceſſity of the *whole Churches acceptation.* And againſt that only it was, that my words were directed, *nihil hic de acceptatione* --- there was no ſyllable in *Clemens*, from whence to conclude the neceſſity of ſuch acceptation. And unleſs I have miſtaken in this, certainly there is neither confidence nor magiſterial affirming imputable to me in this matter.

12. And it ſeems the *Prefacer* doth as little adhere to *Blondel*'s rendring, as I, for he renders it [*willing conſent*] And how knows he that I reject this rendring of *willing conſent*, or that if *Blondel* had ſo rendred it, I would then have rejected it. Truly if that conſent ſignifie no more than a voluntary act of acquieſcence and good liking (as *conſent* ordinarily ſignifies) I have no diſlike to that rendring; only I rather think the word here ſignifies a little more, (not *leſs*,) an outward expreſſion of this good liking; which was the only reaſon which moved me to uſe the phraſe [*applaudente aut congratulante*] meaning thereby, that the *Church* had expreſt that good liking and joy of theirs, which is more than their *bare conſent* to what was done, in the conſtitution of their *Biſhops*.

13. So that the *Prefacer* needed not to have undertaken this verbal contention with me, about the ſignification of an ordinary word. In that he really is at more peace with me, than it ſeems he knew of; and ſo men are apt to be, which begin and purſue quarrels, ſo haſtily and ſo keenly.

14. The truth is, it is the matter of the concluſion, which I then reſiſted in *Blondel*, and ſo muſt ſtill in the *Prefacer*; *Blondel* made the *people's acceptation*, a *ſine quâ non*, a *neceſſary condition*, affirming that *Biſhops*, &c. were *never conſtituted by the Apoſtles and Apoſtolical men*, *miſi*, unleſs they had this, which, I ſuppoſe, makes the *peoples acceptation previous* to the *Apoſtles* act, for if it followed after, it can be of no moment, the *Act* of the *Apoſtles* was compleat without it, and ſtood valid without it, and though it was moſt happy when it followed, yet ſtill this, as any other conſequent, muſt be accidental and extrinſecal to the Conſtitution of *Biſhops*, as that which *advenit enti in actu exiſtenti*, *comes to it when it is* (which is the definition of an accident) is no way required to, or conſtitutive of its being.

15. And ſo in like manner this *Prefacer* alſo, though he pretend only to the conſent of the people, yet by ſaying that the *Biſhops* were appointed to their *office by the conſent*] and by his after mention of his notion of συνευδοκεῖν, for *conſent to a thing to be done*, *or to the doing of it*, and laſtly by expreſſing his ſence of this conſent of the people, as of a thing needful, or required to the conſtitution of thoſe *Biſhops*, I am aſſured that he affirms this conſent of the people, to have been required and needful antecedently to the *Apoſtles* inſtituting *Biſhops* at that time.

16. And this is the thing that I ſtill profeſs not to believe concluſible from the words of *Clement*; and whether it be or no, let us now examine by proceeding to the ſecond and third things, even now propos'd by me, the poſition of this phraſe, and the circumſtances of the context in this place of *Clements*.

17. The poſition of the phraſe may firſt deſerve to be taken notice of, Τὺς καταςαθέντας ὑπ' ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, συνευδοκησάσης τῆ ἐκκλησίας πάσης καὶ λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως --- μεμαρτυρημένης τε ὑπὸ πολλοῖς χρόνοις ὑπὸ πάντων --- *Thoſe that were conſtituted by the Apoſtles, or after by other illuſtrious perſons, the whole Church expreſſing their good liking or conſent, and that have officiated without blame, and been well reported of by all for a long time*, &c. Here in ſetting down the unreaſonableneſs of the ſedition raiſed againſt their *Biſhops*, he aggravates it by theſe gradations, 1. that theſe *Biſhops* were conſtituted by the *Apoſtles*, or other illuſtrious perſons after them; 2. that when they were ſo conſtituted, the whole Church liked it very well, and expreſt their liking it, I mean the conſtituting them by the *Apoſtles*; 3. that being in office, they had *without blame diſcharged* it; 4. that for a long time they had *every mans good word*, though now they were ejected by them.

18. By this diſtinct view of the words 'tis plain, that the whether conſent or good liking, which the people thus expreſt, was after the *Apoſtles conſtituting* them; as after that again, their officiating, and after their officiating, their continued approbation. And indeed it were as reaſonable to affirm, the ſecond teſtimony or approbation [μεμαρτυρημένης, &c.] to be previous to their blameleſs officiating [λειτουργήσαντας ἀμέμπτως] as to ſay their conſent was needful or required to their conſtitution, *as to the thing to be done*, for that alſo ſuppoſeth it previous to it.

19. This was a competent ſecurity to me, that my rejecting *Blondel*'s concluſion, was no Magiſterial dictate of mine; But then the Circumſtances of the context through the whole *Epiſtle* make it moſt evident, that *Blondel* then was, and this *Prefacer* now is miſtaken.

20. For to repreſs the fury of the στασιασαὶ, *ſeditious* againſt their *Biſhops*, he had before immediately told them how theſe *Biſhops* were placed among them, *viz.* after this manner. The *Apoſtles* ἔγνωσαν διὰ --- χριστοῦ *knew* or *underſtood by Chriſt that there would be contention for the name or dignity of Biſhops*: For which cauſe, πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, κατέστησαν τὺς προειρημένους, *having received perfect foreknowledge, they conſtituted the foreſaid Biſhops*, and after left a liſt or roll (of *ſucceſſors*) that when any died, διαδέξωνται ἕτεροι δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες τὴ λειτουργίαν αὐτῶν, *Other approved perſons ſhould take up*, or *ſucceed to their office.*

21. Here the Queſtion may be, What is meant by δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες, *approved perſons*, and who had the approving them? For if the People had, then *Blondel* and the *Prefacer* are in the right; but if not, then ſtill here is nothing to be pretended for them.

22. And indeed, another (yet former) fundamental place of *Clement* in this *Epiſtle*, takes away all place of doubting, and tells us punctually whoſe approbation it was; *The Apoſtles*, ſaith he, *preaching through regions and cities*, *conſtituted their firſt* converts, δοκιμάσαντες τῷ πνεύματι, *examining* or *approving them by the ſpirit*, *to be Biſhops and Deacons*, τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν, *of thoſe which ſhould* come in to the *Faith.*

Here

Here 1. it is not imaginable how the examination and approbation could belong to the people, or the *whole Church*, when thoſe, over whom they were conſtituted, were not yet come in, they are made *Biſhops* ἢ μελλόντων πιστεύειν, *of thoſe which ſhould afterward* come in to the Faith. And 2. if there had been a full Church to chuſe, yet the matter in *Clemens*, extending not only to the *Biſhops* of the preſent, but alſo to the ſucceſſors for the future age, what right could the then preſent people have to chuſe, not only for their own, but the future age, and ſo deprive their ſucceſſors of their Privi-ledge? 23.

But waving both theſe, the matter is otherwiſe clear, They are the ſame perſons which did preach and conſtitute, and examine or approve, *i. e.* the *Apoſtles* did every of theſe; And doing it τῷ πνεύματι, *by the Spirit*, by Revelation or direction of the *Spirit* (in the ſame manner as they are ſaid to *know by Chriſt*, that there would be contention about this matter, and that having received perfect foreknowledge, they conſtituted thoſe *Biſhops*) it is evident they had no need of any act of the People in doing it, and ſo, that the examination and approbation was that of the *Apoſtles*, and not of the *People*; of the *Apoſtles* aſſiſted and directed by the Spirit of God, and not ſo much as adviſed, that we hear of, or inſtructed by the people. 24.

This farther appears by another paſſage in that *Epiſtle*, where this act of the *Apoſtles* approving by the *Spirit*, and *receiving perfect foreknowledge* what would fall out, and what they ſhould do, is by him illuſtrated by the example of *Moſes*, who προέγνω *foreknew*, (*i. e.* certainly) had it revealed to him by *God*, that *Aaron ſhould be the Prieſt*. 25.

Examples of ſuch Revelations of God's in the firſt times, I have ſet down in the * *Diſſertations*; As firſt of *Matthias*, when God being pray'd to, that he would *demonſtrate* or *declare* (ἀνάδειξον τίνα) *which of the two he had choſen*, he did by lot point him out to be the perſon, *Acts* 1. 24. Secondly of *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Acts* 13. 2. Thirdly of *Timothy*, to whom the *Epiſcopal* dignity was given διὰ προφητείας, *by Prophecy*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. and κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπ' αὐτῷ προφητείας, *according to the prophecies which had before been delivered of him*, 1 *Tim.* 1. 18. Upon which *Chryſoſtom* and *Theophylact* make their obſervation, Τὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας καὶ ἱερωσύνης ἀξίωμα μέγα ὄν, καὶ τῶν Θεοῦ δεῖται ψήφου ὥστε καὶ ἄξιον δέξασθαι, *The dignity of Biſhop* (which they there ſtile of *Doctorſhip* and *Prieſthood*) *being great, wants Gods direction that a worthy perſon may receive it.* And the ſame is affirmed by *Clemens* in *Euſebius*, *l.* 3. *c.* κγ'. of the *Biſhops* whom S. *John* ordained in *Aſia*, that they were ὑπὸ τῷ πνεύματος σημαινόμενοι, ſignified to him by the *Spirit*. According to what S. *Paul* had formerly ſaid of the *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, *Acts* 20. that the *Holy Ghoſt* had ſet them to preſide over the flock peculiarly. 26. * *Pag.* 267.

This, I muſt think, was, and ſtill is ſufficient to clear the difficulty, and put it beyond queſtion, who they were, by whom the *Biſhops* in *Clement* are ſaid to be approved, certainly not the *People*, but the *Apoſtles* that conſtituted them, or yet higher, the Spirit of God who ſignified or pointed them out unto them, or by whoſe directions they approved them. 27.

I ſhall not now need more largely to inſiſt on all the ſeverals here objected againſt me by the *Prefacer*; By this clear ſetting down of the whole matter, 'tis certain, all his exceptions muſt ſpeedily vaniſh. I ſhall but touch on them that have not yet ſo fully been taken notice of and prevented in paſſing. 28.

And 1. that ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες were *viri Apoſtolici*, though it was truly ſuppoſed by me, yet was it not my magiſterial dictate, but, to my hand, the plain affirmation of *D. Blondel*; My words were regularly to be confronted to his concluſion in the very form wherein he had produced it, and ſo I was to ſet it by *Apoſtolicis* alſo. 29.

The Reader may, if he will, ſee my rendring of ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, literally by *illuſtribus viris*, and the putting of [*i. e. Apoſtolicis, & Spiritu Dei probatis*] into a *Parentheſis*, ſignified [*Apoſtolicis*] to be no rendring of ἐλλογίμων, but another character of the ſame men, collected out of other parts of the *Epiſtle*. 30. *Pag.* 278.

And ſo indeed it is moſt evident by the whole place, [Τοὺς ὑπ' ἐκείνων ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, *The Biſhops conſtituted by the Apoſtles, and after them by other illuſtrious perſons*] that thoſe that are there called ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες, *illuſtrious men*, were the ſucceſſors of the *Apoſtles*, ſuch as, when they were gone, conſtituted *Biſhops* in the Church. 31.

And then, what offence was there in my calling them *Apoſtolical* perſons? Or what pretence for the *Prefacer* to ſay they were *only the choice men of the Church*, in oppoſition to my calling them *Apoſtolical? Choice men* of the *Church*, I know, they were, for ſo muſt they be deemed, who by the *Apoſtles* were left *Rulers* of it. But ſuch the *Prefacer* cannot mean, when he ſets it in oppoſition to me, who called them *Apoſtolici*; He muſt therefore queſtionleſs mean the *choice* men of the *People*, and then thoſe choice men muſt be concluded to conſtitute *Biſhops*, and not only to conſent to their conſtituting, (as before he had ſet it) And then I deſire he will ſay poſitively, that this was his meaning, and that from any place of Scripture or ancient Writer, he will ſhew me where any choice men of the people conſtituted *Biſhops* after the departure of the *Apoſtles*. 32.

Secondly, when he ſaith, that the words [*ex juſſu Dei & approbatione, by the appointment and approbation of God*] are added by me, 'tis not imaginable what he ſhould mean by it: Thoſe words are evidently ſet by me as an argument that they could not want the approbation of the people, becauſe they were ſufficiently furniſhed by the appointment and approbation of God, as had appeared by the teſtimony of *Clement* ſet down in the page immediately precedent: And what is produced by me as an argument to convince the unconcludency of *Blondel*'s collection, can it be blamed in me, as an inſertion or addition either to *Clement*'s or *Blondel*'s words? 33.

And when he goes on reproaching this addition with his [*as though any particular command or approbation of God were intimated for the conſtituting of the Biſhops and Deacons mentioned*] I hope it hath ſufficiently appeared that there was ſuch command or appointment of God, more than intimated by *Clemens* in that *Epiſtle*, and the like expreſt in Scripture in many parallel caſes, and this particularly a deſignation of the perſons, which were to be ordained, and ſo ſomewhat beyond the general inſtitution of the *Lord Jeſus* (which he ſpeaks of, I ſuppoſe he means the commiſſion of the *Apoſtle* to *Titus* and the like) *that Elders ſhould be ordained in every Church*. 34.

Thirdly;

35. *Thirdly*; When he ſaith 'tis argumentatively weak and unconcluding, he muſt mean that this argument of mine is a weak, and unconcluding argument, I ſhall therefore repeat it again, and put it formally into a *ſyllogiſm*; *They who had been conſtituted by the appointment and approbation of God, cannot then be thought to want the acceptation of the people: But the Biſhops, ſpoken of by* Clement, *had been conſtituted by the appointment, and approbation of God: Therefore, they cannot be thought to want the acceptation of the people.* What propoſition can here be denied, I confeſs I ſee not.

36. The *Major* hath its evidence in its ſelf; for certainly that which is already done, and done by Gods appointment, needs no other extrinſecal addition or accompliſhment, unleſs that alſo be ordained by God, which in this caſe of the acceptation of the Biſhop by the people, no way appears, and till it doth appear, cannot be ſuppoſed, or pretended by any to be thus needful.

37. And for the *Minor*, it is the expreſs affirmation of *Clement*, that they that inſtituted them, examined and approved them by the *ſpirit*, and knowing by the *Lord Chriſt*, and having perfect foreknowledge of what ſhould be, καθίσησαν *conſtituted* theſe *Biſhops*; and this is mention'd by *Clement* as an aggravation of their crime, that rejected theſe that were thus conſtituted. And then I hope the premiſes having ſtrength, the *concluſion* from them regularly inferr'd, will not be denied me.

38. For as to the examples of *Saul* and *David*, I am ſure they prove nothing; for if there were perfect truth in all which is here pretended, which is more than from the circumſtances of the ſtories I can affirm, *viz.* that God, who deſigned them *Kings*, would have the *People* come together to chuſe them, then, from that act of God's will it was, and from God's expreſſing it, that the convening and election of the People was neceſſary, and if God had not will'd it, or not appointed it, it had then as certainly not been neceſſary.

39. Now let any ſuch declaration of God's will be ſhew'd, that he would have the People convene and chuſe their *Biſhop*, and then I ſhall think my argument weak, but otherwiſe I muſt not think it concluded ſo, by theſe examples.

40. So in the caſe of the *Deacons Acts* 6. the *Apoſtles* appointed the *Diſciples* to ſeek out *ſeven men from among them*, withal directing them how they ſhould be qualified, and reſerving to themſelves the intire power of conſtituting them ἐπὶ χρείας ταύτης, to the office of *Deacon*. And ſo nothing from that third inſtance can be inferr'd againſt us, it being no way parallel to the caſe in *Clement*, as already is viſible: For in the *Acts*, the *Diſciples* look out, and chuſe (*v.* 5.) the perſons, and bring them to the *Apoſtles*, *v.* 6. and the *Apoſtles* lay their hands on them in the remainder of that *verſe*: But in *Clemens*, *God deſigns* the *perſons* (and ſo in the other Scripture inſtances, and in that of *Clemens Alexandrinus* of the firſt *Biſhops* of *Aſia* ordained by S. *John*) and the *Apoſtles*, and their *ſucceſſors ordain* and *lay hands* on them.

41. As for that of *Acts* 14. 23. that the ordaining of the *Elders* was *with the Peoples election* (by the way, it was even now *by*, as well as *with* the conſent of the People) or indeed, that any mention of the *People* is made there, or ſo much as intimated by the word χειροτονήσαντες, All that I can ſay, is, that it hath been diſproved, as far as any, that I know of, hath yet endeavoured to prove it, *i.e.* all arguments, that I have ſeen for it, I have * elſewhere anſwered: But what will ere long be manifeſted, I am not able to forecaſt, and ſo am not now to provide anſwers by divination.

* *Reſol. to the fifth Queſt.*

42. No more am I able to foreſee what he ſaith will one day be found, and yet I think it is very poſſible neither he, nor I may live to ſee that day, when any thing ſhall be farther manifeſted in this matter, than what the great *Doctors* already ſuppoſe. The reſolution of the *queſtion*, what right every one hath in theſe affairs, being founded in plain matter of *fact*, *viz.* what *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles* inſtituted in the Church, and that being already as viſible to them, that are converſant in Scripture and ancient Records of the Church, as it can well be imagined to be, till either a new *mine* of ſuch Records is ſprung, or men receive knowledge of ſtory by *Revelation*: Neither of which am I forward to expect in this *age*.

43. In the next place for his *objections* againſt my interpreting of πνεύματι δοκιμάζοντες, of *Gods extraordinary revealing whom he would have ordained*, they will ſoon vaniſh alſo. For 1. the place of S. *Paul* concerning *Timothies ordaining* of *Deacons*, and appointing δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, *let them be firſt tried or examined*, 1 *Tim.* 3. 10. belongs nothing to this of the trying by the *ſpirit*: *Timothy* might have ordinary means of trying (and the whole diſcourſe of S. *Paul*, then ſetting down the qualifications of thoſe that were to be ordained, tends to that) and then he had no need of extraordinary.

44. And ſo likewiſe the *Apoſtles Acts* 6. referr'd the matter of trial and approbation to the *Diſciples*, and without more ado, and without this πνεύματι δοκιμάζειν, *trying by the ſpirit*, ordained thoſe that were thus preſented to them. But theſe two inſtances can no way *preclude divine revelations* concerning *Matthias*, and *Paul*, and *Barnabas*, and *Timothy*, and the *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, and the *Biſhops* of *Achaia*, of whom the expreſs words of Scripture and *Clemens*, are, that by *God* and his *Spirit*, and *Prophecy*, theſe were aſſigned to their Offices.

45. And accordingly though one of thoſe *Deacons* in the *Acts* be ſuppoſed to have *proved none of the beſt*, yet we ſee that *Clemens* here uſeth it as an argument to evidence the unreaſonableneſs and impiety of ejecting their *Biſhops*, that they were thus conſtituted, which I ſuppoſe concludes, that this was not to be ſuſpected or feared of them, which was experimented to have befallen *Nicolas*.

46. *Secondly*; for the notion of [πνεύματι, *by the ſpirit*] that it ſignifies, as I affirm, and not, as he ſuggeſts [*ſpiritually proving* them, *&c.*] he knows (and ſtrait confeſſes) one way, by which I prove it, the mention of πρόγνωσιν εἰληφότες τελείαν, that they *had perfect foreknowledge* to this matter, and what is that *reciving* of *perfect foreknowledge*, but the *ſpirit* of *prophecy*? and that, as was ſaid, immediately before, ἔγνωσαν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *they knew it by our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, and by him were directed perfectly to do what they did. And ſo this is one competent proof of it.

47. And by the way, how is the very firſt part of the phraſe [δοκιμάζοντες, *trying*] being applied to the *Apoſtles* and their *Succeſſors* [if πνεύματι had been left out] reconcileable with the peoples trying, examining, or approving? Before 'twas ſaid, that this work of *trying* (δοκιμαζέσθωσαν πρῶτον, 1 *Tim.* 3. 10.) was by the *Apoſtles* given to the multitude, *Acts* 6. But how can it poſſibly be ſo here

in

in *Clement*, where it is ſaid of the *Apoſtles*, that they did δοκιμάζειν πνεύματι, *try them by the ſpirit?*

This I ſay, to ſhew how far he would be from gaining his deſign, though it ſhould be granted which he deſires, that πνεύματι δοκιμάζειν refers not at all to any extraordinary ways of revelation, which if it did not, yet neither refers it to the peoples, but to the *Apoſtles* examining and approving. 48.

But, I ſay, 'tis already evident, that I have given other reaſons, why I interpret *Clemens* thus of *extraordinary revelations*, which he ought to have adverted before, and I have now mentioned them again, and muſt not repeat eternally. 49.

This again ſhews how little I am bound to aſſert, that *every thing, which is ſaid to be done in the ſpirit, is done by immediate revelation*, becauſe if *ſome* things be, this may be one of thoſe *ſome*, and that it is, is ſufficiently proved by thoſe other evidences. 50.

Next to his queſtion, whether the ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες, who *appointed (ordained) Biſhops and Deacons after the Apoſtles times, had alſo this ſpecial revelation or no?*] I anſwer, that *Clement* no where ſaith that they had, only that they καθίσησαν, *ordained* (that is all one with *laying hands on*) *them*, whom the *Apoſtles* by their Prophetick ſpirit had deſigned to that office. 51.

To this the *Context* in *Clement* is clear, that the *Apoſtles* by that πρόγνωσις, *foreknowledge*, *ordained* ſome; and μεταξὺ, *for the future*, to be ſucceſſors to them, ἐπινομὴν δεδώκασι, they left a *roll* or *liſt* of names, who ſhould ſucceed unto their dead places; and theſe, as oft as any *Biſhop* (ordain'd by the *Apoſtles*) died, were by the other *Biſhops*, *i. e.* the ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες, *ordain'd* in their *places*, according to that rule left by the *Apoſtles* for their ſucceſſion. So that in this matter there could be no need of any further revelation; they were to ordain thoſe which were next upon the *Apoſtles liſt*, and that might be done without multiplying of revelations. 52.

And ſo his next queſtion is at an end alſo; for I have no occaſion or ground to extend theſe revelations any farther than the perſons of the *Apoſtles* (though I know there were alſo *Prophets* in thoſe times, beſide *Apoſtles*) but may ſafely and reaſonably leave all others, where the *Apoſtles* had left no ſuch *liſts*, or when they were at an end, to be concluded by *Paul*'s directions to *Timothy*, without depending farther on *ſpecial revelations*. 53.

And now I think I have anſwer'd all his queſtions, or given him my *Key* to do it himſelf, and ſo muſt be content to return weary home, without receiving any of thoſe thanks from that *generation* of men whom he pleaſeth to mention, but ſhall be content with my *lot*, being alſo competently ſecured from the trouble of looſing knots, which thoſe thanks were deſigned to bring along with them. 54.

SECT. II.

Another teſtimony in Clemens *concerning the power of the People examined.* Τίς ἐν γενναῖος;

BUT this buſineſs of the power of the *People* in the *Church* is not to be diſmiſt ſo, but muſt more largely be reſumed again, and my attendance ſhall be anſwerable to my *Leaders* pleaſure, who thus inlargeth his *digreſſion*; 1.

"Before we return, let us look but a little further, and we ſhall have a little more light given us, "into what was the condition and power of the people in the Church in the days of *Clemens*, ſpeak- "ing of them who occaſioned the diviſion and ſchiſm in the Church of *Corinth*, or them about whoſe "exaltation into office, or dejection from it, that ſad difference fell out, he gives them this advice; "Τίς ἐν ὑμῖν γενναῖος; τίς ἔυσπλαγχνος; τίς πεπληρωμένος ἀγάπης; εἰπάτω, εἰ δι' ἐμὲ στάσις καὶ ἔρις καὶ σχίσ- "ματα, ἐκχωρῶ, ἄπειμι, ἔ ἐὰν βόληθε, καὶ ποιῶ τὰ προσασσόμενα ὑπὸ τῦ πλήθες, μόνον τὸ ποίμνιον τῦ Χριςῦ "εἰρηνευέτω μετὰ τ καθισαμένων πρεσβυτέρων. It ſeems the πλῆθος, the multitude, or the people, were "not ſuch poor inconſiderable things as they are reported to be, when he adviſes them to ſtop and "ſtay the ſedition by yielding obedience to the things by them appointed and commanded. If it "were in it ſelf evil, diſorderly, and not according to the mind of Chriſt, that the people ſhould "order and appoint things in the Church, it had been ſimply evil for *Clemens* to have adviſed any to "yield obedience to the things by them ſo appointed. Where is now *Ignatius* his ὑποτάσσεσθε τῷ ἐπι- "σκόπῳ and χωρὶς --- Even thoſe who are contending about rule and government in the Church, are "adviſed to ſtand to the determination of the people, and to cry, τὰ προσασσόμενα ὑπὸ τῦ πλήθες ποιῶ- "μεν. This is alſo inſiſted on by *Blondellus*, who thence argues, *Poteſtatem plebis circa ſacra Diſſert.* "4. c. 8. ſect. 4. *Ad verba hæc* (ſaith our Doctor) *prodigii inſtar eſt, quod notandum duxit D. Blon-* "*dellus* [*poteſtatem plebis circa ſacra*] (*de quâ tandem integram diſſertationem elucubravit*) *artificiis* "*quibuſcunque aſſerturus. Hic* (*inquit*) *nos monet Clemens fideles etiam de Epiſcopatu aut Presby-* "*terio contendentes, non ab Epiſcopi ſingularis* καὶ ὑπερέχοντος *nutu, ſed à multitudinis præceptis* "*pendiſſe.* But let not our Doctor be angry, nor cry out ſo faſt of Prodigies; a little "time will manifeſt that many things may not be prodigious, which yet are contrary to ſun- "dry of his exceptions and apprehenſions. I cannot but acknowledge him to be provoked, but "withal I muſt ſay, that I have found very commonly, that reaſons uſher'd in by ſuch loud cla- "mours, have in examination proved to have ſtood in need of ſome ſuch noiſes, as might fright "men from the conſideration of them. What is in the next Sections ſet up to ſhield the children "of Epiſcopacy from being affrighted with this prodigy, may perhaps be of more efficacy there- "unto, than the exclamations before mention'd: He therefore proceeds, Sect. 5. *Certè* (ſaith "he) *ſi ſeriò rem egerit D. Blondellus, de Presbyteris ſuis* (*non de Epiſcopis noſtris*) *actum planè &* "*triumphatum erit, nec enim ab univerſo aliquo Presbyterorum Collegio, quod ille tam efflictim ardet,* 2.

" *ſed à multitudinis ſolius arbitrio, tum contendentes de Epiſcopo, tum fideles omnes Corinthios pepen-*
" *diſſe, æquè concludendum erit.* If any man in the world hath manifeſted more deſperate affection
" towards Presbytery, than this Doctor hath done toward Epiſcopacy, for my part *ſolus habeto.*
" But though neither *Clemens* nor *Blondellus* ſpeak any one word about the ordering of things, *multi-*
" *tudinis ſolius arbitrio*, yet here is that ſaid by them both, as is ſufficiently deſtructive, not only to
" the Epiſcopacy the Doctor contends for, as a thing wholly inconſiſtent with the power and liberty
" here granted the people, but of any ſuch Presbytery alſo, as ſhall undertake the ordering and diſ-
" poſing of things in the Church of God, without the conſent and concurrent ſuffrage of the people.
" Such a Presbytery it ſeems *Blondellus* does not defend. But yet neither the Doctor's out-cry, as at
" a prodigy, nor this retortion upon Presbytery, is any anſwer to the teſtimony of *Clemens*, nor in-
" deed is there the leaſt poſſible reflection upon an orderly Goſpel Presbytery in any Church, and
" over it, by what *Clemens* here profeſſeth to be the power of the people; all appearance of any
" thing is from the term *ſolius*, foiſted into the Diſcourſe of *Blondellus* by the Doctor, in his taking
" of it up to retort. *Clemens* in the very next words ſecures us from any thought, that all things de-
" pend *à multitudinis ſolius arbitrio.* His very next words are, Μόνον τὸ ποίμνιον τῦ Χριςῦ εἰρηνεύτω μετὰ
" τῶν καθεςαμένων πρεσβυτέρων. Our Doctors and Maſters having ſtuft their imaginations with the ſhape
" and lineaments of that hierarchical fabrick, which the craft, policy, ſubtilty, avarice, pride,
" ambition of many ages ſucceſſively had formed and framed according to the pattern they ſaw in the
" Mount of the World, and the governments therein, upon the firſt hearing of a Church, a flock of
" Chriſt, walking in orderly ſubjection to their own Elders concurring with them, and conſenting
" to them in their rule and government, inſtantly as men amazed, cry out a prodigy. It is not ima-
" ginable into what ridiculous, contemptible miſcarriages, pride, prejudice, and ſelfulneſs
" do oftentimes betray men, otherwiſe of good abilities in their ways, and commendable indu-
" ſtry.

" But Section the ſixth, the Doctor comes cloſer and gives his reaſon why this teſtimony of *Clement*
" is not of any efficacy to the purpoſe in hand, ſaith he, *At quis (ſodes) à fidelibus de Epiſcopatu (ut*
" *ais) contra ipſos ab Apoſtolis conſtitutos contendentibus, quis à populo contra principem ſuum tumultus*
" *ciente, quis verbis ad retundendum ſeditionem ad plebem factis, argumenta ad Authoritatem populo ad-*
" *judicandum principi derogandum duci poſſe exiſtimavit?* Though many words follow in the next Se-
" ction, yet this is all of anſwer that is given to this ſignal teſtimony of *Clement*'s. I know the Do-
" ctor for the moſt part meets, not only with favourable Readers, but alſo partial Admirers; or
" elſe certainly his exclamation would ſcarce paſs for an invincible argument, nor ſuch Rhetorical
" diverſions as this be eſteemed ſolid Anſwers. There is not by *Blondellus* any argument taken from
" the faithfuls tumultuating againſt the Biſhops (that, of appointed by the Apoſtles which is thruſt
" in, taken for the perſons of thoſe Biſhops, is againſt the expreſs teſtimony of *Clemens* in this
" Epiſtle) nor from the peoples ſeditiouſly rebelling againſt their Prince, nor from any word ſpoken
" to the people to repreſs their ſedition; neither was any thing of this nature urged in the leaſt by
" *Blondellus*, nor is there any colour given to ſuch a collection from any thing in the words cited from
" the Epiſtle, or the Context of them. It is the advice of the Church of *Rome* to the perſons (whe-
" ther already in office, or aſpiring thereunto) about whom the contention and diviſion was in the
" Church of *Corinth*, that is inſiſted on. It is not the words nor plea of them who were in diſorder,
" there is not any reprehenſion given to the body of the Church, the multitude or people who are
" ſuppoſed to tumultuate, to quiet them, but a direction given (as was ſaid) by the Church of *Rome*
" to the perſons that occaſioned the difference, how to behave themſelves ſo, that a timely iſſue
" might be put to the diviſion of the Church. To this end are they adviſed to obſerve the προσάγμα-
" τα, the Orders, Precepts, Decrees, or Appointments of the multitude, as (from *Acts* 15.) the
" body of the Church is called. It is not that they ſhould yield to their tumultuating, but to yield
" obedience to their orderly precepts, τὰ προσασσόμενα ὑπὸ τῦ πλήθες, are by him approved; and had
" it not been lawful for them, with the Presbyters, προσάτ]ειν in affairs of the Church, *Clemens*
" writing this Epiſtle to the whole Church, could not poſſibly have led them into a greater
" ſnare.

" It is a ſad thing to conſider the pitiful entanglements and ſnares that ſome men run into,
" who will undertake to make good, what they have once engaged for, let what will come againſt
" them.

3. In this *Section* again the uſe is, as formerly, very extraordinary: Firſt, I am put under *Diſcipl*
to teach me (that which was anciently accounted a very high pitch, *propè res una*, but theſe times may be able to advance one to, which is but of ordinary parts) the *Nil admirari*, to ſee, and hear the moſt portentous things, and to admire at nothing; I muſt not be permitted to ſay of any, though never ſo ſtrange, unreaſonable a collection of *Blondel*'s, that it is *inſtar prodigii*, but I am cenſured as angry, and guilty of loud clamors, out-cries, exclamations, noiſes, and theſe deſigned to *fright men from conſideration of my reaſons*, as after (on as little cauſe) of *deſperate affection to Epiſcopacy*, of *forgery*, or *foiſting in the word* ſolius *into* Blondel's *diſcourſe*; and if this be not enough for my *humiliation*, there is a reſerve of [*ridiculous, contemptible miſcarriages*, ſuch as it is not imaginable men ſhould be betray'd to] and yet farther, as the cauſes of theſe, *pride*, *prejudice*, and *ſelfulneſs*] and to conclude [*pitiful intanglements* and *ſnares*, &c.]

4. This is truly ſomewhat above the proportion of the turgent ſtile, or the but four barbarous words in ſeven *Epiſtles*, and yet I verily believe the *Section* is *genuine*, no part of it inſerted by any ὑποζολεύς, it bears ſo perfect proportion with what I have hitherto had from the ſame hand. And the aſſuring him, that all this might, if he had ſo pleaſed, have been very eaſily ſpared, is all that I have to return to the more *Rhetorical* part of this *Section*.

5. Only when after all this ſeverity, he thinks fit to give me ſome of his benediction at parting, and to allow me a room among men of *good abilities in their ways*, *and very commendable induſtry*, I cannot but remember the critical note of *Eumenides* the *Atticiſt*, that the ordinary form of χαίρειν in

Epiſtles

Epiſtles was firſt uſed by *Cleon* to the *Athenians*, after he had taken πῦλ☉ from them, whereupon a *Comical* perſon anſwered, Πρῶτ☉ ἡμᾶς ὦ Κλέων, χαίρειν προσείπας, πολλὰ λυπῶν ἥ πόλιν, *You, Sir, are the firſt that bid us be well, and rejoyce, having given us much cauſe of ſadneſs.* This our *Engliſh proverb* expreſſes very ſignificantly, and I that had as little right to his *plaſter*, as I had to the *diſpleaſure* which made him think I wanted it, may tell him, he hath diſpenſed both without any merit of mine.

As for the argumentative part of his diſcourſe, I ſhall now come briefly to that, and doubt not to 6.
ſhew, 1. That *D. Blondel's Collection* was very ſtrange, and ſo merited the expreſſion that was beſtowed on it [*inſtar prodigii*] (I meant not that it lookt like a *blazing ſtar*, or any other ſuch *prodigie*) 2. That *ſolius* was not *foiſted* in by me. In a word, that all really was as I pretended it to be. This muſt be cleared by a brief narration of the whole paſſage, as it lies viſible in the fifth *Diſſert. c.* 8.

There was a *ſedition* in the *Church* of *Achaia*, the *Metropolis* whereof was *Corinth*; and that ad- 7.
vancing ſo high, as to the ejecting their *Biſhops* out of their office (ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποξάλλειν) and theſe *Biſhops* καλαξαθέντας ὑπ' Ἀποσόλων, thoſe very perſons which by the *Apoſtles* had been either deſigned, and put upon the liſt, or actually ordained and conſtituted among them.

This was done, ſaith *Clemens*, δι' ἕν ἢ δύο πρόσωπα, *for one or two* only *perſons* ſakes, whom the 8.
actors in the commotion had a mind to advance to that office.

For the calming this tempeſt, *Clemens* makes uſe of many methods and arguments of perſwaſion. 9.
At length he betakes himſelf to the perſons, for the advancing of whom, all this ſtir was made, this tempeſt was raiſed: To them he thus makes his addreſs; Tells them what *Moſes* had done when the people were in a foul ſin, being himſelf content to be blotted out of the book of the living, rather than the wrath of God ſhould light on the people; and then (in the words which are ſet down by the *Prefacer*) τίς οὖν ἐν ὑμῖν γενναῖ☉ ---- *Who then among you is a generous perſon? who hath bowels of kindneſs and compaſſion? who is repleniſhed with love or charity? Let him thus ſay* (to this ſeditious multitude) *If the ſedition, and contention, and ſchiſms are for me*, or *my ſake* (*viz.* that I am not in ſo great place or office as you contend, and deſire to have me) *I am gone, I depart to what place ſoever you will, and do what the multitude appoint me; only let the flock of Chriſt be at peace with the Elders that are placed over them.* Adding, Ταῦτα οἱ πολιτευόμενοι ἥ ἀμεταμέλητον πολιτείαν τῷ θεῷ, ἐποίησαν καὶ ποιήσουσιν, *Thus godly men have done, and will do*, and πολλοὶ ἐξεχώρησαν ἰδίων πόλεων ἵνα μὴ σασιάζωσιν ἐπὶ πλέον, *Many have removed out of their own Cities, that the Sedition might not farther extend it ſelf.*

In theſe words nothing can be more manifeſt than 1. That this ſhort *Oration* to the tumultuous 10.
people was only deſigned to ſtill their commotion, and to reduce them at once to peace and ſubjection to their ſuperiors placed over them in the Church. And ſo it can be no farther argumentative, than to that, or the like caſe, or conjuncture, *viz.* that for the acquiring peace to the publick, and quiet ſubjection to Governours, any generous or charitable perſon ought even to leave his Country, if need ſo require, and if that will do it, to do, or ſuffer any thing for the regaining the publick peace; not that every *Chriſtian* is in all caſes bound to do this, or that what is charitable in theſe circumſtances, is ſimply, and without them, neceſſary: For then the example there uſed of *Moſes* muſt be obligatory too, and every man ſhall at all times be bound to wiſh and pray, what in that one caſe he did.

Secondly; That it is by *Clement* put into the mouth, not of the *true Biſhops* or *Elders*, duly conſti- 11.
tuted among them at that time; for ſhould they have offer'd to go out and depart, 1. There is no queſtion but they had been permitted to do ſo, by them who had already ejected them from their λειτυργία or *Miniſtration*: And 2. how could the ποίμνιον εἰρηνεύειν μετὰ ἥ καθεσαμένων πρεσβυτέρων, the *flock be at peace together with theſe conſtituted Elders* (*i. e.* with theſe that were already conſtituted) in caſe they ſhould thus depart? And 3. how had *Clemens* done the work to which his whole *Epiſtle* was deſigned, *viz.* re-eſtabliſht the true Governours in their chairs again, if they had thus, by his advice, departed? But, I ſay, this ſpeech of ἀναχωρῶ, ἄπειμι, *I am gone, I depart*, is by *Clement* put into the mouth of the one or two perſons δι' ἃ *for whoſe ſakes* this commotion was raiſed againſt their *Eccleſiaſtical Governours* (αἰσχρὸν δι' ἕν ἢ δύο πρόσωπα σασιάζειν πρὸς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους) and this is ſo manifeſt, that it is to him that ſhall but lightly view the place in the *Epiſtle*, impoſſible to make any queſtion of it.

Thirdly; It is here as manifeſt, that the *receſs* here ſpoken of, and after exemplified in the πολλοὶ, 12.
the many that had done ſo, and in like manner by *Kings* and *Princes*, that in times of *plagues* had, in obedience to the *Oracles*, delivered themſelves up to *death*, ἵνα ῥύσωνται διὰ τοῦ ἑαυτῶν αἵματ☉ τοὺς πολίτας, *that by their own bloud they might reſcue and deliver their citizens*, as before it had been by *Moſes*'s *zealous* prayer [*blot me out* ---] was an act of generoſity and charity in them that ſhould do it, a meer *ſpontaneous, voluntary receſs*, no act of ordinary duty or obligation. And conſequently, though it were very lawful for *Clemens* to adviſe this generoſity, yet it had been very ill in the ſeditious people to require them to be *gone*, who ſo earneſtly deſired the reſtoring them to peace, and due ſubjection, and ſo this can be no inſtance of the peoples power in this or any thing elſe.

Theſe things being granted, the ſtrangeneſs of *D. Blondel*'s *concluſions* from the words will immedi- 13.
ately appear: They are *two*; the one ſet down *p.* 12. the other *p.* 13. of his *Apologie*: In *p.* 12. thus: *Hic nos monet, fideles etiam de Epiſcopatu ſive Presbyterio contendentes, non ab Epiſcopi ſingularis, καὶ ὑπερέχοντ☉ nutu, ſed à multitudinis præceptis pependiſſe. Here* Clement *mindeth us, that the faithful even* ſuch as *contend for the Biſhoprick*, or *office* of *Elder*, *depend not on the pleaſure of the Biſhop*, the *ſingular Biſhop*, and who had *the ſupream power, but on the precepts of the multitude.* In *p.* 13. thus, *Presbyteros nihil ἀρχοντικῶς attentâſſe, ſed propter Chriſtum communemque piæ fraternitatis ædificationem, multitudinis dicto audientes fuiſſe: That the Elders attempted not to do any thing by way of command* or *empire, but for Chriſt's ſake, and for the common edification of the brethren, they were obedient to the command of the multitude.*

In the firſt of theſe *concluſions*, that which is very ſtrange, is, that the believers ſhould from *Cle-* 14.
ment's words be concluded 1. not to have depended on the pleaſure of their *Biſhop*; 2. to have depended on the precepts of the multitude: Whereas 1. there is no one ſyllable of their not depending on the

pleaſure of their *Biſhops*, but ſpecial mention of the preſerving their *Biſhops* quietly in their ſeats, as the end, which, with the peace of the Church, was the only thing they had in their view: And 2. they no otherwiſe depended on the precepts of the multitude, than as for the avoiding and quieting the Sedition, they ſhould voluntarily ſubmit themſelves; which is as far from concluding any due power in the multitude, as my bribing a Plunderer to ſave my life, is from inferring that he hath a lawful power over it; or my telling any man in an extremity, *I will do whatſoever you bid me*, on condition you will be quiet, and let my Maſter alone, will conclude that man to have had any power over me, before I had ſaid it, or that that power ſhall always continue to have obligation on me afterwards: Or, to go no farther than the Context in *Clemens*, than the Kings being content to die for the removing the Plague from the People, can be a precedent and obligation to all Kings and Rulers, not only to do the like in the like caſe, but to acknowledge themſelves univerſally to depend upon the commands of the people.

15. By this it already appears, how free I am from being chargeable with thoſe things of which the *Prefacer* accuſes me: As 1. that I foiſt in the [*ſolius*] into *Blondel*'s diſcourſe. It is an ugly word, but ſure I am not guilty of it: For doth not *Blondel* ſay, *non ab Epiſcopi nutu, ſed à multitudinis præceptis? that they depended not from the Biſhops pleaſure, but from the multitudes precepts?* Is not the [*non, ſed, not, but*] here perfectly all one with [*ſolius, only?*] Where there are but two parts, the Governour (or Governours, as *Blondel* would have it) in every Church, and the People; what is done by the power of the People, and not by the power of the Governours, muſt ſure be done by the power of the People alone. That which can be done but three ways, by the *Prefacer*, or by *me*, or *conjunctim* by *both* of us together; if it be done by him, and not done by *me*, is it not done by him only? What poſſibility is there that I ſhould deceive my ſelf, or any man elſe by thus concluding?

16. This *Prefacer*, I acknowledge, ſeems to ſet it otherwiſe than *Blondel* had done, and ſo, I ſuppoſe, fanſies it a joynt power of the *orderly Goſpel Presbytery* and the *People:* But then 1. I that was ſpeaking to *Blondel*, was not to be ſuppoſed to ſpeak to this *Prefacer*, who differs from *Blondel*. And 2. that which is done by the *Presbytery* and *People joyntly*, how can it be ſaid to be done not by the *Presbytery*, or to be done *by*, or *depend from the peoples command, not from the Presbytery?* So that certainly I was capable of a more benign cenſure, I might have been ſpared the accuſation of *foiſting* or *forgery* in this matter.

17. So likewiſe for his ſecond charge, that I miſreport *Blondel*'s way of arguing, making him *take his argument from the faithfuls tumultuating againſt the Biſhops, from the peoples ſeditiouſly rebelling againſt their Prince, from words ſpoken to the people to repreſs their ſedition; whereas*, ſaith he, *there is not any thing of this nature urged in the leaſt by* Blondel] this ſure will vaniſh preſently alſo: For as to the firſt two branches, 'tis certain I no where thus recite *Blondel*'s arguing: My words he had juſt before ſet down truly, if he would have conſtrued them right, *Quis, ſodes, à fidelibus de Epiſcopatu contra Epiſcopos contendentibus, quis à populo contra Principem ſuum tumultus ciente ---- argumenta ---- duci poſſe exiſtimavit? Who, I pray, for the aſſerting the authority of the people, would think arguments might be brought from the faithful contending for authority againſt their Biſhops, from a people raiſing ſedition againſt their Prince?*] that is, from any thing ſaid or done by ſuch men at ſuch a time. This is not from the faithfuls contending, or the peoples rebelling (as the *Prefacer* was pleaſed to miſconſtrue me) but from the *faithful contending*, i. e. who *contended*, or (as the parallel to that) the *people rebelling*, or, *who rebelled*. And, I pray, doth not *Blondel* fetch his argument in this place of *Clement*, from theſe, and none but theſe? Are not his very words, *fideles de Epiſcopatu contendentes --- à multitudinis præceptis pependiſſe, that the faithful contending*, or, *who contended for the Biſhoprick, depended on the commands of the multitude*] and doth he not draw his argument for the peoples power, from them, and (which was the third thing) from the words, that they are by *Clement* bid uſe to the people to repreſs their ſedition? From whence, I beſeech him, is *Blondel*'s argument drawn, if not from hence, when from this one ſpeech of theirs (made for them by *Clement*) it is, that this whole argument is drawn?

18. 'Tis true, indeed, *Blondel* ſhould not have affirmed of thoſe whom he calls the *Contenders*, that they *depended on the commands of the people*, but that *Clemens* bid them that they ſhould make that offer to them, that in that particular they would. But I, who was confuting *Blondel*'s argument, was to take it as he ſet it, not as it ought to have been ſet by him, and ſo have done nothing criminous in ſo doing.

19. There is yet a third charge in a *parentheſis*, that the words [*appointed by the Apoſtles*] taken for the perſons of thoſe *Biſhops*, is *thruſt in by me*, and is *againſt the expreſs teſtimony of* Clemens *in this Epiſtle.*] But certainly this is alſo a groundleſs accuſation. For as to *Blondel*'s words or arguing, they are not by me thruſt into them, but uſed as a circumſtance of ſome force in my arguing againſt him, to ſhew that his argument taken from what was ſaid or done by thoſe whom he acknowledges *contenders*, was ſure to be no good argument, when they, againſt whom they are by him ſuppoſed to *contend*, being the *Biſhops* of *Corinth*, thoſe *Biſhops* were, ſay I, conſtituted by the *Apoſtles:* This was but a light circumſtance, yet that which I thought would be ſome farther prejudice to his argument, when the words, from whence he inferr'd his *concluſion*, were ſuppoſed to be ſpoken by the *contenders*, thoſe again, *contenders* againſt *Biſhops*, and thoſe *Biſhops conſtituted* by the very *Apoſtles*.

20. And then for *Clement*, 'tis moſt certain (whatſoever the *Prefacer* is pleaſed to affirm to the contrary) that he expreſly ſaith this of theſe *Biſhops*, whom they contended againſt, and ejected, that they were καθισθέντες ὑπ' ἐκείνων, ἢ μεταξὺ ὑφ' ἑτέρων ἐλλογίμων ἀνδρῶν, *conſtituted by the Apoſtles, or after by other eſteemed men*, ſome immediately both deſigned and ordain'd to the *Office* by the *Apoſtles perſonally*, others deſigned and nominated, or put upon the ἐπινομὴ, the liſt of ſucceſſion by the *Apoſtles*, and as places were vacant, actually ordain'd by the impoſition of the hands of thoſe eſteemed or eminent men, the ſucceſſors of the *Apoſtles* (ſuch as were alſo themſelves call'd *Apoſtolical* men by *Blondel*, and by the *Ancients*, *Apoſtoli ſecundarii*, *ſecundary Apoſtles.*)

This

This is moſt evident again by what was cleared in the laſt *Section:* And ſo the *Parentheſis* had as little of Juſtice in it, as the main period, and might have been ſpared alſo, if the *Prefacer* had ſo pleaſed. 21.

What follows after in this place [*It is the advice of the Church of* Rome ----] is for the moſt part true, and I have ſuggeſted nothing againſt it, nor am now a whit concerned in the contents of it, and therefore though there be ſome infirm parts in it alſo, and many more in the former words, yet having vindicated my ſelf, I ſhall not trouble the Reader to purſue this matter any farther; what he hath miſtaken, he may, if he pleaſe, rectifie by what hath been ſaid, and particularly inform himſelf of his doubts, that they to whom the advice is given, and on occaſion of whom the *ſedition* was raiſed, are not they that were in danger of being dejected from their office (as at the beginning of this *Section* he thought it poſſible) nor conſequently they (as toward the end he ſaith) which were already in office, but they * *for whom* the *people contended* to have them advanced to the *Biſhops ſeats*, they that were the occaſion and the ſubject matter of the contention, and as we may conclude from ſome paſſages, ‖ ἀρχηγοὶ τῆ σάσεως, the *ring-leaders of the ſedition*, and * καταβολὴν τῆ σάσεως ποιήσαντες, *they that laid the foundation of it.* 22.

* εἰ δ' ἐμὲ φάσκοις, p. 69 and δι' ἣν ἢ δύο πρόσωπα κατηνάγκασε, pag. 62.
‖ Pag. 69.
* Pag. 72.

And that brings me to the ſecond ſtrange part of *Blondel*'s collection, *Communi Presbyteros conſilio Eccleſiam rexiſſe, eoſdem nihil ἀρχοντικὸς attentâſſe, ſed --- multitudinis dicto obedientes fuiſſe, that the Presbyters by Common Council ruled the Church, and that the ſame Presbyters* (in the text of *Clemens*) *were obedient to the command or ſaying of the multitude.* But that certainly could not be hence concluded, the perſons into whoſe mouth *Clemens* put theſe words being not *Presbyters* nor *Biſhops* neither, but thoſe whom the people would have *Biſhops*, and to that end raiſed this *ſedition*, and caſt the true *Biſhops* out of the *Church*. And ſo they of whom this ſage obſervation is made, [that they *did nothing imperiouſly, but depended on the commands of the multitude*] are but theſe unruly fellow-believers, not really veſted with any power in the Church, only one part of a *ſeditious multitude*, exhorted by him to endeavour to pacifie another, and to endeavour to reſcue the legal *Biſhops* from ſuffering in this tempeſt (yea, though the ſame popular tumult would have put them into their places) others being reſolved to ſhake the whole Church, rather than they would miſs of their deſign of raiſing thoſe that they thought fit to admire. 23.

And for any ſuch words uſed (or by *Clemens* adviſed to be uſed) betwixt one part of this multitude and the other, I ſtill deſire it may be conſidered, whether it be poſſible that an argument can be regularly drawn from them, on which to found the right or power of the people, in ordering *Eccleſiaſtical affairs*, when beſides, all that hath formerly been ſaid, 'tis certain the ſpeech was made to that part of the people, which were in open rebellion againſt their ſuperiors, and was only a μαλακτικὸν or *mollifying plaſter* applied to the part which was at that preſent moſt inflamed, *embrocation* to allay the *paroxyſm.* 24.

I might now joyn iſſue with the *Prefacer*, and examine the truth of his *poſitive affirmation*, that in this ſaying of *Clemens*, there is that *laid which is ſufficiently deſtructive to the Epiſcopacy that I contend for* (and alſo of any *ſuch Presbytery as ſhall undertake the diſpoſing of things in the Church of God, without the conſent and concurrent ſuffrage of the people*) or that the *Epiſcopacy I contend for*, is wholly inconſiſtent with the power and liberty here granted to the people. But there is not one ſyllable here produced for the defence of this affirmation. And I think it competently appears by this time, how far that bare text of *Clement* is from founding it, and therefore I have now nothing more to contend with; my contrary affirmation, that no ſuch thing is yet concluded, will certainly be true, and fit to be confronted to, and balanced with it; and if I ſhould farther improve it into this, that nothing is concluſible, I think, having already ſeen the utmoſt, that two ſuch skilful artificers, *Blondel*, and the *Prefacer*, have been able to produce toward it, it would not be thought any grand inſolence. 25.

One thing only I cannot omit, that when he ſpeaks of the power of the people, he calls it [*their concurrent ſuffrage*] once, and after joyns them with the *Presbyters* in the προστάξει *commanding* or *ordaining* in the affairs of the Church. But I ſhall demand, can any thing like that, be drawn out of the place in *Clement?* Is it not certain that the multitude, whoſe προστάγματα, *Ordinances* he there ſpeaks of, had caſt out their *Biſhops* or *Elders* out of the Church, and thoſe that are to ſpeak to them, and joyn with them, are not *Presbyters*, but thoſe whom they would have exalted to that office, and raiſed their tumult about it? And how then can the *Presbyters* in that place be ſuppoſed to joyn with the people in this *ordaining?* 26.

I ſhall not make my obſervations from hence, but leave the *Prefacer* to examine himſelf, with what juſtice he hath managed his replies to me, or reproacht my anſwers to *D. Blondel*. And ſo indeed, as he ſaith, *It is a ſad thing to conſider the pitiful intanglements and ſnares*, &c. And ſo much for this *Section* alſo. The imployment is ſo dry to me, and the profit to the Reader ſo thin from ſuch kind of debates, that I ſhould be glad it were the laſt of them. 27.

CHAP.

CHAP. V.

Of the plurality of Elders in Clements *Epiſtle.*

SECT. I.

The difference betwixt Ignatius *and* Clement *in the enumeration of Officers in the Church.* Clements *Epiſtle to the Churches of* Achaia. (Παροικοῦσα.) Paul's *Epiſtles to thoſe. Metropolitical Churches in the Apoſtles times. Anſwer to a charge concerning* Grotius.

1. IN the next place, this digreſſion concerning the *power* of the *people*, being abſolved, I am called back again to *Ignatius*, and in him, to that of his aſſerting the *three Orders* in the *Church*, which is thought fit to be conſidered a while by comparing it with *Clements* doctrine in this matter; who is acknowledged to name but two. And then his charge againſt *Ignatius* and againſt me is thus managed;

2. "To return then, it is evident that in the time of *Clement* there were but two ſorts of Officers in "the Church, Biſhops and Deacons, whereas the Epiſtles of *Ignatius* do preciſely in every place, "where any mention is made of them, as there is upon occaſions, and upon none at all, inſiſt on "three orders diſtinct in name and things. With *Clement* it is not ſo. Thoſe whom he calls Biſhops "in one place, the very ſame perſons he immediately calls Presbyters, (after the example of *Paul*, "*Acts* 20. 28. and *Tit.* 1. 5. 7.) and plainly aſſerts, Epiſcopacy to be the office of Presbyters, "ἁμαρτία, ſaith he, ὐ μικρὰ ὑμῖν ἔσαι, ἐὰν τὺς ἀμέμπλως, κ) προσεπέσχονλας τὸ δῶρα τ ἐπισκοπῆς ἀποδίδωμεν, "μακάριοι οἱ προοδοιπορήσανλες πρεσβύτεροι, *viz.* Becauſe they were in no danger to be caſt from their "Epiſcopacy. And whereas the fault which he reproves in the Church of *Corinth*, is their diviſion, "and want of due ſubjection to their ſpiritual Governours, according to the order which Chriſt "hath appointed in all the Churches of the Saints, he affirms plainly, that thoſe Governours were "the Presbyters of the Church, αἰσχρὰ (ſaith he) κ) λίαν αἰσχρὰ, κ) ἀναξία τ ἐν Χριςῷ ἀγωγῆς ἀκέεσθαι "τ βεβαιοτάτην ἀρχαίαν Κορινθίων ἐκκλησίαν, δι' ἓν ἢ δύο πρόσωπα σασιάζειν πρὸς τὺς πρεσβυτέρυς. And in all "places thoughout the whole Epiſtle, writing (ἐκκλησία τ θεῦ παροικύσῃ Κόρινθον) to that particular "Church of *Corinth*, the Saints dwelling there, walking in the order and fellowſhip of the Goſpel, "where he treats of thoſe things, he ſtill intimates a plurality of Presbyters in the Church, (as "there may, nay there ought to be in every ſingle Congregation, *Acts* 20. 28.) without the leaſt "intimation of any ſingular perſon promoted upon any account whatever above his fellows. So in "the advice given to the perſons, who occaſioned the diviſion before mentioned; μόνον τὸ ποίμνιον "τ Χριςῦ εἰρηνευέτω μετὰ τ καθισαμένων πρεσβυτέρων. Had there been a ſingular Biſhop at *Corinth*, much "more a Metropolitan, ſuch as our Doctor ſpeaks him to have been, it had been impoſſible that he "ſhould be thus paſſed by in ſilence.

"But the Doctor gives you a double anſwer to this obſervation, with the ſeveral parts whereof I "doubt not but that he makes himſelf merry, if he can ſuppoſe that any men are ſo wedded to his "dictates, as to give them entertainment; for indeed they are plainly jocular. But learned men "muſt have leave ſometimes to exerciſe their fancies, and ſo ſport themſelves with their own ima-"ginations.

"1. Then, For the mention that is made of the many Presbyters in the Church of *Corinth*, to "whom *Clement* in the name of the *Church* of *Rome*, exhorts to give all due reſpect, honour, obedi-"ence. He tells you that by the Church of *Corinth*, all the Churches of *Achaia* are meant and in-"tended. The Epiſtle is directed only τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ θεῦ παροικύσῃ Κόρινθον, without the leaſt intima-"tion of any other Church or Churches. The difference it is written about, was occaſioned by one "or two perſons in that Church only; it is that Church alone that is exhorted to order, and due ſub-"jection to their Elders, from the beginning to the end of the Epiſtle, there is not one word, *apex* "or tittle, to intimate the deſignation of it to any Church or Churches, beyond the ſingle Church of "*Corinth*, or that they had any concernment in the difference ſpoken to. The Fabrick of after ages "lies ſo cloſe to the Doctors imagination, that there is no entrance for the true frame of the Primi-"tive Church of Chriſt, and therefore every thing muſt be wreſted and apportioned to the conceit of "ſuch an Epiſcopacy as he hath entertained. Whereas he ought to crop off both head and heels of "his own imagination, and the Epiſcopacy of the later days, which he too dearly affects, he chu-"ſeth rather to ſtretch and torture the ancient Government of the Church, that it may ſeem to anſwer "the frame preſently contended for. But let us a little attend to the Doctors learned arguments, "whereby he endeavours to make good his aſſertion.

"1. He tells you, that *Corinth* was the chief City of *Achaia*, the Metropolis (in a political ſenſe "and acceptation of the word) of *Greece*, where the Proconſul had his reſidence, *Diſſ.* 5. *cap.* 2. *Sect.* "3. Let us grant this to our Learned Doctor, leſt we find nothing to gratifie him withal; and "what then will follow? Hence, ſaith he, it will follow (*Sect.* 4.) that this Epiſtle which was ſent "*Eccleſiæ παροικύσῃ Κόρινθον, non ad unius Civitatis Eccleſiam, ſed ad omnes totius Achaiæ Chriſtianos, "per ſingulas civitates & regiones, ſub Epiſcopis aut Præfectis ſuis ubique collocatas miſſa exiſtimetur:* "But pray Doctor, why ſo? We poor creatures, who are not ſo ſharp ſighted, as to diſcern a Me-"tropolitan Archbiſhop at *Corinth*, of whom all the Biſhops in *Greece* were dependant, nor can find "any inſtituted Church in the Scripture, or in *Clement*, of one denomination, beyond a ſingle Con-"gregation, cannot but think, that all the ſtrength of this conſectary, from the inſinuation of ſuch

"a ſtate

" a ſtate of things in the Church of God, is nothing but a pure begging of the thing in queſtion,
" which will never be granted upon ſuch terms.

" Yea, but he adds, *Sect.* 5. that *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle not only to the Church of *Corinth*, but al-
" ſo to all the Churches of *Achaia*, therefore *Clement* did ſo alſo. At firſt view this argument ſeems
" not very concluſive, yea, appears indeed very ridiculous; the inforcement of it, which inſues,
" may perhaps give new life and vigour to it: How then is it proved that *Paul* wrote not only to
" the Church of *Corinth*, but to all them in *Achaia* alſo? why ſaith he in the 2 *Ep.* 1. *Chap.* 1. *ver.*
" it is ſo expreſt: he writes, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ, σὺν τοῖς ἁγίοις πᾶσι τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ
" Ἀχαΐᾳ. Very good! It is indiſputably evident, that *Paul* wrote his ſecond Epiſtle to the Church
" of *Corinth*, and all the reſt of *Achaia*, for he expreſly affirms himſelf ſo to do, and for the firſt
" Epiſtle it is directed not only to the Church of *Corinth*, 1 *Chap.* 2. *v.* but alſo, πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπικαλου-
" μένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, that is, ſaith our Doctor, in the whole region
" of *Achaia*. So indeed ſays the Doctors great friend *Grotius*, to whom he is beholding for more
" than one rare notion. I ſay it not in any way of any reproach to the Doctor, only I cannot but
" think his careful warding of himſelf againſt the thoughts of men, that he ſhould be beholding to
" *Grotius*, doth exceedingly unbecome the Doctors gravity, and ſelf-denial. This is complained
" of by ſome who have tried it in reference to his late Comment on the *Revelation*. And in this Diſ-
" ſertation he is put by his own thoughts (I will not ſay guilty) to an Apology, *cap.* 1. *Sect.* 24.
" *Quâ in re ſuffragium ſuum tuliſſe Hugonem Grotium, & πάνυ ex Annotationibus, poſthumis, nuper edi-*
" *tis, & poſtquam hæc omnia Typographo tranſcripta eſſent, curſim perlectis edoctus gratulor.* Let not
" the Reader think that Doctor *Ham.* had tranſmitted his papers full of rare conjectures to the Prin-
" ter, before *Grotius* his Annotations on the *Revelation* were publiſhed, but only before he had read
" them. The Doctor little thinks what a flye this is in his pot of Oyntment, nor how undecent with
" all impartial men, ſuch Apologies, ſubſervient to a frame of ſpirit in bondage to a mans own
" eſteem and reputation, appear to be: but let this paſs: and let the Saints that call upon the name
" of *Jeſus* Chriſt in every place, be the Saints in every part of *Achaia*, though the Epiſtle it ſelf
" (written indeed upon occaſion taken from the Church of *Corinth*, yet) was given by inſpiration
" from God, for the uſe not only of all Saints in the whole world, at that time wherein it was writ-
" ten, but of all thoſe who were to believe in any part or place of the world, to the end thereof: al-
" though the aſſertion of it be not built on any tolerable conjecture, but may be rejected with the
" ſame facility wherewith it is tendred; what now will hence enſue? why hence it follows, that
" *Clement* alſo wrote his Epiſtle to all the Churches in *Achaia*. Very good, *Paul* writing an Epiſtle
" intituled, chiefly to the *Corinthians*, expreſly and ῥητῶς directs it to all the Saints or Churches
" of *Achaia*, yea, to all that call upon the name of God in every place, ſo that his Epiſtle being of
" Catholick concernment, is not to be confined to the Church of *Corinth* only, although moſt of the
" particular things mentioned in that Epiſtle related only to that particular Church; Therefore *Cle-*
" *ment* directing his Epiſtle to the Church of *Corinth* only, not once mentioning nor inſinuating an in-
" tention of extending it to any other, handling in it only the peculiar concernment of that Church,
" and a difference about one or two perſons therein, muſt be ſuppoſed to have written to all the
" Churches of *Achaia*. And if ſuch arguments as theſe will not prove Epiſcopacy to be of Apoſtoli-
" cal conſtitution, what will prevail with men ſo to eſteem it? *Si Pergama dextrâ defendi poſſent,*
" *etiam hâc defenſa fuiſſent.* And this is the cauſe of naming many Elders or Presbyters in one
" Church: For my part I ſuppoſe the Doctor might more probably have adhered to a former con-
" jecture of his, *Diſſert.* 4. *cap.* 10. *Sect.* 9. concerning two ſundry different Churches, where were
" diſtinct Officers in the ſame City, *Primò* (ſaith he) *reſpondeo, non uſquequaque verum eſt, quod pro*
" *conceſſo ſumitur; quamvis enim in unâ Eccleſiâ aut cœtu, plures ſimul Epiſcopi nunquam fuerint* (pray
" except them mentioned, *Acts* 20. 28. and thoſe *Acts* 14. 23.) *nihil tamen obſtare, quin in eadem ci-*
" *vitate duo aliquando cœtus diſterminati fuerint.* He might (I ſay) with more ſhew of probability
" have abode by this obſervation, than to have rambled over all *Greece*, to relieve himſelf againſt
" his adverſaries. But yet neither would this ſuffice. What uſe may or will be made of this conceſ-
" ſion ſhall elſewhere be manifeſted.

That which is extended to this *length* in this part of the *Prefacers* diſcourſe, may briefly be ſumm'd up into theſe four heads; 1. a brief touch of the difference betwixt *Clemens* and *Ignatius*, the one mentioning but *two*, the other *three Orders* in the *Church*: 2. His aſſerting the *Biſhops* mentioned in *Clemens* to be bare *Presbyters*, concluding that from the number of them, *many* in that *one Church* of *Corinth*; 3. a taking notice of a *firſt anſwer* of mine to that argument, and endeavouring to invalidate it; 4. a reproach of my vain-glory in borrowing notions from *Grotius*, and being unwilling to be thought to do ſo. Which laſt, though it hang looſe from the matter in hand, being perfectly *extrinſecal* to our *Controverſie*, whether about *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles* or *Epiſcopacy*, (becauſe 'tis certain that one that hath received help from *Grotius*, is not for that the more likely to be in the wrong, or to be unable to maintain his aſſertions; and becauſe he that hath faults in his manners, the vain-glorious and ingrateful, may yet by ſo good a guide as *Grotius*, fall upon ſome truth) yet I ſhall afterward punctually reply to, and diſpatch that alſo, and ſhew how little happy the *Prefacer* is in all his acts of ſeverity. But as the order and the rule before me directs, I muſt begin with the more material parts. 3.

And firſt for the difference betwixt *Clement* and *Ignatius*, it was far from being any obſervation of the *Prefacers*, or uſeful to him againſt us; It is known to be a principal ingredient in the foundation, on which I build and aſſert *Epiſcopacy*, *viz.* that in the times of the *Scriptures* and of *Clemens*, there appear to have been *two*, and not above *two Orders* in the Church of *Chriſt*, *Biſhops* and *Deacons*; that theſe *Biſhops* were promiſcuouſly ſtiled, Ἐπίσκοποι and Πρεσβύτεροι, *Biſhops* and *Elders*, the nature of each word agreeing, to denote a *ſingular Governour*, and the uſe of it both in *Scripture* and *Clemens*, no way inclining to determine it to a number or *Colledge* of *Presbyters* in each *Church*, ruling in *Common Council*: That S. *Paul*, *Phil.* 1. 1. *Tit.* 1. 5, 7. 1 *Tim.* 3. expreſly ſets down this 4.

courſe,

courſe, under the two plain heads of *Biſhops* and *Deacons*; that *Clemens* is as expreſs, that the *Apoſtles* at their firſt preaching conſtituted or ordained their firſt converts to be *Biſhops* and *Deacons of thoſe that ſhould after believe*; that *Epiphanius* voucheth it out of the profoundeſt Hiſtories, the ancienteſt Records, that while the paucity of Chriſtians was ſuch, as neither to need more than a *Biſhop*, and his *Deacons* in each *Church*, nor to afford much choice of perſons for any more, ἠρκέσθησαν, they were contented every where with theſe two: Laſtly, that when the number of believers was greatly increaſed, and ſo permitted and required it, then a ſecond order, under *Biſhops*, and above *Deacons*, was erected in each Church by *Apoſtles* and *Apoſtolical* men, particularly, as may probably be collected, by S. *John* in *Aſia*, toward the end of his days, and accordingly, that *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*, written ſome years after *John*'s death, are the firſt that mention that ſecond order.

5. All this in every branch hath been diſtinctly cleared both in the *Diſſertations*, and ſince in the *Vindication* of them from the *London Aſſemblers*, and not one word is here pretended to invalidate any one part of it, any farther, than as it will fall under one of the two following heads of diſcourſe, and therefore I am now to haſten to them. Only to be ſure to have neglected nothing, that can expect to be conſidered in the leaſt, It is here preſently viſible, 1. how cauſeleſly *Ignatius* is quarrell'd with, for mentioning the *Orders* of the *Church* upon no occaſion, when the deſign of his *Epiſtles* being to preſerve truth and peace among the *Churches*, he had no better and more *compendious* way to do it, than by requiring their ſubjection to their Governours, and thereupon he ſo conſtantly inculcates it, and this is a very important occaſion, and that which always makes it very ſeaſonable and pertinent, whenſoever it is done by him.

6. Secondly, How fallaciouſly the diſcourſe proceeds, which ſuppoſeth *Clemens* to call thoſe *Presbyters* (which ought to ſignifie as among us the word now ſignifies, *collegues* and *fellow-rulers* in the ſame *Church*) whom before he had called *Biſhops*, adding that he *plainly aſſerts Epiſcopacy to be the office of Presbyters*, and that their Spiritual Governours were the *Presbyters* of the *Church*, and a plurality of *Presbyters* in the ſame *Church*; whereas all this while he knows that *Clement* ſaith, that the *Apoſtles* inſtituted *Biſhops* and *Deacons* in all Cities and Regions, and that theſe are by us cleared to be *ſingular Biſhops*, and that to prevent contentions, they left a liſt of *ſucceſſors* to that *ſingular office* in each *Church*, and that theſe *ſingular Biſhops* are oft called Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, not only before, but after *Clemens*, even by thoſe that appear, and are acknowledged to aſſert the *three Orders*, and conſequently that *Clement* may well be allowed to ſtile them ſo, in whoſe time, for ought appears, there were none of that ſecond order, now vulgarly called *Presbyters*, yet erected, either at *Rome*, from whence or at *Corinth*, or in all *Achaia*, to which he wrote this *Epiſtle*.

7. Thirdly, How infirm a way of arguing it is, to ſay that *Clement* doth not in the *leaſt intimate any ſingular perſon, promoted above his fellows, and that, had there been any ſuch at* Corinth, *it had been impoſſible he ſhould be thus paſs'd by in ſilence*; when he knows, that the *Apoſtles conſtituting Biſhops* and *Deacons*, and what follows on that account, is by us inſiſted on, and confirmed to be more than an intimation of it, and when the whole purport of the *Epiſtle* is to preſerve the authority of the Governours of the ſeveral Churches under that *Metropolis*, whom he knows we contend and prove to be the *ſingular Biſhops*, and muſt not forgo that pretenſion till it be confuted.

8. To proceed to the ſecond head of diſcourſe, his aſſerting the *Biſhops* mentioned in *Clemens* to be *bare Presbyters*.] For this, it is certain, that he makes no tender of any other argument, or appearance of proof, but only the mention of Πρεσβύτεροι (which he renders *Presbyters*) in the *plural*, whom therefore he concludes to be *many Presbyters* in the *ſame Church*: But 1. Πρεσβύτερος *Elder*, ſignifies *Biſhop* in *Scripture*, in *Clemens*, in *Polycarp*, in thoſe of the *Ancients* after them, that are known to aſſert the *ſingular Biſhop* above *Presbyters* in each *Church*. And this having been ſaid and cleared in the *Diſſert.* is not, in the leaſt, attempted to be diſproved by him.

9. Secondly, Theſe *many Elders* are not all (or more than one) ſaid or intimated by *Clement* to be in one City. For the *Epiſtle*, as was ſhewed in the *Diſſert.* is, I ſuppoſe, moſt certainly, may have been addreſt by *Clement*, not to the ſingle Church of that one City of *Corinth*, but to the Churches of all *Achaia* or *Greece*, of which *Corinth* was the chief, being the *Metropolis*.

10. That it was not ſo, is barely ſaid; but largely proved in that place, *Diſſert.* 5. *cap.* 2. firſt from the title of the *Epiſtle*, ἡ ἐκκλησία θεοῦ παροικοῦσα Ῥωμὴν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον, where it is on each part the παροικία, or *whole province*, as of *Rome*, ſo of *Corinth*, the Region and territory that belonged to either of thoſe *Metropoles*, which in that age was called παροικία, or the *adjacent region*, expreſt by *Ignatius*, by τόπος χωρὶς τῶν Ῥωμαίων, *the place of the region of the Romans*, by *Polycarp* in the ſame kind, ſpeaking of *Philippi*, ἐκκλησία παροικοῦσα Φιλίπποις, *the Church adjoyning* or *belonging to Philippi*, and by * *Euſebius*, ἡ ἐν Κορίνθῳ παροικία, the *Province belonging to Corinth*, of which *Dionyſius* was *Biſhop* or *Metropolitan*.

* *Lib.* 4. *cap.*

11. *Secondly*, this was proved by the *analogie* held between this *Epiſtle* of *Clemens*, and the *Epiſtle* of S. *Paul*, inſcribed to the *Corinthians*; For I demand, was not this *Epiſtle* of *Clement* written to the ſame Church or Churches, to whom S. *Paul*'s *two Epiſtles* had been addreſſed? That it was, is more than probable by the Common title; and other Characters in the *Epiſtle* it ſelf incline to it. As, that he refers them to the *Epiſtles* of S. *Paul* written to them, and that upon the like occaſion of diviſions and factions, ſo early crept in among them. So *pag.* 61. Ἀναλάβετε τὴν Ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου, τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ εὐαγγελίου ἐγραψεν, ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν περὶ αὐτοῦ τε καὶ Κηφᾶ καὶ Ἀπόλλω, διὰ τὸ τότε καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἡ πρόσκλισις ἐκείνη ἧττον ἁμαρτίαν ὑμῖν προσέφερεν --- *Take*, ſaith he, *the Epiſtle of S.* Paul, *conſider what he ſaith to you in the beginning of his preaching to you, certainly it was by inſpiration from God, that he wrote to you concerning himſelf and* Cephas, *and* Apollos, *becauſe that then ye had partialities and inclinations to one more than to another, but that partiality brought leſs ſin unto you* --- Here ſtill it is the ſame [ὑμεῖς, *you*] that before, and now, were guilty of this ſin of *carnality*, *admiration* of *perſons*, *faction*, and now at length *ſedition*, and ſo the ſame Churches now and then, to whom theſe *Epiſtles* on that occaſion were addreſt, and there is no circumſtance producible, that reſtrains one more than the other.

Now

Now of the *Epiſtles* of *Paul*, it is evident they were not confined to the one City of *Corinth*, but 11.
to *all* the Churches of *Achaia*; ſo it is ſpecified of the ſecond of them, 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. *To the Church of God which is at* Corinth, *with all the Saints which are in all* Achaia: And though this be not expreſly ſaid of or in the firſt *Epiſtle*, or in this of *Clement*, yet the relation that one hath to the other, will conclude it of thoſe alſo; and the phraſe, which there we find ſuperadded to the Church of *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. πᾶσι ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα Χριστῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, *to all that are called by the name of Chriſt, all Chriſtians, in every place*] (and the like form at the concluſion of this, *The Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt be with you,* καὶ μετὰ πάντων πανταχῆ τῶν κεκλημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, *and with all every where that are called by God*] hath in all probability the ſame importance) for that being univerſal, and extended beyond *Corinth*, muſt not yet be interpreted of all Chriſtians in the world, for that would make each of theſe a *Catholick Epiſtle*, and would conclude the *Apoſtle* to have received an *Epiſtle* from the *Catholick Church*, to which this return was made; *c.* 7. 1. and ſo likewiſe the *particular ſins, and ſinners* both there and here, to which they apply their exhortations, the inceſt, the *going to Law before heathen Judicatures*, the *ſeditions*, &c. do evidently reſtrain it from that latitude; which two circumſtances being balanced on each ſide, will certainly leave it in the middle, betwixt the one Church of *Corinth* on the one ſide, and the univerſal Church of the whole world on the other, and ſo leave it commenſurate and appliable to the πάντα κλίματα τῆς Ἀχαΐας, *all the coaſts of Achaia.* Thus when 1 *Cor.* 3. 5. it is ſaid of *Apollos*, that he hath watered them, as the *Miniſter* by which they to whom he wrote, believed (and ſo in this of *Clemens*, that they had been factiouſly inclined to *Apollos*) it is evident by the ſtory in the *Acts*, that this belonged not only to *Corinth*, but to *Achaia* indefinitely, *Acts* 18. he reſolved to go into *Achaia*, and coming thither he *contributed much to thoſe that believed*, ver. 27.

To theſe are added theſe farther indications, that in the *Epiſtle* to the *Romans* ſent from *Corinth*, 12.
the ſalutations are ſent from the Churches of *Chriſt*, in the plural, *Rom.* 16. 16. mention is made of the Church which is at *Cenchrea* (which is one of theſe Churches) *ver.* 1. ſo what the *Apoſtle* writes in theſe *Epiſtles* concerning the collection for *Judea*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 1. and 2 *Cor. c.* 8. and 9. evidently belongs to all *Achaia*, *Rom.* 15. 26. Macedonia *and* Achaia *have pleaſed to make a certain contribution*, and *I know your forwardneſs*, Achaia *hath been ready* or *prepared*, 2 *Cor.* 9. 2. and ſo when *c.* 1. 9. he had ſaid, *when I was preſent among you and wanted, I burthened no man*, it follows, ver. 10. *this boaſting ſhall not be ſhut up againſt me in all the regions of* Achaia. Where ſtill [ὑμεῖς] and [Ἀχαΐα] [*you*] and [*Achaia*] are all one; and if that liberty be but allowed in this *Epiſtle*, the whole difficulty is at an end; for then, as there were many cities and *Epiſcopal ſees* in *Achaia*, the chief of which was *Corinth*, and what was ſent to that *Metropolis*, was from thence to be communicated, as it belonged, to all thoſe others: ſo the *Biſhops* of each of theſe might very fitly be called by *Clement* πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, and not the *Elders* of that one Church or City of *Corinth*, but all that related to that *Metropolis*.

This, I may have leave to hope, will be lookt on as a firmer foundation on one ſide, to conclude 13.
that the Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*, which is alſo the title of *Biſhops*, in this *Epiſtle*, being alſo called Biſhops here, (a title which, as is * elſewhere ſhewed at large, as far as the *Scriptures*, never was applied to a bare *Presbyter*) were the ſeveral *Biſhops* or ſingular Governours of the many cities of *Achaia*; than the bare number or multitude of them, without any other circumſtance to inforce it, will be ſufficient to infer that they were the many *Presbyters* in one city.

* *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 8. & *c. Vindic. c.* 2. *ſect.* 2.

To come therefore to the third thing, the taking notice of this anſwer, and his endeavouring 14.
to invalidate it, I ſhall briefly examine whatſoever is ſaid by him in purſuit of that attempt. And his firſt Method is that of the Scoffer, to prepare his Reader to look on this anſwer as ridiculous, he doubts not *but the Doctor makes himſelf merry, if he can ſuppoſe any ſo wedded to his dictates, as to give it entertainment, for it is plainly jocular*; and again, I muſt in the ſame *Sceptick* humour, be ſtiled a learned man, ſo to be allowed to exerciſe my fancy, to *ſport with my own imaginations.*

But 1. truly, Sir, I was neither then nor am now at ſo much vacancy, which might call for ſport; 15.
If I were, I would find out more Chriſtian-like divertiſements. 2. I could never think that what was thus confirmed by Arguments (and this had been done in the *Diſſert.* on the ſame grounds of probation, which have here been mentioned) could be liable to the cenſure either of Dictates on one ſide, or of jocular, on the other; and 3. If he had been as well able to confute my anſwer, or confirmations of it, as he was to ſcoff and cry, jocular, *&c.* he muſt needs have thought it more like a Chriſtian, and a Scholar, and a propugner of truth, to have inſiſted wholly on the former, and omitted the latter. Laſtly, I learn from hence, wherein my crime conſiſted, when I ſaid of one of *Blondel*'s obſervations from *Clement*, that it was *inſtar prodigii*; It ſeems I ſhould have ſaid that it was plainly jocular, have ſmiled inſtead of wondring, and all had been very well.

Having thus anſwered his *Proeme*, I come to his narration: And there truly I find no one argument 16.
of force to countenance or juſtifie his mirth. A *cumulus* there is, but that will ſignifie nothing, unleſs ſome one of the particulars, of which it conſiſts, do ſo. And that they cannot do, being by him known to be denied by me, before they are mentioned, and yet no proof added to ſupport them.

As 1. that the *Epiſtle* is directed to the Church παροικίαν Κόρινθον, *without the leaſt intimation of any* 17.
other Church or Churches, and after in the like words, a little varied, that there is not *an apex or tittle to intimate the deſignation of it to any but the Church of* Corinth.] This is a negative unproved, and concluding nothing; whereas it is evident to him, that the very phraſe [παροικίαν Κόρινθον] is taken by me for more than an intimation that it was the whole παροικία or *Province*, which he wrote to, and that the conſent betwixt this and S. *Paul*'s *Epiſtles*, intimated them to be addreſt to the ſame, and ſo to the Churches of all *Achaia*.

So 2. when he ſaith the *difference it was written about, was occaſioned by one or two perſons in that* 18.
Church only, and that it was *that Church only that is exhorted to order and due ſubjection to Elders*; that is *petitio principii*, and that which no way appears in the *Epiſtle*; one or more of theſe might

be in other *Churches* of *Achaia*, and thoſe other Churches might be all exhorted to order and ſubjection to their ſeveral *Biſhops*.

19. 3. When he falls back ſo ſoon into his firſt *Topick* again, that of *Contumely* [*the fabrick of after-ages lies ſo cloſe to the Doctor's imagination, that there is no entrance for the true frame, and therefore every thing muſt be wreſted*, &c.] and yet more, that *whereas I ought to crop off head and heels* (a phraſe that I have not met with, *croping off heels*) *I choſe to ſtretch and torture* ---] 1. It is evident how eaſily this might be retorted, thus, that the fabrick of this laſt part of this laſt age in this Iſland of ours, lies ſo cloſe on my *Monitor*'s imagination, that the frame in *Clement*'s time, of a *Church* governed by *Biſhops*, ordained by the *Apoſtles* and their *ſucceſſors*, not by the people or the whole congregation, cannot find entrance with him. And ſecondly, from the recurring of ſuch kind of *Rhetorick* as this ſo ſoon, I might very probably conclude, that his whole confidence was placed in this one *Topick*, which is ordered both to lead the van, and alſo to bring up the reer, to be the reſerve as well as the forlorn hope; And then upon this view of his reply, I deſire it may be indifferently conſidered, whether my arguments were not as valid to confirm my anſwer, as his mirth and repetitions and bare negations without any attempt of proof, were of force to aſſert the contrary.

20. Next he promiſes to attend to my arguments, but cannot hold his countenance again, they muſt be ſtiled [*learned arguments*] forſooth (to have ſpoken as he thought, had been more like a ſerious perſon, that meant to attend to arguments) And the firſt that he attends to, is, that *Corinth* was the *Metropolis* of *Achaia*, *in a political ſence and acceptation of the word, where the Proconſul had his reſidence*, and this he grants, but for my *conſectary* from thence, that the *Epiſtle* inſcribed to the *Church* παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον, ſhould be conceived ſent to the *Chriſtians* of *all Achaia*] *all the ſtrength thereof*, ſaith he, *from the inſinuation of ſuch a ſtate of things in the Church of God, is nothing, but a pure begging of the thing in queſtion.*

21. But firſt, certainly this cannot be that fallacy called τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ, the begging of the queſtion; It is the inferring of that which is there proved both before and after; *before*, both as that ſignifies *long before*, and *immediately before*; *long before*, viz. *Diſſert.* 4. *c.* 5. the erection of *Metropoles* and *Metropolitanes* in the Church had been demonſtrated; *Immediately before*, it had been mentioned as a *præcognoſcendum*, that *Corinth* was ſuch an one, which if granted, it muſt follow, that there was a *Metropolitan Archbiſhop* at *Corinth*, of whom all the *Biſhops* in *Achaia* were dependent. So again this was proved after, by the conſent betwixt *this* and *Paul*'s *Epiſtles*; thoſe were written to all the *Chriſtians* of all *Achaia*, and then why ſhould not this be reſolved to be ſo written alſo? And how then can the queſtion be here ſaid to be begged by me? If this of *Corinth*'s being a *Metropolis* in the political ſence, were not ſufficient to infer this *concluſion*, firſt that might then have been ſaid, the conſequence denied, and trial made, what was, or what could be farther ſaid to prove it; but that method was not here thought ſafe, it was eaſier to ſay, *the ſtrength of the conſectary is nothing but a pure begging of the queſtion*,] which yet I never heard ſaid of a concluſion, inferred from premiſes, and after, farther undertaken to be proved; I deſire him to conſult *Ariſtotle* in his diſcourſe of that fallacy, and he ſhall find it was not τὸ ἐν ἀρχῇ, on my ſide, a begging of the queſtion, but τὸ ἐν συμπεράσματι, on his, a denying the concluſion.

22. This for the form of his reply; *Secondly* then, as to the matter of it, I did, and ſtill do think it a concluding argument, which I there uſed; and being briefly ſet down, 'twill be more explicitly this: An *Epiſtle* addreſt to a *Metropolitical ſee*, under the title of the Church adjacent to ſuch a chief City or *Metropolis*, is addreſt to all the Cities and Churches that relate to that *Metropolis*; But *Corinth* was ſuch a City, and this *Epiſtle* was ſo addreſt to it --- That *Corinth* was ſuch a *Metropolis*, was apparent, and is not denied, as to the political acceptation of it; And if it were ſo alſo in the *Eccleſiaſtick*, there is no farther difficulty; And if my ſuppoſing and not farther proving of this in that place, were the infirm part of the diſcourſe, and begging of the queſtion, I muſt anſwer, that I had no reaſon to expect it ſhould be eſteemed ſo, having long before, on occaſion of the *Angels* in the *Revelation*, entred into a diſcourſe of *Metropolitical Cities*, and ſhewed, that not only in the *Political* but *Eccleſiaſtical acceptation*, there were ſuch in the *Apoſtles*, and ſo in *Clement*'s time.

23. This was there manifeſted in many inſtances, 1. in *Antioch* the *Metropolis* of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, and all the Churches of thoſe Regions, the παροικία of *Antioch*, and dependant on that; Secondly in *Rome* the *Metropolis* of the *Roman Province*, or *Urbicarian Region*; Thirdly, in *Alexandria* the *Metropolis* of *Egypt*, whereupon *Mark* is ſaid by * *Euſebius* to have *conſtituted Churches* (in the *plural*) there, all which under the title of ‖ ἡ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικία, *the province of*, or belonging to *Alexandria* (as here ἐκκλησία παροικοῦσα Κόρινθον) were by S. *Mark* committed to *Anianus* or *Ananias*, and the Government adminiſtred by him, all the reſt of the Churches there planted by *Mark*, relating to this as to the *Metropolis*. Fourthly, in *Gortyna* the prime *Metropolis* of *Crete*, the Archbiſhop whereof, in the *Epiſtle* of *Dionyſius* Biſhop of *Corinth*, *Ann. Chr.* 175. is ſtiled *Biſhop* ἐκκλησίας παροικούσης Γορτύναν, καὶ λοιπῶν κατὰ Κρήτην παροικιῶν, *of the Church adjacent to* (i. e. the province of) Gortyna, *and of all the reſt in* Crete. Fifthly, in *Philippi*, the *Metropolis* of one *Province* of *Macedonia*, *Acts* 16. 12. to which purpoſe it is, that in the *Epiſtle* ſaid to be written by *Ignatius* to them of *Tarſus*, we find, ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς αἱ ἐκκλησίαι Φιλιππησίων, *the Churches* (in the plural) *of the* Philippians *ſalute you*. Sixthly, in the ſeveral Churches of *Aſia*, mentioned *Rev.* 1. each of them a *Metropolis* over ſome other Cities, and *Epheſus* the prime of all the *Proconſular Aſia*. And this form, or this ſtate of things in the Church of God, is there by three Canons of the three great Councils, *Nice*, *Antioch*, *Epheſus*, teſtified to be the *ancient Primitive*, *Apoſtolical* ſtate.

* *Lib.* 2. *c.* 16'.
‖ *Ibid. c.* 24'.

24. This being then done at large, and thereby the *Primitive conſtitution* of *Metropolitical Churches* competently aſſerted, it ſeemed to me ſufficient but to re-mind the Reader, that *Corinth* was one ſuch *Metropolis* of *Achaia* or *Greece*, and accordingly, that upon that account (in the *Eccleſiaſtical* as well as *Political* acceptation) the *Epiſtles* of *Paul* inſcribed πρὸς Κορινθίους, *to the Corinthians*, were meant to all the *Churches* of *Achaia*, and not only to that one of *Corinth*. And what error I have

have committed herein, I confeſs I am not yet able to diſcern or divine, or what there is behind that wants farther proof.

The only thing I can yet think of, is, that in this *Prefacer*'s judgment, I have not made it ſufficiently appear by that one evidence of *Corinth*'s being a *Metropolis*, where the *Proconſul* of *Achaia* kept his reſidence, *Acts* 18. 12, 15. (*i. e.* a *Metropolis* in the *Political* acceptation) that it was alſo a *Metropolis* in the *Eccleſiaſtical notitiæ*, and then it may be fit perhaps farther to add ſomething to clear that, and put it out of queſtion, not only in *theſi*, that the Church generally thus correſponded with the ſtate, (according to that of *Origen*, ὥπω δὲ καὶ ἄρχοντα ἐκκλησίας ἑκάσης πόλεως ἀρχοῦσι τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει συσκηνιτῶν, *the Governour of the Church of every City muſt keep conformity to the ruler of thoſe that are in the City*, *Contr. Celſ. l.* 3.) but alſo in *hypotheſi*, that ſo it was particularly in this of *Corinth*. 25.

To which purpoſe it were eaſie to multiply teſtimonies, which put it out of queſtion that *Corinth* was a *Metropolitical Church*, and ſo is recorded to be in all the *Notitiæ*, that are extant; But I ſhall content my ſelf with one teſtimony, that of * Saint *Chryſoſtom*, who asketh this queſtion, Διὰ τί τῇ μητροπόλει γράφων, πᾶσι δι' αὐτῆς ἐπιστέλλει, ὁ παυλαχοῦ τοῦτο ποιῶν; Θεσσαλονικεῦσι γὰρ ἐπιστέλλων οὐδέπω καὶ Μακεδόσιν ἐπέστελλε, καὶ Ἐφεσίοις γράφων, ὁμοίως ὁ περιέλαβε τὴν Ἀσίαν ἅπασαν, καὶ ἡ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους δὲ ἐπιστολὴ, οὐχὶ καὶ τοῖς τὴν Ἰταλίαν οἰκοῦσίν ἐστιν ἐπεσταλμένη, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα αὐτὸ ποιεῖ, καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Γαλάτας, οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖ μίᾳ πόλει, καὶ δύο καὶ τρισὶν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς παυλαχοῦ διεσπαρμένοις ἐπιστέλλει λόγων, Παῦλος ἀπόστολος --- ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Γαλατίας ---- *Why writing to the Metropolis, he writes* (*i. e.* expreſſes himſelf to write) *to all by or through that, whereas in other Epiſtles he doth not do ſo? for writing to the* Theſſalonians, *he no where addreſſeth it to the* Macedonians *alſo, and writing to the* Epheſians *in like manner, he comprehendeth not all* Aſia, *and the Epiſtle to the* Romans *was not addreſt alſo to the inhabitants of* Italy; *but here this he doth, and in the Epiſtle to the* Galatians, *for there alſo he makes his addreſs, not to one, or two, or three Cities, but to all every where diſperſed, ſaying*, Paul *an Apoſtle --- to the Churches of* Galatia --- where, as *Corinth* at the time when S. *Paul* wrote that *Epiſtle*, is by him ſuppoſed to be a *Metropolis*, and ſo *Theſſalonica*, and *Epheſus*, and *Rome*, ſo both in the *Epiſtles* to the *Corinthians*, and in that to the *Galatians*, there were more *Cities* than one, to whom they were addreſt. And then I ſuppoſe there is a full teſtimony to all, and more than I undertook to prove from it. At the preſent it ſufficeth, *Corinth*, ſaith he, was a *Metropolis*, and that in the *Eccleſiaſtick* notion, when S. *Paul* wrote to it. 26.

* *Edit. Savil. Tom.* 3. *p.* 343.

What the *Prefacer* farther adds, is for the examining my next proof or evidence, that *Clement*'s *Epiſtle* belonged to the *Churches* of *Achaia*, and not to *Corinth* only, becauſe the *Epiſtles* of S. *Paul* appear to have done ſo. And beſides the ſcoffs and the demurer accuſation about *Grotius* (which ſhall anon be conſidered) all that he replies is, 1. That though S. *Paul*'s *being expreſly and* ῥητῶς *directed to the Churches of* Achaia, *cannot be confined to the Church of* Corinth, *yet* Clement *directing his Epiſtle to the Church of* Corinth *only, without mention, or inſinuation of any intention to extend it to any other, handling in it the peculiar concernment of that Church, and a difference about one or two perſons therein, cannot be ſuppoſed to be written thus to the Churches of all* Achaia. *Secondly*; That in his opinion *I might more probably have adhered to a former conjecture of mine concerning two different Churches, with diſtinct Officers, in the ſame City, though this would not ſuffice neither.* 27.

To theſe I reply, 1. That of S. *Paul*'s, only *one* (the *ſecond*) is expreſly directed to all the *Churches* of *Achaia*, and yet the former is without that expreſs direction, already ſufficiently cleared (and not here denied) to belong to the ſame *Churches*, and the ſame reaſons hold for this of *Clemens*, which was written to them, to whom *Paul* wrote, and not to the *Church* of *Corinth*, but παροικοῦσῃ Κορίνθου to the *Church adjacent*, the παροικία the *Territory*, that belonged to it. And therefore, *ſecondly*; That this is more than an inſinuation of an intention to extend it to thoſe other Churches. *Thirdly*; That the concernments of the *Epiſtle* are no way reſtrained to the particular Church of *Corinth*, but lye common to the other *Churches* of *Achaia*. *Fourthly*; that the difference, or rather ſedition, doth no way appear to be peculiar to the Church of that one City: The one or two, if they ſignifie ſtrictly no greater a number than two, might yet as probably be in any one or two other Cities of *Greece*, as in that one of *Corinth*. And there is no probability of reaſon to conclude, that the Errors about the *Reſurrection*, &c. had ſpread no farther than that one *City*. 28.

Laſtly, for his opinion that I *might more probably have adhered to my former conjecture*, concerning the *two different Aſſemblies* of *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Chriſtians* in *one city*; All that I need ſay, is, that though I ſtill adhere to that conjecture, as far as ever, and no way fear what he threatens, that any uſe, which I ſhall repent of, will, or ever can be made of this conceſſion, yet I never thought fit to apply it to this matter, both becauſe here is no need of ſuch aids, (and I may have leave to think, the *Prefacer* would not have ſuggeſted it to me, if there had, and that if he had had any way to wreſt the former hold from me, he would not thus have attempted it by diverſion) and becauſe as I am not ſure that there ever were two ſuch *diſtinct Cœtus* at *Corinth* under *diſtinct Biſhops* (only from the authority of *Dionyſius Biſhop* of *Corinth*, that there were two parts of their *firſt plantation*, one from *Paul*, another from *Peter*) ſo if there ever were, yet they might before this time of *Clement*'s writing, be made up into one body, as I know the *Jewiſh* and *Gentile Church* at *Rome*, that had been under *different Governours*, were now united under *Clement*. 29.

And therefore to conclude this matter, I deſire every man may be allowed liberty to uſe his own arguments and anſwers, and to take his own time to produce and apply them, and that, till what hath been ſaid, be refuted, I may be permitted to think that the whether Ἐπίσκοποι or Πρεσβύτεροι, *Biſhops* or *Elders*, in this *Epiſtle* of *Clement* are the ſingular Governours of the ſeveral cities of *Achaia*. 30.

What he ſaith by the by, of *Acts* 20. 8. and *Acts* 14. 23. that thoſe two places muſt be excepted from the univerſal negative, that there were *never more Biſhops than one in a city*, he cannot but know how little force it hath againſt me, who have manifeſted out of *Ireneus*, that the Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders* or *Biſhops*, *Acts* 20. were the *Biſhops* of *Aſia*, not of the one city of *Epheſus*, and that the *Elders* ordained in every Church, *Acts* 14. were the *Biſhops* ordained at *Lyſtra*, *Iconium* and *Antioch*, and not any plurality of *Presbyters* in one city. 31.

32. Having now done with all the three former particulars, wherein *Ignatius* and *Clement*, *Epiſcopacy* and *Presbytery* were concern'd, there remains only that which is perſonal to me, in relation to *Grotius*, but that conſiſting of ſeveral branches, of which it will preſently appear how *many*, or rather how *few* of them have any degree either of weight or of truth in them.

33. The firſt is very light and unconſiderable, that in interpreting [*all in every place*] 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. *Grotius* ſaith the ſame with me. And would not any man believe this aſſertion of the *Prefacer*, take it on his word, and not think it needful to examine it, but reſolve, it is ſo much the better, and that thereby it ſeems, that I am not ſingular in my imagination? But to ſee the luck of it, having no ſuch *idea* in my memory, I turn'd to *Grotius*'s Notes on the place, and this is all that they ſay there; *Oſtendit vocationem omnibus eſſe communem, ac proinde unum eſſe corpus debere, non tantum unius loci, ſed & omnium locorum, puta Achaiæ & Macedoniæ, in quâtum erat Paulus, Eccleſiam. The Apoſtle* by the *phraſe* [*all that in every place call on the name of the Lord Jeſus, both theirs and ours*] *ſhews that vocation is common to all, and conſequently that the Church, not only of one place, but of all places, to wit of* Achaia, *and* Macedonia, *where* Paul *then was, ought to be one body*] From hence truly I was not ſo diligent a reader of that learned mans *Annotations*, as to make any collection at all; or ſo much as to remember that he had ſaid it, nor was I ever ſo acute, or ſagacious, as from thoſe words to have been able to infer this *concluſion*, that the *Epiſtle* was written to *all* the Churches of *Achaia*: For as long as *Corinth* was in *Achaia*, there had been perfect truth in *Grotius*'s words, though the *Epiſtle* had been written only to *Corinth*; as there is on the other ſide, in his mention of *Macedonia* (where *Paul* then was) though *Paul* was not conceived by *Grotius* to have been in above one City of *Macedonia* (viz. *Philippi*) at this time when thus he wrote.

34. The ſecond is, that *H. Grotius* is my *great friend, to whom I am beholding for more than one rare notion.* To which I anſwer, that this is ſo far perfect truth, that he is one whoſe memory I exceedingly reverence and value for what he hath written; one from whom I have from my firſt entrance on the conſideration of Divine and Moral learning, received more uſeful notions than I have from any Writer of this laſt Age, and ſo may any man elſe that is not very much above my pitch, if he read him with a ſincere deſire of knowing and practiſing the truth. As for any uncertain conjectures, which I ſuppoſe the *Prefacer* means by *rare notions*, or for any expedients whereby to defend the matter in hand, that of *Epiſcopacy*, I know not that I received any the leaſt hint or direction from him.

35. The third is, that *I ward my ſelf carefully that I may not be thought beholding to* Grotius. To which I reply, that I never was ſparing on any occaſion, whether by words or writings to give my teſtimony of my valuing, and my being beholding to him, but eſpecially that I have done this very frequently in my Papers that have been publiſht, as I ſhall not need make proof by citations or references to them; and I pretend not either to more gravity or ſelf-denial, than is perfectly reconcileable with this; how far either of theſe are diſcover'd by the *Prefacer*, it is not my purpoſe to examine. And whereas it is ſuggeſted as the *complaint of ſome that have tried it in reference to the Comment on the Revelations*, this muſt needs be in thoſe men, whoſoever they are, a moſt groundleſs complaint or quarrel, 1. Becauſe it is moſt certain that *Grotius*'s Book of Notes upon the *Revelation*, came out after I had penn'd the *Annotations* on the *Revelation*, and ſo all that I had to do, was to ſurvey them as ſoon as they came out, and comparing my Notes with his, to reap what benefit I could from him; but did not, could not receive from him my *ſcheme* of that *Prophecy*, or *ſeries* of my *interpretations* on the whole, or on any part thereof, ſave only thoſe two *Chapters* (13. and 17.) whereon he had formerly written.

36. Secondly; Becauſe in the one place which my memory at preſent ſuggeſteth to me, that I borrowed the *interpretation* from him, there I find upon *examination*, that I have own'd it from him, in that of the *two Witneſſes*, p. 962. I ſay, it is *reaſonable to forſake all other conjectures, and pitch upon that which the learned* H. Grotius *hath reſolved on.*

37. Laſtly, Becauſe I had made my particular and ſolemn acknowledgments to this *Learned* man, by recommending, next after *Chryſoſtom* and the *Greek Scholiaſts*, his admirable *Comments* and *poſthumous Annotations*, in which number this on the *Revelation* was ſpecially comprehended. This is once done in the beginning of the *Preface*, and again toward the end of it. And that is the third argument to ſuperſede all force of this charge. And ſo I am ſtill, I ſuppoſe, free from all appearance of having merited any part of this character faſtned on me by him and his other *complainers.*

38. After I had written thus much, and juſt as this paragraph was tranſcribed, it happens quite above my expectation, that a fourth evidence was offered to me in a Letter from a Learned friend, an account whereof, by tranſcribing ſome few paſſages in it, will a little longer divert the Reader: It is in theſe words:

Sir, I have ſeen a Preface of Mr. Owen's *before his Anſwer to Mr.* John Goodwin *touching Perſeverance, and I doubt not but you have ſeen it, or will ſee it, before this Paper comes to you; ſo I will take no trouble to render to you any thing more of that Digreſſion, which he ſpends upon you, than to give you notice that I obſerve amongſt the many reproaches, wherewith he endeavours to load you, in the* 17. *and* 18. *pages, he tells men, That there are many that complain of your ſecret vain-glory, in ſeeking to diſclaim the direction from* H. Grotius *in reference to your Comment on the Revelation. This charge, I ſuppoſe, reflects upon the very cloſe of your Præmonition concerning the Interpretation of the Apocalypſe*, viz. (Among which number I now alſo find the moſt learned *Hugo Grotius*, in thoſe poſthumous Notes of his on the *Apocalypſe* lately publiſhed.] *It ſeems thoſe many complainers ſuſpect, that (for the main delineation of your work on that Prophecy) you took it from* Grotius, *though you do pretend, that* without any other light going before you, *you derived it* from the light ſhining in the Prophecy it ſelf. *Unleſs you think it more fit for you to contemn than to vindicate your ſelf from that aſperſion, ſure you want not ſufficient evidence to reprove that ſurmiſe. I doubt not but you communicated your thoughts concerning that Prophecy to ſeveral friends, whom you judged proper to be conſulted in ſuch a matter: Amongſt others, I am ſure you acquainted Mr.* John D. *with the firſt draught of your Interpretation, who thereupon told you, That when he and I converſed together, which was in the year* 1645. *I had in ſome diſcourſes declared my*

opinion

opinion concerning that Prophecy, to what times it referred, and that he found a great concurrence in your opinion and mine, which relation of his moved you to write to me, and require of me to communicate my thoughts to you about the ſcope of that Prophecy; and this your Letter was dated Octob. 9. 1648. *To which deſire I forthwith paid a due reſpect, and in ſuch manner, as I was able, gave you a ſcheme of my thoughts on that Prophecy, and then ſoon after my anſwer ſent to you, I received a ſecond Letter from you, in which you ſaid* [That which you have now ſent me is the laying down of all the very grounds, which I have laid down for the interpreting the *Apocalypſe*, and unleſs it be in one little particular, the concurrence is exactly the ſame for the interpretation of the ſeveral parts.] *And then you proceeded in that Letter to give me the ſumm of every part of the Prophecy, which is the exact ſumm of your interpretation which is publiſhed: And this ſecond Letter was dated* Decemb. 18. 1648. *I have thus punctually ſet down the times, becauſe it is very likely that you cannot with ſo much eaſe diſtinguiſh the times as may clear you perfectly from that calumny, if you think fit to take any notice thereof at all.*

All that I ſhall add to this ſeaſonable aſſiſtance of my ill memory, is but this, that *Grotius*'s *Notes* were not publiſhed till the year 1650. And ſo much above what I intended in anſwer to that ſuggeſtion.

The fourth thing is, that which is concluded from mine own *Apologie*, as he is pleaſed to call it, *Diſſert.* 5. *c.* 1. *ſect.* 24. where I ſaid, that I was *glad to find by* Grotius's *Annotations on the Revelation (read haſtily by me after the Diſſertations were finiſht and tranſcribed for the Printer) that he was of my opinion concerning a Gentile and a Jewiſh congregation of Chriſtians in the ſame city.* How I offended in this, or why this ſhould be ſtiled an *Apologie*, or what I ſhould have ſaid in any ſyllable otherwiſe than I did, I confeſs I cannot imagine. This only I know, that it was perfect truth, what there I ſaid, that that whole diſcourſe, about the two ſorts of *Aſſemblies* and *Biſhops*, in every branch of it was made before his *Annotations* either were *read* by me, or *publiſht*; that if I had had his authority to have voucht for the whole obſervation, I ſhould moſt gladly have own'd it, and counted it my intereſt to do ſo, that I might not be blamed for the ſingularity of the obſervation by thoſe, who were otherwiſe minded: That as it was, I was glad I had his ſuffrage, and accordingly expreſſed I was ſo. 39.

And now truly I am very little concern'd in the *gloſs*, which, quite contrary to my expectation, I find put upon it; were it not my duty to avert the ſuſpicion of a vice, and the ill example conſequent to it, I ſhould never have diſturbed the *fly*, which he tells me, this hath let into my *pot* of *ointment*. The *Prefacer* ſhould have had my free leave to have ſaid this, and much more (ſo long as it was ſo far from truth) againſt me, without my making any word of ſolemn reply to it. As it is, I am not ill pleaſed, that I am now at an end of it. 40.

SECT. II.

A digreſſion concerning ſome jealouſies ſpread of Hugo Grotius.

YET becauſe I will be as little in the debt of that learned man *Hugo Grotius*, as I may, and becauſe I have the occaſion offer'd, which ſuggeſts it my duty to make ſome return of gratitude to ſo good a friend of mine, as I am told he is, I ſhall do it in a way, which ſeems to me moſt proper at this time. 1.

This very *pious*, *learned*, *judicious* man hath of late among many fallen under a very unhappy fate, being moſt unjuſtly calumniated, ſometimes as a *Socinian*, ſometimes as a *Papiſt*, and as if he had learnt to *reconcile Contradictories*, or the moſt *diſtant extreams*, ſometimes as both of them together. 2.

For that of his being a *Socinian*, three things are vulgarly made uſe of, to infuſe that jealouſie into mens minds: 1. Some parcels of a Letter of his to *Crellius*. 2. Some relations of what paſt from him at his death. 3. Some paſſages in his *Annotations*. Of theſe it may ſuffice to ſay briefly, that the collection, which is made from the firſt, and the whole of the ſecond, is perfect *calumny* and *forgery*; the third an injuſtice in the publiſher. 3.

For the firſt of them, having ſeen above twenty years ſince, ἀποσπασμάτια, *fragments* or *excerpta* of a letter of his to *Crellius* (on occaſion of that mans defence of *Socinus*, againſt his excellent Book *De ſatisfactione Chriſti*) wherein there were many civilities and commendations of what was any way commendable in the *Socinian* writings, and finding that this was lookt on as an indication of his judgment, very favourable to that *ſect*, that inſtead of replying to his confutation, he returned nothing but words of kindneſs and eſteem to him and his whole tribe, and having then commodity to make a more particular inquiry into the truth of that whole matter, I accordingly made uſe of it, and had this account from that learned man, which as well as my memory will afford, I will ſet down intirely, 1. that upon the *Survey* of *Crellius*'s book againſt him, he found there was but one thing of any weight, which ſeemed to ſtand in force againſt him, and to exact any *reply* from him, and that was about ἀντίψυχία, *vicaria ſatisfactio*, one mans *laying down* his life for another, the innocent to reſcue the nocent: Secondly, that after the publication of his Book, *De Satisfactione*, but withal, long before *Crellius*'s *reply*, he had taken that one particular into more ſerious conſideration, and in his book, *De Jure Belli ac Pacis*, ſet down his thoughts on that ſubject more exactly; I think it was *l.* 2. *c.* 21. Thirdly, that to that diſcourſe he remitted him, being of opinion, that he needed not add any more in relation to that *Controverſie*, as it lay betwixt them, joyning as appears by the *Excerpta*, many paſſages of civility and commendations, which he thought due to them in one reſpect, their profeſt deſire to advance the practice of vertue and Chriſtian life. And this account of this letter gives it a quite different and diſtant appearance, from that which the fragments, all of one ſort, taken alone, out of this conjunction, had given it. 4.

For

5. For the ſecond, concerning ſome words which are reported (variouſly) to have paſt from him at his death, they will be evidenced to be either totally falſified, or foully miſtaken and diſtorted from the true meaning of them, by the account given of his ſickneſs and laſt paſſages, by *John Quiſtorpius*, *Doctor* of *Divinity*, and *Paſtor* of the chief Church in *Roſtoch*, who aſſiſted him in his laſt trial. His Letter being already in *Print*, in *Doctor Cauſabone*'s little Book intituled (as I remember) *De Uſu verborum*, I muſt not here ſet it down, but refer the *Reader* to that view of it, where he will find no other words of his but theſe; when the *Doctor* wiſhed he had been to converſe with him in health, his anſwer was, *ita Deo viſum eſt, thus God hath pleaſed* to diſpoſe of it; when he mentioned *confeſſion* of *ſins*, and the *example* of the *Publican*, he interpoſed, *Ego ille ſum Publicanus, I am that Publican*; when he remitted him to *Chriſt*, *without whom* there is no *Salvation*, he replied, *In ſolo Chriſto omnis ſpes mea repoſita eſt, In Chriſt only all my hope is repoſed.* When he uſed the prayer beginning *Herr Jeſu wahrer Menſch und Got*, &c. he folded his hands and followed him in a low voice; when he asked him at the end, whether he underſtood, he anſwered, *probè intellexi, I underſtood it well*; when upon reciting ſome ſeaſonable texts of Scripture, he askt again whether he underſtood him, his laſt words were, *Vocem tuam audio, ſed quæ ſingula dicas difficulter intelligo, I hear your voice, but do not eaſily underſtand every word you ſay.* And having ſaid ſo, he became Speechleſs. This bare recital of his *noviſſima*, is a ſufficient confutation of all the uncharitable relations that are made of them.

6. Laſtly then, for the paſſages in the *Annotations*, it may ſuffice to remember that they are in his *poſthuma*, thoſe which have been publiſht ſince his death, thoſe eſpecially on the *Epiſtles*, of which it is evident, that they had never been formed by him, or fitted for the publick, but were put together by ſome body elſe, after his death, who finding many things in his *adverſaria*, thrown into *Paper books* as he had at any time occaſion, either from his reading of *Scripture* or others *writings* (it being ordinary for every man to note, not only what he *approves*, but what he *diſlikes*, and what he thinks matter of *farther conſideration*) hath, as he thought fit, made a body of *Annotations*, and publiſht them under his *name*. Many indications of the truth of this I might produce, having elſewhere mentioned ſome. I ſhall only add one, *Col.* 1. 16. where the *Apoſtle* ſaith [*by him all things were created that are in Heaven* ---] the *Annotation* publiſht under *Grotius*'s name, hath theſe words, *Rectius eſt; ἐκτίσθη, hic interpretari, ordinata ſunt, novum quendam ſtatum ſunt conſecuta, the righter interpreting of* [*were created*] *is, were ordered, obtained a new kind of ſtate*, and ſo in the end, *All things were created by him*] the *Scholion* is, *Intellige omnia quæ ad novam creationem pertinent, Underſtand all things which belong to the New Creation.*

7. Which explications as they more than ſavour of the *Socinian leaven*, not willing to permit *Chriſt* there to be ſaid the *Creator* of *Angels*, but referring all to the *New Creation* (as the *Socinians* generally do, and accordingly interpret, *In principio*, John 1. 1. *In principio Evangelii, In the beginning of the Goſpel*) ſo they are expreſly contrary to the words of *Grotius*, as we know they were publiſht by him on *John* 1. 3. where on thoſe words [*without him was nothing made that was made*] the *nothing*, ſaith he, is put to take away all *exception*, *Id autem ideo factum, ut in iis, quæ per verbum ſunt condita, intelligerentur etiam ea quæ conſpicua nobis non ſunt*, Col. 1. 16. *This was done, that among thoſe things that were created by the word, may be underſtood alſo thoſe things that are not ſeen*, citing this very place to that *ſence*, *Col.* 1. 16. which in the *poſthumous Annotations*, is interpreted in ſuch a contrariety both to this former note, and to the writings laſt publiſhed by him before his death, that nothing can be more diſcernably injurious to him.

8. By this the Reader may obſerve and judge of others, and conſider how unequal we are likely to be to dead men, if we judge of their opinions by all that is after death publiſhed under their names. Witneſs alſo his Book, *De Poteſtate Regis circa ſacra*, which being written by him in his younger days, but never approved by him to be publiſht in his life, but purpoſely ſuppreſt, only ſome Copies ſtoln out in *Manuſcripts* from him (in which form I read it many years ſince) 'tis now againſt his conſent (and in many things diſtant from his ſence expreſs in later writings) publiſht, as if it had been fully allow'd by him. But this by the way.

9. Next then for the charge of *Popery* that is fallen upon him, it is evident from whence that flows, either from his profeſt oppoſition to many doctrines of ſome *Reformers*, *Zuinglius*, and *Calvin*, &c. or from his *Annotations* on *Caſſander*, and the *Debates* with *Rivet*, conſequent thereto, the *Votum pro Pace* and *Diſcuſſio*.

10. For the former of theſe 'tis ſufficiently known what conteſts there were, and at length how profeſt the diviſions betwixt the *Remonſtrant* and *Contraremonſtrant*, and it is confeſt that he maintain'd (all his time) the *Remonſtrants* party, * vindicating it from all charge, whether of *Pelagianiſm*, or *Semipelagianiſm*, which was by the oppoſers objected to it, and preſſing the favourers of the *Doctrine* of *Irreſpective Decrees* with the odious conſequences of making ‖ God the author and favourer of ſin, and frequently expreſſing his ſence of the evil influences that ſome of thoſe *Doctrines* were experimented to have on mens lives; and by theſe means it is not ſtrange that he ſhould fall under great diſpleaſure from thoſe, who having eſpouſed the opinion of *irreſpective decrees*, did not only publiſh it as the *truth* and *truth* of *God*, but farther aſſerted the queſtioning of it to be *injurious* to *God's free Grace*, and his *eternal Election*, and conſequently retain'd no ordinary patience for, or charity to oppoſers.

* *Diſquiſ. an Pelagiana ſint dogm. &c.*

‖ Appendix to *de Antichriſto.*

11. But then ſtill this is no *medium* to infer that charge. The *Doctrines*, which he thus maintained, were neither branches nor characters of *Popery*, but aſſerted by ſome of the firſt, and moſt learned and pious *Reformers*. Witneſs the writings of *Hemingius* in his *Opuſcula* (moſt of which are on theſe ſubjects) whereas on the contrary ſide, *Zuinglius* and others, who maintained the rigid way of *irreſpective decrees*, and infuſed them into ſome of this *Nation* of ours, are truly ſaid by an * *excellent Writer* of ours to have had it firſt from ſome ancient *Romiſh Schoolmen*, and ſo to have had as much (or more) of that guilt adherent to them, as can be charged on their oppoſers.

* Dr. *Jacksons* Book 10. ch. 49.

12. The truth is, theſe (or the like to them) have been matters controverted in all times, and in theſe latter days the controverſies inflamed, and the doctrines warmly maintained on both ſides, by the

Lutherans

Lutherans againſt the *Calviniſts*, who are yet no more *Papiſts* than they, and by the *Papiſts* among themſelves, witneſs the continual diſputes between the *Jeſuits* and the *Dominicans*, and at this time between the *Moliniſts* and *Janſenians*, the parties for a long time ſo equally balanced, that the *Popes* have thought it prudent to wave defining on either ſide, till this laſt year *Innocentius* X. upon the inſtance of the *French King* hath made a deciſion of them.

So that from hence to found the jealouſie, to affirm him a *Papiſt* becauſe he was not a *Contraremonſtrant*, is but the old method of ſpeaking all that is *ill* of thoſe, who differ from our opinions in any thing, as the *Dutch* man in his rage calls his horſe an *Arminian*, becauſe he doth not go as he would have him. And this is all that can ſoberly be concluded from ſuch ſuggeſtions, that they are diſpleaſed and paſſionate that thus ſpeak. 13.

As for the *Annotations* on *Caſſander*, &c. and the conſequent vindications of himſelf againſt *Rivet*, thoſe have with ſome colour been deemed more favourable toward *Popery*; but yet, I ſuppoſe will be capable of benign interpretations, if they be read with theſe few cautions or remembrances. 14.

1. That they were deſigned to ſhew a way to peace, whenſoever mens minds on both ſides ſhould be piouſly affected to it. Secondly, that he did not hope for this temper in this age, the humour on both ſides being ſo turgent, and extreamly contrary to it, and the controverſie debated on both ſides by thoſe, *qui æterna cupiunt eſſe diſſidia*, ſaith he, *who deſire to eternize*, and not *compoſe contentions*, and therefore makes his appeal to poſterity, when this *paroxyſm* ſhall be over, *Judicet æqua poſteritas, ad quam maximè provoco.* 15. *Vid. Ep. ad Gal. p. 36.*

Thirdly; That for the chief uſurpations of the *Papacy*, he leaves it to *Chriſtian Princes* to joyn together to vindicate their own rights, and reduce the *Pope ad Canones*, to that temper which the ancient Canons allow and require of him, and if that will not be done, to reform every one within their own dominions. 16.

Fourthly; That what he ſaith in favour of ſome Popiſh doctrines, above what ſome other learned Proteſtants have ſaid, is not ſo much by way of aſſertion or juſtification of them, as to ſhew what reaſons they may juſtly be thought to proceed upon, and ſo not to be ſo irrational or impious as they are ordinarily accounted; and this only in order to the peace of the Chriſtian world, that we may have as much charity to others, and not as high animoſities, live with all men as ſweetly, and amicably, and peaceably, and not as bitterly as is poſſible; accounting the Wars, and Seditions, and Diviſions, and Rebellions, that are raiſed, and managed upon the account of *Religion*, far greater and more ſcandalous unchriſtian evils, than are the errors of ſome *Romiſh doctrines*, eſpecially as they are maintain'd by the more ſober and moderate men among them, *Caſſander*, *Picherel*, &c. 17.

Fifthly; What he ſaith in his *Diſcuſſio*, of a conjunction of Proteſtants with thoſe that adhere to the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, is no farther to be extended than his words extend it. 1. That there is not any other viſible way to the end there mention'd by him, of acquiring or preſerving univerſal unity. 2. That this is to be done not crudely, by returning to them as they are, ſubmitting our necks to our former yoke, but by taking away at once the diviſion, and the cauſes of it, on which ſide ſoever; adding only in the third place, that the bare Primacy of the *Biſhop* of *Rome ſecundùm Canones*, ſuch as the ancient Canons allow of (which hath nothing of ſupreme univerſal power or authority in it) is none of thoſe cauſes, nor conſequently neceſſary to be excluded in the διαλλάξικον, citing that as the confeſſion of that excellent perſon *Phil. Melanctbon.* 18. *Page* 255.

So that in effect that whole ſpeech of his, which is ſo ſolemnly vouched by * Mr. *Knot*, and lookt on ſo jealouſly by many of us, is no more than this, That ſuch a Primacy of the *Biſhop* of *Rome*, as the ancient Canons allow'd him, were, for ſo glorious an end, as is the regaining the peace of Chriſtendom, very reaſonably to be afforded him, nay abſolutely neceſſary to be yielded him, whenſoever any ſuch Catholick union ſhall be attempted; which as it had been the expreſs opinion of *Melanctbon*, one of the firſt and wiſeſt Reformers, ſo it is far from any deſign of eſtabliſhing the uſurpations of the *Papacy*, or any of their falſe doctrines attending them, but only deſigned as an expedient for the reſtoring the peace of the whole Chriſtian world, which every diſciple of Chriſt is ſo paſſionately required to contend and pray for. 19. * *Page* 167.

So that, in a word, ſetting aſide the prudential conſideration and queſtion, as whether it were not a hopeleſs deſign that *Grotius* ingaged himſelf in, expreſſing deſires of an univerſal reconciliation, when there was ſo little hope on either ſide, that the extream parties would remit ſo much, as to meet in the middle point (to which alſo the expreſſing of his no hopes of it at this time, and the making his appeal to more impartial poſterity, is a ſatisfactory anſwer) all that this very learned man was guilty of in this matter, was but this, his paſſionate deſire of the unity of the Church in the bands of peace and truth, and a full diſlike of all uncharitable diſtempers, and impious doctrines (whether thoſe which he deemed deſtructive to the practice of all Chriſtian virtue, or which had a particularity of ill influence toward the undermining of Government, and publick peace) whereſoever he met with them. 20.

All which notwithſtanding, the temper of that learned man was known to be ſuch, as rendred him in a ſpecial manner a lover and admirer of the frame and moderation obſerved in our Church of *England*, as it ſtood (ſhaken, but not caſt down) in his life time, deſiring earneſtly to live himſelf in the Communion of it, and to ſee it copied out by the reſt of the world. 21.

And ſo much for this large digreſſion, which if it be no neceſſary return to the *Prefacer*, may yet tend to the ſatisfaction of ſome others, and to the vindicating the memory of that Learned man. 22.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Of Πρεσβύτεροι *in* Clemens. *How many Orders there were in* Corinth *at the writing this Epiſtle.* Βεβαιοτάτην ἀρχαίαν ἐκκλησίαν. *Metropolitical Churches at the firſt.* Philippi *a Metropolis at the firſt, as* Canterbury *at* Auguſtines *firſt planting the Faith. The Inſtitution of Presbyters, when, by what authority.* S. Jerome's *opinion. The uſe of the word Presbyters in Scripture. The Biſhops task.*

1. THE *Prefacer* now proceeds to take notice of a ſecond Anſwer of mine to the Objection from the plurality of the *Elders* in *Clement*, and this yields him alſo matter for many queſtions, and great appearance of triumph. It is managed in theſe words;

2. "But the Doctor hath yet another anſwer to this multiplication of Elders, and the mention of "them with Deacons, with the eminent identity that is between them and Biſhops through the "whole Epiſtle, the ſame perſons being unqueſtionably intended in reſpect of the ſame office, by "both theſe appellations. Now this ſecond anſwer is founded upon the ſuppoſition of the former "(a goodly foundation!) namely, that the Epiſtle under conſideration was written and ſent not to "the Church of *Corinth* only, but to all the Churches of *Achaia*, of which *Corinth* was the Metropo-"litan.

"Now this ſecond anſwer is, that the Elders or Presbyters here mentioned, were properly thoſe "whom he calls Biſhops, Dioceſans, men of a third order and rank above Deacons and Presbyters "in the Church Adminiſtrations and Government: And for thoſe, who are properly called Presby-"ters, there were then none in the Church. To give colour to this miſerable evaſion, *Diſſert.* 4. "*c.* 10, 11. He diſcourſeth about the government and ordering of Church affairs by Biſhops and Dea-"cons, in ſome Churches that were ſmall, not yet formed or compleated, nor come to perfection "at the firſt planting of them; how well this is accommodated to the Church of *Corinth*, which *Cle-"ment* calls βεβαιοτάτην ἀρχαίαν, and which himſelf would have to be a Metropolitical Church, being "confeſſedly great, numerous, furniſhed with great and large gifts and abilities, is ſeen with half "an eye. How ill alſo this ſhift is accommodated to help in the caſe, for whoſe ſervice it was firſt "invented, is no leſs evident. It was to ſave the ſword of *Phil.* 1. 1. from the throat of Epiſcopacy "he contendeth for: That Epiſtle is directed to the Saints or Church at *Philippi* with the Biſhops and "Deacons. Two things do here trouble our Doctor: 1. The mention of more Biſhops than one at "*Philippi*. 2. The knitting together of Biſhops and Deacons, as the only two orders in the Church, "bringing down Epiſcopacy one degree at leaſt from that height, whereto he would exalt it. For "the firſt of theſe he tells you, that *Philippi* was the Metropolitan Church of the Province of *Mace-"donia*, that the reſt of the Churches, which had every one their ſeveral Biſhops (*Dioceſan* we muſt "ſuppoſe) were all compriſed in the mentioning of *Philippi*: ſo that though the Epiſtle be preciſely "directed τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν Φιλίπποις, yet the Biſhops that were with them, muſt be ſuppoſed to "be the Biſhops of the whole Province of *Macedonia*, becauſe the Church of *Philippi* was the Metro-"politan. The whole Country muſt have been ſuppoſed to be converted (and who that knows any "thing of Antiquity, will diſpute that) and ſo divided with *Dioceſans*, as *England* of late was, the "Archbiſhops ſo being at *Philippi*: but how came it then to paſs, that here is mention made of Bi-"ſhops and Deacons only, without any word of a third order or rank of men diſtinct from them cal-"led Presbyters or Elders? To this he anſwers ſecondly, that when the Church was firſt planted, "before any great number were converted, or any fit to be made Presbyters, there was only thoſe "two orders inſtituted, Biſhops and Deacons, and ſo that this Church of *Philippi* ſeems to have been "a Metropolitical Infant. The truth is, if ever the Doctor be put upon reconciling the contradicti-"ons of his anſwers one to another, not only in this, but almoſt in every particular he deals withal "(an intanglement which he is thrown into, by his bold and groundleſs conjectures) he will find it "to be as endleſs as fruitleſs: but it is not my preſent buſineſs to interpoſe in his quarrels, either "with himſelf, or Presbytery. As to the matter under conſideration, I deſire only to be reſolved in "theſe few Queries.

"1. If there were in the time of *Clement* no Presbyters in the Churches, not in ſo great and flou-"riſhing a Church as that of *Corinth*; and if all the places in Scripture, where there is mention of El-"ders, do preciſely intend Biſhops, in a diſtinction from them who are Deacons, and not Biſhops "alſo, as he aſſerts; when, by whom, by what Authority, were Elders, who are only ſo inferiour "to Biſhops, peculiarly ſo termed, inſtituted and appointed in the Churches? And how comes it to "paſs that there is ſuch expreſs mention made of the office of Deacons, and the continuance of it, "none at all of Elders, who are acknowledged to be ſuperiour to them, and on whoſe ſhoulders in all "their own Churches, lies the great weight and burthen of all Eccleſiaſtical adminiſtration? As we "ſay of their Biſhops, ſo ſhall we of any Presbyter, not inſtituted and appointed by the authority of "Jeſus Chriſt in the Church, let them go to the place from whence they came.

"2. I deſire the Doctor to inform me in what ſence he would have me to underſtand him, *Diſſert.* "2. *cap.* 20, 21, 22. Where he diſputes that theſe words of *Hierom*, *Antequam ſtudia in Religione "fierent, & diceretur in populis, Ego ſum Pauli, ego Cephæ, communi Presbyterorum conſenſu Eccleſiæ "gubernabantur*, are to be underſtood of the times of the Apoſtles, when the firſt Schiſm was in the "Church of *Corinth*, when it ſeems that neither then, nor a good while after, there was any ſuch "thing as Presbyters in the Church of *Corinth*, nor in any other Church, as we can hear of: As alſo "to tell us whether all thoſe Presbyters were Biſhops properly ſo called, diſtinct from Elders, who "are only ſo, out of whom one man is choſen to be a Biſhop properly ſo called. To theſe enquiries "I ſhall only add,

"3. That

3. "That whereas in the Scripture, we find clearly but two ſorts of Church-officers mentioned, "as alſo in this Epiſtle of *Clement*, the third that was afterward introduced, be it what it will, or "fall on whom it will, that we oppoſe. This (ſaith the Doctor) is that of Presbyters, give us "the Churches inſtituted according to the word of Chriſt, give us in every Church, Biſhops and "Deacons (rather than we will quarrel, give us a Biſhop and Deacons) let thoſe Biſhops attend "the particular flock, over which they are appointed, preaching the Word, and adminiſtring the "holy Ordinances of the Goſpel, in and to their own flock; And I dare undertake for all the Con-"tenders for Presbytery in this Nation, and much more for the Independents, that there ſhall be an "end of this quarrel: that they will not ſtrive with the Doctor, nor any living, for the intro-"duction of any third ſort of perſons (though they ſhould be called Presbyters) into Church office "and Government. Only this I muſt add, that the Scripture more frequently terms this ſecond "ſort of men Elders and Presbyters, than it doth Biſhops, and that word having been appropria-"ted to a third ſort peculiarly, we deſire leave of the Doctor and his aſſociates, if we alſo moſt "frequently call them ſo, noways declining the other appellation of Biſhops, ſo that it be applied "to ſignifie the ſecond, and not third rank of men. But of this whole buſineſs, with the nature, "conſtitution, and frame of the firſt Churches; and the ſad miſtakes that men have by their own "prejudices been ingaged into, in this delineation of them, a fuller opportunity (if God will) may "ere long be afforded.

Here firſt I ſhall demand, whence it appears, that I accommodated a double anſwer to the multi-plication of *Elders* in *Clemens*, &c. Truly I do not yet know or remember that I did. This cer-3. tainly was all (and this can amount (if to any) but to one anſwer, that which we have vindicated already) that the *Elders* in the *Epiſtle* of *Clemens* were all the *Biſhops* of *Achaia*. This indeed when it was propoſed, was more diſtinctly ſet down by four ſteps or degrees, (but then again thoſe are no more two than four anſwers) 1. that the *Epiſtle* was addreſt to the *Church*, παροικίαν Κόρινθον, *i. e.* to the whole *Province*; Secondly, that (to make it capable of that title) *Corinth* was known to be the *Metropolis* of *Achaia*. Thirdly, that S. *Paul*'s *Epiſtles* to the *Corinthians* belonged to all the *Churches* of *Achaia*, not only to *Corinth*, and ſo in any probability, *Clements* was to do alſo, being written to the ſame, and inſcribed ἐκκλησίᾳ παροικίαν: and therefore Fourthly, that theſe many *El-ders* were the *ſingular Biſhops* in the ſeveral Cities of *Achaia*, in each of which, the *Apoſtles* had in-ſtituted a *Biſhop*. And this is all that is there ſaid in that ſecond *Chap.* of *Diſſ.* 5. And (yet farther) no part of this adapted as an anſwer to that objection of the plurality of *Elders* (or any other) but as things thought fit to be premiſed concerning that *Epiſtle* of *Clemens*, before the taking into conſidera-tion any teſtimony produced out of it.

This might ſpare me the pains of farther conſidering what is here replied to this ſuppoſed ſecond an-4. ſwer. But I have not hitherto been ſo thrifty, as might now juſtifie any ſuch haſty diſmiſſion of him, I ſhall therefore firſt diſpoſe the matter orderly before me, which is a little diſordered and intangled by the *Prefacers* haſty handling, and then give anſwer to every appearance of ſcruple mentioned by him.

There are two things (to the buſineſs of *Epiſcopacy*) chiefly obſervable in this *Epiſtle* of *Clement*, 5. *Firſt*, what he ſaith of the *Apoſtles conſtitution* of *Biſhops* and *Deacons* at their firſt preaching of the Go-ſpel, and this univerſally conſidered, through all Regions and Cities where they preached; without any reſtraining of their ſpeech to the whether *Church* of *Corinth*, or *Churches* of *Achaia*. This is con-ſidered in *Diſſ.* 5. *cap.* 10. and reference made in the margent to a former diſcourſe, *Diſſ.* 4. *cap.* 10. where out of the moſt ancient Records it had been cleared, that at the firſt the *Apoſtles* had conſti-tuted no more in every *Church*, than here were mentioned, a *Biſhop* and one or more *Deacons*. And ſo to this early practice of the *Apoſtles*, it is, that that refers, which is here by the *Prefacer* miſcalled the colour of this *ſecond anſwer* (which he farther ſtiles a *miſerable evaſion*) and ſo evidently it belongs not to the *plurality* of *Elders* in *Corinth*, &c.

The *ſecond* thing there diſcernable is, the *plurality* of *Biſhops* (ſtiled alſo Πρεσβύτεροι *Elders*) among 6. thoſe to whom he there writes. And thoſe, ſay I, are the *Biſhops* of all *Achaia*, as that is the Παροι-κία or *Province* pertaining to that *Metropolis*.

Now theſe things ought thus to have been ſevered, and then having competently vindicated the 7. former of theſe, *Chap.* 3. *Sect.* 4. (that there were indeed at the firſt but *two orders*, ſhewing when the middle order of *Presbyters* came in, *viz.* moſt probably in S. *John*'s time in *Aſia*) and ſo * lately, as * *Cap.* 5. *Sect.* 1. I was required, manifeſted the ſecond, that of the *Biſhops* of *Greece* being meant by the Πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders*, I might, as I ſaid, have reaſonably been ſpared from being ſo ſpeedily called out again to the ſame exerciſes.

But as it is, I ſhall now attend him; and firſt, when he objects, that what was diſcourſed of *ſome* 8. *Churches*, *ſmall*, *and not yet formed* or *compleated* at the firſt planting, cannot be *accommodated to the Church of* Corinth, *which* Clement *calls* βεβαιοτάτην καὶ ἀρχαίαν, *moſt firm and ancient*, and which I affirm to have then been a *Metropolitical Church*, *being confeſſedly great*, *numerous* --- To this I anſwer, 1. That I have no where affirmed this *Church* to be in *Clements* time *ſmall*, *unformed*, &c. nor had any occaſion or temptation to do ſo. 2. That I no where accommodate to this *Church* at that time, what I had be-fore obſerved of the *Church* indefinitely at the firſt planting; Theſe two are but effects of the *Prefa-cers haſt*, without any foundation in any words of mine. 3. That if I am now asked, whether at this time of *Clement*'s writing, there were any more than *two orders* in *Corinth*, and the other Cities of *Greece*, I muſt ſay, as formerly, that though 'tis probable there were none, yet I find no foundation in this *Epiſtle* either for denying or affirming it.

The chief occaſion of writing the *Epiſtle* was the ſedition againſt the *Biſhops*, or Governours of the 9. firſt order, on deſign ἀποδάλλειν ἐπισκοπῆς, to caſt out of their *Biſhopricks* ſome of thoſe, whom the *Apoſtles* had placed over them; and either for *Presbyters*, the *ſecond*, or *Deacons*, the *third order*, there was no ſuch contention, but only (as ſaith he, the *Apoſtles foreſaw*) περὶ ὀνόμα]ος ἐπισκοπῆς, *for the name* or *dignity of Biſhop*, and ſo there is no occaſion to mention any but their *Biſhops*, which yet is far from concluding that there were not any other, for *Deacons* we are ſure there then were, no *Biſhop* be-ing ever without ſuch.

10. Again, that *Biſhops* continued to retain the name of Πρεσβύτεροι, *Elders*, even after there was a ſecond ſort ordained, whom we now call *Presbyters*, hath elſewhere appeared from *Polycarp*, *Papias*, *Irenæus*, and *Tertullian*, who certainly lived to ſee them in the *Church*, and yet call *Biſhops* Πρεσβύτεροι and *Seniores*, and ſo the *Biſhops* being call'd Πρεσβύτεροι in *Clement*, is no indication that there were at that time no ſecond order of *Presbyters* in that Church.

11. And yet on the other ſide, *Clement*'s death falling not far from S. *John*'s, which was in the third of *Trajan*, 'tis as poſſible, and, I confeſs, to me much more probable, that there might be yet no *Preſbyters* ordain'd at *Corinth*, or in the reſt of *Achaia*, at the time of his writing this *Epiſtle*. And ſo there lies no obligation on me, whoſe conjectures are wont to bring me ſo little thanks from the *Prefacer*, to interpoſe them in this matter, where I have ſo little light to ſee by. Only I am ſure that the *Prefacer*'s objection here mention'd, would be of no force againſt me, in caſe I ſhould deny that there were then any *Presbyters* at *Corinth*, becauſe, as the meaning of βεβαιοτάτην ἡ ἀρχαίαν, which *Clemens* affirms of it, can be no more than this, that this Church was founded and eſtabliſht by the Apoſtles themſelves, and ſo was kept upright by them till the time of this ſedition, which * *Hegeſippus* tells us was Πρίμῳ ἐπισκοπεύοντι, Primus *being Biſhop of* Corinth, ſo that concludes nothing for their having *Presbyters* ordain'd among them. And when I ſaid, that at the firſt preaching of the *Apoſtles*, they inſtituted none but *Biſhops* and *Deacons*, I never granted, or implyed, or believed, that as ſoon as ever that was done, they inſtituted more, *viz. Presbyters* alſo.

* *Euſeb. l.* 4. *c.* 22.

12. And whereas he fanſies my obſervation to be made of ſome Churches only, that were ſmall, and *not yet formed*, &c. this is another miſtake; for I take *Clement*'s and *Epiphanius*'s words univerſally of all Churches at their firſt planting, the fuller, as well as the thinner plantations. As at *Jeruſalem*, where all the Ancients tell us there was a *Biſhop* preſently upon *Chriſt*'s *Aſcenſion*, and the number of *Believers* ſo great, that there were *ſeven Deacons* inſtituted to attend him, yet neither in Scripture, nor in the Ancients find we any footſteps of this middle order of *Presbyters* in that City, at that time, or ſoon after. And the reaſon is clear, that though in ſome Cities there were more, in ſome fewer converts, and ſo comparatively to others, the Church at *Corinth*, and through *Achaia* might be numerous, both *Paul* and *Peter* having labour'd there ſucceſfully, yet for ſome time there were not any where ſo many, but that the *Biſhop*, and his *Deacon*, or *Deacons* might be ſufficient for them.

13. So likewiſe the being a *Metropolis* is no argument that there ſhould be *Presbyters* by this time conſtituted there; for ſuppoſing, as I do (and my grounds have been largely ſet down) that the *Apoſtles* conformed their models to the Governments and forms among the Nations where they came, at their firſt planting the Faith in any region, it muſt follow, that the Church of *Corinth*, as ſoon as it was formed into a Church, with a *Biſhop* over it, was alſo a *Metropolitan* Church, in relation to all other Cities of *Greece*, which either then did, or ſhould after believe, as *Jeruſalem* was to all the Cities of *Judea*, or as *Philippi*, being a prime City, or *Metropolis* of *Macedonia*, and the firſt where *Paul* planted the *Faith*, was ſtraightway a *Metropolitical* Church, how few, or how many Chriſtians there were in it, it matters not.

14. And therefore for his change of the ſcene from *Corinth* and *Clement*'s, to *Philippi* and S. *Paul*'s *Epiſtle*, it will bring him no advantage. The caſe between them is exactly parallel. There was a μέρις, or *Province* of *Macedonia*, ſaith S. *Luke*, of which *Philippi* was πρώτη πόλις, the *Metropolis*, juſt as *Corinth* was of *Achaia*, and this City being the firſt in that Region, wherein S. *Paul* planted the Faith, it was certainly a *Metropolitical Church*, and *Epaphroditus* was the *Metropolitan* of that Province, the firſt day he was *Biſhop* of it. The truth of which is ſo evident, that the jeer of the [*Metropolitical Infant*] might ſeaſonably have been controverted into a more ſerious, and decent expreſſion, there being no reaſon imaginable, why, if the *Apoſtles* did inſtitute *Metropolitical Churches* (as here is not one ſerious word of objection againſt all that hath been ſaid to aſſert it) thoſe Churches ſhould not at their firſt inſtitution (call it their infancy if you will) be *Metropolitical Churches*. For as to that of the whole countries being ſuppoſed to be converted, and divided into *Dioceſes*, that is not conſequent or neceſſary to my aſſertion; for as *Clement* ſaith of the *Biſhop* and *Deacon* in each City at the firſt planting of the Faith, that they were conſtituted in relation to them (not only which did, but expreſly μελλόντων πιστεύειν) *who ſhould afterward believe*, ſo the Church and *Biſhop* in the *Metropolis*, when that was firſt converted, might very well be *Metropolitical* in reſpect of the other Cities of that Province, which ſhould afterward receive the Faith.

15. As we know when *Auguſtin* came firſt over into *England*, and preacht the Faith, and converted Chriſtians firſt at *Canterbury*, *Ethelbert*'s ſeat, and the *Metropolis* of that Province, he was by being made *Biſhop* there, made *Metropolitan* alſo. That ſure was *Bede*'s meaning, when he ſaith of it, *lib.* 1. *c.* 27. *Venit Arelas & ab Archiepiſcopo ejuſdem civitatis Etherio Archiepiſcopus Genti Anglorum ordinatus eſt*; *He came to* Arles (*in* France) *and by* Etherius *Archbiſhop of that City was ordained Archbiſhop to the Nation of the Engliſh*; and if, as a learned *Antiquary* thinks, *Bede* ſpake after the uſe of his own time, and that the word *Archiepiſcopus* was not in uſe here then, at *Auguſtine*'s coming hither, yet for the ſubſtance of the thing, wherein I make the inſtance, and all that I contend from thence, there can be no doubt, but that he being at firſt made *Biſhop* of the *Metropolis*, was thereby made alſo *Metropolitan*.

16. As for the diviſions into *Dioceſes*, how little force that hath againſt all that I have ſaid, or thought in this buſineſs, whether of *Biſhops* or *Metropolitans*, I have ſpoken enough to that in the *Vindication* to the *London Miniſters*, *c.* 1. *ſect.* 19. and to that I refer the *Prefacer*.

17. And ſo ſtill I am free enough from quarrelling with my ſelf in the leaſt, or from being ingaged in any endleſs labour to reconcile the contradictions of my anſwers, which as far as my weak underſtanding can reach, are perfectly at agreement with one another. If the labour of ſhewing they are ſo, prove fruitleſs, I know to whom I am beholding for it, even the Task-maſter whom I have undertaken to obſerve, and in that guiſe of obedience, ſhall now proceed briefly to anſwer every of his queſtions, and I hope there cannot now need many words to do it.

To

To the firſt, concerning the Inſtitution of the ſecond order, that of *Presbyters*; for the [*when*] I anſwer, I know not the year, but evidently before the writing of *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*, in *Trajan*'s time, and, in all probability, after the writing all the Books of Scripture, and, for ought I can diſcern, of *Clement*'s *Epiſtle*, as far as concerns either *Rome*, or *Corinth*. 18.

For the [*by whom*, and *by what authority*] I anſwer, I think they were firſt inſtituted by S. *John* in *Aſia*, before his death, and ſhall add to my reaſons elſewhere given for it, this farther conſideration, that *Ignatius* in all his *Epiſtles* to the Churches of *Aſia*, *Epheſus*, *Smyrna*, *Trallis*, *Magneſia*, *Philadelphia*, makes mention of them, within few years after S. *John*'s death, though in his *Epiſtle* to the *Romans* he doth not. And if this be ſo, then alſo it appears by what authority, *viz.* ſuch as S. *John*'s was, *Apoſtolical*. Or if this ſhould not be firmly grounded, as to the perſon of S. *John*, yet the reaſon why they were not at firſt inſtituted, as well as *Deacons*, being but this, becauſe there was no need of them yet, and the power given by the *Apoſtles* to the *firſt Biſhops*, being a plenary power, ſo far that they might communicate to others, what was committed to them, either in whole or in part, and thoſe accordingly, in the force thereof, conſtituting *Presbyters*, *in partem officii*, the authority ſtill, by which they were inſtituted, will be *Apoſtolical*, and ſo if (as this *Prefacer* gives order) they be *let go to the place from whence they came*, they will not be much hurt, they are but remitted to the ſociety of the *Apoſtles* and *Apoſtolical* perſons by this. 19.

To the ſecond, concerning the meaning of my words, *Diſſ.* 2. *c.* 29, 21. when I ſay that *Hierom*'s *words* [*of Churches being governed by common conſent of Presbyters*] are to be underſtood of the times of the *Apoſtles*, and *whether all thoſe Presbyters were Biſhops properly ſo called*] I anſwer, that my meaning was, that if *Hierom* be reconcileable to himſelf, that muſt be his meaning, that in the *Apoſtles* times the Churches were firſt governed by common conſent of *Presbyters*, and after, in the *Apoſtles* times too, upon the riſing of *Schiſms*, a *Biſhop* was every where ſet over them; that accordingly in *Hierom*'s notion, all thoſe *Presbyters* were not *Biſhops*, but ſuch, as out of whom after, one was choſen in every Church to be a *Biſhop*. 20.

That this was the truth of the fact, I no where expreſt my ſelf to think; but that this was the moſt commodious meaning to be affixt to *Hierom*'s words *ad Euagrium*, ſo as they might be reconcileable with the many other teſtimonies brought out of him, which concluded it his opinion alſo, that the *three orders* were of *Apoſtolical inſtitution*. But if I am now asked my ſence expreſly, whether I think thus it was, as *Hierom* (I think) conceived it, I anſwer poſitively, that I think *Hierom* was miſtaken in that circumſtance, and that *Clemens Romanus*, and the Records that *Epiphanius* citeth, are much a more competent authority for the contrary, that *Biſhops* were *firſt inſtituted*, whenſoever any *Apoſtle* in his travel planted a Church in any City, and retain'd not the Government in his own hands. Yet if by any Record it ſhall be made to appear, that before any ſuch City was left by the *Apoſtle*, and ſo before any *Biſhop* were inſtituted in it, the *Elders*, or, as thoſe may ſignifie, the chief believers (a name of age, as well as of power) were truſted by them for ſome ſhort time of their abſence (as I mention'd it there *ſect.* 20. as a poſſible thing) there will then be ſome ground of S. *Hierom*'s miſtake in that circumſtance. But this, I confeſs, more than yet hath any way appear'd to me, and therefore I am content to part with it as a fancy, or σόφον φάσμακον to help S. *Hierom*, and not ſo much as a conjecture. And ſo much for his *Queries*. 21.

As for his addition by way of *Corollary* to his queſtions, the anſwers to the queſtions have already perfectly ſuperſeded it: The three orders in *Ignatius* have already appeared to be of *Apoſtolical inſtitution*, and the very frame of the firſt Churches, though there was no need of the ſecond of them, νὺξ ὁλῷ κηρύσσαι, at the firſt plantations in every City. And it will not be eaſie for any man which hath looked into ancient writings, to be perſwaded the contrary; It being the univerſal affirmation of all that ſpeak of it from *Ignatius* to S. *Hierom*, and for many hundred years downward (though there be ſome difference in ſome few circumſtances, S. *Hierom* thinking that *Presbyters* firſt ruled in common, before the *ſingular Biſhop* was brought in over them, for the avoiding of Schiſms) that the three orders were all inſtituted in the Church by the *Apoſtles* appointment. And if this be the ſad miſtake and prejudice, from which he will ſhortly deliver us, I may have leave to adviſe him the one method of attempting it, that cheaper, of ſetting *Antiquity* aſide in the delineation, and not the more coſtly, of profeſſing to make his appeal to it, as in this *Preface* he hath adventured to do. 22.

One thing he here thinks farther neceſſary for him to add, that the *Scripture more frequently terms this ſecond ſort of men Elders and Presbyters, than it doth Biſhops*, wherein there be but theſe three miſadventures; 1. That this ſecond ſort of men are frequently mention'd in Scripture: 2. That this ſecond ſort of men are ſometimes call'd *Biſhops* in Scripture: 3. That they are frequently call'd *Elders* there: No one of which he will ever be able to juſtifie. Let him pleaſe to turn to the *Vindication of the Diſſert. from the Exceptions of the London Miniſters*, cap. 2. and if againſt what is there ſaid, or before in the *Diſſertations*, he think himſelf able to evince any one of theſe three propoſitions, I ſhall willingly acknowledge my ſelf his *Diſciple*, being alſo ſure, that unleſs both *Biſhops* and *Elders* ſignifie nothing but *Presbyters* in every place, their ſignifying moſt frequently ſo, is the giving the queſtion, the yielding the whole cauſe to the *Prelatiſt*. 23.

As for the tasks of the *Biſhops office*, and his performance of them, I ſhall willingly grant him my ſuffrage, *let them diſcharge them* (and I beſeech all who have any way hindred them, at length to let, and quietly permit them.) On condition he will do this as chearfully as I, I ſhall never contend with him concerning the nature of their task, be it, as he ſaith, their *attending their particular flock, over which they are appointed* (the *Biſhop* of *Oxford* over that Flock or portion, to which he was, and is appointed, and ſo all others in like manner) be it their *preaching and adminiſtring the holy Ordinances of the Goſpel, in, and to their own flock*, and whatſoever elſe of duty and *ratione officii* belongs to a rightly *conſtituted Biſhop*. And let all that have diſturbed this courſe ſo duly ſetled in this Church, and in all the Churches of Chriſt, ſince the *Apoſtles* planting them, diſcern their error, and return to that peace and unity of the Church, from whence they have ſo cauſeleſly, and unexcuſably departed, and let none be ſo uncharitable as to ſurmiſe, that he which thus exhorts them, hath any other deſign in doing it, than that which alone he profeſſeth to have, their timely, and now, if ever, ſeaſonable *Reformation*. 24.

CHAP. VI.

Of Testimonies in Ignatius, *deemed to favour the Congregational way.*

SECT. I.

The Prefacer's pretensions avoided. Κατ' ἔνσασιν. *His Hypothesis confutable from* Ignatius. *The power of prejudice. Of Popish Churches. Chorepiscopi. Metropoles. Conformity of Ecclesiastick with Civil distributions. The* Ignatian *Churches fansied by the Prefacer. The Gnostick heresie no deflowring of the purity of the Church. The several branches of the fansied Model, how well grounded in* Ignatius. Ἐπίσκοπον καλεῖν. Ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. *A Catholick, a National, a Metropolitical, a Diocesan Church in* Ignatius.

1. BUT we are from *Clemens* once more brought down to *Ignatius* again, and of the great prejudices and mistakes, and unjust apprehensions which we *Prelatists* have had in reading, and bringing Testimonies from him, we are now to be admonished in these words, as followeth;

2. "To return then to our *Ignatius*, even upon this consideration of the difference that is between "the Epistles ascribed to him, and the writings of one of the same time with him, or not long be- "fore him, as to their language and expressions about Church-Order and Officers, it is evident that "there hath been ill favour'd tampering with them, by them who thought to prevail themselves of "his authority, for the asserting of that which never came into his mind.

"As I intimated before, I have not insisted on any of those things, nor do on them altogether, "with the like that may be added, as a sufficient foundation for the total rejection of those Epistles "which go under the name of *Ignatius*. There is in some of them a sweet and gracious spirit of "Faith, Love, Holiness, Zeal for God, becoming so excellent and holy a witness of Christ as he "was, evidently breathing and working. Neither is there any need at all, that for the defence of "our Hypothesis concerning the non-institution of any Church-Officer whatsoever, relating to more "Churches in his office, or any other Church, than a single particular Congregation; that we should "so reject them: For although many passages, usually insisted on, and carefully collected by D. *H.* "for the proof of such an Episcopacy to have been received by them of old, as is now contended for, "are exceedingly remote from the way and manner of the expressions of those things, used by the "Divine Writers, with them also that follow'd after, both before, as hath been manifested, and "some while after the days of *Ignatius*, as might be farther clearly evidenced, and are thrust into "the series of the discourse with such an incoherent impertinency, as proclaims an interpolation, "being some of them also very ridiculous, and so foolishly hyperbolical, that they fall very little "short of Blasphemies, yet there are expressions in all, or most of them, that will abundantly mani- "fest, that he who was their Author (whoever he was) never dreamt of any such fabrick of Church- "Order as in after Ages was insensibly received. Men who are full of their own apprehensions, be- "gotten in them by such representations of things, as either their desirable presence hath exhibited "to their mind, or any after prejudicate presumption hath possest them with, are apt upon the least "appearance of any likeness unto that Church, they fansie, to imagine that they see the face and all "the lineaments thereof, when upon due examination it will easily be discovered, that there is not "indeed the least resemblance, between what they find in, and what they bring to the Authors, in, "and of whom they make their inquiry. The Papists having hatched and own'd by several degrees, "that monstrous figment of Transubstantiation (to instance among many in that abomination) a fol- "ly, destructive to whatever is in us as being living creatures, Men, or Christians, or whatever by "sense, reason, or Religion, we are furnished withal, offering violence to us in what we hear, what "we see with our eyes, and look upon, in what our hands do handle, and our palats taste, break- "ing in upon our understandings with vagrant flying forms, self-subsisting accidents, with as many "expres contradictions on sundry accounts, as the nature of things is capable of relation unto, at- "tended with more gross Idolatry than that of the poor naked *Indians*, who fall down and worship "a piece of red-cloth, or of those who first adore their Gods, and then correct them; do yet upon "the discovery of any expressions among the Ancients seeming to favour them, which they now "make use of, quite to another end and purpose, than they did, who first ventured upon them, ha- "ving minds filled with their own abominations, do presently cry out, and triumph, as if they had "found the whole fardel of the Mass in its perfect dress, and their breaden God in the midst of it. "It is no otherwise in the case of Episcopacy; men of these later Generations, from what they saw "in present being, and that usefulness of it to all their desires and interests, having entertain'd "thoughts of love to it, and delight in it, searching Antiquity, not to instruct them in the truth, "but to establish their prejudicate opinion received by Tradition from their Fathers, and to confute "them with whom they have to do, whatever expressions they find, or can hear of, that fall in, as "to the sound of words, with what is now insisted upon, instantly they cry out *vicimus, Io-Pean!* "what a simple Generation of Presbyters and Independents have we, that are ignorant of all Anti- "quity, or do not understand what they read and look upon. Hence if we will not believe that in "*Ignatius*'s days there were many Parish Churches with their single Priests, in subordination to a Di- "ocesan Bishop, either immediately, or by the interposed power of a *Chore-episcopus* and the like, "and those Diocesans again in the precincts of Provinces, laid in a due subjection to their "Metropolitans, who took care of them, as they of their Parish Priests, every Individual Church "having

" having no Officer but a Presbyter, every Dioceſan Church having no Presbyter but a Biſhop, and " every Metropolitan Church having neither Presbyter nor Biſhop properly related unto it, as ſuch, " but an Archbiſhop, we are worſe than Infidels: Truly, I cannot but wonder, whether it doth not " ſometimes enter into theſe mens thoughts to apprehend how contemptible they are in their proofs, " for the fathering of ſuch an Eccleſiaſtical diſtribution of Governours and Government, as undeni- " ably lacquied after the civil diviſions and conſtitutions of the times and places, wherein it was in- " troduced, upon thoſe holy perſons, whoſe ſouls never once entred into the ſecrets thereof.

" Thus fares it with our Doctor and his *Ignatius*: οὐκ εἶδεν, (it ſhould be ἴδεν) ἀλλ' ἐδόκησεν ἰδεῖν " διὰ νύκλα σελήνην. I ſhall only crave leave to ſay to him as *Auguſtus* of *Quintilius Varus*, upon the " loſs of the Legions in *Germany* under his command; *Quintili Vare, redde Legiones; Domine Do-* " *ctor, redde Eccleſias:* Give us the Churches of Chriſt, ſuch as they were in the days of the Apoſtles, " and down to *Ignatius*, though before that time (if *Hegeſippus* may be believed) ſomewhat deflou- " red, and our conteſt about Church-Officers and Government will be nearer at an end, than per- " haps you will readily imagine. Give us a Church all whoſe members are holy, called, ſanctified, " juſtified, living ſtones, Temples for the Holy Ghoſt, Saints, Believers, united to Chriſt the head " by the Spirit that is given to them, and dwelleth in them, a Church whoſe πλῆθος is ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ " ἐπίσκοπος, that doth nothing by its members apart, that appertains to Church-order, but when it " is gathered ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, a Church that being ſo gathered together in one place συνδάζει πάντα πράσσειν " ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ θεῷ προκαθημένῳ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, acting in Church things, in its whole body under the rule and " preſidence of its Officers, a Church walking in order, and not as ſome, who ἐπίσκοπον μὲν καλοῦσιν, " χώρις δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα πράσσουσιν (of whom ſaith *Ignatius*, οἱ τοιοῦτοι οὐκ εὐσυνείδητοι μὲν εἶναι φαίνονται. " Διὰ μὲν τὸ μὴ βεβαίως κατ' ἐντολὴν συναθροίζεσθαι, ſuch as calling the Biſhops to the Aſſemblies, yet do " all things without him (the manner of ſome in our days) he ſuppoſeth not to keep the Aſſemblies " according to the command of Chriſt) give us, I ſay, ſuch a Church, and let us come to them when " they are πάντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ἅμα συναχθέντες, ſuch as the Churches in the days of *Igna-* " *tius* appear to have been, and are ſo rendred in the Quotations taken from his Epiſtles, by the " learned Doctor for the confirmation of Epiſcopacy, and as I ſaid before, the conteſt of this preſent " digreſſion will quickly draw to an iſſue.

The firſt thing here aſſumed, is the evidence of ſome ill favoured tampering with *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*, deduced from the *difference between them and* Clement's, *in their expreſſion about Church-Order and Offi-* 3. *cers.* But indeed if there were any ſuch thing, I hope it will not be imputed to me, who have been as careful as is poſſible, to get an *emendate* copy of theſe *Epiſtles*, and having firſt contented my ſelf with that, which had paſt *Vedelius*'s trial at *Geneva*, which one might hope would burn up all the ſtubble, which could be gotten in there, toward the founding of *Epiſcopacy*, I have ſince fallen upon Copies much more purified than that, cleanſed from almoſt all the droſs, every paſſage, which this *Prefacer* hath thought fit to accuſe or diſlike in them: And ſeeing he now profeſſeth againſt the total rejecting of them, and gives them many good words in teſtimony of a *ſweet and gracious ſpirit breathing in them*, if he ſhall now be pleaſed to direct me to any way of procuring a yet more *emendate* Edition, and ſuch as may perfectly accord his language with all others of *his time, or not long before him*, particularly with *Clemens*, I ſhall acknowledge it a great obligation, and a diſcovery worth his undertaking. But as far as my eyes yet ſerve me, there is little hope of this, and therefore as it is, I muſt be content to think, as the evidences before me exact from me, that though *Clemens* ſaith truly, that the *Apoſtles* at their firſt preaching placed no more but a *Biſhop* and *Deacon* in each City, yet before *Ignatius*'s time, there was a middle order conſtituted in the Churches of *Aſia*, and that alſo by the appointment of the *Apoſtles*, and that this is a very fair account of all the difference of their language and *expreſſion about Church Order and Officers.*

In the next place he hath very ingenuouſly diſcovered, upon what account it is, that he hath be- 4. ſtowed ſo many of his good words at laſt upon *Ignatius*, becauſe, forſooth, *he hath no need for the defence of his Hypotheſis totally to reject them*, and becauſe *there are expreſſions in all, or moſt of them, that will abundantly manifeſt, that he who was their Author, never dreamt of any ſuch fabrick of Church-order as in after ages was inſenſibly received.* But 1. I think not this the right way of judging mens works, whether they be theirs or no (the due motive of receiving or rejecting any ancient writing) by comparing them with our own *Hypotheſes*, and obſerving which way our neceſſities oblige us. This we were wont to call ἀναγκάζειν ὑποθέσει, ſerving and requiring all others to ſerve and miniſter to the wants of our *Hypotheſis.*

Secondly; If it ſhould really appear, what is here pretended, that there ſhould be expreſſions in 5. theſe *Epiſtles* which would *abundantly manifeſt that their Author never dreamt of our modern Hierarchy*, how eaſie would it be for one that would tranſcribe copies from our *Prefacer*, to reply, that ſuch and ſuch places were interpolated and inſerted by ſome later hand, who meant unkindly to *Epiſcopacy*, and then what ſecurity could be found to aſcertain thoſe paſſages to be *genuine*, which would not as reaſonably ſerve our turn, to retain thoſe which we think define for *Epiſcopacy.*

Thirdly; Whereas he adds, that the fabrick we plead for, being *not yet dreamt of in* Ignatius's 6. *days, was in after ages inſenſibly received*, why may not that alſo miniſter to us an excuſe, in caſe we ſhould not have been able to anſwer one of his former queſtions, to ſet down diſtinctly at what time *Presbyters* (the ſecond or middle order) came firſt into the Church, it being as eaſie to imagine, and as credible to be affirmed, that after the writing *Clement*'s one, before the writing of *Ignatius*'s many *Epiſtles*, this order was brought in, but ſo as to us at this diſtance of ſo many *Centuries*, it is not now ſenſible or diſcernable.

All this may again be ſaid πρὸς ἔνστασιν, and to ſhew that it is no hard matter to write ὑπερεχείτικα, 7. *Animadverſions* on the *Author* of the *Animadverſions*. At the preſent I am to take notice what the *Prefacer*'s *Hypotheſis* is, which he hath undertaken to defend, *viz.* That there never was any *Church-Officer inſtituted in thoſe firſt times, relating to more Churches in his Office, or to any other Church than a ſingle particular Congregation.* The very ſame indeed that my memory ſuggeſts to me out of the

Saint's

Saint's Belief, printed twelve or fourteen years ſince, where inſtead of that *Article* of the *Apoſtolick Symbol*, the *Holy Catholick Church*, this very *Hypotheſis* was ſubſtituted. But then it muſt be remembred, that the *Diſſertations* being written in anſwer to *Blondel*, were not obliged to be confronted to this *Hypotheſis*, and that though *Ignatius* ſhould be found to ſay as little as I, againſt this, yet he might yield competent teſtimonies againſt *Blondel* for the ſuperiority of *Biſhops* above *Presbyters*, which was all that I there endeavoured, becauſe all that I was there required to evince from them.

8. But then *ſecondly*; *Ignatius* is not perfectly ſilent in this matter neither; for as in his *Epiſtle* to the *Smyrnæans*, beſide the πλῆθος, or multitude under a particular *Biſhop*, there is ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, *the Catholick Church*, which ſure is more than a *ſingle particular Congregation*, ſo the National Church of *Syria* under the *Metropolis* of *Antioch*, of which *Ignatius* himſelf is ſtiled the *Biſhop* and *Paſtor*, is frequently mention'd in thoſe *Epiſtles*. In the *Epiſtle* to the *Epheſians*, προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ, *pray for the Church which is in* Syria, the Church of that whole Nation put under that one denomination, of which yet certainly there were divers aſſemblies; and ſo twice in the *Epiſtle* to the *Magneſians*, Τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας, and τῆς ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίαν, *the Church in* Syria; and in the *Epiſtle* to the *Philadelphians*, τῆς ἐκκλησίαν τῆς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας, *the Church of* Syria *which is at* Antioch, joyning them all under *Antioch*, the *Metropolitical Church*. And let this ſerve for a taſte of *Ignatius*'s judgment of our *Prefacer*'s *Hypotheſis*.

9. What again here follows of the *hyperbolical*, and *little ſhort of blaſphemous* paſſages in theſe *Epiſtles*, of their impertinency, of their remoteneſs from the way and manner of expreſſion in the Divine Writings, and thoſe which follow'd after, I have formerly wearied my ſelf, and the Reader, with the account of them ſeverally, and, I think, given him reaſon to believe with me, that they needed not here again have been heaped up ſo ſoon by way of repetition.

10. The next larger portion of this *Section* endeavours to ſhew what prejudice, or the fulneſs of a mans own apprehenſions, is able to do in the reading and citing Teſtimonies out of *Authors*; and this is by me ſo fully granted, and in part experimented in this *Prefacer*, particularly, in his fetching the power of the people in *Eccleſiaſtical affairs*, from *Clement*'s bidding the generous perſon (τὶς ἐν γενναῖος) to ſacrifice his own proſperity and poſſeſſions to the peace of the People, as when a King ventures his life, or *Moſes* ſaith, *Blot me out of thy book*, in order to the ſame end; that truly I needed not the inſtance of the *Papiſt* fetching his doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation* out of the *Ancients* to convince me of it. As it is, I have no exceptions to his evidence, nor to the concluſion inferr'd by it, in general, of men full of their own apprehenſions. Only I crave leave to interpoſe, before it be thought applicable to me: For unleſs he can prove that *Ignatius*'s plain mentions (ſo oft repeated, that it is become a charge of impertinence againſt him) of the three Orders in the Church, *Biſhops*, *Prieſts*, and *Deacons*, are as little able to infer (what I alone undertook to deduce from them) that there were more than *two Orders* in the Church in *Ignatius*'s time (and ſo before *Blondel*'s *æra* of 140 years) as the teſtimonies from whence the *Papiſts* conclude their *Tranſubſtantiation*, and their whole fardel of the *Maſs*, are unable to infer their deſired concluſion, I ſhall ſit down in peace, wholly unconcern'd in that large inſtance, and the ἀνταπόδοσις of it, or application, to the *men of theſe latter days in the matter of Epiſcopacy*.

11. Only let me aſſure him, that theſe later days afford ſome men, which have ſearcht Antiquity to inſtruct them in the truth, taking the pains of that travel on purpoſe for that one end, and after the Scripture, have expected to fetch truth from that ſearch, rather than any other; and have therefore begun their ſtudy of Divinity in that order, and counted the ordinary courſe of ſetting out from the modern ſyſtemes, to be very prepoſterous; and if the *Prefacer*'s own conſcience ſhould chance to tell him that he hath not exactly obſerved this method, that he hath firſt eſpouſed opinions and frames of Government, and then ſearcht Antiquity to eſtabliſh them; or if it ſhould not, yet becauſe it is as credible, and eaſily ſuggeſted of him, as by him of others, and others conſciences may and do excuſe them as perfectly, as his can be pretended to excuſe him, I hope this will be a competent reply to that part of this *Section* alſo.

12. For as to that which follows in the purſuit hereof, of the Pariſh Churches in *Ignatius*'s days, of the *Chorepiſcopus*, &c. of the *Dioceſan*'s ſubjection to the *Metropolitanes*, &c. from whence his neceſſary wonder ariſeth, whether it doth not *enter into our hearts, how contemptible we are in our proofs*, &c. It may ſuffice to ſay, that the *Prefacer* hath ſure forgotten himſelf, when he deſired to perſwade others, that all theſe are the concluſions which I have made (or any other *Prelatiſt*) out of *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*: Certainly the aſſerting of the *three orders*, all of them as *Apoſtolical*, is the one thing which we need deduce from thence, and if that be granted us from that authority, there is an end of the *Prelatiſt*'s contention with *Blondel*.

13. As for that of Pariſh Churches, ſure I have as yet concluded nothing from *Ignatius* concerning that ſubject, nor ever expreſt my ſelf to think him *worſe than an Infidel*, that diſcern'd them not in theſe *Epiſtles*. The firſt time I ever ſpake of them, was very lately in anſwer to the *London Miniſters*, which the *Prefacer*, having not yet ſeen, may turn to it, *cap.* 1. *ſect.* 19. And I ſhall now only add in relation to *Ignatius*, that the form of Government there deſcribed being this, *one Biſhop* with his *Presbytery*, i. e. *Colledge* of *Presbyters* under him, and one, or more *Deacons* of a *third* rank, ruling, and adminiſtring in their ſeveral places and offices the affairs of any one particular Church, be it *Trallis*, *Magneſia*, or the like (together with the whole *Territory* belonging to that Church of ſuch a City; or if it be a *Metropolis*, the *Province* adjoyning) all this may very well be done, and very eaſily imagined without any exact diſtribution into ſeveral congregations, ſuch as we now call Pariſhes, as long as the Orders of the *Biſhops*, *without whom*, ſaith he, *nothing was to be done*, were by all inferiours regularly obſerved. And if, as occaſion ſeemed to require, or expedience adviſe, the *Biſhop* (either then or afterwards) made more punctual diſtributions of the believers committed to his charge, and ſo appointing ſeveral aſſemblies in the ſame City, and in each village one, placed alſo a *Presbyter* in every ſuch aſſembly, this I hope, will not be ſtiled any working of the myſtery of iniquity (which I ſee by and by mentioned) but a regular acting of the *Biſhop* according to that *power*, which from the *Apoſtles* every ſuch ſingularly inſtituted Governour was intruſted with in every Church.

Next

Next for the *Chorepiſcopi*, it is known how little I am concerned to juſtifie the deducing them from theſe *Epiſtles*. I profeſs to believe there is not a word ſaid of them there, nay when *Blondel* was willing to deduce them from *Clement*'s phraſe, κατὰ χώρας, and out of him the *London Miniſters*, I have * refuted their deduction, and ſhew'd that they came not into the Church ſo early; And ſo for that alſo he might have omitted his wonderment now, as reaſonably, as I was but lately rebuked for it. 14. * *Diſſ.* 3 *cap.* 8. *Sect.* 17. *&c Vind to Lond. Miniſt. cap.* 3. *Sect.* 1. *n.* 16.

As for that of *Metropolitan Churches* or *Biſhops*, I do not again remember that *Ignatius* firſt gave me the model for that frame; Certainly I have produced other, I hope, competent evidences to conclude whatſoever I affirm of it; and if ſome not obſcure intimations out of *Ignatius* were obſerved to be given that way, as when in the *Epiſtle* to the *Romans* he calls himſelf ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Συρίας, *Biſhop of Syria*, and ὁ ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας ποιμήν, *the Paſtor of the Church in* Syria, being at that time the known *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, one ſingle City, but that the *Metropolis* of *Syria*; to which I may add, that in the *Epiſtle* to *Polycarp*, ſpeaking of his ſucceſſor, he doth it in the like ſtile, ὁ μέλλοντα καλὰξιοῦσθαι τοῦ εἰς Συρίαν πορεύεσθαι, *he that ſhould be thought worthy of the dignity of going into* Syria; yet have not I in thoſe *Diſſertations* laid the weight on them, (much leſs counted them *worſe than Infidels*, that are not convinced by them) though if I had, that would not have rendred my proofs ſo admirably contemptible, as 'tis pretended. 15.

Laſtly, for the whole frame of *Eccleſiaſtick Government*, being, in his phraſe, *lacquied after the civil diviſions*,] as I no where Father it on, or deduce it from *Ignatius*, whom now we have to deal with, ſo if inſtead of his darker phraſe of contempt, the matter be ſet down in more ſignificative intelligible words, *viz.* That the *Apoſtles* in each *Nation*, where they came to plant the Faith, thought not fit to innovate (unneceſſarily) in this matter of diſtributions already made, whether in *Judæa* or the *Gentile Regions*, but planting a Church in a chief City, and extending the Faith to the Region about it, and to other adjacent inferior Cities, annext the Regional-Church to the City-Church, and preſerved the ſubordination of inferior City-Churches to the chief City-Church, *i. e.* to the *Metropolis*, and this conſtantly when there was no conſiderable reaſon to adviſe any change; if, I ſay, the matter be thus intelligibly, and without the help of odious expreſſions, repreſented, I know not what appearance of exception can lie againſt it: But of this alſo I have formerly and * elſewhere ſpoken ſufficiently, and here is nothing, I am ſure, ſuggeſted, to which any farther reply can be accommodated. And therefore as yet I need add no more of it. 16. * *Vindic. to Lond. Miniſt. cap.* 1. *ſect.* 16.

So that what follows of the *redde Legiones*, and *redde Eccleſias*, requiring me to reſtore the Churches of Chriſt, as they were in the *Apoſtles* days, &c. was ſure very unneceſſary. I have in no kind robb'd him of the Churches, which before my tampering with *Ignatius*, he had found, and made himſelf owner of there: If *Quintilius Varus* had been as guiltleſs of the loſs of the Legions in *Germany*, as I have been of purloining the frame of *Independent Congregations*, out of theſe *Epiſtles*, I believe *Auguſtus* would not have inflicted any ſevere fine upon him for that miſadventure. I can truly aſſure him, that if I had found any Model formed according to his *hypotheſis* in thoſe *Epiſtles*, when I read them, as diligently as I could, to diſcern what the Government was in his time, I might, and ſhould have anſwer'd *Blondel* another way than I did, and replied firſt to his *Preface*, which is much of it written with ſome aſperity againſt the *Independents*, and had that more *compendious* way of not being concern'd in the whole ſubſequent Apology, which is deſigned againſt *Epiſcopacy*: And I ſhall not lye, if I now tell him that I have ſince my writing the laſt period, once more read over all the ſeven *Epiſtles*, as they are in *Voſſius*'s Edition, on purpoſe to obſerve whether there were any one word, formerly unobſerved by me, which might in the leaſt favour his *hypotheſis*; and I ſhall ſpeak my ſenſe uprightly, that I might as ſucceſsfully have ſought it in the firſt *Chapter* either of *Geneſis*, or S. *Matthew*'s *Goſpel*; whether the former *interpolated* copies, or *ſuppoſititious Epiſtles* may afford him any aid, he will pardon me, I hope, that I have not had the curioſity or leiſure to examine. 17.

This being thus true, it was but neceſſary for him to remember out of *Hegeſippus*, that the *Churches* before *Ignatius*'s time were *defloured*: That place of *Hegeſippus* to which he refers, is ſure the ſame which he had ſet down in the entrance on the view of *Antiquity*, and which I took a view of *cap.* 1. *Sect.* 1. and ſhew'd how unjuſt his *collection* was from thence, as it was by him applied to the Ancient writings: And I have now the like reaſon to complain again, that what *Hegeſippus* ſaith of thoſe *vile heretical Apoſtates*, the *Gnoſticks*, that they oppoſed their falſe *Doctrine*, and preacht it up againſt the κήρυγμα ἀληθείας, *preaching of the truth*, ſhould by him be applied to the prejudice of the *true Church*, which carefully oppoſed all their inſinuations, or to theſe *Epiſtles* of *Ignatius*, which were purpoſely written, almoſt every one of them, to keep that poiſon out of the *Churches*. It is moſt certain, that the firſt method of theſe deceivers, was, by deſpiſing and ſpeaking evil of the Governours of the Church, to inſinuate their poiſon into the brethrens minds, and ſo that they were the λαθροδήκλαι, the *ſecret biters* firſt, and then afterward the κύνες λυσσῶντες, the *raving dogs*, as he calls them, which flew in the face of the Government, but the *Church* held out conſtantly againſt their *clancular*, and open aſſaults, and they never were able in the leaſt to deflour it; the *hereticks doctrines*, and their *practices*, are continually branded by the Writings of thoſe times, and there is not the leaſt appearance of their leaven, but all the direct contrary, in any *Epiſtle* of *Ignatius*, or other writings of thoſe times. 18.

It is time that I now come to the interpretation of his *redde Eccleſias*, the particulars of his demand, concerning the *Churches*, which he hath found in *Ignatius*, and I am accuſed for robbing him of. And though I have already ſaid enough of this in the groſs, yet I ſhall ſpare no pains to give punctual anſwer to every branch of it. 19.

And 1. ſaith he, *Give us a Church, all whoſe members are holy, called, ſanctified, juſtified, living ſtones, Temples for the Holy Ghoſt, Saints, Believers, united to Chriſt the head by the Spirit that is given to them, and dwelleth in them.* To this I anſwer very briefly, that in all *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*, there is no title ſo much as of intimation that any *Church*, to which he wrote, or which was under his Government, or which he had any occaſion to ſpeak of, was thus qualified, particularly all whoſe members were holy or ſanctified. *Secondly*; I am not ſure, that if that were the *Ignatian* model of a 20.

Church,

Church, this *Prefacer* would be able to parallel it in any *Congregation*, which these last, not best days, have brought out among us. *Thirdly*; That this might as well be done, and as probably hoped under a subordination of *Officers* and *Governours*, such as we *Prelatists* pretend to, as in any equal number of men, by whatsoever other form compacted or knit together. This may suffice without farther insisting, till some reason be urged to the contrary against any of these three affirmations.

21. *Secondly*; He demands a *Church* whose πλῆθος or *multitude is where the Bishop appears.* This character of a *Church*, or rather exhortation how it ought to be, is indeed set down by * *Ignatius* in his *Epistle* to the *Church* of *Smyrna*, where in pursuit of the advice, Πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, *Let all men follow the Bishop*, and Μηδεὶς χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου τι πρασσέτω, *Let no man do ought of the things that belong to the Church without the Bishop*, and that *Eucharist* was to be accounted βεβαία, *firm*, or *valid*, which was done by the *Bishop*, or by some commissionated by him, he then adds ὅπου ἂν φανῇ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος ἔστω, ὥσπερ ὅπου ἂν ᾖ Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, ἐκεῖ ἡ καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία, *Where the Bishop appeareth, there let the multitude be, as where Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholick Church*, making in the latter part, that difference between the *Orthodox*, and *heretical Apostate Gnosticks*, that the former acknowledged and adhered to him, and the later denied him, and proportionably in the former, making the same difference betwixt the *Eucharist duly*, and *unduly* administred; that where it was duly, there the people received it in communion with their *Bishop*, either of him, or of some body commissionated by him; which as it is competently distant from their model, where neither *Bishop*, nor any from him commissionated, is received, so I am sure it is far enough from any contrariety to the *Prelatists*, or favour to the *Prefacers* pretensions. What particle of it, it is, which to his fancy looks so agreeable, I cannot divine, and so have no more to reply to it.

* *Voss. Edit.* p. 6.

22. *Thirdly*; He demands a *Church that doth nothing by its members apart, but when it is gathered* ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό. This, I presume belongs to a place in the *Epistle* to the *Magnesians*, which we shall meet again in his last demand, and there consider it more fully. At the present, let it suffice, that it is no more than this, That no man was to do any thing on his own head, or without the *Bishop* and *Presbyters*, but when they met together they should joyn in one prayer, &c. And this sure may be granted without any damage to the *Prelatist*, who desires as much as any, that publick Assemblies be frequented, which is the meaning of being gathered ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, and that no inferiour member of the *Church* do ought ἀνηκόυστον εἰς ἐκκλησίαν that *belongs to the Church*, without the *Bishop*. But if the meaning of the demand be, either that the *Bishop* with his *Presbyters*, who are indeed members of the *Church*, shall do nothing without the concurrent consent of the πλῆθος or *people*, which was the thing he contended for out of *Clemens*, this I am able to assume, will never be inferr'd from that place, or out of these *Epistles*; and for any other inference he will draw from hence, in order to the no other *Church*, but a single particular Congregation, which we find in his *hypothesis*, this I shall speak to in answer to his last demand, where he recurs to this place again.

23. *Fourthly*, He demands a *Church* that being so *gathered together in one place*, doth συνδάζειν πάντα πράσσειν ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ θεῦ, προκαθημένης ἐπισκόπου, *acting in Church things in its whole body, under the rule and presidence of its officers.*] Here if [*acting in its whole body*] denote any power again of the πλῆθος or *whole body* of the *people*, or any more than their regular obedience to the lawful commands of the Bishop over them, I shall be able to demonstrate that the words of *Ignatius* sound nothing toward it. They are in the *Epistle* to the * *Magnesians*, and are a plain exhortation to unity and concord, and that to be evidenced in their actions, and the rule of that, obedience to their *Bishop*, presiding, saith he, εἰς τόπον θεῦ, *in the place of God, as the Presbyters in the place of the Colledge of Apostles, and the Deacons intrusted with the Ministery of Jesus Christ*, from whence he concludes with the ἐντρέπεσθε ἀλλήλοις paying *reverence to one another*, i. e. (according to the meaning of that phrase in S. *Peter*, ἀλλήλοις ὑποτασσόμενοι, 1 *Pet.* 5. 5.) to the *Bishop*, &c. their superiours, and, besides mutual love, and care of avoiding divisions, to the ἑνώθητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, &c. *being united to the Bishop, and those that are set over them, for a pattern and doctrine of incorruption* or *Orthodox Religion*, in opposition to the infections and corruptions of the *Gnostick Heresies*. And then what analogy bears this with the *hypothesis* of the *Prefacer*, what unkind aspect hath it on the *Prelatist*'s pretensions?

* *Voss. Edit.* pag. 33.

24. *Fifthly*, He demands a *Church walking in order, and not as some, who*, ἐπίσκοπον μὲν καλοῦσι, χωρὶς δὲ αὐτοῦ πάντα πράσσουσιν, which he renders, *such as calling the Bishop to the Assemblies, yet do all things without him* ---- Here it was a little news to me to see a piece of *Greek Englished*. (This being, I think, the first time that the *Prefacer* hath done so, I shall not attempt to guess at the reason of it) But indeed it was much more so, to find [καλοῦσιν ἐπίσκοπον] rendred [*calling the Bishop to the Assemblies.*] Doth he mean that the people had the power of calling Assemblies, or calling the *Bishop* to them? I shall not again detain the Reader with my conjectures of his sence. This I am sure of, 1. that there is no mention of *Assemblies*, but that those words, [*to the Assemblies*] are perfectly *interpolated* by the *Prefacer*: 2. that καλοῦσιν ἐπίσκοπον] is no more than *they call him Bishop*, allow him the name or title, but, as he adds, *do all without him*, subject not their actions to his directions or command (as in the words immediately precedent, πρέπον ἔν ἐστιν, μὴ μόνον καλεῖσθαι χριστιανὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἶναι, *being only called Christians*, and being truly such, are set as extreamly contrary, or as in the same * *Ep. ad Magnes.* ἄτοπόν ἐστι χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν καλεῖν, καὶ Ἰουδαΐζειν, *calling Jesus Christ*, is opposed to *true Christianity*, and sure doth not signifie *calling Jesus Christ* to their *assemblies*) and then of them that do thus, *Ignatius* may be allowed to add, μὴ βεβαίως καὶ' ἐντολὴν συναθροίζεσθαι, *that they do not assemble validly according to the command* (all actions of such, χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου, having no kind of validity in them) and by so adding, he passes no sentence upon the *Prelatist*, unless he be only nominally such, plead for *Bishops* and not obey them.

* *Voss. Edit.* pag. 36.

25. *Lastly*, saith he, *give us such a Church, and let us come to them*, when they are πάντες ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ ἅμα συναχθέντες, (i. e. *all in the same place assembled together in prayer*) *such as the Churches in the days of* Ignatius *appear to have been, and are so rendred in the quotations taken from his Epistles by the Doctor for the confirmation of Episcopacy.*] To this I answer, 1. that if the *Church* he would have, be set down by me as he desires, in the quotations from *Ignatius*, then I needed not have been called to, for the giving him his *Churches* back again; I had, it seems, either never detained them, or else rendered

rendered them already. Secondly, for this laſt paſſage, the moſt that I have quoted toward it, is from the *Epiſtle* to the *Magneſians*, And the whole paſſage lies thus, Ἑνώθητε τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ, *Be ye united to the Biſhop* --- and ſtrait, ὥσπερ οὖν ὁ κύριος ἄνευ τοῦ πατρὸς οὐδὲν ἐποίησεν, ἡνωμένος ὢν, ὅτε δι' ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτε δι' Ἀποστόλων, οὕτως μήτε ὑμεῖς ἄνευ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων μηδὲν πράσσετε, μήδε πειράσητε εὔλογόν τι φαίνεσθαι ἴδια ὑμῖν, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μία προσευχὴ, μία δέησις, εἷς νοῦς, μία ἐλπὶς, ἐν ἀγάπῃ, ἐν τῇ χαρᾷ τῇ ἀμώμῳ. *As the Lord therefore being in union with, did nothing without his Father, neither by himſelf, nor by his Apoſtles, ſo neither do ye any thing without the Biſhop and his Presbyters, nor attempt to account any thing reaſonable, which appears ſo to you privately, but in the ſame place let there be one prayer, one ſupplication, one mind, one hope, in love, and joy unblameable.* Pag. 33.

This whole place, I did not conceive what it imported, ſave only perfect agreement and ſubmiſſion to the judgment of their ſuperiors, in oppoſition to the ἰδιωγνώμονες, thoſe that entertain'd *private doctrines*, which were not left in the *Church* by the *Apoſtles*, together with all *mutual unity, charity, conjunction* in *prayer* of all ſorts, for ſupply of wants, pardon of ſins, in the ſame hope and joy --- But I now ſuppoſe that the thing here deſigned to be inferred from this in the cloſe (as from the ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ toward the beginning) of his demands, is the eſtabliſhment of his grand *hypotheſis* forementioned, the *non-inſtitution* of any *Church-Officer* whatever, *relating to more Churches in his Office, or any other Church than a ſingle particular congregation.* And this, it ſeems, he was ſo willing to have competently teſtified here, that one and the ſame teſtimony, a little diſguiſed, is fain to appear twice to the ſame purpoſe, and ſo becomes a double witneſs (a military trick, which officers ſometimes uſe, when their *companies* are not *full*, to *muſter* the ſame *ſouldier* twice under ſeveral names.) And ſo we ſee that which truly I have attended for all this while (and could not really think it deſigned by him, till this repetition of the teſtimony ſhew'd me, that ſpecial weight was laid on it,) that this one place of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ and προσευχὴ (for ἅμα συναχθέντες is again inſerted to help the inference) muſt conclude the *non-inſtitution* of any *Church-Officer relating to any but a ſingle particular congregation.* The reaſonableneſs of which will be judged by any man, if he ſhall but put the premiſes and concluſion together thus; It was *Ignatius*'s command to the *Magneſians*, that *no man muſt do any thing on his own head without the Biſhop and Presbyters*, but when they aſſemble together, they muſt have *one prayer, one ſupplication* (adding, *one mind, one hope in charity, in joy unblameable*) therefore in *Ignatius*'s time there was no other Officer inſtituted in the *Church, which related to more Churches in his office, or to any other Church than a ſingle particular congregation.* 26.

If this be the manner of *concluding Church-models* from *ancient Writers*, I ſhall not wonder that the *Prelatiſts* ways of inference have been diſliked; for I acknowledge they bear no proportion with this. For certainly 1. if he had ſpoken of ſome ſingle congregation, which conſtantly met *in the ſame place*, within the ſame walls, and bid them when they thus met, they ſhould have *one prayer, one ſupplication*, as *one mind, one hope*, this would only conclude, that there were ſuch particular congregations, and ſo we know among us every *Pariſh Church* is, where none but the *publick Liturgie* is uſed; but this would no way conclude, as the *hypotheſis* doth, that there is no other but ſuch. A particular affirmative hath no power of excluding all but its ſelf. *Ignatius*'s ſpeaking of a ſingle houſe, cannot conclude it his opinion, that there is no *Town*, no *City*, no *Province*, no *World* made up of all theſe, nor conſequently, that he which is Ruler of that houſe, may not alſo be placed in office in the *City*, in the *Nation*, &c. 27.

But then *ſecondly*; 'tis manifeſt that in this place, where he talks of [ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ] he talks alſo of the *Biſhop* and *Presbyters*, and the *Prefacer* hath not yet told me, that his particular congregation will bear all thoſe; a *Biſhop* and *Deacon*, or *Deacons*, he ſaid he could allow, but then that *Biſhop* was to be but a *Presbyter*, whatſoever he was call'd: And therefore I may ſuppoſe that a *Biſhop* and *Presbyters* in *Ignatius*'s ſence, ſuch as he makes *two orders*, ſuperiour to *Deacons*, and all *three* in that Church of the *Magneſians*, to which he ſpeaks, will not be born by his particular Congregation, and therefore even that, which *Ignatius* here ſpeaks of, was not ſuch. 28.

Thirdly; They that live under a *Biſhop* and *Presbyters*, and do every one of them, ſomewhere or other, aſſemble with other *Chriſtians* in ſome one place (as whoſoever aſſemble in any place, muſt aſſemble in *one*) may yet all of them make up above one ſingle congregation; the ſeveral *Chriſtians* of the *City* of *Oxford*, may live obediently under the *Biſhop* of *Oxford*, and under the *Presbyters* of that *City*, and every one aſſemble ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, partake conſtantly of the Church-meetings, ſome at S. *Peters*, others at *Allhallows*, and every one at ſome or other, and yet all thoſe make up many particular Congregations, and the *Biſhop* govern them all, and ſo relate in his office to them all, and by the ſeveral *Presbyters*, ordain'd and inſtituted to the ſeveral charges, adminiſter and order all. 29.

Nay *fourthly*; the ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ μία προσευχὴ --- might fitly be rendred no more but *unanimous prayer*, all one with διαμένετε ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν, καὶ τῇ μετ' ἀλλήλων προσευχῇ, *continue in concord, and in prayer one with another*, in the *Epiſtle* to the *Trallians*, and that may equally be done, whether they meet all in *one*, or in many places. And ſo ſtill he hath not gain'd ſo much as his particular affirmative from hence, that the [ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ] here ſpoken of by *Ignatius*, referr'd to a ſingle congregation; which yet if it did, were far enough from concluding the [*none* but *ſuch.*] 30.

Laſtly, It is farther evident from *Ignatius*, 1. that there is καθολικὴ ἐκκλησία a *Catholick Church*. 2. ἡ ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησία, *the Church in* Syria, joyned under himſelf as their *one Paſtor*, *i. e.* a *National Church*; and *thirdly*, ἐκκλησία ἡ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας, *the Church of* Syria *at* Antioch, a *Metropolitical Church*, and ſo ἐκκλησία ἥτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χώρας Ῥωμαίων, *the Church which preſided in the place of the Region*, or *Province of the* Romans, a *Metropolitical* and *Provincial Church* again: And *fourthly*, in every *Epiſtle*, a *Church* under a *Biſhop*, *Presbyters*, and *Deacons*, which the world hath hitherto call'd a *Dioceſan Church*, conſiſting of many ſingle Congregations. 31.

It is not eaſie to reckon up all the inconſequences of this *inference*, whereby the *Prefacers hypotheſis* is concluded from this *Teſtimony* of *Ignatius*. Theſe may at the preſent ſuffice, till farther diſcovery be made by him; what *medium* will be choſen to draw this *concluſion* out of theſe *premiſes*, which ſeem not at all inclin'd to it. And ſo though we are not come much nearer to a *concluſion* of this *contro-* 32.

verſie, there is yet no ſeaſon of adding more to the debating of it, and therefore ſo much for this *Section* alſo.

SECT. II.

The myſtery of iniquity. Clement's *argument for the allaying the ſedition. Proofs of the Congregational way invalid. The contrary more than intimated by* Ignatius. *The Eccleſiaſtick diſtributions contemper'd by the Apoſtles to the Civil.* Γνώμη *in* Ignatius.

1. THat which next follows, is the telling us three things that he will not inſiſt on, and only one fourth that he will, and methinks that ſhould not detain us long. He thus begins,

2. "Being unwilling to go too far out of my way, I ſhall not
"1. Conſider the ſeverals inſtanced in, for the proof of Epiſcopacy by the Doctor, ſeeing inde-
"niably the interpretation muſt follow, and be proportioned by the general iſſue of that ſtate of the
"Church, in the days wherein thoſe Epiſtles were writ, or are pretended ſo to be, if that appear
"to be ſuch as I have mention'd, I preſume the Doctor himſelf will confeſs, that his witneſſes ſpeak
"not one word to his buſineſs, for whoſe confirmation he doth produce them. Nor
"2. Shall I inſiſt upon the degeneration of the inſtitutions and appointments of Jeſus Chriſt, con-
"cerning Church-Adminiſtrations, in the management of the ſucceeding Churches, as principled,
"and ſpirited by the operative and efficacious myſtery of iniquity, occaſion'd and advantaged by the
"accommodation of Eccleſiaſtical affairs to the civil diſtributions, and alotments of the political
"ſtate of things in thoſe days; nor
"3. Inſiſt much farther on the exceeding diſſimilitude and inconformity that is between the ex-
"preſſions concerning Church Officers, and affairs in theſe Epiſtles (whence ever they come) and
"thoſe in the writings of unqueſtionable credit, immediately before, and after them, as alſo the
"utter ſilence of the Scripture in thoſe things, wherewith they ſo abound. The Epiſtle of *Clemens*,
"of which mention was made before, was written for the compoſing and quieting of a diviſion and
"diſtemper that was fallen out in the Church of *Corinth*. Of the cauſe of that diſſention that then
"miſerably rent that congregation, he informs us in that complaint, that ſome (ὑ δικαίως ἀποδάλες-
"θαι τ λειτυργίας) were wrongfully caſt from the Miniſtry by the multitude, and he tells you, that
"theſe were good honeſt men, and faithful in the diſcharge of their duty; for ſaith he ὁρῶ μὲν ὅτι
"ἐνίυς ὑμᾶς μεταγάγετε, καλῶς πολιτευομένυς, ἐκ τ ἀμέμπτως ἐντοῖς τεθιμημένης λειτυργίας, though they
"were unblameable both in their converſation and Miniſtry, yet they removed them from their
"office: To reprove this evil, to convince them of the ſinfulneſs of it, to reduce them to a right
"underſtanding of their duty, and order, walking in the fellowſhip of the Goſpel, what courſe doth
"he proceed in? what arguments doth he uſe? He minds them of one God, one Chriſt, one Body,
"one Faith; tells them that wicked men alone uſe ſuch ways and practices, bids them read the
"Epiſtle of *Paul* formerly written to them upon occaſion of another diviſion, and to be ſubject to
"their own Elders; and all of them leave off contending, quietly doing the things which the people,
"or the body of the Church commanded. Now had this perſon writing on this occaſion, uſing all
"ſorts of arguments, artificial, or inartificial for his purpoſe, been baptiſed into the opinion and
"eſteem of a ſingle Epiſcopal Superintendent, whoſe exaltation ſeems to be the deſign of much
"which is ſaid in the Epiſtles of *Ignatius*, in the ſence wherein his words are uſually taken, would he
"yet never once ſo much as bid them be ſubject to the Biſhop, that reſemblance of God the Father,
"ſupplying the place of Chriſt, nor told them how terrible a thing it was to diſobey him, nor
"pawn'd his ſoul for theirs, that ſhould ſubmit to him, that all that obeyed him were ſafe, all that
"diſobeyed him were rebellious, curſed, and ſeparated from God. What Apology can be made
"for the weakneſs and ignorance of that Holy Martyr, if we ſhall ſuppoſe him to have had appre-
"henſions like thoſe in theſe Epiſtles of that ſacred order, for omitting thoſe all-conquering rea-
"ſons, which they would have ſupplied him withal, to his purpoſe in hand, and pitching on argu-
"ments every way leſs uſeful and cogent. But I ſay I ſhall not inſiſt on any ſuch things as theſe, but
"only
"4. I ſay there is not in any of the Doctor's *Excerpta* from thoſe Epiſtles, nor in any paſſage
"in them, any mention, or the leaſt intimation of any Church whereunto any Biſhop was related,
"but ſuch an one, as whoſe members met altogether in one place, and with their Biſhop diſpoſed
"and ordered the affairs of the Church. Such was that whereunto the holy Martyr was related;
"ſuch were thoſe neighbouring Churches that ſent Biſhops and Elders to that Church: And when
"the Doctor proves the contrary, *erit mihi magnus Apollo:* From the Churches and their ſtate and
"conſtitution, is the ſtate and condition of their Officers, and their relation to them to be taken.
"Let that be manifeſted to be ſuch from the appointment of Jeſus Chriſt to his Apoſtles, or *de facto*
"in the days of *Ignatius*, or before the contemperation of Eccleſiaſtical affairs occaſionally, or by
"choice, to the civil conſtitution of Cities and Provinces in thoſe days, as would, or poſſibly could
"bear a rural Dioceſan, Metropolitical Hierarchy, and this controverſie will be at an end: When
"this is by any attempted to be demonſtrated, I deſire it may not be with ſuch ſentences as that urg-
"ed by our Doctor from *Epiſt. ad Epheſ.* Ἰησῦς χριςὸς τῦ πατρὸς ἡ γνώμη, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι οἱ κατὰ τὰ πέ-
"ρατα ὁρισθέντες Ἰησῦ χριςῦ γνώμη εἰσίν. The expreſſion in it concerning Chriſt being unſound, un-
"ſcriptural; concerning Biſhops, unintelligible, or ridiculous.

How

How unwilling the writer of this *Preface* (therein to shew the judgment of Antiquity concerning *Perseverance*) hath been to go out of that his way, the large *Animadversions*, which he hath afforded *Episcopacy*, *Ignatius*, and *me*, will sufficiently demonstrate: As it is, the sooner he shall now return to his rode again, the more tolerably easie it will be for the Reader, and me; and therefore I shall endeavour to make as much haste as he, and neither take any notice of what hath been said in the *Dissertations* for proof of *Episcopacy*, but yield, that if it appear, that there were none but particular *Independent Congregations* in *Ignatius*'s time, I have then produced no testimony from him by which the *Prefacer* may be concluded, though as far as concerns *Blondel*, who went upon distant *hypotheses*, all that I said, may have been in full force against them. 3.

His second consideration, concerning the *degenerating* of *Christs institutions concerning Church Administrations in the management of succeeding Churches*, and the principle of that degeneration, the working of the mystery of iniquity, and the occasion of that again, the accommodation of *Ecclesiastical affairs* to the *Civil distributions* (which is in effect that the *Apostles* erecting *Mother-Churches* in chief Cities, where they first preacht, as at *Jerusalem* to all *Judæa*, *Antioch* to all *Syria*, &c. was a special occasion of, and advantage to the working of the mystery of iniquity) is that which in the several degrees of it might yield large discourse; the mystery of iniquity, in S. *Paul*, being remote enough from this, and distributions of Churches, such as were most commodious, far enough from having either iniquity or mystery in them. But I shall readily transcribe his pattern, and as he hath not, neither shall I insist on it. 4.

The third, on which he will *not insist much farther*, was competently insisted on before, in comparing *Clement*'s *two orders* in the *Church* (and the like in S. *Paul*) with *Ignatius*'s *three*. But the design of returning to it again, was to offer one argument more, which had not formerly been made use of, and I must not let that fall to the ground: It is this, that *if the Bishop had been in that esteem in* Clement's *time, in which these Epistles set him out, as the resemblance of God the Father, he would certainly have bid them be subject to him, and used that as an argument to compose the sedition, of which he wrote unto them.* 5.

But 1. It is certain that negative arguments prove nothing; there might be *Bishops* in *Clement*'s days, and the power due to them as great, as that which would intitle them to the image of God the Father, and yet, the sedition being raised against the *Bishops* themselves, and the question being not concerning the Order, but the Persons, who should be advanced to it, the mention of the dignity of the Order, or of the due subjection to it, might be no proper way of appeasing that sedition, nor, as such, chosen to be made use of by *Clement*. 6.

Secondly; We know that next the obligations to peace, &c. the first and principal argument used by *Clemens*, was the *institution* of these their *Bishops* by the *Apostles*, and the dignity of that Order being such, that the *Apostles* foresaw the contentions that would be περὶ ὀνόμα]Θ for the dignity or name of it, he tells them that the *Apostles* had made a list of successors in each *Church*, presuming, and not needing more particularly to tell them, that this was an high aggravation of their crime, in throwing those out, whom God had thus particularly set over them. And I know not that *Ignatius* would or could upon his *hypotheses*, have argued stronger to his purpose. 7.

What the *Prefacer* adds by way of flourish, I shall not need to attend to: By this brief account 'tis clear, though *Clemens* mentions but *two Orders*, and *Ignatius three*, yet *Bishops* may have been in equal esteem with both of them. And that is all that I need reply, to that which, he saith, is one of the such things which he will not insist on. 8.

The fourth thing, on which he is resolved to insist, and inlarge his digression, is, that which I had thought had been already newly insisted on (and, I hope, competently answer'd) that *in all the Epistles there is no intimation of any Church whereunto any Bishop related, but such an one as whose members met altogether in one, and with their Bishop disposed and ordered the affairs of the Church.* And so on, to the same purpose; and I shall be *Magnus Apollo*, if I shew him any. 9.

Now I am perswaded, 1. that it already appears sufficiently, that the [ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ] the members of each *Church meeting together* in *prayer*, is no proof, that to them belonged in the least, to dispose and order the affairs of the Church; and yet besides, that nothing hath yet been pretended for it out of *Ignatius*, unless it be the μηδὲ τι ἰδίᾳ, *nothing on their own heads*, in the same place, which is much remoter from that purpose. 10.

Beyond this it hath appear'd farther, that the office of all members under the *Bishop* was by *Ignatius*'s doctrine to obey their superiours, to live under subjection; and that is not to dispose, or order. And the places so long insisted on out of *Clemens* also, have, I hope, appear'd to infer nothing to that purpose. 11.

Secondly; 'Tis as certain that I have * already performed this task laid on me by him, and shew'd him that *Ignatius*, as *Bishop* of *Antioch*, the *Metropolis*, is call'd *Bishop* and *Pastor* of the *Church* of *Syria*, and some other the like passages, which directly infer what he requires me to infer, and so that I have thus much title to his favour, and should not be put off to a Poetical expression for my reward. 12. * See sect. 1. n. 8. & 14.

As for the condition he interposeth, that I must shew this before the contemperation of *affairs to the civil constitutions of Cities* and *Provinces*, I confess that to be a rigorous condition, and such as unless I be released from that restraint, I shall be utterly disabled to perform my task: For he cannot but know, that it is my affirmation, that at the first planting of the Churches, the *Apostles* thus contemper'd the *Ecclesiastick* to the *Civil distributions* of *Cities* and *Provinces*, having no power of making *new Cities* or *Provinces*, any more than of constituting *new Nations*, and yet planting their *Churches*, and constituting *Bishops* in *Cities* (and thence κατὰ πόλιν, *in every City*, and κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, in every *Church*, is all one in the sacred stile) which must necessarily infer, that the *Ecclesiastical* agreed with the *civil distributions*. And truly, how the *Church* was order'd before the *Apostles* planted it, I have not the curiosity to inquire. 13.

A second condition he is also pleased to lay on me by way of farther restraint, to make my obedience yet more difficult. That my proofs must not be such as is that *Testimony* urged by me from the *Epistle* to the *Ephesians*, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Χριστὸς τῶ πατρὸς ἡ γνώμη, ὡς καὶ οἱ ἐπίσκοποι --- Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώμη ἐστίν.] This passage 14.

it ſeems hath not found favour with him; the firſt part of it is, ſaith he, *unſound* and *unſcriptural*, the *ſecond unintelligible* or *ridiculous*.

13. But I cannot yield to his cenſure in either part. For the *firſt*, Let it but be conſidered that *Chriſt* came to reveal the *will* of his *Father*, that whatſoever he taught, he taught from his *Father*, and there can be no unſoundneſs in the expreſſion, to ſay, that *Chriſt* is the *ſentence* of his *Father* (any more than that he is the *word*, or the *wiſdom* of his *Father*) meaning thereby, that what he delivered, was his *Fathers ſentence* or *good pleaſure*; for ſo in the title of the *Epiſtle* to the *Philad.* ἐν γνώμῃ Χριστοῦ *by Chriſts ſentence*, is explained immediately by κατὰ τὸ ἴδιον θέλημα, *according to his own will*.

14. And for the ſecond, let him but read it as he may find *Voſſius* and the *Archbiſhop* of *Armagh* read it, ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ γνώμῃ, *by the appointment* or *ſentence*, or ἴδιον θέλημα, *own will of Chriſt*, and ſure it is very *intelligible*, and far from *ridiculous*, even no more than this, that the *Biſhops* ordained in all Regions by the *Apoſtles*, were appointed by, or by appointment of *Chriſt*, as the ſame matter is in the *Epiſtle* to the *Philadelphians* ſet down in a parallel phraſe, where the *Biſhop*, *Presbyters* and *Deacons* are ſaid to be ἀποδεδειγμένοι ἐν γνώμῃ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, *deſigned by the appointment of Jeſus Chriſt*. Or if the ἐν be left out, then, reading γνώμῃ with ἰῶτα *ſubſcriptum*, as the old *Latin*, *Sententia*, will bear, it is directly all one with the former. Or if in the third place, it be read in the *nominative* caſe, γνώμη, then the figure is very intelligible, that theſe *Biſhops* are *Chriſts appointment*, *Chriſts ſentence*, *Chriſts will*, i. e. are *appointed* or *determined* or *willed* by him. And ſo I hope there is yet nothing ſo very *unintelligible*, or at all *ridiculous* in *Ignatius*, or my teſtimonies from him, that I ſhould need this caution to be interpoſed, againſt I produce more.

CHAP. VII.

Of Metropoles and Metropolitans.

SECT. I.

Some account of the probations produced for Epiſcopacy, ἔξαρχοι. *The power of Metropolitans. Their relations to more Churches than one. An enumeration of Primates, and Metropolitans.*

1. HAving made this ſolemn promiſe, that I ſhould be ſo highly rewarded, in caſe I produced any *intimation* to prove, that there was any other but *ſingle particular Congregations*; It was now timely remembred, that I had done ſomewhat like this already, in proving the ſeven *Angels* of the ſeven *Churches* in the *Revelation* to be *Metropolitans*, and to the *conſideration* of that, he now next proceeds, and that brings in an examination of what I have ſaid of *Metropoles* and *Metropolitans*: And it begins thus,

2. "But it may be ſaid, what need we any more writing, what need we any truer proof, or teſtimo-"ny? The learned Doctor in his *Diſſertations*, *Diſſert.* 4. *cap.* 5. hath abundantly diſcharged this "work, and proved the ſeven Biſhops of the ſeven Churches mentioned, *Revel.* 2. 3. to have been "Metropolitans or Archbiſhops; ſo that no juſt cauſe remains, why we ſhould farther contend.

"Let then the Reader pardon this my utmoſt excurſion, in this digreſſion, to whoſe compaſs I "had not the leaſt thoughts of going forth at the entrance thereof, and I ſhall return thither whence "I have turned aſide.

"*Diſſert.* 4. *cap.* 5. The Doctor tells us, that *Septem Eccleſiarum Angeli non tantum Epiſcopi, ſed* "*& Metropolitæ*, i. e. *Archiepiſcopi ſtatuendi ſunt*, i. e. *principalium urbium* ἔξαρχοι, *ad quos provinciæ* "*integræ, & in iis multarum inferiorum urbium Eccleſiæ, earumque Epiſcopi tanquam ad Archiepiſcopum* "*aut Metropolitanum pertinebant*.

"The Doctor in this Chapter commences *per ſaltum*, and taking it for granted, that he hath "proved Dioceſan Biſhops ſufficiently before, though he hath ſcarce ſpoken any one word to that "purpoſe in his whole book (for to prove one ſuperintending in a Church, by the name of a Biſhop, "others acting in ſome kind of ſubordination to him, by the name of Elders, and Presbyters, upon "the account of what hath been offered concerning the ſtate of the Churches in thoſe days, will no "way reach to the maintenance of this preſumption) he ſacrifices his pains to the Metropolitical "Archiepiſcopal dignity, which as we muſt ſuppoſe, is ſo clearly founded in Scripture and Anti-"quity, that they are as blind as Bats and Moles, who cannot ſee the ground and foundation of "it.

"But firſt, be it taken for granted, that the Angels of the ſeven Churches are taken for the Go-"vernours of thoſe Churches, then that each Angel be an Individual Biſhop of the Church to which "he did belong: 2. Be it alſo granted, that they were Biſhops of the moſt eminent Church or "Churches, in that Province, or *Roman* political diſtribution of thoſe Countries, in the manage-"ment of the government of them, I ſay, Biſhops of ſuch Churches, not *urbium* ἔξαρχοι (as the Do-"ctor terms them) what advance is made by all this to the Aſſertation of a Metropolitical Archiepiſ-"copacy, I cannot as yet diſcover. That they were ordinary officers of Chriſts inſtitution, rela-"ting in their office and ordinary diſcharge of it, not only to the particular Churches wherein they "were placed, but to many Churches alſo no leſs committed to their charge, than theſe wherein "they did reſide, the Officers, Rulers, Governours, of which Churches depended on them, not "only as to their advice and counſel; but as to their power and juriſdiction, holding their place

"and

"and employment from them, is ſome part of that, which in this undertaking is incumbent on our "Doctor to make good, if he will not be ſuppoſed to prevaricate in the cauſe in hand.

Being here called out anew to the maintaining of what I had ſaid in the *Diſſert.* concerning *Metropolitical Churches*, and *Biſhops*, and having ſo lately been ingaged in the ſame task by the exceptions of the *London Miniſters*, and many objections, which here in the proceſs of this diſcourſe are lightly propoſed, being by them formerly made, and accordingly anſwer accommodated to them; and yet farther, the main thing which is here done, being to ſet down many *Latin* paſſages, out of the *Diſſert.* and to deem them confuted by the bare recital of them; upon theſe grounds I do not foreſee that there will be any neceſſity of making any large returns to this laſt, but not conciſeſt part of his digreſſion. What had been returned to the *London Miniſters*, the Reader will find in that *Vindication*, *Cap.* 1. *Sect.* 16. (of which number, by the fault of the *Printer*, he will meet with *two Sections*) and ſo on for the three ſubſequent *Sections*, and to the *Diſſertations* themſelves, and that *vindication* of them, I ſhall willingly refer this matter. Yet ſhall I not omit to gather up whatſoever I ſhall here find ſuggeſted, which was not there punctually ſpoken to; and of that nature here are four things in this *Paragraph*. 3.

Firſt, that in the 5 *Chap.* of *Diſſ.* 4. I *commence per ſaltum, taking it for granted*, that I had *proved Dioceſan Biſhops before, though*, ſaith he, I had *ſcarce ſpoken one word to that purpoſe* in my *whole Book*. To this I anſwer, that as in the firſt *Diſſertation* I had anſwered one ſort of objections againſt *Epiſcopacy*, and in the whole ſecond *Diſſ.* aſſerted it out of *Ignatius* and S. *Hierom* himſelf, ſo in the *third*, I had deduced it from *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles*, and I ſuppoſe laid thoſe *grounds*, and by all *antiquity confirmed*, and by anſwer of *Blondel*'s *objections vindicated* them, ſo that they were competently fitted to bear that ſtructure of *Epiſcopacy*, which I had laid upon them; and then having in the fourth *Diſſ.* added to this the viſible practice of this, in the hands of *ſingle Governours*, whether the *Apoſtles* in their ſeveral κληροὶ, or their ſucceſſors the firſt *Biſhops*, called *ſecundary Apoſtles*, mentioned in the *Scripture*, and yet more particularly in the *Angels* of the *ſeven Churches*, (which being acknowledged to be the *Governours* of thoſe *Churches*, were proved to be *ſingle Governours* of them, which was the only thing in queſtion betwixt *Blondel* and me) I had ſome reaſon to hope that I might be allowed to have *ſpoken* ſome *one word to that purpoſe* in that *Book*, before I came to prove thoſe *Angels* to have been *Metropolitans*, which he knows was not attempted, till all this of *Epiſcopacy* had been premiſed by me. 4.

The reaſon, which he adds in a *parentheſis*, why he affirms thus expreſly, that I had *ſcarce ſpoken one word* to *prove a Dioceſan Biſhop* in that *Book*, is the ſecond thing I am to reply to; *For*, ſaith he, *to prove one ſuperintending in a Church by the name of Biſhop, others acting in ſome kind of ſubordination to him under the name of Elders and Presbyters, will no way reach to the maintenance of this preſumption.* 5.

To which I anſwer, that the queſtion lying, as there it did betwixt *Blondel* and me, there can be no doubt, but, if I have evinced the power in every *Church*, to have been in the hands of a ſingle *Biſhop*, and either no *Colledge* of *Presbyters* in that *Church*, or elſe thoſe *Presbyters ſubordinate* to the *Biſhop* (meaning by *ſubordinate*, ſubject to his power and authority over them) I have alſo evinced the cauſe againſt *Blondel*; And this I may have leave to hope is there done, till the contrary be made appear; and here being no offer of that, but only a mention of the *account of what hath been offered* by the *Prefacer*, *concerning the ſtate of the Churches in thoſe days*, 1. that account hath already been ſhewn to have no force in it, 2. if it had, it belongs not to the controverſie, as it lay betwixt me and *Blondel*, but is as contrary to *Blondel*'s pretenſions as to mine; and ſo ſtill I cannot ſee how I fell under his *Animadverſion* in this matter, or how I *commenced per ſaltum*, in doing what there I did, as regularly as I could imagine. 6.

The third thing is, that I call the *Biſhops* of the moſt *eminent Churches*, *urbium* ἔξαρχοι, whom he will haved called *Biſhops* only. But of this there can be no *Controverſie*, the fitneſs and propriety of words being to be judged from the uſe of them, and the caſe being clear, that a *Metropolitan*, eſpecially a *Primate*, was called ἔξαρχος in the ancient Councils and * Church-writings, and from them, and not from *Scripture*, which uſeth no higher ſtile for them, than of *Biſhops* and *Angels*, it is, that I borrowed that appellation. 7.

* ὁ Ἐφέσου ὑπέρτιμος καὶ ἔξαρχος πάσης Ἀσίας. *Codin.*

The laſt thing, that I muſt, if I will not be ſuppoſed to prevaricate, make good, is, that the *Angels* of the *Churches* related in their office not only to the particular *Churches* wherein they were placed, but to many *Churches* alſo, *no leſs committed to their charge, than theſe wherein they did reſide, and that to power and juriſdiction*, &c. 8.

That they related to other *Churches* beſides their own, even to all that belonged to their *Province*, I ſuppoſe my ſelf obliged to make good; and the 34 *Apoſtolick Canon* is alone able to do it in general, as ſhall anon appear. Then more particularly, that they had power of ordaining *Biſhops*, and of judging them alſo, is S. *Chryſoſtoms* affirmation of *Titus*, whom I ſuppoſe to be ſuch a *Metropolitan* in *Crete*; That if any were made *Biſhop* ἄνευ γνώμης Μητροπολίτου, *without the judgment* and *liking of the Metropolitan*, μὴ δεῖν εἶναι ἐπίσκοπον, *He ought not to be a Biſhop*, is the ſixth Canon of the firſt Council of *Nice*; And what is there defined of the *Metropolitan*'s rights, beſides that 'tis done by 318 *Biſhops*, the moſt ſelect of the whole Chriſtian world, and in an age very competent to paſs a *judgment* of an *Apoſtolical* cuſtom; it is alſo vouched by them expreſly as one of the ἀρχαῖα ἔθη, the ancient immemorial cuſtoms of the *Church*. And much more to the ſame purpoſe is evident by the ancient *Canons* of the *univerſal Church*, as hath in ſome meaſure been ſet down (and as far as I can be concerned to make good, either againſt the *Preſbyterian*, or *Congregational*, or *Popiſh* way) in a tract of *Schiſm*, *Chap.* 3. *Sect.* 11, &c. 9.

To this the ſtory of thoſe firſt times exactly accords, telling us that *Irenæus* by being *Metropolitan* of *Lyons*, ἐπεσκόπει τὰς κατὰ Γαλλίαν παροικίας, *was Biſhop* (that ſure muſt be interpreted *Metropolitan* or *Primate*) *of the Dioceſe* (and ſo *Biſhops*) that pertain to *France*, and * again τῶν κατὰ Γαλλίαν ἀδελφῶν ἡγεῖτο, he had the *Government of the Brethren*, i. e. the Chriſtians that belong to *France*; 10.

Euſeb. Eccleſ. Hiſt. l. 5. c. κς'.

* *Ibid.* c. κς'.

And

Ibid. c. xβ. And this *Irenæus*, the Scholar of *Polycarp*, *auditor* of the *Apoſtles*: That, *Demetrius* τῶν κατ' Ἀλεξανδρείαν παροικιῶν ἐγχειρίζεται, *undertook the adminiſtration of the Dioceſes belonging to Alexandria*; and both theſe at the ſame time in *Commodus*'s reign. And that whole Chapter in *Euſebius* is but the enumeration of ſeveral ſuch *Metropolitans* by name, who were all at the ſame time; of the *Church* of the *Antiochians*, *Serapion*, the *eighth* from the *Apoſtles*; of the *Church* of *Rome*, *Eleutherius*'s ſucceſſor, *Victor*; of *Ceſarea* ἡ Παλαιστίνων, or as he phraſeth it in the next Chapter, ἡ ἐν Καισαρείᾳ παροικίας, *Theophilus*; of the *Church* in *Jeruſalem*, *Narciſſus*; of the *Church* of *Corinth*, ἡ κατ' Ἑλλάδα, *Banchyllus*; *c. xδ.* and of *Epheſus*, or, as he phraſeth it, ἡ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ παροικίας, *Polycrates*, of whom he after ſaith, that ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀσίας ἐπισκόπων ἡγεῖτο, *he was chief*, or *Prime* or *Ruler* of the *Biſhops of Aſia*. In the ſame manner as afterward, S. *Cyprian Biſhop* of *Carthage* in the *Council* of *Conſtantinople in Trullo*, is ſtiled *Can. 2.* Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος τῆς Ἄφρων χώρας, *Archbiſhop of the Region*, or *Province* of *Africk*; which is, as to the matter of it, own'd by himſelf, *Epiſt.* 40. and 45. where he mentions his *Province*, and the extent of it.

SECT. II.

Of Churches in the plural, and a Church in the ſingular in the Scripture.

1. IN purſuit of this matter of *Metropolitans*, he proceeds next to take notice of one *obſervation* of mine in theſe words;

2. "To this end he informs us *ſect.* 2. that in the New Teſtament there is in ſundry places mention "made of Churches in the plural number, as *Gal.* 1. 21. 1 *Theſ.* 2. 14. *Acts* 9. 35. *Acts* 15. 41. 1 *Cor.* "16. 1. *Gal.* 1. 2. *Rev.* 1. 11. ſometimes of Church only in the ſingular number, as *Acts* 8. 1, 15. "4. 22. *Acts* 11. 26. *Heb.* 16. 1. 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. 2 *Theſ.* 1. 1. *Rev.* 2. 1, 8, 12, 18. Now this "is an obſervation, which as we are not at all beholding to the Doctor for it, no more I ſuppoſe will "he be found to be to it, when the reaſon of it ſhall be a little weighed and conſidered. The ſumm "is, that the name Church, in the ſingular number, is never uſed, but when it relates to the ſingle "Congregation, in, or of ſome City or Town: That of Churches reſpecting the ſeveral Churches "or Congregations that were gathered in any Country or Province: Manifeſt then it is from hence, "that there is in the New Teſtament, no Church of one denomination beyond a ſingle Congregati- "on: And where there are more, they are always called Churches: How evidently this is deſtru- "ctive to any Dioceſan or Metropolitical Officer, who hath no Church left him thereby of Chriſt's "inſtitution to be related to, another opportunity will manifeſt.

3. Here is but one thing done by the *Prefacer*, a recital of my *obſervation* in the words, juſt as I ſet it, that there is in the *New Teſtament* mention ſometimes of *Churches* in the *plural*, ſometimes of a *Church* in the *ſingular*.

4. For this obſervation he ſaith, he is not beholding to me, and I ſhall imitate him thus far in replying, that neither is he the firſt that hath miſtaken it, the *London Miniſters* had done before him juſt what now he thinks fit to do. For having duly recited the obſervation, when he comes to give the ** Pag. 85.* ſumm of it, that ſumm is very different from the particulars (juſt as by the * *London Miniſters* it had been before) *viz.* that my obſervation is, that the *word Church is never uſed in the ſingular, but when it relates to a ſingle congregation.*

5. Here I muſt interpoſe (as to the *London Miniſters* I did, and to the * *Vindication* there I refer the ** Pag. 86, 87, 88.* Reader for it, and ſhall here recite it no farther than only thus) that I only ſay the word *Church* was ſo uſed in the ſingular for the *Church* of *one City*, meaning ſtill (as I there expreſs, and I always do, when I ſpeak of a *City-Church*) with the territory adjoyning, whether again that be a territory of more *Cities*, when that which is ſpoken of, is a *Metropolis*, as many of thoſe which I there mention, were, *Corinth*, *Epheſus* (and all certainly, except *Cenchrea*, being near unto, and an *Haven-City* of *Corinth*, πόλις, ἡ ἐπίνειον Κορίνθου, ſaith *Stephanus Byzantinus*, περ. πολ.) or whether the villages adjacent, when it is not a *Metropolis*. But that the word *Church* in the *ſingular*, is *never uſed but when it thus relates to the ſingle congregation in, or of one City, Metropolis*, or not *Metropolis*, that I never ſaid, nor thought, nor was it uſeful to me to obſerve or ſuggeſt any ſuch thing.

6. And ſo being miſtaken in his ground, his inference muſt alſo ſuddenly vaniſh, which he affirm'd to be ſo manifeſt; and ſo likewiſe all the advantage, which when opportunity ſhould ſerve, he meant to have made of it.

SECT. III.

The meaning of Provinces. Philippi *a Metropolis.* Dionyſius's *Epiſtle to* Gortyna. Philip *Biſhop of all the Churches in* Creet. Παροικία.

FRom the mention of my obſervation, he goes on to examine the uſe which I made of it. 1.

"For the preſent (ſaith he) let us ſee what uſe our Doctor makes of this obſervation. 2.
"*Sect.* 3. ſays he, *Judæa*, and the reſt of the places where Churches are mention'd, are the names "of Provinces, ἐπαρχιῶν, *quatenus ea παροικίαις & διοικήσεσι contradiſtinguuntur:* But if the Doctor "takes theſe words in an Eccleſiaſtical ſence, he begs that which will upon ſuch unworthy terms ne-"ver be granted him: If no more be intended but that *Judæa*, *Galatia*, and the like names of Coun-"tries were Provinces wherein were many Churches; *Smyrna*, *Epheſus*, of Towns and Cities where-"in there was but one, we grant it him.
"And how much that conceſſion of ours is to his advantage hath been intimated: And this ſeems "to be his intendment by his following words, *Provinciarum, inquam, in quibus plurimæ civitates ſin-"gulæ ſingularum Eccleſiarum ſedes, comprehendebantur, ideoque Eccleſiæ in plurali iſtius ſive iſtius Pro-"vinciæ dicendæ*; well, what then? *cum tamen unaquæque civitas, cum territorio ſibi adjuncto* (λῆρος!) "*ab Epiſcopo ſuo adminiſtrata, ſingularis Eccleſia dicenda ſit: Ideoque quod κατ' ἐκκλησίαν factum dici-"tur, Acts* 14. 15. *κατὰ πόλιν fieri jubetur, Tit.* 1. 5. that in every City there was a ſingular Church "in thoſe Provinces, (I ſpeak of thoſe where any number were converted to the Faith) I grant, for "the annexed territories let the Doctor take care: There being one Church at *Corinth*, and another "at *Cenchrea*, ſo that every ſingle City had its own ſingle Church with its Biſhop in it, as at *Philippi*.
"The paſſage mentioned by the Doctor, concerning the Epiſtle of *Dionyſius* to the Church of *Gorty-"na* in *Crete*, is very little to his purpoſe: Neither doth he call *Philip* the Biſhop of that Church, "the Biſhop of all the other Churches in *Crete*, as the Doctor intimates; but the Biſhop of them to "whom eſpecially and eminently he wrote.

It being here, as he ſaith, uncertain to him, what I mean, when I ſay *Judæa*, *Syria*, and the like 3.
are *Provinces*, as they are *contra-diſtinguiſhed* from thoſe which were no more than *Dioceſes* in our modern uſe of the word, though I thought I had ſpoken intelligibly enough before, yet I am moſt ready farther to explain my ſelf, That I mean *Province* in an *Eccleſiaſtick* ſence, the ſeveral *Churches* of ſeveral *Cities* (with their territories adjoyning to them) all together making up one *Provincial Church*, ſo ſtiled, as meeting occaſionally, or at ſet times, at the *Metropolis* in an *Aſſembly* ordinarily called *Provincial*, in which the *Biſhop* of the *Metropolis* preſideth, as *James* at *Jeruſalem* with the *Biſhops* of all *Judæa* joyning with him, as I conceive the model ſet down both *Acts* 15. and *Rev.* 4. 4. by way of viſional repreſentation.

Theſe ſeveral Churches conſidered by themſelves, are each the *Church* in, or of ſuch a City, and 4.
ſo each mentioned in the ſingular number; but being conſidered all together, though the denomination, wherein they all agree, be in the ſingular alſo, *Judæa*, *Syria*, &c. (and accordingly we have in *Ignatius* the *Church* of *Syria*, both *Church* and *Syria* in the ſingular number) which, as comprehenſive of all the ſeverals in it, I call a *Province* (as men have generally done before me) yet the ſeverals ſo comprehended, are oft mentioned in the plural, the *Churches* of *Judæa*, &c. This is the obſervation, and being, as I thought, evidenced by the inſtances there made, I did not think it could want farther proof, or be liable to be cenſured as that fallacy of *begging the queſtion* on ſuch terms, as he is pleaſed to think unworthy.

At the preſent, all that I had there to ſay in the * *Diſſertations* being only this, the rendring ſome 5.
reaſon of that difference of ſtile in Scripture, ſometimes the *Churches* in the plural, ſometimes in the ſingular, and that reaſon being viſible, becauſe *Judæa* had many *Churches* in it, as many *Cities*, and *Cenchrea*, &c. was but *one Church* of *one City*, and the territory (though perhaps many places of *Eccleſiaſtick aſſemblies* in that circuit) this cannot be a *begging* of more than is made evident. All that I am by him warned to take farther care of, is, the territory, (what cauſe he had to cry λῆρος! at the mention of it, I ſhall not enquire) which I ſhall be mindful to do, when it is in any danger, or need of my care, which as yet it is not, being no way aſſaulted by him, and therefore here is at preſent no place of my farther ſolicitude.
* *Diſſert.* 4. c. 5. *Sect.* 3.

What he is pleaſed to interpoſe of *Philippi*, its being a *ſingle City* with its *Biſhop* in it, he cannot 6.
but know, is, as to me, a meer *begging* of the *queſtion*, which juſt then he had accuſed in me, ſome pains being taken in that *Diſſertation*, *cap.* 10. to ſhew that thoſe *plural Biſhops*, were not the *Biſhops* of that *one City* of *Philippi*; To which having never offered the leaſt word of anſwer, the contrary ſhould not thus have been taken for granted by him.

One thing he adds in the cloſe, which was a little unexpected, that *the paſſage, concerning the* 7.
Epiſtle of Dionyſius *to the Church at* Gortyna *in* Crete, *is very little* to my *purpoſe*, and that *neither doth he call the Biſhop of that Church, the Biſhop of all the other Churches in* Crete. What truth there is in this ſuggeſtion will ſoon be diſcerned.

And firſt, theſe are the words of that Epiſtle, or the title of it, in *Euſebius l.* 4. *c.* κγ'. *Dionyſius* 8.
Biſhop of Corinth, τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παροικούσῃ Γορτύναν (this he ſhould not have rendred, *to the Church of Gortyna*, but) *to the Church adjacent* or *lying about Gortyna,* ἅμα ταῖς λοιπαῖς κατὰ Κρήτην παροικίαις, *together with the reſt of the* παροικίαι (the word common to *Dioceſes* and *Provinces*) *in Crete.* The controverſie, I perceive, here, is not concerning παροικίαις, what that ſignifies (but the λοιπαὶ the *reſt*, how far that extends, whether to all, or to ſome to whom he eſpecially and eminently wrote) and ſo I ſhall not need inſiſt on it, elſe it were eaſie to ſhew, that ſignifying originally, *adjacence* of *habita-*

tion,

tion, it belongs indifferently, whether to a greater or leſs circuit, a *Pariſh* (which word comes from thence) or *adjacence* of *houſes*; a *Dioceſs*, or adjacence of *Pariſhes* to a *City*; a *Province*, or *adjacence* of *Cities* (with their territories) to a *Metropolis or chief City*. And which of theſe it ſignifies at any time, the *Context* muſt define.

9. So the *Church* παροικῶτα Γορτύναν, muſt here be the *whole Province*, relating to *Gortyna* the chief *Metropolis* of *Crete*, and then the λοιπαὶ κατὰ Κρήτην παροικίαι; can be no other but *the reſt of the Provinces*, which were in *Crete*. And then certainly the adding of λοιπαῖς *the reſt*, to the mention of that, of which *Gortyna* was the *Metropolis*, muſt conclude him to comprehend all the other, beſide that, which were in *Crete*; and *Philip*, which is there ſaid to be *Biſhop* ἀυτῶν *of them*, in the plural, not only ἀυτῆς *of that* about *Gortyna*, muſt needs be concluded *Primate* of them all, which he could not be any other way, than as he was *Biſhop* of the chief *Metropolis*, to which thoſe other related. And then, what could be more to my purpoſe than this, I confeſs I know not. Againſt this there is no word of reaſon offered, only 'tis ſaid that *it is not to my purpoſe* --- and ſo I have nothing to which I can make reply in this matter.

SECT. IV.

The Original of Metropolitical Churches. Accommodation of the Eccleſiaſtick to the Civil diſtributions. The Biſhop of Romes *greatneſs.*

1. THE next thing he is pleaſed to examine, he calls (I ſhall not debate how fitly) my *application* of the forementioned *obſervation*, and from thence he expects ſome great *advantage*.

2. "*Sect.* 4. ſaith he, Application is made of the forementioned obſervation: *Sect.* 2. and the Interpretation given of it, *Sect.* 3. in theſe words, *His ſic poſitis, illud ſtatim ſequitur ut (in Imperii cognitione) in provinciâ qualibet, cum plures Urbes ſint, una tamen primaria & principalis cenſenda erat, μητρόπολις ideo dicta, cui itidem inferiores reliquæ civitates ſubjiciebantur, ut civitatibus regiones, ſic & inter Eccleſias, & Cathedras Epiſcopales unam ſemper primariam & Metropoliticam fuiſſe.*

"In this Section the Doctor hath moſt ingenuouſly and truly given us the riſe and occaſion of his "Dioceſan and Metropolitical Prelates, from the aims of men, to accommodate Eccleſiaſtical or "Church-affairs, to the ſtate and condition of the civil government, and diſtributions of Provinces, "Metropolitan Cities, and chief Towns within the ſeveral dependencies (the neighbouring villages "being caſt in as things of no great eſteem, to the lot of the next conſiderable Town and ſeat of Ju"dicature) did the Hierarchy, which he ſo ſedulouſly contendeth for, ariſe; what advantage were "afforded to the work, by the paucity of believers in the Villages and leſs Towns (from which at "length the whole body of Heatheniſh Idolaters were denominated Pagans) the firſt planting of "Churches in the greater Cities, the eminence of the Officers of the firſt Churches in thoſe Cities, "the weakneſs of many rural Biſhops, the multiplying and growing in numbers and perſons, of gifts, "abilities, and conſiderable fortunes and employments in this world, in the Metropolitan Cities, "with their fame thereby, the tradition of the abode of ſome one or other of the Apoſtles in ſuch "Cities and Churches, with the eminent Accommodation at the adminiſtration of civil Juriſdiction "and other affairs, which appeared in that ſubordination and dependency, whereunto the Provinces, "chief Cities, and territories in the *Roman* Empire were caſt, with which opportunities Satan got by "theſe means, to introduce their ways, ſtate, pomp, words, phraſes, terms of honour of the "world into the Churches; inſenſibly getting ground upon them, and prevailing to their declenſion "from the naked ſimplicity and purity wherein they were firſt planted, ſome other occaſion may "give advantage for us to manifeſt; for the preſent it may ſuffice that it is granted, that the Magni"fick Hierarchy of the Church aroſe from the accommodation of its ſtate and condition of the *Roman* "Empire and Provinces. And this in the inſtances of after-ages that might be produced, will eaſily "be made yet farther evident; in thoſe ſhameful, or indeed rather ſhameleſs conteſts, which fell out "among the Biſhops of the third Century, and downward, about precedency, titles of Honour, ex"tent of Juriſdiction, Eccleſiaſtical ſubjection to, or exemption from one another, the conſiderable"neſs of their Cities in the Civil ſtate of the *Roman* Empire where they did reſide, was ſtill the moſt "prevalent and cogent argument in their brawles: the moſt notable bruſh, that in all Antiquity we "find given to the great Leviathan of *Rome*, who ſported himſelf in thoſe gatherings together of the "waters of people, and multitudes, and Nations, and Tongues, or the general Councils (as they "are called) was from an argument taken from the ſeat of the Empire, being fixt at *Conſtantinople*, "making it become new *Rome*, ſo that the Biſhop of the Church there, was to injoy equal priviledge "with him, whoſe lot was fallen in the old imperial City.

3. The brief ſumm of what he there quotes in *Latin*, is this, That as in the *civil account*, the *chief City* where there are many in a *Province*, is the *Metropolis*, to which the inferior Cities are ſubjected (and relate to it, as the *adjacent region* to the *City*) ſo the chief Church in a *Province* was by the *Apoſtles* deſigned (which I hope is far enough from *Satans introducing* it) to be a *Metropolitical Church*, on which the inferior *Churches* and their *Biſhops* depended, and obſerved concord and unity with it. This the *Prefacer* looks on, as a ſpecial diſcovery, and having threatned what *ſome other occaſion may give advantage to manifeſt*, he is not pleaſed to make any the leaſt objection againſt it at this time, or to endeavour to prove that it was not thus, but is very well ſatisfied that it is granted, that the *Magnifick* (as he will ſtile it) *Hierarchy* of the *Church* aroſe from this accommodation of the *Eccleſiaſtick* to the *Civil forms* of *diſtributions*.

4. This indeed, as far as concerns every *national Church*, which by this means is beſt diſpoſed for order and unity within it ſelf, is by me willingly and profeſtly granted; and if the reaſonableneſs,

that

that it ſhould do ſo, do not competently vindicate it, yet ſuppoſing (as the *diſcourſe* there doth) that the *Apoſtles* themſelves did generally ſo deſign it in every Region, I hope there will lye no charge againſt it; And if farther than ſo, the obſerving of it proved uſeful, as he ſaith it did, to the reducing the *Biſhop* of *Rome* to ſome moderate terms, equalling another *Biſhop* to him, when the *Empire* was removed to another *ſeat*, I know not ſtill, why this ſhould be ſuch a diſobligation to the *Prefacer*, who will hardly be able to give any more moderate or leſs *Popiſh* account of the immenſe greatneſs which that *Biſhop* by preſcription of ſome number of years did challenge, than this of the *Imperial ſeat* having been fixt at *Rome*, and theſe priviledges accruing to him by that means, and not by any inveſtiture from *Chriſt*, by ſucceſſion to S. *Peter*, as they plead, nor by appointment of the *Apoſtles* in their firſt plantations, which now we ſpeak of.

I have elſewhere ſpoken on this ſubject in the Tract of *Schiſm*, in the latter part of *Chap.* 3. and to 5.
the *London Miniſters*, *cap.* 1. *ſect.* 16. and there briefly ſhewed the reaſonableneſs of it. And here being yet nothing but promiſes of objections againſt it, it may ſuffice that I defer the anſwering them, till they be produced.

SECT. V.

The Grounds of the Apoſtles inſtituting Metropoles. The frame of Heathen Governments, and the patterns among the Jews, Civil and Sacred.

NExt he proceeds to that which I add, as an image of this model in the *Church*, taken from *Gods* 1.
direction to *Moſes* for the government of the *Jews*, thus,

"But our Doctor adds, *Sect.* 5. *Illud ex Judæorum exemplari tranſcripſiſſe Apoſtoli videntur, cum* 2.
"*Moſaicâ id lege cautum eſſet, ut Judices & miniſtri in qualibet civitate ordinarentur*, Deut. 16. 18.
"*illi vero in rebus dubiis ad Judicem* (*Moſis ſucceſſorem*) *Synedrio Hieroſolymitano cinctum recurrere te-*
"*nerentur*, Chap. 17. 9. and in Sect. 6. he proves *Jeruſalem* to have been the Metropolis of that whole
"Nation, *Egregiam vero laudem!* But

"1. The Doctor I preſume knows before this, that thoſe with whom he hath to do, will never
"give him the thing in queſtion upon his begging, or requeſt. That which alone falls under our
"conſideration and inquiry is, whether the Apoſtles inſtituted any ſuch model of Church order and
"Government, as is by the Doctor contended for; to this he tells you, that the Apoſtles ſeem to
"have done it, from the pattern of Moſaical inſtitutions in the Church of the *Jews*; But, Doctor, the
"queſtion is not, with what reſpect they did it, but whether they did it at all or no? This the Do-
"ctor thought good to let alone till another time, if we would not grant him upon his petition, that
"ſo they did.

"2. This then is the Doctors ſecond argument for his Dioceſan and Metropolitan Prelates. His
"firſt was, from the example of the Heathens, in their civil adminiſtrations and rule, this ſecond
"from the example of the *Jews*. Not to divert into the handling of the Church and Political ſtate
"of the *Jews*, as appointed by God, nor that diſſonancy that is between the inſtitution of civil Ma-
"giſtrates, and Evangelical adminiſtrations, this is the ſumm of the Doctors reaſoning, in his 5, 6, 7,
"and 8. Sections. God in the Church and among the people of the *Jews*, choſe out one City to place
"his name there, making it the place where all the types and ceremonies which he had appointed for
"the diſcovery and ſhadowing forth of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, were viſibly and glorioully to be ma-
"naged, acted, and held forth (ſundry of them being ſuch, as whoſe Typicalneſs would have been
"deſtroyed by their multiplication) and principally on this account making that place or City (which
"was firſt *Shilo*) the ſeat of the Kingdom, or habitation of the chief ruler, for the adminiſtration of
"Juſtice, who appointed Judges in all the Land, for the good and peace of the people, therefore
"the Churches of Jeſus Chriſt, diſperſed over the face of the whole world, freed from obligations
"to Cities or Mountains, walking before God, in, and with a pure and ſpiritual worſhip, having no
"one reaſon of that former inſtitution, in common with the Church of the *Jews*, muſt be caſt into
"the ſame mould and figure; I hope without offence I may take leave to deny the conſequence, and
"what more I have to ſay to this argument I ſhall yet defer.

One great fallacy I am here charged to be guilty of, (but having been oft accuſed of this very 3.
crime, I yet never had the ill luck to be convict by him) that I beg the queſtion again, which, ſaith he, is only this, *Whether the Apoſtles inſtituted any ſuch order*, or no?

But can this be a begging the queſtion, when *Sect.* 9. of that *Chapter*, I expreſly undertake to prove 4.
that the *Apoſtles* did inſtitute ſuch model, and when he himſelf in the very next Paragraph, expreſly confeſſes that I proceed to prove it?

Can that be ſaid to be begged, which is undertaken to be proved, and the proofs as yet not ſo much 5.
as conſidered by him, and ſo certainly not invalidated? Or can a man be bound to prove his aſſertion, before he hath explained what he means by it, or upon what grounds of credibility he affirms it?

That which I do in that *Chapter* may *analytically* be divided into *two* parts, 1. the grounds upon 6.
which I conceive the *Apoſtles* thus modell'd the Church, and ſecondly, the proofs or teſtimonies by which I manifeſt that they did ſo. The queſtion in hand being a matter of fact, whether or no the *Apoſtles* inſtituted *Metropolitical Churches*, &c. that was to be proved or diſproved only by teſtimonies; and if that be not attempted to be done, but taken for granted, that were indeed a begging of the queſtion; but a due place being reſerved for that, in the latter part of the *Chapter*, I conceive it no breach of the Laws of diſcourſe, owned and exemplified by Artiſts, firſt to render the aſſertion credible, by propoſing the grounds upon which I conceive they did it.

7. And thoſe grounds were of two ſorts, 1. The known frame of the *Heathen Governments*, where they came to plant the Goſpel, and by attending to which, they ſhould plant it more advantagiouſly; and then what *Nazianzen* ſaith of *Julian*, that it was in him a wiſe but a wicked policy, for the reducing *Heatheniſm* among *Chriſtians*, to appoint the *heathen Prieſts* to make uſe of the *Chriſtian* obſervances, may be very credible, as an act of *Divine* policy in the *Apoſtles*, to make their advantage for the propagating and preſerving the *Faith*, by obſerving and not going contrary to the civil diſtributions, which they ſhould meet with among the *Heathens*.

8. Secondly, The patterns of this among the *Jews*, and thoſe we know, the more conſiderable in this, becauſe they were there inſtituted by God himſelf, and becauſe many other obſervances in *Chriſtianity* are by *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles* viſibly accommodated from the *Jews*. And again there are two of thoſe patterns, one in their *civil managery*, *Judges* and *Officers in every City*, *Deut.* 16. 18. and *Moſes* in matters of higher concernment and difficulty with his *Sanhedrim* at *Jeruſalem*; and the other in their *Eccleſiaſtical*, the three families of the *Levites*, ſeparated for the ſacred offices, a נשיא or *chief* over them, *Num.* 3. 24. and over them *Eleazer* the Son of *Aaron* the נשיא נשיא ἀρχων ἀρχόντων, *the chief of the chiefs* of the *Levites*. And the advantages of order, and unity, and due adminiſtration of *Juſtice*, which recommended thoſe forms among the *Jews*, were all fit to be taken care of, and conſequently were ſo many motives to induce the *Apoſtles* to copy them out under the *New Teſtament*, and to obſerve the like uniformity in all their *Plantations*.

9. And theſe grounds being thus laid as a foundation, to ſupport and fit the building, which in the remainder of the *Chapter* was regularly, *i. e.* by teſtimony of the *Scripture* and the *Ancient Church*, *ſuperſtructed* on it, I cannot gueſs, what I could otherwiſe have done in reſpect of the *Method*, than what was there deſigned by me. And truly if I did let the proof of the fact alone, as he ſaith, till another time, as long as that other time was ſo near at hand, in the ſame *Chapter*, in the very next *Section* after the ſetting down the *exemplars* among the *Jews*, I cannot yet diſcern how I have offended in it. No man can do two things at once, and I was free to chuſe my own *Method*, as long as I neither omitted nor put off (as the *Prefacer* hath often done, and ſo now again in the laſt words of this *Paragraph* he doth) to ſome other occaſion, that which was ſo neceſſary to be proved there.

10. As for his ſummary account of my diſcourſe again, it is very much varied from that, which thoſe *four Sections* yield, which is no more than this, that as by Gods appointment to *Moſes*, there were many inferiour and one ſuperiour Court; many in the ſeveral Cities of *Judæa*, and one at *Jeruſalem*, to which the inferiour related, as the *Mother* and *prime*; and as in the *Temple* above the *Levites* there were *heads* of the *Levites*, and *heads* of thoſe *heads*, ſo it would be exactly parallel in the *Apoſtles* to *inſtitute Biſhops* in every *City-Church*, and *Metropolitans* in the *chief Cities*; which as it is no argument at all to prove the matter of fact, that indeed it was ſo, nor by me deſigned for ſuch, propoſed only as an *exemplar* or *parallel*, not as a *proof*, and accordingly induced with [*ad hanc imaginem*, *after this image*] *Sect.* 9. an [*as*] and [*ſo*] not a [*therefore*] (and ſo there was no conſequence in it capable of being denied) ſo again ſuch as it was, it very much differed from that which is here ſet down in *Italick letters*, as if it were the *Engliſh* of my *Sections* (which, again, were never ſet down in *Engliſh*, till now that this advantage might be gain'd by it.)

11. This manner of dealing, what it imports, I ſhall not judge, but leave the *Prefacer* to paſs his own *Animadverſions* on it.

SECT. VI.

Of Antioch *the Metropolis of* Syria, Acts 15. *What the dependence of Inferiour Churches to their Metropolis. The reference to* Jeruſalem *made by the Church of* Antioch. *The decrees delivered to other Churches.* Jeruſalem *the grand Metropolis.* Philo's *Teſtimony.* Ignatius *Paſtor*, *Biſhop of* Syria. *The Epiſtle to the* Antiochians. *A Teſtimony thence.*

1. NOW then he proceeds to the examination of my proofs, (If it might have been foreſeen that there were any ſuch, the laſt *Paragraph* might certainly have been ſpared.)

2. "But, *ſaith he*, the Doctor proceeds to prove, that indeed the Apoſtles did diſpoſe of the "Churches in this frame and order, according to the pattern of the Civil government of the *Roman* "Empire, and that inſtituted of God among the *Jews*. The ninth Section, wherein he attempts the "proof of this aſſertion, is as followeth.

"*Ad hanc imaginem, Apoſtolos Eccleſias ubique diſponendas curâſſe, & in omnibus plantationibus ſuis,* "*minorum ab eminentioribus civitatibus dependentiam & ſubordinationem conſtituiſſe, exemplis quidem* "*plurimis monſtrari poſſit; illud in Syriâ & Ciliciâ patet Act.* 16.4. *cùm enim ζήτημα illud* c. 15.2. *Hie-* "*roſolymas referetur ab Eccleſiâ ἰδίως Antiochia, Cap.* 14. 26. *&* 15. 3. *& decretum ab Apoſtolis denuò* "*ad eos mitteretur v.* 22. *in Epiſtolâ quâ decretum illud continebatur, ſimul cum Antiochenſibus,* Τὰς κα- "τὰ Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν Ἀδελφὰς *comprehenſos videmus* v. 23. *Dein Epiſtolâ iſtâ Antiochenæ Eccleſiæ reddità* "v. 30. *Paulus tandem & Sylas Syriam & Ciliciam peragrantes* v. 41. c. 16.4. δόγματα κεκριμένα ὑπὸ "τῶν Ἀποστόλων *ſingulis civitatibus obſervanda tradiderunt, ut quæ ad hanc Antiochiæ Metropolin, ut toti-* "*dem ſubordinatæ Eccleſiæ pertinerent, ut & ipſa Antiochia ad Hieroſolymas, primariam tam latæ* (*ut* "*ex Philone prædiximus*) *Provinciæ Metropolin pertinebat, & ad eam, ad dirimendam litem iſtam, ſe* "*conferebat.*

"This being all that the Doctor hath to produce from the Scripture to his purpoſe in hand, I have "tranſcribed it at large; for this being removed, all that follows, will fall of its own accord.

"1. Then, the dependence on, and ſubordination of leſſer Cities to the greater, is aſſerted as an "Apoſtolical inſtitution; Now becauſe I ſuppoſe the Doctor will not aſſert, nor doth intend

"a civil

"a civil dependance, and ſubordination of Cities, as ſuch, among themſelves, nor will a depen-
"dance as to counſel, advice, aſſiſtance, and the like ſupplies, which in their mutual communion,
"the leſſer Churches might receive from the greater and more eminent, ſerve his turn: but an Ec-
"cleſiaſtical dependance and ſubordination, ſuch as whereby many particular Churches, with inferi-
"our Officers reſiding in them, and with them, depended on, and were in ſubjection to ſome one
"perſon of a ſuperiour order, commonly reſiding in ſome eminent City, and many of theſe Gover-
"nours of a ſuperiour order in the greater Cities were in ſubordination unto ſome one of high degree,
"termed a *Metropolitan*, and all this by *Apoſtolical* inſtitution, is that which he aimeth at, which
"being a moſt gallant adventure, in a waking generation, we ſhall doubtleſs find him quitting him-
"ſelf like a man in his undertaking.

"2. Then he tells you that the queſtion about Moſaical Rites, and neceſſity of their obſervation,
"was referred to *Jeruſalem* by the ſingle *Church* of *Antioch*. But how does the Doctor make good
"this firſt ſtep, which yet if he could, would do him no good at all? It is true, that *Paul* was
"now come to *Antioch*, *Chap.* 14. 26. and alſo that he was brought on his way by the Church,
"*Chap.* 15. 3. But yet that the brethren who were taught the Doctrine conteſted about, *v.* 1. were
"only of the Church of *Antioch* (when it is moſt certain from the Epiſtles of *Paul* to the *Galatians*,
"*Coloſſians*, *Romans*, and others, that great diſturbance was raiſed far and wide, in all the Church-
"es of the Gentiles about this controverſie) nothing is offered. It ſeems indeed that their diſputes
"grew to the greateſt heights at *Antioch*, whither brethren from other parts and Churches did alſo
"come, whilſt *Barnabas* and *Paul* abode there, but that that ſingle Church referred the determining
"of that controverſie to them at *Jeruſalem*, excluſively to others, the Doctor proves not. And it
"is moſt evident, from the return of the anſwers ſent by the Apoſtles from *Jeruſalem*, *ver.* 23. that
"the reference was from all the Churches of the Gentiles, yea and all the ſcattered brethren, per-
"haps as yet not brought into the Church order, not only at *Antioch*, but alſo throughout *Syria* and
"*Cilicia*. It is then granted what he next obſerves, *viz.* that in the anſwer returned from *Jeruſalem*,
"with them at *Antioch*, thoſe in *Syria* and *Cilicia* are joyned, the reaſon of it being manifeſt, name-
"ly their trouble about the ſame controverſie, being no leſs than theirs at *Antioch*. It is alſo gran-
"ted, that as *Paul* paſſed through the Cities, that he delivered them the decrees to keep, that were
"ordained by the Apoſtles and Elders, *cap.* 16. 4. and that not only to the Churches of *Syria*, and
"*Cilicia*, which he left *cap.* 15. 41. but alſo to thoſe throughout *Phrygia*, and the Regions of *Gala-
"tia*, *ver.* 6. What now follows out of all this? What? but that *Antioch* by Apoſtolical inſtituti-
"on was the Metropolitan See of all the Churches of *Syria* and *Cilicia*. Good Doctor do not be angry
"but tell us how this may be proved. Why doubtleſs it was ſo; as *Antioch* belonged to the Metro-
"politan Church at *Jeruſalem*, as he told us out of *Philo* (who was excellently acquainted with
"Apoſtolical inſtitutions) what *Jeruſalem* was to the whole Church and Nation of the *Jews*, while
"the name of God was fixed there, we know; But what was the primitive ſtate of the Churches of
"Jeſus Chriſt, made of Jews and Gentiles, tied neither to City, or Mountain, I muſt be par-
"doned if I cannot find the Doctor making any tender of manifeſting or declaring. The reaſons of
"referring this controverſie unto a determination at *Jeruſalem*, the Holy Ghoſt acquaints us with
"*Acts* 15. 2. That we have no need of this Metropolitical figment, to inform us in it. And
"now if we will not, not only ſubmit to Dioceſan Biſhops, but alſo reverence the grave Metropo-
"litans, ſtanding upon ſuch clear Apoſtolical inſtitution, It is fit that all the world ſhould count us
"the arranteſt Schiſmaticks that ever lived ſince *Pope Boniface* his time. The ſumm then of this
"doubty argument for the Apoſtolical inſtitution of Metropolitans (that none might ever more dare
"to call Dioceſans into queſtion hereafter) is this; *Paul* who was converted about the third or
"fourth year of *Caligula*, five or ſix years after the aſcenſion of Chriſt, having with great ſucceſs for
"three years preached the Goſpel, went up to *Jeruſalem* with *Barnabas*, upon the perſecution raiſed
"againſt him at *Damaſcus*, *Acts* 9. 22. whence returning to the work, he went firſt to *Tarſus*, *Acts*
"9. 30. thence to *Antioch*, where he abode one whole year, *Acts* 11. 25, 26. and was then ſent
"to *Jeruſalem* with the collections for the Saints, about the fourth year of *Claudius*, *ver.* 30. thence
"returning again to *Antioch*, he was ſent out by the command of the Holy Ghoſt more eminent-
"ly, and peculiarly than formerly for the converſion of the Gentiles, *Acts* 13. 1, 2, 3. in this under-
"taking in the ſpace of a year or two, he preached and gathered Churches (whereof expreſs men-
"tion is made) at *Salamis*, *Acts* 13. 5. in the Iſle of *Paphos*, *ver.* 6. at *Perga* in *Pamphylia*, *ver.* 13. at
"*Antioch* in *Piſidia*, *ver.* 14. at *Iconium*, *cap.* 14. 1. at *Lyſtra* and *Derbe*, *ver.* 6. and at *Perga* 26. in
"all theſe places gathering ſome believers to Chriſt, whom before they returned to *Antioch*, he viſi-
"ted all over the ſecond time, and ſetled Elders in the ſeveral congregations, *Chap.* 14. 21, 22, 23.
"in this journey and travel for the propagation of the Goſpel, he ſeems in all places to have been fol-
"lowed almoſt at the heels, by the profeſſing *Phariſees*, who impoſed the neceſſity of the obſervati-
"on of Moſaical Ceremonies upon his new Converts; for inſtantly upon his return to *Antioch*, where
"during his abſence, probably they had much prevailed, he falls into diſpute with them, *Chap.*
"15. 1. and that he was not concern'd in this controverſie, only upon the account of the Church of
"*Antioch*, himſelf informs us, *Gal.* 2. 4. affirming that the falſe brethren, which cauſed thoſe diſ-
"putes and diſſenſions, crept in to ſpy out his liberty, in his preaching the Goſpel among the
"Gentiles, *ver.* 2. that is in the places before mentioned, throughout a great part of *Aſia*. For the
"appeaſing of this difference, and the eſtabliſhing of the Souls of the Diſciples, which were grie-
"vouſly perplexed with the impoſition of the Moſaical yoke, It is determined that the caſe ſhould be
"reſolved by the Apoſtles, *Acts* 15. 2. partly becauſe of their authority in all the Churches, where-
"in thoſe, who contended with *Paul*, would be compelled to acquieſce, and partly becauſe thoſe Ju-
"daizing teachers pretended the commiſſion of the Apoſtles for the Doctrine they preached, as is
"evident from the diſclaimure made by them, of any ſuch commiſſion or command, *ver.* 24. Upon
"*Pauls* return from the aſſembly at *Jeruſalem*, wherein the great controverſie about Jewiſh Ceremo-
"nies was ſtated and determined, after he had in the firſt place delivered the decree and Apoſtoli-
"cal ſalutation by Epiſtle to the Church at *Antioch*, he goes with them alſo to the Churches in *Syria*

" and *Cilicia*, expreſſed in the letter by name, as alſo to thoſe in *Pamphylia*, *Piſidia*, *Derbe*, *Lyſtra*,
" *Iconium*, &c. *Chap.* 16. 1, 2, 3, 4. and all the Churches which he had gathered and planted in his
" travels through *Aſia*, whereunto he was commanded by the Holy Ghoſt, *Acts* 13. 1, 2. Things
" being thus ſtated, it neceſſarily follows, that the Apoſtles had inſtituted *Dioceſan* and *Metropolitan*
" Biſhops. For though the Churches were ſo ſmall, and thin, and few in number, that ſeven years
" after this, may we believe our Doctor, the Apoſtles had not inſtituted or appointed any Elders or
" Presbyters in them, *viz.* When *Paul* wrote his Epiſtle to the *Philippians*, which was when he was
" Priſoner at *Rome*, as appears, *cap.* 1,7,13,14. *cap.* 4. 22. about the third year of *Nero*, yet that he
" had fully built and ſetled the Hierarchical fabrick contended for, who once dares queſtion?

Audacia ----
Creditur à multis fiducia.

" But if this will not do, yet *Ignatius* hits the nail on the head, and is ready at hand to make good
" whatſoever the Doctor will have him ſay, and his teſtimony takes up the ſence of the two next fol-
" lowing Sections, whereof the firſt is as follows.

" *Hinc dicti Ignatiani ratio conſtat in Epiſtolâ ad Romanos, ubi ille Antiochiæ Epiſcopus ſe* ὁ ἐν Συρίᾳ
" ἐκκλησίας ποιμένα, *paſtorem Eccleſiæ quæ eſt in Syriâ appellet, cùm ad Antiochiam ſcil. ut ad Metropo-*
" *lin ſuam, tota Syria pertineret. Sic & Author Epiſtolæ ad Antiochenos,* ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ παροικούσῃ ἐν Συρίᾳ
" τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ *eam inſcribens, totam Syriam ejus* παροικίαν *eſſe concludit.*

" But yet I fear the Doctor will find he hath need of other weapons, and other manner of Aſſiſtance
" to make good the cauſe he hath undertaken. The words of *Ignatius* in that Epiſtle to the *Romans*
" are μνημονεύεσθε ἐν τῇ ἐυχῇ ὑμῶν ὁ ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας ἥτις ἀντ' ἐμοῦ ποιμένι χρῆται τῷ κυρίῳ: Becauſe he re-
" commends to them that particular Church in *Syria*, which by his impriſonment was deprived of its
" Paſtor, therefore without doubt he was a *Metropolitical* Archbiſhop. *Tityre tu patulæ*, &c.

" But the Doctor is reſolved to carry his cauſe, and therefore being forſaken of all fair and honeſt
" means, from whence he might hope for aſſiſtance or ſucceſs, he tries (as *Saul* the Witch at
" *Endor*) the counterfeit, ſpurious title, of a counterfeit *Epiſtle* to the *Antiochians*, to ſee if that
" will ſpeak any comfortable words, for his relief or no. And to make ſure work, he cauſes this
" Gentleman ſo to ſpeak, as if he intended to make us believe that *Syria* was in *Antioch*, not *An-*
" *tioch* in *Syria*, as in ſome remote parts of the world, they ſay they inquire whether *London* be in
" *England*, or *England* in *London*; What other ſence can be made of the words as by the Doctor
" tranſcribed? ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ παροικούσῃ ἐν Συρίᾳ τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, To the Church of God dwelling in
" *Syria* which is in *Antioch*: now if this be ſo, I ſhall confeſs it is poſſible we may be in more errors
" than one, and that we much want the learned Doctors aſſiſtance for our information; the words
" themſelves, as they are uſed by the worſhipful writer of that Epiſtle, will ſcarce furniſh us with
" this learned and rare notion, they are at length, Ἰγνάτιος ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος (for ſo he firſt opens his mouth
" with a lye) ἐκκλησίᾳ ἠλεημένῃ ὑπὸ θεοῦ, ἐκλελεγμένῃ ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ παροικούσῃ ἐν Συρίᾳ, καὶ σπόρῳ Χριστοῦ ἐπω-
" νυμίαν λαβούσῃ τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, What is here more expreſſed, than that the latter paſſage, *in An-*
" *tioch*, is reſtrictive of what went before, was ſpoken of its reſidence in *Syria*, with reference to
" the name of Chriſtian, firſt given to the Diſciples in that place, I know not; and therefore
" it is moſt certain that the Apoſtles inſtituted Metropolitan Archbiſhops, ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι.

3. The large tranſcripts of the *Latin ſections* being the foundation of his whole inſuing diſcourſes, it is a little neceſſary they ſhould be made intelligible to all, to whom the confutation of them is addreſt: This I ſhall be content to do for him; and the plain *Engliſh* is this.

4. *According to the image of the civil government among the Jews*, and the like again in their *Temple* (forementiond) the *Apoſtles* appear to have diſpoſed of *Churches* every where, and in all their Plantations to have conſtituted a ſubordination and dependance of the *Churches* in the inferiour Cities, to thoſe in the *Chief* or *Metropoles*. An example of this we have in the ſtory of the *Acts*, concerning *Syria* and *Cilicia*, and the ſeveral Cities thereof, in relation to *Antioch* the *Metropolis*; For when the queſtion *Acts* 15. 2. was referred and brought to *Jeruſalem* from the *Church* (*peculiarly*) of *Antioch*, *Cap.* 14. 26. and 15. 3. and the Decree of the *Council* returned to them by whom the queſtion was propoſed, *i. e.* to the *Church* of *Antioch*, ver. 22. yet in the *Epiſtle* in which that decree was contained, we find the *brethren through Syria* and *Cilicia*, i. e. all the *Chriſtians* of that *Province*, to be expreſſed and joyned with thoſe of *Antioch*, *ver.* 23. And after, when that *Decretal Epiſtle* was delivered to the *Church* of *Antioch*, *ver.* 30. *Paul* and *Silas* went over *Syria* and *Cilicia*, *ver.* 41, 42. and as they went, they delivered to every City the *Decrees* of the *Council*, *c.* 16. 4. which is an evidence, that the *Churches* of thoſe Cities, related either immediately to *Antioch*, or, as *Antioch* it ſelf did to *Jeruſalem*, and were in ſubordination to it, as to the principal *Metropolis*, of ſo wide a *Province*, according to that of *Philo*, that *Jeruſalem* was in his time the *Metropolis* not of *Judea* alone, but of many other Regions, in reſpect of the *Colonies*, which it ſent out of the *Jews* that dwelt in them, naming *Syria* and *Cilicia* and divers others.

5. What is here ſaid, may be divided into two branches, one concerning the Cities of *Syria* as relating to *Antioch*, the other concerning *Antioch* it ſelf and other Cities, relating to *Jeruſalem*: The latter is mentioned incidentally; the former is it, which was propoſed for the example to teſtifie the *Apoſtles diſtributions*, and the plain ſtory of the *Acts* ſeemed to me to manifeſt it fully, that the *Churches* of the inferiour Cites of *Syria*, &c. related to *Antioch* as to the *Metropolis*; And the matter alſo being farther clear by all *Eccleſiaſtick* writers, which make *Antioch* the *Metropolis* of *Syria*, I gave a taſte thereof out of *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtle* to the *Romans*, who being the known *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, ſetled there by the *Apoſtles*, calls himſelf *Paſtor* (as elſewhere *Biſhop*) of the *Church* in *Syria*. And ſo the *Ancient* writer of the *Epiſtle* to the *Antiochians* under *Ignatius*'s name, (but none of thoſe which we receive from *Polycarp*'s collection) hath theſe words in his Inſcription, Ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ παροι-
κούσῃ ἐν Συρίᾳ τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, *to the Church of God which is at* Antioch, *lying together in* Syria, making *Syria* to be the παροικία or *Province*, of which *Antioch* was the *Metropolis*.

The

The ſame is after manifeſted of other chief Cities, *Rome*, *Alexandria*, *Gortyna* in *Crete*, and the ſeven *Churches* of *Aſia*, and the plain words of the three *Councils* forementioned, which devolve the whole buſineſs of the rights of *Metropoles* to their *firſt plantations*. And of all theſe there is not one word replied, ſave only what concerns *Rome* and *Alexandria*. To thoſe two, we ſhall come in the next *Section*, But in this I am to conſider what he hath to object to the ſeveral proofs concerning the Church of *Antioch*, being as I conceive it manifeſt, a *Metropolitical Church* in the *Apoſtles* times. 6.

And firſt it ſeems I muſt define, what I mean by this dependence and ſubordination of inferiour Churches to their *Metropolis*. And I ſhall do it, in my own words, not in his, for they are very obſcure; 1. I mean by inferiour Churches, the ſeveral Churches in the ſeveral leſſer Cities with the Region adjoyning, adminiſtred and governed each of them by the *Biſhop* of each ſuch leſſer City-Church, and his officers under him. 2. By the *Metropolis*, I mean the Church of the chief City of that Region or Province; and ſuch, ſay I, was the Church of *Antioch* in reſpect of *Syria*. 3. By the ſubordination and dependence of the inferiour to the *Metropolis*, I mean not any inferiority of order and dignity, nor a dependence only as to counſel and advice and mutual Communion, but an inferiority of power in many things, which the *Apoſtles* left not to the *Biſhops* of the inferiour Cities, but reſerved to the *Metropolitans*. To this purpoſe the 34*th Apoſtolick Canon* is clear, Τὸς ἐπισκόπους ἑκάστου ἔθνους εἰδέναι χρὴ τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς πρῶτον, καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὡς κεφαλὴν, *the Biſhops of every Nation muſt know their Primate*, (ἤτοι μητροπολίτου Ἀρχιερέα, ſaith *Zonaras*) and *account him as the head of them*; and the powers that thus belong to him, are known in the ancient Councils by the title of πρεσβεῖα *privileges* and *preeminencies*, which are proper to ſuch, and for which even immemorial and *Apoſtolical* tradition and cuſtom is vouched by them. Such as receiving accuſations againſt, and appeals from inferiour *Biſhops*, ordaining of them, as *Titus* is appointed to do through *Crete*, and as the ſixth *Canon* of *Nice* ſaith, that he that is made *Biſhop without the Metropolitan*, ſhall not be deemed a *Biſhop*; For this I again refer the Reader to the *Diſcourſe* of *Schiſm*, *pag.* 60, &c. and there to that ninth *Canon* of the Council of *Antioch*, the ſame in effect with the 34*th Apoſtolical Canon* forementioned, where the *Biſhops* of inferiour Cities are interdicted doing, without the *Metropolitan*, any thing which is there ſtiled περιττὸν, *i. e.* (as is there explain'd) wherein more Churches than one are concerned equally; The *Biſhops* power extending to the adminiſtration of affairs in his own Dioceſe, ὅσα τῇ ἀνῆκε παροικίᾳ ἐπιδάλλει, *whatſoever belongs to his Dioceſe*, ſay both thoſe *Canons*; but things of a more foreign nature, which belong not to the *particular Biſhop*, *ratione officii*, ἃ εἰς κοινὴν ἀφορᾷ τὴν ἐκκλησίας κατάστασιν, which reſpect *the common ſtate of the Church* (as *Zonaras* interprets περιττὸν) being reſerved and pertaining to the care of the *Metropolitan*. 7.

This, I ſuppoſe, ſufficiently expreſſes, what ſubordination I mean, the very ſame which the moſt *Ancient Canons* of the *Univerſal Church* expreſs to be due from the *Biſhop* to the *Metropolitan*; and then I ſhall not trouble my ſelf to inquire what he means by [*ſome eminent Cities*, and, *Governours of a ſuperiour order in greater Cities*] which I ſhould have thought had been *Metropoles* and *Metropolitans*, had I not found them all placed by him *in ſubordination to ſome one of high degree termed a Metropolitan.*] And by that Character being aſſured, that by the former he muſt mean no more but *Biſhops* of inferiour Cities, I muſt be content not to underſtand the myſtery, why they ſhould yet be ſtiled eminent and greater Cities, and ſo briefly paſs to the next thing. 8.

Secondly then, he will examine my plea from that paſſage in the *Acts*, *cap.* 15. and the thing he diſlikes, is, my making the queſtion ſent for reſolution to *Jeruſalem*, to be referred to them by the ſingle Church of *Antioch*. *This*, ſaith he, *I do not prove, though if I could prove it, it would do me no good at all.* And yet, to ſee, in the proceſs of the diſcourſe, he ſeverally grants all the reſt, And only deſires me not to be angry, but *to prove that* Antioch *by Apoſtolical inſtitution was the Metropolitan See of all the Churches of* Syria *and* Cilicia, which is in effect to deny, or bid me prove the concluſion, without offering to deny above one propoſition, which therefore, I muſt aſſume, will, if it be proved, infer the concluſion, and ſo do me all the good, which I pretend to expect from it. 9.

Now truly, that this queſtion thus refetred to *Jeruſalem*, was at this time, *Acts* 15. 1. referred to it, by the ſingle Church of *Antioch* (but that, as *Metropolis* of all *Syria*) I thought ſufficiently proved by the *text* it ſelf firſt cited, *cap.* 14. 26. and 15. 3. In the former of theſe places, the *Apoſtles* were come to *Antioch*, as that ſignifies *Antioch* the *great* (to difference it from another City of that name, *v.* 21. the ſame which is by *Pliny* placed in *Piſidia*, as here alſo it is, *ver.* 24.) that City peculiarly where the Scripture ſaith they were firſt called *Chriſtians*, and whereof *Euodius* and *Ignatius* were conſtituted *Biſhops* by *Peter* and *Paul*, one of the *Jewiſh*, the other of the *Gentile Chriſtians*. And being there, they gathered the Church together, *ver.* 27. that I ſuppoſe to be the Church of the City of *Antioch*, (or if any more, thoſe certainly as ſome way relating and ſubordinate to *Antioch*, which again infers *Antioch* to be their *Metropolis*) Then of *Antioch* it follows that there they abode, *v.* 28. And then *cap.* 15. 1. *certain men*, which came down from *Judea*, infuſed the *Judaical ritual doctrine* into the *brethren*; who are thoſe, but the *Chriſtians* of *Antioch*, where then they were? And upon the diſpute had with thoſe *Judaizers*, v. 2. *they determined*, (that ſure, muſt ſtill be the Church of *Antioch* peculiarly) *that* Paul *and* Barnabas *ſhould go to* Jeruſalem *about this queſtion*, and then *ver.* 3. they are *brought on their way* by the *Church*, What *Church* is this ſtill, but the *Church cap.* 14. 27. *i. e.* the *Church* of *Antioch*? 10.

This was my way of proof (deſigned to lay the foundation of that argument of *Antioch*'s being the *Metropolitical* See) that this queſtion was referred to *Jeruſalem* from the *Church* peculiarly of *Antioch*. And I muſt hereby think it competently proved, unleſs ſome weak part be diſcovered in it, or ſome abſurdity or repugnancy be objected to it; None of which, I ſee, is here done. 11.

For 1. as to that which is offered at, by his ſaying that I have *not proved that the brethren that taught the doctrine conteſted about*, ver. 1. *were only of the Church of* Antioch, ſure that is of no force. For as I doubt not but the ſame doctrine might be, and was infuſed into many others in *Galatia*, *Coloſſe*, yea, and *Rome* it ſelf, as he truly ſaith; and never conceived that the poiſon was confined to, or incloſed within *Antioch*; ſo all that is needful to my turn, is this, that at this point of time noted *Acts* 15. 1. 12.

the *Judaizers* pretensions were solicited at *Antioch*, and that on that particular occasion of the dispute between *Paul* and them, the question was by them peculiarly referred to *Jerusalem*. And that sure might be done by them alone, though others far distant, as well as they, either at that or some other time, were disturb'd with the like scruples.

13. That which the *Prefacer* here confesses, that the disputes grew to the greatest height in *Antioch*, is a very sufficient account in this matter, why *Antioch* peculiarly should send up to *Jerusalem* about this question, when others, who were not so much concern'd in it, did not do so; And moreover the convenience of such *Messengers*, *Paul* and *Barnabas*, who could say so much, from the success they had had among the *Gentiles*, toward the deciding of the question, might both qualifie and incite them to do it, rather than any others at this time; And so still there is more reason why I should conceive the question referred to *Jerusalem*, peculiarly or alone by *Antioch* (and not so by *Colosse*, or *Rome*, or *Galatia*) and no appearance of any thing yet produced to the contrary.

14. Secondly, He adds, *then to* Antioch *brethren from other parts and Churches also came, whilst* Paul *and* Barnabas *abode there*. To what purpose this is urged by him I know not, but this I know, that there is no mention in that story of any such, but only of those which *ver.* 1. came from *Judea*, and taught the necessity of *Judaizing*. And of them 'tis not probable that they joyned with the *Antiochians* to refer the question to *Jerusalem*; or if they did, I am sure the *Decretal Epistle* from the *Council* was not addrest to them, but to the *Gentile Christians*, *ver.* 19. 23. and takes no other notice of them, than as of *seducers*, *ver.* 24. And so still it appears not of any, that they thus referred the question, but only of the *Antiochians*.

15. Thirdly, Whereas he concludes it most evident from the *Council*'s answer, *ver.* 23. that the *reference is made from all the Churches of the Gentiles*, if he mean it of all other *Gentile Churches*, beside *Syria*, and *Cilicia*, as *Phrygia*, *Galatia*, &c. Which he after mentions, and *Rome*, and *Colosse*, which before he had mentioned, there is no appearance of truth in it, the Text saying expresly, that it was sent to the brethren of the *Gentiles* in *Antioch*, and *Syria*, and *Cilicia*; But if he means it of *all* not *absolutely*, but *all* of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, and not only of *Antioch*, then as that is the very thing observed by me, to prove that *Antioch* was the *Metropolis* of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, so certainly it is far from evidencing the contrary. I grant, nay, I make it matter of observation, that when the *Question* was sent to *Jerusalem* by *Antioch* peculiarly, the *Decretal Answer* of the *Council* is addrest, not only to *Antioch*, but also to all the *Christians* of *Syria* and *Cilicia*; and what reason can there be for that, when the *Question* was not, as far as appears, proposed by them, but only this, that those *Regions* depended on, and related to that *Church*, from which the *Question* was sent, *i.e.* to *Antioch*? which if it be but possible (much more, if by other evidence, that out of *Ignatius*, it be proved to be more than possible, even perfectly true) it must thence follow, that the argument drawn from the *Council*'s answer being addrest to *Syria* and *Cilicia*, as well as to *Antioch*, will no way conclude that the *Question* was referr'd by all those, when the *Text*, which is the only ground of affirming ought in this matter, mentions none but the *Church* of *Antioch* in the referring of the question, and this other reason is so ready at hand, for the mention of more, in their giving answer to it.

16. *Fourthly*; Whereas he adds, that the *Apostles delivered these Decrees, not only to the Churches of* Syria *and* Cilicia, *which* Paul *left*, c. 15. 41. *but also to those throughout* Phrygia, *and the Regions of* Galatia, *ver.* 6. 1. 'tis no where said, that they did so in *Phrygia*, and the *regions* of *Galatia*; for the mention of the delivering the *Decrees*, being *ver.* 4. no way belongs to *Phrygia* and *Galatia*, which are not mention'd till *ver.* 6. nor can be farther extended than to *Derbe* and *Lystra* forementioned *ver.* 1. which we know were Cities of *Lycaonia*, *Acts* 14. 6. and neither of *Phrygia* nor *Galatia*. Nay, 2. it is not necessary, that the delivering of the *Decrees* mentioned *chap.* 16. 4. should belong to all the *Cities* which had by that time been mention'd: S. *Luke*'s words will be true, that as they went *through the Cities, they delivered them the Decrees to keep*] though it should be affirmed, that they delivered them only to the *Churches* of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, which they are said to *confirm*, *cap.* 15. 41. as here to *establish in the Faith*, *cap.* 16. 5. But these two things having been said only εἰς ἔνδειξιν, to shew how far the *Prefacer* is from speaking demonstratively, when he is censuring others for want of that: In the third place, I shall acknowledge it very possible, and most probable, that S. *Paul* did *deliver these Decrees of* Jerusalem *to other Churches beyond* Syria *and* Cilicia, where he came, particularly to the *Churches* of *Lycaonia*, *Derbe* and *Lystra*, yea, and to the *Churches* of *Phrygia* and *Galatia*, which no way disturbs my pretensions, because as *Paul* that *planted* those *Churches*, might reasonably have care to uphold them in the truth, so in the latitude of *Philo*'s speech, all these, even *Phrygia* and *Galatia* also, in respect of the Jewish inhabitants dispersed among them, might in the secular account refer to *Jerusalem* as their *grand Metropolis*.

17. For so saith *Philo*, it was the *Metropolis* of most, whither it had sent *Colonies*, naming *Ægypt*, *Phœnice*, *Syria*, and *Cœlosyria*, and τὰς πόρρω διοικημένας, others *far distant*, *Pamphylia*, *Cilicia*, *and a great deal of* Asia *as as far as* Bithynia *and* Pontus (and *Lycaonia*, &c. are sure within this distance, nearer to *Jerusalem* than some here named) and then by the contemperation we speak of, of the *Ecclesiastick* to the *Civil distributions*, why should not they all relate to the *Metropolitical Church* at *Jerusalem* also?

18. And S. *Paul*'s delivering them these δόγματα, *decrees*, to *keep*, and doing it not upon his own authority, as his γνώμη, his *private Apostolical judgment*, but as κεκριμένα ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων τῶν ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, *judged*, and *conciliarly determined* by the *Council* at *Jerusalem*, this sure is an evidence that S. *Paul*, that *planted* these *Churches*, set them in subordination to, and dependance on the grand *Metropolis* of those parts, that at *Jerusalem*: Which is the thing I was to prove, that these *distributions* were made by the *Apostles*, that *planted Christianity*.

19. But then it must still be remembred, that the *Cities* of *Lycaonia* and *Phrygia*, and *Galatia* were not named in the *Councils Epistle*, but only *Syria* and *Cilicia*, and accordingly this of *c.* 16. 4. is no proof, I acknowledge, that these *Churches* did belong, and were subordinate to *Antioch*: That was to be proved, not by this passage *c.* 16. 4. (thus understood) but from the inscription of the

response

reponſe of the *Council to the brethren of* Antioch, *and* Syria, *and* Cilicia, as it was before explained and cleared, and farther from *Ignatius* his ſtiling himſelf *Paſtor* of *Syria*, who, we know, was no otherwiſe ſo, than as he was *Biſhop* of *Antioch*, the *Metropolis* of *Syria*. And ſo ſtill I hope the concluſion now regularly follows out of theſe premiſes, there ſhortly ſet down, but here more largely evidenced to infer, that *Antioch* was by *Apoſtolical inſtitution* the *Metropolitan See* of all the *Churches* of *Syria*, and *Cilicia*. And ſo ſure I have no temptation to be angry, nor ever diſcovered any part of that paſſion to the *Prefacer*, and ſo needed not have been beſought, ſo affectionately, not to fall into it at this time, when there is no rub in my way, no difficulty to oppoſe, or provoke the leaſt degree of it, in the moſt rageful.

What follows by way of ſcoff at the citation from *Philo*, as if I took him for a perſon well *acquainted with Apoſtolical Inſtitutions*, might alſo, as now appears, very well have been ſpared. I had brought in that Teſtimony ſeaſonably enough *ſect.* 6. when I was ſpeaking of the *exemplar* among the *Jews*, and by it ſhewed that *Jeruſalem* was the *Metropolis* to all thoſe regions in the *Jewiſh* account, and now all that I concluded in reference to that citation, was, that *Antioch* was in the number, and then the appeal which *Antioch* made to the *Council* at *Jeruſalem* (and not the *Teſtimony* of *Philo*) was the argument on which I inferr'd the Concluſion, that the *Church* of *Antioch* was now ſubordinate to the *Church* or *Council* at *Jeruſalem* (which if it were, muſt be by the *Apoſtles inſtitution*) as all *Syria*, in *Philo*, was to the *Sanhedrim* at *Jeruſalem*. 20.

To which I ſhall now farther add: If it were not ſo, why did the *Church* ſend up *Paul* and *Barnabas* thither? Why did not *Paul*, who planted *Chriſtianity* there, finally determine the controverſie? Why did the πρεσβύτεροι or *Elders*, whoſoever they were (the *Biſhops* of *Judea*, I ſuppoſe, but it will be much more ſtrange, if they were but the *Presbyters* of *Jeruſalem*) joyn with the *Apoſtles* in making *Decrees*, whereby thoſe of *Antioch*, and all through *Syria*, ſhould be bound, if all this while the *Church* of *Jeruſalem* were not their *Metropolis*, and ſo had no manner of power over them? 21.

As to that which he ſaith, that *the Holy Ghoſt*, Acts 15. 2. *acquaints us with the reaſons of referring this controverſie to a determination at* Jeruſalem, *ſo that he hath no need of this* (as he will ſtile it) *Metropolitical figment, to inform him in it*: I confeſs I cannot reach him in it, for all that that *verſe* informs us, is, that upon occaſion of that diſpute between *Paul* and *Barnabas* on the one ſide, and the *Judaizers* that came from *Judea*, on the other ſide, the Church determined to ſend up to *Jeruſalem* about this *Queſtion*. This only informs us of the occaſion of referring the queſtion, whereon there was συζήτησις οὐκ ὀλίγη, *no ſmall diſpute*, ſuch, as it ſeems, they could not ſo convincingly decide within themſelves; but this renders no account, why they ſent and referr'd it to *Jeruſalem* peculiarly, and not to any other *Church*, unleſs we here ſuppoſe, as I do, that *Jeruſalem* was lookt upon as their *Mother-Church*. 22.

What reaſon it is which the *Prefacer* finds in that ſecond verſe, or by what *medium* it comes to have the force of a reaſon, he is not here pleaſed to communicate, but only ſaith, the *Holy Ghoſt hath there acquainted us with the reaſon*. But in the next page he is more liberal, gives us the reaſons of their ſending to *Jeruſalem*, *partly becauſe of the authority of the Apoſtles* (*which were there*) *in all the Churches, wherein thoſe, who contended with* Paul, *would be compell'd to acquieſce*; *partly becauſe thoſe Judaizing Teachers pretended the commiſſion of the Apoſtles for their doctrine*. 23.

As for the firſt of theſe, I ſuppoſe that, taken alone, cannot be the reaſon, becauſe there being but two Apoſtles there at that time, *Peter* and *John*, 1. there might be ſo many in ſome other City. 2. *Paul* and *Barnabas* being before this ſeparated by Gods command to the *Apoſtolick Office*, were in this reſpect of equal authority with them, and ſo in this ſence the words of S. *Paul* have truth, in relation to them, *Gal.* 2. 6. οὐδὲν ἐμοὶ προσανέθεντο, *they added nothing to me*. 3. The reference is made *Acts* 15. 2. not to the *Apoſtles* alone, but to the *Apoſtles* and *Elders*, i. e. the *whole Council* at *Jeruſalem* at this time. 4. The cauſe of the reference was not only the contention of thoſe who came out of *Judea*, but the *Antiochian Chriſtians* being taught, *i.e.* ſeduced by them, *c.* 15. 1. and accordingly the *Decree* reſpected them peculiarly. And ſo this firſt reaſon is of no force. 24.

For the *ſecond*; 'tis true indeed, and 'tis affirm'd *ver.* 1. that *certain men, which came down from* Jeruſalem, *taught the brethren, and ſaid, except ye be circumciſed, ye cannot be ſaved*, and that may ſeem to be ſet down as the reaſon of their making this reference to *Jeruſalem*, becauſe the men came from *Judea*, which made it fit to inquire, whether the *Apoſtles* and *Council* there were of theſe mens opinions: But then even this will very little advance his, or prejudice our pretenſions: For this goes upon a ground which will be uſeful, not diſadvantageous to me, *viz.* that if theſe certain men, which came from *Judea*, had been truly ſent, or commiſſionated by the *Church* of *Jeruſalem*, then this would have been of ſome force at *Antioch* (which it could not be, if *Antioch* were perfectly *Independent* from *Jeruſalem*) and accordingly in the *Epiſtle* from the *Council*, ver. 24. we have theſe words; *For as much as we have heard, that certain, which went out from us, have troubled you*, &c. *to whom we gave no ſuch commandment* or *commiſſion* (ſo διεστειλάμεθα literally ſignifies) *It ſeem. d good unto us*, &c. 25.

Where it is apparent, that any ſuch former commiſſion being diſclaim'd, now they ſend their expreſs decree, not their bare counſel, or advice, or aſſiſtance, which the *Prefacer* would allow, but, I ſay, a δόγμα, a *conciliary, dogmatical definition*, by which, as it appears by the conſequents, all were deemed to be obliged, which were within the circuit, of which *Jeruſalem* in the *Jewiſh* account was the *Metropolis*. And ſo ſtill, this reaſon, if any ſuch be diſcernable, *Acts* 15. 2. confirms my aſſertion inſtead of invalidating it. 26.

That which next follows in the *Prefacer*, as the ſumm of my argument, is very far from being what he ſaith it is, either my argument, or the ſumm of it: My argument it is not, being quite a diſtant thing, a recapitulation of the whole ſtory of S. *Paul* from his converſion to his coming this time to *Jeruſalem* from *Antioch*, whereas I collected nothing from any part of the whole ſtory, but only from this particular, the reference from *Antioch* to *Jeruſalem*. And then, what is ſo much larger than the particulars diffuſively taken, is ſure very unlikely to be the ſumm of them. And yet 'tis a little ſtrange, that that which is ſo over large a recitation, ſhould chuſe to omit the one thing, 27.

whereon

whereon the whole force of my argument lies, *i. e.* either the reference made to *Jeruſalem* from *Antioch*, to infer the dependence and ſubordination of *Antioch* to *Jeruſalem*, or the ſtile of the *Epiſtle* from the *Council*, taking in *Syria* and *Cilicia*, as well as *Antioch*, when the reference had been made, and the *Meſſengers* ſent from *Antioch* peculiarly.

28. And when he ſaith, that *for the appeaſing of the difference it was determined, that the caſe ſhould be reſolved by the Apoſtles*, that ſure is unduly ſuggeſted; for *c.* 15. 2. the reference is not made either to the *Apoſtles indefinitely*, whereſoever they were, or to the *Apoſtles* that were at *Jeruſalem* at that time, and to none but ſuch; but in expreſs words, *to Jeruſalem to the Apoſtles and Elders*, comprehending under the word *Apoſtles*, *James* the *Biſhop* of *Jeruſalem*, which was none of the twelve, and yet pronounceth the decree, ἐγω κρίνω, *I judge*, or, *my ſentence is*, v. 19. and by the word *Elders*, as I ſuppoſe, all the *Biſhops* of *Judæa*, ſitting in Council with him: And ſo ſtill this is to the *Church* of *Jeruſalem*, as the *Metropolis* of *Judæa*, and, in an eminent manner, of *Syria* alſo, and not only to the *Apoſtles alone*, or *peculiarly* to be reſolved by them.

29. The *Prefacer* here in his haſte ſaith, that *Paul goes with the decrees to the Churches in* Pamphylia, Piſidia, *and by name* Iconium, citing *c.* 16. 1, 2, 3, 4. *and all the Churches which he had gathered through* Aſia. Whereas 1. there is no mention of *Piſidia*, or *Pamphylia*, in thoſe verſes (nor ſince, *c.* 14. 24. for what is ſaid of *Mark*'s departing from them from *Pamphylia*, c. 15. 38. belongs to the former ſtory) nor of any City but of *Derbe* and *Lyſtra*, which are known to be in *Lycaonia*. *Secondly*; That there is no mention of their paſſing through *Iconium*, nor of the very name of the City, but once incidentally, that *Timothy* was *well reported of by the brethren that were at* Iconium, *ver.* 2. *Thirdly*; That for *Aſia*, the *Text* ſaith expreſly, *ver.* 6. that *they were forbidden of the Holy Ghoſt to preach the word in* Aſia, and that therefore when they had gone though *Phrygia* and *Galatia*, they came to *Myſia*, *&c.* So that he could not well have multiplied more miſtakes in ſo few words, and all to make up his *hypotheſis*, that the *Decree* of *Jeruſalem* had no more reference to *Antioch*, and the Regions, whereof that was the *Metropolis*, than to all thoſe other *Churches*, which yet if it be extended no farther than to *Aſia* it ſelf, will by *Philo*'s words be interpretable of the *Province ſubordinate* to *Jeruſalem*.

30. What remains to this head, is made up of contumely and reproach of my audaciouſneſs, with reflexion only upon a ſuppoſition of mine, that after this time the *Churches* were ſmall, and thin, and few in number, and ſo that of *Philippi* was ſeven years after this, which is deſigned as a prejudice to my *hypotheſis* concerning *Metropolitan Churches* ſo early. But to the former of theſe, the reproaches, I have nothing to return but my thanks; to the latter I have anſwered formerly, that the ſmallneſs of the number of *Chriſtians* nothing hinders the dependence of one *Church* upon another. See *Vindic.* to *Lond. Miniſt. chap.* 1. *ſect.* 16. *numb.* 14. And ſo much for the evidence out of the *Acts*.

31. Next he comes to my proof out of *Ignatius*, who, ſay I, being *Biſhop* of *Antioch* doth yet in the *Epiſtle* to the *Romans*, call himſelf *Paſtor of the Church of* Syria. The words wherein he ſo ſtiles himſelf, he ſets down in the *Greek*, and inſtead of tranſlating them (as they ſhould be tranſlated) *Remember in your prayers the Church of* Syria, *which inſtead of me hath Chriſt for their Paſtor* (*viz.* now that he was carried from them to his *Martyrdom*) he takes advantage of the Readers unskilfulneſs in that language, and forms my proof into a ridiculous argument, *Becauſe he recommends to them that particular Church in* Syria, *which by his impriſonment was deprived of its Paſtor, therefore without doubt he was a Metropolitical Biſhop*; and then is very pleaſant with his

Tityre tu patulæ ----

32. But would not a little ſadneſs and juſtice have done better, and then it had been moſt clear that *Ignatius* his ſaying, that *Chriſt* was now their *Paſtor inſtead* of him, muſt neceſſarily imply, that he was formerly their *Paſtor*; and whoſe *Paſtor* was he? expreſly ὁ ἐν Συρίᾳ ἐκκλησίας, *the Paſtor of the Church in* Syria; where it is evident, that the *whole Church* in *Syria*, not that *particular Church* only of *Antioch*, is by him ſuppoſed to be under his *Paſtoral* care, the ſame thing being before in the ſame *Epiſtle* expreſt in words no way liable to miſunderſtanding, ὁ ἐπίσκοπος Συρίας καλὴν ἔσχεν ὁ Θεὸς, *God hath vouchſafed or dignified the Biſhop of* Syria, calling himſelf *Biſhop* of *Syria*, and ſo not of *Antioch* only. This hath been formerly cleared againſt all exception, and need not be here farther repeated. *Chap.* 6. *Sect.* 1. *n.* 15.

33. There remains the teſtimony of the *Author* of the *Epiſtle* to the *Antiochians*, which I vouched not as the *genuine* writing of *Ignatius*, but only as an ancient Writer according with the *genuine* in this matter. Hence I am cried out on, as *forſaken of all fair and honeſt means*, and like *Saul trying the Witch of* Endor, *&c.* But this is but ordinary ſtile, a flouriſh of his Rhetorick, and need not ſtay us to conſider it; that which follows is more to the purpoſe, that I *make this counterfeit ſpeak as if* Syria *were in* Antioch, *not* Antioch *in* Syria, and he asks, *What other ſence can be made of the words* as by me *tranſcribed*, ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ παροικούσῃ ἐν Συρίᾳ τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, *to the Church of God dwelling in* Syria, *which is in* Antioch, and then triumphs in this diſcovery.

34. But certainly the *Witch* was not ſo contrary to a *wiſe woman*, the counterfeit author ſo perfect a changeling, as here he is ſet out to be. Certainly the *Greek*, as tranſcribed by me, lies thus in the conſtruction, ἐκκλησίᾳ θεοῦ τῇ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ, *to the Church of God which is at* Antioch, with this farther denomination added to it, παροικούσῃ ἐν Συρίᾳ, *adjacent*, or *lying together in* Syria, or allowing them the ſame poſition in *Engliſh*, which they have in *Greek*, *To the Church of God lying together in* Syria, *the Church*, or, *that which is at* Antioch; but taking all the words together (of which I there only gave the abſtract) *to the Church pitied by God, choſen by Chriſt, lying together in* Syria, *which firſt received the ſirname of Chriſtian, the Church which is at* Antioch ---- And ſo he may diſcern it poſſible to make ſence of theſe words, a very little skill in that language being ſufficient to enable one to joyn τῇ with ἐκκλησίᾳ, the not very remote, as well as with Συρίᾳ, the immediate Antecedent. And ſo this leaves it clear as the day, 1. That *Antioch* was believed by that *Author* to be in *Syria* (not *Syria* in *Antioch*) and 2. That *Syria* was the παροικία, or *Province* belonging to *Antioch* the *Metropolis*; and that is a proof, as far as his authority will bear, that the *Apoſtles* inſtituted *Metropolitans*, and ſo of the very thing in earneſt, ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι *which was to be demonſtrated*.

And

And if this authority were not so great as the former of the true *Ignatius* had been, yet, first, he was an ancient Writer, and so acknowledged; and, secondly, one that imitated ancient stile, and calls himself *Ignatius*, ὁ καὶ Θεοφόρος, the known title of *Ignatius*, by which he was condemn'd by *Trajan*; and so, though he feign'd a person, yet did it decently, and so testifies his opinion that this was the stile of *Ignatius*'s days, or else would not have discovered himself by using it. Thirdly, his testimony added to *Ignatius*'s, and in concord with it, will not (certainly) take off the force from *Ignatius*'s. And fourthly, if this be finally reprobated, there be several more behind of *Scripture* and the *Ancients* concerning *Gortyna* in *Crete*, and *seven Metropolitical Churches* in *Asia*, and a reference to the *Archbishop* of *Armagh*'s discourse on that subject, and passages collected out of the *Canons* of the *Ancient Universal Church*, and no one word offer'd to be replied to all this; which makes it very impertinent to go about farther to confirm this assertion, which else I might do, and for brevities sake refer the Reader to *Frigevillæus Gautius*, *Par.* 1. *c.* 4. the subject of which *Chapter* is, *Primates esse jure Divino*, *That Primates are by Divine right.* 35.

SECT. VII.

Ἐφέσιοι ἀπὸ Σμύρνης. Τόπος χωρὶς Ῥωμαίων. Casaubon's *Censure of that phrase.*

NExt he comes to examine *Sect.* 11. and that one small testimony from the Inscription of *Ignatius*'s *Epistle* to the *Romans*. Before I proceed to which, I shall confess to the *Prefacer*, that he hath mist an opportunity of great rejoycing: For the truth is, in the end of *sect.* 10. there lay a passage, wherein though I affirm'd not, but only past my conjecture (*crediderim*, &c.) yet I now, by a last reading over of *Ignatius*'s *Epistles*, discern my self to have mistaken: For in the *Epistle* to the *Magnesians*, Ἐφέσιοι ἀπὸ Σμύρνης, *the Ephesians from Smyrna*, are not, as I conceived it possible, the *Smyrnæans* called *Ephesians*, because *Ephesus* was the *prime Metropolis*; but the *Ephesians*, which together with some of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, were sent with him from *Smyrna*, such as *Burrhus* mention'd in the *Epistle* to the *Smyrnæans*, who appears to be a *Deacon* of the *Church* of *Ephesus* in the *Epistle* to them, and yet is said to be sent with him by the *Smyrnæans*, ἅμα Ἐφεσίοις τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὑμῶν, with other of the *Ephesians* also. This I desire the Reader now to correct in the *Dissertations*, by blotting out that last part of * *Sect.* 10. which concerns that matter. 1. *Pag.* 9. *Pag.* 18. *Pag.* 9. * *Diss.* 4. *c.* 5.

I come now to his view of the Testimony from the *Epistle* to the *Romans*, and it is set down in these words; 2.

"But to make all sure, the learned Doctor will not so give over, but *Sect.* 11. he adds, that the "Epigraph of the Epistle to the *Romans* grants him the whole case, that is, ἐκκλησία ἥτις προκάθηται "ἐν τόπῳ χωρὶς Ῥωμαίων, *ex qua* (saith he) *Ecclesia Romana ejusque Episcopo super Ecclesiis omnibus in "urbicariâ regione, aut provinciâ Romanâ contentis, præfecturam competiisse videmus.* 3.

"Although I have spent some time in the consideration of mens conjectures of those suburbicarian "Churches, that (as is pretended) are here pointed to, and the rise of the Bishop of *Romes* juris- "diction over those Churches, in a correspondency to the civil Government of the Prefect of the "City, yet so great a Critick in the *Greek* tongue as *Casaubon Exerc.* 16. *ad An.* 150. having pro- "fessed that expression, ἐν τόπῳ χωρὶς Ῥωμαίων, to be barbarous, and unintelligible, I shall not con- "tend about it. For the presidency mentioned of the Church in, or at *Rome*, that it was a presiden- "cy of jurisdiction, and not only in eminency of Faith and Holiness that is intended, the Doctor "thinks it not incumbent on him to prove: Those with whom he hath to do are of another mind; "although by this time some alteration might be attempted; yea, there was, as elsewhere shall be "shewed: And so much for *Ignatius* his Archiepiscopacy.

This Testimony it seems must be thrown off upon the one score of *Isaac Casaubon*'s *Censure*, that the expression was barbarous and unintelligible: I must therefore examine his words, which I find *Exerc.* 16. *sect.* 150. though not *ad Ann.* 150. that whole book of *Exercitations* against *Baronius* extending no farther than the *Life of Christ*. 4.

Casaubon's words are these (speaking of *Bellarmine*'s collection of the *Roman* domination from thence) *Rogandi sunt ut barbaram locutionem prius nobis explicent, quam ullum ex iis verbis argumentum ducant, quæ nè ipsi quidem intelligant. They that endeavour to draw these words to this purpose, are to be intreated first to explain to us a barbarous expression, before they draw any argument from those words, which they themselves do not indeed understand.* Here it is true that *Casaubon* saith of ἐν τόπῳ, that it is *barbara locutio*, but for the *unintelligible*, which the *Prefacer* adds, and which seems to be expresst in these words also, it is possible it may be a mistake. *Isaac Casaubon* conceived himself to have observed by many indications, that *Cardinal Bellarmine* understood no *Greek*; he calls him a little before, *hominem Græcarum literarum prorsus ἀμύητον, a man utterly unskill'd in the Greek learning*; adding, that *all his works, especially that which he last wrote, demonstrate it.* And why may not the [*nè ipsi quidem intelligunt*] be thus meant by him, that *Bellarmine* was very unfit to make collections out of a *Greek passage*, which 'twas certain he did not understand. So I am sure he had before said of him expresly, concerning the writings of *Dionysius Areopagita*, *Est quidem ridicula planè res --- It is a very ridiculous thing for one that hath no Greek, to offer to judge of a Greek Author.* Which being granted of that *Cardinal*, I should yet well have hoped, that the *Prefacer*, who hath so much *Greek* in this *Preface*, and very little of it translated, might himself have been able to understand such plain words (for, of the words it is, that *Casaubon* speaks, not of the full importance of them) ἥτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρὶς Ῥωμαίων, *which presides in the place of the Region of the* Romans. 5. *Pag.* 541.

But then, *secondly*, there will be little reason to doubt what the full sence also of these words is: For without disputing what *Casaubon* saith, that the word τόπος is not proper or vulgar stile, but in 6.

some

ſome reſpect barbarous, I ſhall yet ſuppoſe it put by *Ignatius* (being joyned with προκάθηται, *preſidence*) for the *Latin ſedes*, *ſeat*, or *ſee*, which [τόπος, *place*] will, without any forcing, ſignifie; as when the *Gallican Church* in their *Epiſtle* to *Eleutherius*, ſaith of *Irenæus Archbiſhop* of *Lyons*, εἰ γὰρ ἤδειμεν τόπον τινὶ δικαιοσύνην περιποιεῖσθαι, *If we knew that place would purchaſe righteouſneſs to any*, the meaning is, if his being *Biſhop* of ſo eminent a City and Province would commend him --- (and accordingly *Peter Halloix* would here have it read θρόνῳ, *throne*, or *ſeat*, but hath no *Manuſcript* to favour his conjecture) Nay, if we ſhall obſerve the ancient *Latin* forms, we ſhall have no reaſon farther to deem τόπος *barbarous*, than as it directly anſwers to the *Latin* uſage of *locus*, *place*; and that ſure may be allow'd *Ignatius* in an *Epiſtle* to the *Romans*: For in the *ſecond Epiſtle* of *Anacletus* to the *Biſhops* of *Italy*, we have theſe words, *In capite Provinciarum, ipſis quoque in civitatibus vel locis noſtris Patriarchas vel Primates, &c. In the head of Provinces, and in our Cities or places, Patriarchs, or Primates were conſtituted.* The authority of that *Epiſtle* may ſure be ſufficient to manifeſt the uſe of a word; and then, *our City*, and *our place* is all one, and that properly of a chief City or *Metropolis*, ſuch as here *Rome* is conteſted to be. And then the ſence will be as plain as the words intelligible, that the *Church*, to which that *Epiſtle* was addreſt, was the *preſiding Church in the place*, or *ſeat of the region of the Romans*, i. e. in the chief place, or *ſeat*, or *City* of that *Region*, commonly called the *ſuburbicarian Region*. And thus hath *Jacobus Gottofredus*, a learned *Lawyer*, and *Critick*, expreſt himſelf to underſtand it, meaning by the *ſuburbicarian Region*, all that in the *civile notitiæ*, was under the adminiſtration of the *Prefect* of the City of *Rome*, anſwerable to which circuit was the *Primitive Province* of the *Roman Biſhop*. And here being nothing offer'd againſt it, I have no occaſion to give farther anſwer: For as to that of Juriſdiction, what degree of that belonged to the *Primate* in every *Province*, over and above that which belonged to a *Biſhop* of an ordinary City and territory, that hath oft been ſpoken to already, and need not be again repeated or inlarged on.

Euſeb. lib. 5. c. 4.

7. In the cloſe he is pleaſed to add, that *by this time* (i. e. in *Ignatius*'s time, who ſuffer'd in *Trajan*'s time, and ſurvived S. *John* very little) *ſome alteration was attempted*; and if that were ſo meant by him, as to belong to the juriſdiction of the *Church* of *Rome* over other *Churches*, which the diſcourſe is upon, this truly might paſs for pretty ancient, being ſcarce diſtinguiſhable from *Apoſtolical*, and ſo if what was attempted, were attain'd alſo, 'twill be very like the yielding that, which I contended from that teſtimony.

SECT. VIII.

Alexandria *a Patriarchate inſtituted by S.* Mark. *This proved and vindicated. The* Eſſens *in* Alexandria, *Chriſtians*; *Biſhops among them.*

1. IN the next and laſt place, he will paſs his judgment on the evidence drawn from the ſtory of the *Church* of *Alexandria*, thus;

2. "The example of *Alexandria* is urged in the next place in theſe words, *Idem de Alexandriâ, de* "*quâ Euſebius, Marcum* ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας συστήσασθαι, *Eccleſias* (*in plurali*) *pri-* "*mum in Alexandriâ inſtituiſſe. Has omnes ab eo ſub nomine* ἃ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικίας *adminiſtrandas* "*ſuſcepiſſe Anianum, Neronis anno octavo idem Euſebius affirmat*; *quibus patet primariam Alexandriæ* "*& Patriarchalem Cathedram fixam eſſe, ad quam reliquæ Provinciæ illius Eccleſiæ à Marco plantatæ,* "*ut ad Metropoliticam ſuam pertinebant*; doubtleſs; for 1. There is not any paſſage in any ancient "Author more clearly diſcovering the uncertainty of many things in Antiquity, than this pointed to "by the Doctor in *Euſebius*: For firſt, the ſending of *Mark* the Evangeliſt into *Ægypt*, and his "preaching there at *Alexandria*, what he had written in the Goſpel, is but a Report: Men ſaid ſo, "but what ground they had for their ſaying ſo, he relates not. And yet we know what a founda- "tion of many aſſertions, by following Writers, this rumor or report is made to be. 2. In the ve- "ry next words, the Author affirms, and inſiſts long upon it in the next Chapter, that *Philo*'s book "περὶ τοῦ βίου τῶν Ἀσκητῶν was written concerning the Chriſtians converted by *Mark*'s preaching at *Alex-* "*andria*, when it is notoriouſly known, that it treateth of the *Eſſens*, a Sect among the *Jews*, "amongſt whoſe obſervances many things were vain, ſuperſtitious, and fooliſh; unworthy to be "once applauded as the practice of any Chriſtian in thoſe days; that ſame *Philo*, as far as can be ga- "thered, living, and dying in the *Jewiſh* Religion, having been employed by them with an Apolo- "gy to *Rome* in the days of *Caligula*. But 3. ſuppoſe that *Mark* were at *Alexandria*, and preached "the Goſpel there, which is not improbable, and planted many Churches in that great and populous "City of Jews and Gentiles, and that as an Evangeliſt the care of thoſe Churches was upon him in a "peculiar manner; nay, and add farther, that after his death, as *Hierom* aſſures us, the Elders and "Presbyters of thoſe Churches choſe out one among themſelves to preſide in their Convocations and "meetings: If, I ſay all this be ſuppoſed, what will enſue? why then it is manifeſt that there was "fixed at *Alexandria* a Patriarchal Chair, and a Metropolitical Church, according to the appoint- "ment of Jeſus Chriſt by his Apoſtles, *Si hoc non ſit probationum ſatis, neſcio quid ſit ſatis.* If ſome "few Congregations live together in love and communion, and the fellowſhip of the Goſpel in a Ci- "ty, he is ſtark blind that ſees not that to be an Archbiſhops See. The reaſon is as clear as his in the "Comœdian, for the freedom of his Wife; Sy. *Utinam Phrygiam uxorem meam unà mecum videam* "*liberam.* Dem. *Optimam mulierem quidem.* Sy. *Et quidem nepoti tuo, hujus filio, hodie primam mam-* "*mam dedit hæc.* Dem. *Hercle, verò, ſerìò, ſiquidem primam dedit, haud dubium quin emitti Æquum* "*ſiet.* Mic. *Ob eam rem?* Dem. *Ob eam.* And there is an end of the conteſt. The Doctor indeed "hath ſundry other Sections added to theſe foregoing, which as they concern times more remote "from thoſe who firſt received the Apoſtolical Inſtitutions, ſo I muſt ingenuouſly profeſs that I can-

"not

"not see any thing whereon to fasten a suspicion of a proof, so far as to call it into examination, and "therefore I shall absolve the Reader from the penalty of this Digression.

It is most true that I have deduced the *Original* of *Metropolitans* from the first *plantation* of the *Faith* in *Alexandria*, the prime City of *Ægypt*, and having * before spoken many things of it, I begin here with a reference to what had there been said. And for the clearing of it, it is not amiss that I give the Reader a brief view of all. 3. * *Dissert.* 3. *c.* 10.

They that write the *History* of that *Church*, and are thought to write it least favourably to *Bishops*, do yet affirm out of the Records of that Church, that S. *Mark* founded it, and left *Ananias*, or *Anianus Patriarch* there: Of this *Eusebius* thus speaks, Ἐκκλησίας πρῶτον ἐπ' αὐτῆς Ἀλεξανδρείας συστήσασθαι, *that* Mark *first erected Churches in* Alexandria, *and these* Anianus *received and ruled*, under the title of ἣν ἴσμεν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικίαν the *Province of Alexandria*; adding, that there was such a multitude of them, which upon S. *Mark*'s πρώτη ἐπισολὴ *first onset*, received the *Christian Faith*, being allured to it διὰ ἀσκήσεως αὐτῆς φιλοσοφοτάτης καὶ σφοδροτάτης, *by his most Philosophical, or pious excellent manner of living*, that *Philo Judæus*, who lived at that time, thought fit to write a Book to describe their whole manner of living. 4. *Lib.* 2. *c.* 16'. *Cap.* 24'.

That the same S. *Mark* constituted *Churches* also in *Pentapolis*, is affirmed by the *Author* of his life in *Photius*, and accordingly the sixth *Canon* of the first *Council* of *Nice* appoints those *Churches*, as also all others of *Ægypt* and *Lybia*, to be subject to the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, affirming that so it was to be by the ancient and primitive custom. 5.

Here it is evident, that by *Mark* himself *Alexandria* was constituted a *Metropolitical Patriarchal* See, in the hands and government of a *Patriarch*, who by being *Bishop* of that, had the care of the *whole Province*, and many particular *Churches* in it, and accordingly superintended in all of them. And this the *second Canon* of the *Council* of *Constantinople* refers to, when it decrees τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ μόνον οἰκονομεῖν, *that the Bishop of* Alexandria *shall administer only the affairs of* Egypt; and this, in their care μὴ συγχέειν τὰς ἐκκλησίας, *not to confound the Churches, disturb the order anciently observed among them.* 6.

The only thing that I could foresee possible to be objected to this, was the authority of *Eutychius* the *Annalist*, affirming that till the time of *Demetrius*'s *Patriarchate*, there was no other *Bishop* in *Ægypt* but only at *Alexandria*. But to this authority it was sufficient to oppose the far greater of *Eusebius*, who speaking of that *Demetrius*, saith, that after *Julian* he undertook τὴν αὐτόθι παροικιῶν ἐπισκοπὴν, *the government of the Dioceses there*, in the *plural*, which cannot be imagined to be without *Bishops* over them. And the same is in a manner confest by *Eutychius* himself, who saith *Ananias* was made *Patriarch* by *Mark*; which he could not be, if he had no *Bishops* under him. 7.

And indeed *Philo* describing the manner of these *Holy men* in *Ægypt*, the *Christians* of *Mark*'s planting, sets down προσασίας τρόπον τὰς ἐκκλησιαστικὰς λειτουργίας ἐγχειρισμένων, *the manner of presidency*, or *rule of them who performed the Ecclesiastick Ministeries*, and saith it was made up of *. *Deacons* and *Bishops*, who were in the uppermost rank placed over all. 8. *Διακονίαις καὶ ἣ δὴ πᾶσιν ἀνωτάτω ἡ ἐπισκοπῆς προεδρείας.

And so when ‖ *Tertullian* tells us of *Valentinus* the *Heretick*, that he had an ambition to be *Bishop*, it is evident enough that this was in *Ægypt*, for he was of that *Country*; and 'tis no way probable that it was the *Patriarchate* of *Alexandria*, that he sued for, being, as * *Epiphanius* saith, ἐκ τῆς νόμε Ἀθριβίτου, *of the Athribitick division*, which was far distant from *Alexandria*. To which again belongs what was premised of *Mark*'s planting Churches in *Pentapolis*, and the *Nicene Council* giving that *Patriarch* jurisdiction over them by the ἀρχαῖα ἔθη, the *ancient*, or *original customs*, which supposes still, that there were such *Churches* and *Bishops* originally from S. *Mark*. ‖ *Contr. Valent. in init.* * *Hær. Valent. in init.*

The matter lying thus, and being indeed in every branch thus laid in the *Dissertations* (if the *Prefacer* had been at leisure to attend it) I supposed the way clear to my *conclusion*. But he is pleased to make his *Exceptions*. Those he seems to promise shall be more than one, for he begins with [*For* 1.] but then having branch'd that again into *three* parts, and so again beginning [*For first*] by that time he hath gotten through those branches, he hath forgotten what was promised to succeed his first *general* in the *division*. 10.

As it is, we have enough remaining: For his general *exception* being the *uncertainty* of things in this *story* (from whence by the way, he makes haste to *conclude* the *clear discovery of the uncertainty of many things in Antiquity*; so ready he is, upon all occasions, to express his affections that way, that his *conclusion* is far wider than his *premises*) the first that he mentions is, the *sending* Mark *the Evangelist into* Ægypt, *and his preaching at* Alexandria *what he had written in the Gospel: This*, saith he, *is but a report*; *Men said so*; *but what ground they had for saying so*, Eusebius *relates not*. 11.

But 1. is there any thing more acknowledged, and uniformly attested in story, than this of *Mark*'s preaching the *Faith* (that sure is *what he had written in the Gospel*) in *Ægypt*, and particularly at *Alexandria*? Is it doubted of by any *Writer*? or is there the least ground of *doubting*? 12.

Secondly; *Eusebius* being to set down a fact of former times, which he received by *tradition*, either from man to man, or in writing, what could he say more, than [*Men said so?*] And whoever required other grounds of narrations of notorious facts, than the common unquestioned affirmations of men? and so, it seems, it was here: And certainly there is no cause imaginable, why any man should question this, or believe the contrary, and why following Writers should not *found assertions* on such matters of *fact*, with so uncontroll'd a consent of all *Historians* (that speak of that *Churches plantation*) brought down to us, or why we *Prelatists* should not conclude from thence, what even S. *Hierom* himself, and *Eutychius*, the prime *favour'd Authors* of the *Presbyterians*, have yielded us premisses to conclude. 13.

His next branch of *Exceptions* is against *Eusebius*'s affirming *Philo*'s book περὶ βίου τῶν Ἀσκητῶν to have been *written concerning the Christians converted by* Mark's *preaching*, *when*, saith he, *it is notoriously known, that that book treateth of the* Essens, *and* Philo *lived and died a Jew*. But certainly this no way prejudiceth *Eusebius*'s affirmation; *Essens*, we know, signifie *holy pious men*; and *Christians* converted to the *Faith* by S. *Mark*, may doubtless be such; and being *Jews* by *parentage*, and by the *example* 14.

and

and *doctrine* of S. *Mark* brought to a ſtrict *aſcetick* life, why might not *Philo* deſcribe and commend them as ſuch, being, though a *Jew*, yet, that we can any way diſcern, not any profeſt enemy of *Chriſtianity*, which alſo was but *Judaiſm* reformed and heightned.

15. And for any vanities or follies taken notice of in that Sect of the *Jews*, ordinarily call'd the *Eſſens*, there is no neceſſity that thoſe ſhould be found among the *holy* men in *Ægypt*, deſcribed by *Philo*; or if any reliques of them ſhould be diſcern'd among them, 'twould be no ſtranger, than that there ſhould be ſome of the *Phariſaical leaven* among other *Primitive Chriſtians*, as it is evident by *Scripture* that there was.

16. It will be very much more difficult for the *Prefacer* to avoid the force of many paſſages in that book of *Philo*, which inclined *Euſebius* that way, and have had the ſame force on many others; I ſhall mention but one, which is already toucht on, and belongs to our buſineſs in hand, their τρόπος προσασίας, and the *Biſhops* and *Deacons* among them, which will not be found in any *Sect* of *Jews* that were not *Chriſtian*.

17. His third branch is made up of *Conceſſions* and liberalities (one more than is uſeful or neceſſary for me, to have granted) and then, as if he had repeated the full force of my argument, he laughs at it, and falls into a *Scene* of the *Comœdian*, and ſo concludes in great chearfulneſs: And truly I am very glad to find him in ſo good humour; and although my argument might with eaſe have been truly and fully repeated [*viz.* that S. *Mark* planting many Churches in *Ægypt*, ſubjected them all to the *Patriarch* of *Alexandria*, therefore here is an example in the *Apoſtles* times of a *Metropolitical Church conſtituted*] and although the argument lying thus, it be far from ridiculous, and if it were not *concluſive* enough, there are many more evidences of the ſame matter in that *Section* of the *Diſſertations*, and as there is no word offer'd to them, ſo what is objected againſt this, hath appear'd to have no force; yet I ſhall moſt willingly have the *Prefacer* excus'd for all this, and give my *plaudit* to his *exit*, upon that one ſcore of the obligation laid upon me, much more than upon the *Reader*, in *abſolving* me *from the penalty of this digreſſion*.

A SECOND

A SECOND DEFENCE of the LEARNED HUGO GROTIUS; OR A Vindication of the Digreſſion concerning him, from ſome freſh EXCEPTIONS.

WHAT hath newly been ſuggeſted, in an *Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Oxford-heads*, by way of *Reply* to my *Digreſſion about the Learned Hugo Grotius*, will receive punctual *anſwer* within the compaſs of very *few* leaves. But for the *Reader's thrift and eaſe*, I ſhall firſt ſet down the words, wherein the *ſuggeſtion* is delivered. 1.

'From thence, whence in the thoughts of ſome, I am moſt likely to ſuffer, 2.
'as to my own Reſolves, I am moſt ſecure. It is in medling with *Grotius* his Annotations, and
'calling into queſtion what hath been delivered by ſuch a Gyant in all kinds of literature. Since my
'ingagement in this buſineſs, and when I had well-nigh finiſhed the Vindication of the Texts of
'Scripture commonly pleaded, for the Demonſtration of the Deity of Chriſt, from the exceptions
'put in to their Teſtimonies, by the Racovian Catechiſm, I had the ſight of Dr. *H's* Apology for
'him, in his Vindication of his Diſſertations about Epiſcopacy, from my occaſional Animadverſions,
'publiſhed in the Preface of my Book of the Perſeverance of the Saints. Of that whole Treatiſe I
'ſhall elſewhere give an account. My Defenſative as to my dealing with *Grotius* his Annotations,
'is ſuited to what the Doctor pleads in his behalf, which occaſions this mention thereof.

'This very Pious, Learned, Judicious man (he tells us) hath fallen under ſome harſh cenſures of
'late, eſpecially upon the account of Socinianiſm, and Popery. That is, not as though he would
'reconcile thoſe extreams, but being in Doctrinals a Socinian, he yet cloſed in many things with the
'Roman intereſt: as I no way doubt, but Thouſands of the ſame perſwaſions with the Socinians, as
'to the Perſon and Offices of Chriſt, do live in the outward Communion of that Church (as they
'call it) to this day; of which ſuppoſal I am not without conſiderable grounds, and eminent in-
'ſtances for its confirmation. This (I ſay) is their charge upon him. For his being a Socinian (he
'tells us) Three things are made uſe of to beget a jealouſy in the minds of men of his inclinations
'that way. 1. Some parcells of a Letter of his to *Crellius*. 2. Some Relations of what paſ-
'ſed from him at his Death. 3. Some paſſages in his Annotations. It is this laſt alone wherein I
'am concerned. And what I have to ſpeak to them, I deſire may be meaſured and weighed by what
'I do premiſe.. It is not that I do entertain in my ſelf any hard thoughts, or that I would beget in
'others any evil ſurmiſes of the Eternal condition of that man, that I ſpeak what I do. What am
'I, that I ſhould judge another mans Servant? He is fallen to his own Maſter. I am very ſlow to
'judge of mens Acceptation with God, by the Apprehenſion of their underſtandings. This only I
'know, that be men of what Religion ſoever, that is profeſſed in the world, if they are Drunkards,
'Proud, Boaſters, *&c.* Hypocrites, haters of good men, perſecutors and revilers of them, yea if
'they be not regenerate and born of God, united to the head Chriſt Jeſus, by the ſame ſpirit that
'is in him, they ſhall never ſee God.

'But for the paſſages in his Annotations, the ſubſtance of the Doctors plea is, that the paſſages
'intimated are in his poſthuma, that he intended not to publiſh them, that they might be of
'things he obſerved, but thought farther to conſider: and an inſtance is given in that of *Col.* 1. 16.
'which he interprets, contrary to what he urged it for, *John* 1. 1, 2, 3. But granting what is affirm-
'ed as to matter of fact, about his Collections, (though the Preface to the laſt part of his Anno-
'tations will not allow it to be true) I muſt needs abide in my diſſatisfaction to theſe Annotations,
'and of my reſolves in theſe thoughts give the Doctor this account. Of the Socinian Religion
'there are two main Parts; the firſt is Photinianiſm, the latter Pelagianiſm. The firſt concern-
'ing the perſon, the other the Grace of Chriſt. Let us take an eminent inſtance out of either of
'theſe heads: Out of the firſt, their denying Chriſt to be God by Nature. Out of the latter, their
'denyal of his ſatisfaction.

Jam veràſcien-dum eſt, multo quidem citius, quàm nunc de-mum temporis eam reſumi ab-ſolviq; potuiſſe, & quo minus id jam pridem factum ſit, per eum non ſtetiſſe virum, cujus fideli curæ opus integrum ab Authore ipſo primum creditum fuit & ſedulo commendatum. Præmon. ad Lect.

'For the firſt, I muſt needs tell the Apologiſt, that of all the Texts of the New Teſtament and
'Old, whereby the Deity of Chriſt is uſually confirmed, and where it is evidently teſtified unto, He

'hath not left any more than one (that I have observed) if one, speaking any thing clearly to that 'purpose. I say, if one, for that he speaks not home to the business in hand on *Joh.* 1. I shall elsewhere give an account: perhaps some one or two more may be interpreted according to the Analogy of that. I speak not of his Annotations on the Epistles, but on the whole Bible throughout, 'wherein his Expositions given, do for the most part fall in with those of the Socinians, and oftentimes consist in the very words of *Socinus* and *Smalcius*, and always do the same things with them, as 'to any notice of the Deity of Christ in them. So that I marvel the Learned Doctor should fix upon 'one particular instance, as though that one place alone were corrupted by him, when there is not one '(or but one) that is not wrested, perverted and corrupted to the same purpose. For the full conviction of the truth hereof, I refer the Reader to the insuing considerations of his interpretations of 'the places themselves. The condition of these famous Annotations, as to the satisfaction of Christ, 'is the same; not one Text of the whole Scripture, wherein Testimony is given to that sacred truth, 'which is not wrested to another sense, or at least the Doctrine in it, concealed, and obscured by 'them. I do not speak this with the least intention to cast upon him the reproach of a Socinian: I 'judge not his Person: his Books are published to be considered and judged. *Erasmus* I know made 'way for him in most of his Expositions about the Deity of Christ, but what repute he hath thereby 'obtained among all that honour the Eternal Godhead of the Son of God, let *Bellarmine* on the one 'hand, and *Beza* on the other, evince. And as I will by no means maintain or urge against *Grotius* 'any of the miscarriages in Religion, which the Answerer of my Animadversions undertakes to vindicate him from; Nor do I desire to fight with the Dust and Ashes of men; yet what I have said, is, 'if not necessary to return to the Apologist, yet of tendency, I hope, to the satisfaction of others, 'who may inquire after the reason of my calling the Annotations of the learned man to an Account 'in this Discourse; shall any one take liberty to pluck down the Pillars of our Faith, and weaken the 'grounds of our assurance, concerning the person and grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and shall we 'not have the boldness to call him to an account for so sacrilegious an attempt? with those then, 'who love the Lord Christ in sincerity, I expect no blame or reproach for what I have indeavoured 'in this kind; yea that my good will shall find acceptance with them, especially if it shall occasion 'any of greater leisure and abilities farther, and professedly to remark more of the Corruptions of 'those Annotations, I have good ground of expectation. The truth is, notwithstanding their pom-
* *Grotius in lib. 5. de veritat. Relig. in notis R. Sol.* 'pous shew and appearance (few of his Quotations, which was the * manner of the man, being at 'all to his purpose) It will be found no difficult matter to discuss his Assertions, and dissipate his 'Conjectures.

Aben Ezra & Onkelos adducit, sed alienis oculis hic vidit, aut alienâ fide retulit (fortè authoribus illis aut non intellectis, aut propter occupationes non inspectis) aut animositati & authoritati suæ in citandis authoribus, & referendis dictis aut factis, ut ipsi hoc usui veniebat, nimium in scriptis Theologicis indulserit. Voet. disput. de Advent. Mess.

'For his being a Papist, I have not much to say; let his Epistles (published by his Friends) writ-
Reverende Domine, sæpe tibi molestus esse cogor; 'ten to *Dionysius Petavius* the Jesuit, be perused, and you will see the character which of himself he 'gives: As also what in sundry writings he ascribes to the Pope.

sumpsi hanc ultimam operam, mea antehac dicta & famam quoq; à ministris allatratam tuendi; in eo Scripto siquid est, aut Catholicis sententiis disconsonans, aut cæteroqui à veritate alienum, de eo abs te viro Eruditissimo, &c. cujus judicium plurimi facio, moneri percupio. Epist. Grot. ad Dionys. Petav. Epist. 204.

3. The *first* thing that I am here to clear, is the meaning of *plain* words. I said that *Grotius was sometimes calumniated, as a Socinian, sometimes as a Papist, and as if he had learnt to reconcile contradictories, or the most distant extreams, sometimes as both of them together.* And here I am told that the *harsh censures under which he hath fallen, are not as though he would reconcile those extreams* —— And sure I never said, or *intimated* they were, but that the *Socinian* and *Popish* Doctrines were so *contradictory* one to the other (the one *affirming*, the other expresly *denying* the *Eternal Divinity* and *satisfaction* of *Christ*, and many the like) that it was impossible for the same man to be both *Socinian* and *Papist*, without being a greater *artificer* than yet ever was in the world, one that had learnt to *reconcile contradictories*, &c. *i. e.* (if I must farther construe *plain* words) to *believe together* things most *incompetible*, and *impossible* to be believed *together* by the same person, the *affirmations* and the *negations* of the same *Enunciations*, that *Christ* was, and was *not Eternal God*, made, and made *not satisfaction* for our sins; For this work of wonder, above what either *nature* or *divine power* can extend to, is necessarily required to the verifying of that part of the *calumny*.

4. The second is, his *stating* the *jealousie*, as far as it is own'd by him, *viz.* that *H. Grotius being in Doctrinals a Socinian, he yet closed in many things with the Roman interest*; where the *Distinction* being made between *Doctrinals* and *interest*, it is visible, First, That this doth not so much as *pretend* that he was a *Papist*, for it is the *doctrines* only (such is that of the *Popes Supremacy*, &c.) which can give any man that *denomination*; and for *closing* in many things with the *Roman interests*, the *Anabaptists* and other such *Sectaries*, the most *distant* from *Popery*, may and oft are as guilty of that, as any. Secondly, There is no colour for this *suggestion*, as far as *Grotius*'s writings give us to judge (and farther than those, I have no *perspective* to examine his *heart*) For the *fomenters* of the *divisions* in *Christendom*, being the *only* persons whom he profest to *oppose*, the *irreconciliabiles*, and *qui æterna cupiunt esse dissidia*, 'tis consequent, that the *Pacificatory interest* was the *only* one espoused by him, and pursued most *affectionately*; and I could never yet discern by any *pregnant* indication, that this is the *Roman Interest*.

5. The third is, his *manner* of proving his thus stated *suggestion*. First, By his bare *affirmation*, without the least *tender* of *proof* for the *truth* of it; Secondly, By his *confident* undoubted *assurance*, that *thousands of the same perswasions* with *the Socinians, as to the person and offices of Christ, do to this day live in the outward communion of the Church of Rome.* Whereas, First, This could have no force to infer the *conclusion*, as it concerned *Grotius*, who never lived a day, or died in the *communion* of the *Church* of *Rome*, nor is by his most unkind *adversaries* affirmed to have done so, but is known to have profest his willingness to *communicate* with the *Church* of *England*; and secondly, 'tis not imaginable how any

any one *Doctrinal Socinian*, ſhould after his having eſpouſed thoſe *Doctrines*, if his *practices* be conſonant to his *perſwaſions*, live in *outward Communion* with the *Church of Rome*, if by *living in the outward Communion*, be meant either joining in the *offices*, or receiving the *Sacrament* with them; when (beſide many other *obſtacles* in the way, the *Athanaſian Creed*, and the like) the very * *receiving the Euchariſt kneeling*, is by *Socinus* defined to be *Idololatrical*, and moſt ſtrictly required by the *Papiſts* from every *Communicant*.

* *Sedendo vel ſtando poteſt celebrari. Genuflexi eſt Idololatricum Socin. de uſ. & fin. Cœn. Dom.* p. 115.

Fourthly, When he hath premiſed his *profeſſion*, that he would not *beget in others any evil ſurmiſes of the eternal condition of that man* (who is (*bleſſed* be *God*) out of the reach of ſuch *darts*) with a [*what am I, that I ſhould judge another mans ſervant?*] and yet adds in the next words [*He is fallen to his own maſter,*] I cannot but think theſe words ſo far *contrary to his profeſſion*, as may be apt to *beget evil ſurmiſes* in others. The foregoing words are evidently taken from *Rom.* 14. 4. and *judging* there, and here, is uſed in the ſenſe of *condemning*, which is, at the leaſt, *ſurmiſing of the eternal condition*, and [*falling to his own Maſter*] is in like manner taken from the *ſame* verſe, and ſo *mark* by the *Italick letter*, and [*falling*] there evidently ſignifying that Lot, to which the *precedent* [*judging*] determines it, and to which the *ſubſequent* [*ſtanding*] is *oppoſite*, what can this *regularly* infer, but that he which is *fallen to his maſter*, is *fallen* under *condemnation?* But if by [*fallen*] he meant no more than *death*, as I yet hope, and deſire the *Reader* in *charity* to believe he did, I *heartily* wiſh, he would hereafter be more careful in uſing of *Scripture* ſtyle in a ſenſe ſo *diſtant* from the *known* importance of it in *Scripture*, without any *character* to diſcriminate it; and withal, that when he ſpeaks of ſo *nice* a point, as is the *eternal ſalvation* of one that is *dead*, he will not deliver his mind in ſuch *general Aphoriſms*, as thoſe (which the *jealouſie* or *malice* of any man may interpret, to the inferring the moſt *ſanguinary concluſion*) that *the men of what religion ſoever, if they are Drunkards, Proud*, &c. *ſhall never ſee God*. For though I have all reaſons to *believe* that this *Learned* man was *regenerate and born of God*, and *united to the head Jeſus Chriſt by the ſame Spirit that is in him*, and withal, neither *lived*, nor *dyed*, in any one or more of *thoſe waſting* guilts (I heartily wiſh all men living were as *guiltleſs* as he) yet who knows what *ſurmiſes* may be infuſed into thoſe, that are *willing* to believe *ill*, or have no grounds of *knowledge* to pronounce any thing that is *good*, of him, when they find ſuch *Aphoriſms* as theſe (comprehending ſo many ſorts of *ſinners*, which ſhall never ſee *God*) made uſe of to *conclude* a *diſcourſe*, which purpoſely treated of that *perſon*, and cannot diſcern with what *propriety*, they could be directed to that place, if they did not relate to him? 6.

Fifthly when he ſaith, that the *Preface* to the *laſt part of Grotius*'s *Annotations will not allow that to be true*, which I ſaid of his *Poſthuma*, viz. *that they had not been formed by him, or fitted for the publick*, &c. I *anſwer*, that that *Preface* of the *Publiſher*, if it be ſuppoſed to have ſet down the whole truth, hath yet nothing *contrary* to what I ſaid. It ſaith the *Opus integrum* was by the *Author committed and earneſtly commended to the faithful care of* ὁ δεινα. But what was the *Opus integrum?* not that *laſt part* or *volume* of *Annotations* thus *compleated*, and ſo made *Integrum*, *intire*, by his *own hand* (though for as much as concerned the *Apocalypſe* I think it had received from his own *pencil*, by occaſion of the *conteſts* he met with about his *Tract De Antichriſto*, the very *lineaments* and *colors*, wherein it appears) but *Opus integrum*, the *whole volume*, or *volumes* which contained all his ἀνικδοτα *adverſaria* on the *New Teſtament*, which it ſeems were thus *committed* to a *friends hands*, or elſe they had never come to *ours*. And this is perfectly conſonant to what I ſaid, and (I ſuppoſe) *exemplified*, and *evidenced* concerning thoſe *Annotations*. 7.

Sixthly when he ſaith, that *H. Grotius hath not left any more than one text of the New and Old Teſtament whereby the Deity of Chriſt is uſually confirmed, and where it is evidently teſtified* to] I refer him briefly to one place in his *Annotations* on S^t *John's Goſpel*, which alone will be able to diſcover, what weight there is in this *affirmation*. There, having by way of *Preface* obſerved, that S. *John* did more expreſly, than any other of the *Evangeliſts*, and more *early*, in the *very firſt words* of his writing, ſet down the *divine nature of Chriſt*, *ipſo initio Dei nomen ei aſſignandum —— exiſtimans, in the very beginning of his Goſpel aſſigning him the name of God*; accordingly, in his explication of the *firſt* verſe, he makes the [ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν, *In the beginning was*] an expreſſion of *Chriſt's Eternity*, applying to it the place in the *Proverbs* concerning wiſdom, *c.* 8. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27. I was ſet up *from everlaſting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was, when there was no depths I was brought* forth, when there *were no fountains abounding with water, before the mountains were ſetled, before the hills was I brought* forth, *while as yet he had not made the earth nor the field, nor the higheſt part of the duſt of the world, when he prepared the heavens, I was there* —— (and in his *notes* on the *Old Teſtament*, Prov. 8. 27. he expreſly refers to this, *Joh.* 1. 1. and by ſo doing, manifeſtly defines that *eternal wiſdom* to be *Chriſt*) and on this occaſion he brings the moſt expreſs *affirmations* of the *antients*, *Juſtin* and *Athenagoras*, the *former* affirming *Chriſt's pre-exiſtence before the world*, προϋπῆρξε πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, and *p.* 851. ἦν ὄντα πρὸ αἰώνων, *he was God before the worlds*; the *latter* his *eternity*, and that *from the beginning God being an eternal mind*, εἶχεν ἀΐδιον ἐν ἑαυτῷ τὸν λόγον ἀϊδίως λογικὸς ὤν. Then out of the *old Teſtament* from the *Chaldee Paraphraſt* he brings ſeveral places where *God* is interpreted by *God and his word*, *making* and *founding* the *heavens* and *earth*, Iſa. 45. 12. and 48. 13. and according and conſenting thereto, 2 *Pet.* 3. 5. which again are ſo many *more* evidences ſet down by him, of *Chriſts eternal deity*, and then on *v.* 3. to teſtifie that *all things were created by this eternal word*, he appeals to the place, which before I produced from him, *Col.* 1. 16. *by him were all things created* —— 8.

This I hope without farther ſearch, may ſuffice to *prove*, that he hath left *more than one text of the Old and New Teſtament ſpeaking home and clearly* to this *purpoſe*; For what can be more *clear* and *home*, than this, that *Chriſt* was *God before the world* was (whereas *Socinians* make *the beginning*, Joh. 1. 1. to be the *beginning of the Goſpel*) and that *by him the whole world was created*. 9.

In a word, If *one text* acknowledged to *aſſert Chriſt's eternal divinity*, will not ſuffice to *conclude* him no *Socinian* in that point, who was not ſo *Atheiſtical*, as to doubt of the *truth* and *authority* of that *one* place, and ſo cannot be doubted to *believe*, what from *one* place (if there had been no *more*) he did *believe*; Secondly, If *ſix verſes* in the *Proverbs*, *two* in *Iſaiah*, one in St. *Peter*, one in St. *Paul*, added to *many* in the *beginning* of St. *John*, will not yet amount to *above one text*; or *Laſtly*, If that *one* may be doubted of alſo, which is by him interpreted to 10.

affirm *Chriſt eternally ſubſiſtent with God, before the creation of the world*, and that *the whole world was created by him*, I ſhall deſpair of ever being a *ſucceſsful Advocate* for any man.

11. And then how, ſtill, he that *affirmed poſitively* that he hath *not left more than one*, and preſently adds his *doubting* of this one [*not more than one, if one*] and after [*not one, or but one,*] can firſt *inlarge* the Catalogue, that [*perhaps ſome one or two more may be interpreted according to the analogy of that one*] and then preſently contract it again, that [*his Expoſitions always do the ſame things with Socinus and Smalcius*] who it is certain do not permit that *one* to be underſtood of *Chriſt's eternal Divinity*, and yet at length profeſs, that he *ſpeaks not with the leaſt intention to caſt on him the reproach of a Socinian, or to urge againſt him any of thoſe miſcarriages in Religion, which the Anſwerer of his Animadverſions undertakes to vindicate him from* (and *Socinianiſm* was one of them) acknowledging that *Eraſmus made way for him in moſt of his Expoſitions about the Deity of Chriſt*, (which is to make him an *Eraſmian*, rather than a *Socinian*) and after that, ſtill adhere, that *his attempt is ſacrilegious, even to pluck down the Pillars of our Faith —— concerning the Perſon and grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt*, how, I ſay, he can *reconcile* all theſe *contrary appearances*, I have not the *skill*, and therefore ſhall not have the *curioſity* to *divine*, or *conjecture*.

12. *Seventhly* when he *marvels the Doctor* ſhould fix *upon* one *particular inſtance, as though that one* place *only were corrupted by him*] I *anſwer* that he *miſinterprets* my words, and *miſrepreſents* my *deſign* and *aim* in producing *that* particular *inſtance*; It was not to give *example* what place of *Scriptures* thoſe Notes had *corrupted*, or *miſinterpreted*, but to evidence that thoſe *Annotations*, under his name, agreed not with his *ſenſe*; of which as this was one *eminent* and *pertinent* inſtance, interpreting this place, *Col.* 1. 16. after his *death*, to the *Socinians* mind, which in his *life time* he had interpreted expreſly againſt it, and as *one* inſtance thus explicite, is as *concluding* to this matter, as many more could be; ſo elſewhere I have added *many* inſtances more to the *ſame* purpoſe, which I ſhall not here *collect* unſeaſonably.

13. What places in the *Old Teſtament, wherein the Deity* of *Chriſt is evidently teſtified to*, are *corrupted, wreſted or perverted by this learned man, H. Gr.* I profeſs not to *divine*, nor ſhall, it ſeems, come to the *full* conviction of the *truth* thereof, without *reading* over this *whole* (which is a *great*) *volume*, where their *confutation* lies ſcattered, and is not, as I diſcern, put *together* in any part of the *work*, ſave only in the *Title Page*; and to this larger travel my *proſpect* doth not *invite* me, having already by what I have recited from *Grotius*'s Notes on *Joh.* 1. compared with this *Authors ſuggeſtions* a competent δεῖξις, what I am to expect from any farther *inquiry*.

In lieu hereof, I ſhall only add theſe two *ſuppletory* conſiderations. Firſt, That the *word* of *God*, being all, and every part of it *equally* of undoubted *truth*, that doctrine, which is founded expreſly on *five* places of *divine* writ, muſt by all *Chriſtians* be acknowledged to be as *irrefragably* confirmed, as a *hundred* expreſs places would be conceived to confirm it. Secondly, That this *charge* of diſarming the *Church* of her *defences* againſt the *adverſaries* of the *faith*, by *diverting* thoſe places of *Scripture*, which have formerly been uſed to aſſert the great *myſteries* of Salvation, to other and *inferior* ends, though it be a very popular one, and that which is moſt apt to devolve an *odium* on him, which ſhall be repreſented guilty of it, and may therefore probably be choſen, as the field of *declamation* againſt *Grotius*, by any that can gladly expatiate on that ſubject, yet will it upon inquiry be found in ſome degree, if not equally, chargeable on the *learneſt* and moſt *valued* of the *Reformers*, particularly upon Mr. *Calvin* himſelf, who hath been as *bitterly* and *unjuſtly* accuſed, and *reviled*, on this account, (witneſs the book entitled *Calvino-Turciſmus*) as ever *Eraſmus* was by *Bellarmine* or *Beza*, or as probably *Grotius* can be.

14. Eighthly, For the *doctrine* of the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*, and the *interpretation* of thoſe *Scriptures* that belong to it, I cannot imagine any ſurer meaſure can be taken of *Grotius*'s ſenſe, than by that *perſpicuous* and *judicious treatiſe* which he hath written *purpoſely* on that ſubject, againſt *Socinus* himſelf, and which I believe will be found a ſurer *Antidote* againſt that *poyſon*, among conſidering men, than hath been *mixed* by any other the moſt *skilful* hand, ſince that *controverſy* hath been agitated in this *laſt* age; more eſpecially, the places of *Scripture* are by him there * vindicated from the *perverſions* of *Socinus*, and a great *cumulus* of texts brought forth to *teſtifie* to the *doctrine* of *Satisfaction*, which I ſhall not recite, that I may leave on the *Reader* an *ingagement* to ſurvey the *book*, and commit the *judgment* to his own *eyes*.

* *Edit. Lugdun.* p. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, &c.

15. Only becauſe I have heard the *ſignal* place *Iſa.* 53. taken notice of by ſome, as that wherein his *Annotations* are moſt *ſuſpected*, I ſhall there faſten a while. From 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. having inferred that *Chriſt* ſo *bare our ſins*, that he *freed us from the puniſhment of them*, and ſo that *we are healed by his ſtripes*, he at length urges as *parallel* to this, *Iſa.* 53. 11. *my righteous ſervant ſhall juſtify many*, and ſhall *bear their iniquities*, עון *iniquity* ſaith he *, ſignifying the *puniſhment* of *iniquity*, 2 *Kin.* 7. 9. and סבל *to bear*, the *bearing* of *puniſhment*, and thence concluding, *Diſertè ergo hîc dicitur Chriſtus laturus pœnas eorum qui juſtificantur, It is therefore here diſtinctly ſaid, that Chriſt ſhall bear the puniſhments of thoſe who are juſtified*; and according to this *ſpecimen*, he gives the *myſtical* ſenſe of that *whole chapter* (and refutes the *Socinian* arts of *evading* it) and at laſt from *v.* 12. concludes the *puniſhments* which *Chriſt* indured for our *ſins*, to be the *foundation and merit of his dividing the ſpoil, and interceeding, decere enim ut is qui peccata multorum tulerit, jus habeat pro iis intercedendi, for it was fit that he that bare the ſins of many, ſhould have the right of interceding for them*; and much more to the ſame purpoſe, defining *poſitively* againſt all the *adverſaries* κηρυγέλα, that *Peccata ferre patiendo, atque ita ut inde liberentur alii, aliud indicare non poteſt, quàm pœnæ alienæ ſuſceptionem, to bear ſins by ſuffering, and ſo that others may be freed by that means, cannot ſignify any thing elſe, but the undergoings of other mens puniſhment*, annexing *Iſa.* 53. 6. *The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all* — and refuting all the *evaſions*, that were there *interpoſed* by *Socinus*.

* p. 12.

16. And when to this, and the * many *pages* more which are there ſubjoyned for the *vindicating* that one *chapter*, and the ſeveral expreſs *teſtimonies* therein, I ſhall add two things more for preventing all *poſſible* miſtake or *jealouſy* of his *after-change* in this matter, I ſhall have no *motive* farther to inlarge this *conſideration*.

* From p. 12. to p. 18.

Firſt,

First, The *Annotations* of that *Learned* man on the *Old Teſtament*, publiſhed a little before his *death*, are very *brief*, and eſpecially reſpect the *firſt* and *literal interpretation*; As in the *Prophets*, where there is one *immediate completion* of each *Prophecy* among the *Jews* of or near *that* time, wherein it was written, another more *remote* and *ultimate* concerning *Chriſt*, or the times of the *Goſpel* (this might be exemplified in ſeveral *inſtances*, applyed by the *New Teſtament* to *Chriſt*, having had before a *literal completion*, [*Out of Ægypt have I called my ſon*] and many the like) there generally his care is, to ſet down moſt *diſtinctly* the *firſt*, or *literal* ſenſe, as that is *terminated* in the *immediate completion* (and this, I ſuppoſe, becauſe it was moſt *neglected* by other *interpreters*, who were more *copious* in rendring the *myſtical notation*.) And accordingly on *Iſa.* 53. conceiving the *Jews* uſage of the *Prophet Jeremy*, and *Gods* regard to him, to be literally *predicted* there, he interprets every *verſe* of that *chapter* to that ſenſe (which was not ſo eaſily *diſcoverable*, or vulgarly taken notice of) omitting to inlarge on that *other*, more *ſublime completion* in *Chriſt*, which the *New Teſtament* had ſo clearly expreſt, all *Commentators* enlarged on, and himſelf in the *tract de Satisfact.* ſo evidently ſet down, and *vindicated*, that all that was needful to be added, was eaſily ſaid by him by way of *introduction* to that *whole chapter*, in theſe few words, *Hæ notæ in Jeremiam quidem congruunt priùs; ſed potiùs, ſublimiùſque, ſæpe & magis κατ' ἐξοχὴν in Chriſtum. Theſe characters agree indeed firſt to Jeremy; but to Chriſt more principally and eminently, and oftentimes more according to the very letter or diction.* 17.

The ſecond thing that I have to add for the clearing of his *conſtancy*, or *no change* in theſe *doctrines*, will be ſuch, as I think will leave no place of *Jealouſie*, his own *expreſs* words proteſting his *opinion*, when he was *accuſed* of *changing* it. This he hath *publickly* done in his *Diſcuſſion* (written a little *before*, and not publiſhed till *after* his *death*) *p.* 17. by ſetting down the *occaſion* and *author* of that *defamation*, and for the removing of it, referring the *Reader* to what he had in *many places of his Annotations on the Goſpels written concerning the eternity of the Word, the blood of Chriſt given for our redemption, &c.* And this I have before my eyes at this time, more clearly *teſtified* under his *own hand* in a *letter* of his written to a friend of his of this nation, who then held a *correſpondence* with him, in theſe words, *Poteris autem, vir optime, omnibus, qui nos norunt, affirmare, me de iis quæ contra Socini admiratores defendi, non modo nihil diſcedere, ſed & illorum aliquos meâ operâ adductos ad meliorem ſententiam. Quo magis gratias tibi habeo de edito noſtro libro de Satisfactione Chriſti, In quo argumento illos proprietate verborum tam multorum in ſacris literis, & manifeſtiſſimo antiquitatis conſenſu, poſitionibus quibuſdam inanibus abſtractos non dubito.* Giving him *authority* to *aſſure* all that *know him*, not *only that he hath no whit departed from* what he *had maintained againſt the Socinians*, but alſo that *ſome of them had by his indeavour been reduced from the Socinian errors*, charging them with the *vanity of their poſitions*, and *departure* both from the *Propriety of many words in the Scriptures, and from the moſt manifeſt conſent of antiquity*, and *expreſſing* himſelf very well pleaſed that his *Book de ſatisfactione* was *reprinted* at *Oxford*. And all this, long after the *publication* of *Crellius*'s *Book* againſt him, which is the thing ſuppoſed to have wrought the *change* in him. Upon theſe *plain* words I ſhall add no *Deſcants*, but leave them that have entertained *contrary ſurmiſes*, to conſider them. 18.

Ninthly, For the *character* given of this *Perſon*, with whoſe *duſt and aſhes* he yet *deſires not to fight*, *viz.* that *few of his quotations are at all to his purpoſe*; and the *grounds* of that *character*, the words of *Voetius* diſputing againſt him, and affirming that it was *cuſtomary with him to indulge too much to his own authority* in citing *authors or relating ſpeeches or facts*] I ſhall ſay but this, Firſt, That theſe *two* things are *different*, to *miſ-cite*, which was the thing *Voetius* ſpake of, and *not to cite to the purpoſe*; A *falſe citation* is one thing, an *impertinent* or *unſeaſonable* citation, or ſuch as is *not at all* to his *purpoſe*, is another; and ſo this *citation* from *Voetius*, is guilty of the *infirmity* it accuſeth, is not to his *purpoſe* that cited it. Secondly, That *adverſaries teſtifications* of the *faults* of thoſe, whom they find it uſeful to *aſperſe*, are not *valid teſtimonies*, nor competent to *affix* (or juſtifie) *ill characters* on any; and that *Voetius* was ſuch, is known to many, and, I doubt not, to him that cited him. Thirdly, That whoſoever ſhall be willing to profit by that mans *writings*, will find, that as he writes with *great conſent*, ſo is he obſervable to bring the moſt *pertinent teſtimonies* of any man, and ſeldom to omit any, which the moſt *diligent* obſerver ſhall take notice of. And if in ſo large a field he be found ſometimes to have *miſtaken*, or *miſ-cited* a *teſtimony*, there are ſo many *innocent* wayes to *ſuch* kind of *errors*, that until it appear that his were not ſuch, they cannot with reaſon affix an *ill character* on him; And fourthly, That if this *character* were true, it yet infers not the *point* in hand, that he was either *Socinian* or *Papiſt*, thoſe two *Sects* having not the *incloſure*, or *Monopoly* from all other *Sects*, of *writing* or *quoting* what is not *to* their *preſent purpoſe*. 19.

Laſtly, For the little which he hath *to ſay to prove him a Papiſt*, and firſt, For his *Epiſtles written to Dionyſius Petavius a Jeſuit*, and in them the words ſet in the *margin*, I anſwer, Firſt, That it being willingly acknowledged that he wrote *five* very *ſhort Epiſtles* to *Dionyſius Petavius*, which are put together in the *two* laſt *leaves* of his *Epiſtles ad Gallos*, there is this *obvious* account to be given of it, which will no way reflect *ill* upon him. 20.

Petavius was both a very *learned*, and a very *moderate Papiſt*, fit to be joined with *Jac. Sirmundus*, a *Jeſuit* alſo, yet both theſe of ſuch *abilities* and *affections* to the good of *learning*, of ſuch *diligence* in the *ſearch* and *ſtudy* of *antiquity*, and withal of ſo much *temper* above what is generally expected from that *Society* in other *kingdoms*, that it can be no prejudice to him, who ſo earneſtly deſired, and laboured to advance the *peace* of the *univerſal Church*, to have a particular *reſpect* unto, and *acquaintance* with one of theſe; and as his living ſo long in *Paris*, where *Petavius* was an *eminent* perſon, makes it no *miracle*, that he ſhould be thus *acquainted* with him, ſo his *Pacificatory* deſign could not but render it *profitable* and *deſirable*; he muſt have been an *unskilful* manager, if intending to *reconcile* diſtant *intereſts*, he did not acquaint himſelf with the *utmoſt* of *both* their *pretenſions*; And what means was more *commodious* to that end, than this, of receiving *advertiſements* from *Petavius*? 21.

The words of *Grotius* himſelf *, when he was by *Rivet* accuſed for commending *Jeſuits*, are here worth reciting, *Jeſuitas non omnes laudavit Grotius, ſed quorum & mores & eruditio laudem merentur; Eos vero qui in Gallia ſunt, pro talibus habet, quales eos Reges Galliæ volunt exiſtimari, i. e pro bonis civibus; & quid magis neceſſarium eſt pacem Eccleſiaſticam reſtituere cupienti, quam eruditorum audire conſilia,* 22.

* *Diſcuſſ.* p. 61.

consilia, eorum maxime quibus & præsens Ecclesiæ status & antiquior historia percognita sunt? He commends only those Jesuites whose manners and learning deserve praise, the French Jesuites, whom he takes to be such as the Kings of France *account of them*, i. e. *good Subjects to their Prince* — *And what can be more necessary to one that desires to restore the peace of the Church, than to hear the advices of those especially who have the perfectest knowledge of the present state of the Church, and of antient History?* And to the same purpose again, *p.* 91. affirming that he had great *reasons to believe that some of* that *Society, Petavius* no doubt, were *seriously willing as well as able to contribute very much toward the peace of the Church.*

23. Secondly, For the words here cited from his *Epistle*, that *if there were any thing in that answer to Rivet, which agreed not with Catholick Doctrine, or were otherwise distant from truth*, (*or* which he *adds* in that place, but is here *left* out) *minus idoneum ad pacem, less fit for Peace, he desired to be admonished by Petavius.*] The *result* is no more than what all his *controversy* with *Rivet* professes, that he was one, that desired the *return* of all *Catholick truth and peace* into the *Christian World* (and he must renounce his part in *Christ's Legacy* [*peace I leave with you*] that is not in this particular *affected like* him) And then, what wonder he should desire to be *admonished* by a *sober learned* man of the *Romish Communion*, if he wrote any thing which was not *ordinable* to that end?

24. The same *design*, and way of pursuing it, will be yet more visible in the two hundredth *Epistle*, where he hath these words to the same *Petavius*, *Liceat mihi tua ope addere, demere, corrigere quæ opus erit ad verum pacemque promovendam, Give me leave by your help, to add, to take away, to mend what is needful toward truth and the advancing of peace*, *viz.* such an *advancement* of *peace*, as was perfectly *consistent* with *truth*.

25. The Second and *last* Suggestion in this matter is taken from what *Grotius hath said in sundry writings concerning the Pope*] to which I have already spoken somewhat in the *answer* to the *animadversions*, as far as concerned that *passage* in his *Discussio*, which I discerned to be most accused of *inclination* to the *Popes interest*. As for the *Papal power*, whatsoever passage can be brought from him, must sure be interpreted by *analogy* with those *rules*, which he premiseth in his *Discussio*, requiring that it may be *confined* and *limited* *sec. Canones, according to the antient Canonical rights allowed the Pope by the Councils*, and so as the *authority of Scripture*, the *rights of the Catholick Church*, of *Councils*, of *Patriarchs of the East*, of *Primates*, and *Metropolitans*, and other *Bishops*, be preserved intire, as also all the the *just rights* of all *Christian Princes* in their own *Dominions*. See *Discuss. Riv. Apol.* p. 18, 19, 20. And against this, or on this head, here being no one place produced, to support this *indefinite charge*, I cannot reply by *Divination*, and so have thus briefly discharged my present *undertaking*.

26. What is briefly toucht on with reflexion on my self in the end of that *Dedication*, of the *softness* and *gentleness* of the *leaves* of my *Answer* to his *Animadversions*, of the *illness* of my *cause*, wherein I am ingaged against him, and the *illness* of my *Principles* in managing a *good* cause, in the *Treatise of Schism* and *some others*, (which he hath not pleased to name) I am no way qualified to judge of, till his *severer sheets* instruct me, by *discovering* the *infirmities* of my *cause*, and till by his managery of a *dispute* with a *Romanist*, he shall approve his *Principles* to be such as will hold out against all gainsayers. At the present having no more to *add*, I willingly take *leave* of him.

A CONTINUATION OF THE DEFENCE OF HUGO GROTIUS, IN AN ANSWER TO THE REVIEW of his ANNOTATIONS.

WHERETO

Is subjoined a REPLY to some Passages of the *Reviewer* in his *late Book* of *Schism*, concerning his *charge* of *Corruptions* in the *Primitive Church*, and some other particulars.

TO THE STATIONER.

Mr Royston,

I Have been so often called on for the Reply to the Review of Grotius's *Annotations, that I am at length inclined to change my former purpose, and permit these few sheets (prepared as soon as the Review came to my hands, but then laid aside, on a perswasion that they might be safely spared) to follow the former on that subject, rather than deny to any so easie a request. I am*

Septemb. 4. 1656.

Your Friend,

H. H.

Numb. 1. IF he that hath read the *Review of the Annotations* of *Hugo Grotius*, which is offered as a *Reply* to the *ſecond Defence* of that *learned* man, ſeem from thence to have any new ſcruples infuſed into his mind, it will not coſt him many minutes to *depoſite* them, by obſerving with me this *method*.

2. *Firſt*, By adverting (on the *firſt* head, that of the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*) not only what fair and large *characters* of his thoughts lie *legible* to all men in his *Book De ſatisfactione*, written on *purpoſe* againſt *Socinus* on this ſubject, but alſo how thoſe have been ſince back'd with *indubitable* evidences of a *later* and freſher *date*, taken from his own expreſs words in his *Diſcuſſio* (the *laſt* thing he wrote) and in a *letter* under his *own* hand (dated after the time of his *ſurmiſed change*) written on purpoſe to foreſtal this *ſurmiſe*, and to aſſure us of his *conſtant* adhering to that ſenſe which he had delivered in his *Book De ſatisfactione*. Which two as they are moſt *irrefragable* proofs of the matter in hand, being *teſtimonies* of him that certainly beſt knew his own thoughts, whether he were *changed* or no, ſo to *neither* of theſe is the leaſt word of *Reply* here offered by the *Reviewer*, and ſo ſtand in full *force* againſt all that is here *ſuggeſted*.

3. Secondly, By remembring that from the * beginning of this *debate*, the *poſthumous Annotations* on the *Epiſtles* were expreſly *renounced* and *rejected* by me, as departing manifeſtly from the judgment of that *learned* man, formerly expreſſed in thoſe writings which he had *compleated* and publiſhed in his *life* time, and conſequently, as unſufficient *arguments*, or teſtimonies of his *change*, when produced againſt his own *repeated* and *expreſs* declarations to the *contrary*; And yet from theſe are the proofs now *principally* brought in this *Review*, and by the contrariety betwixt theſe and his *Book De ſatisfact.* his change concluded; with what appearance of reaſon, the *Reader* will ſoon diſcern, when he hath conſidered the *premiſſes*, and what ſhall now occaſionally be added thereto.

* See *Anſ. to Animadverſ.* p. 132.

4. For this manner of dealing, *two* things only are pleaded in the *Review*, which here muſt be regarded, before I proceed: Firſt, That the *Accuſer having to deal with that book of Annotations* that goes *under his name, If they are none of his, it is neither on the one hand or other, of any concernment to him.*]

5. To this I reply, *firſt*, that it is in the *Reviewer* a manifeſt *diverſion*, a courſe which is ſure to render all *debates infinite*: In my anſwer to his *Preface* of *Animadverſions* on *Ignatius*'s *Epiſtles*, &c. I inſerted, *ex abundanti*, one, and only *one Digreſſion*, *A Defence of the learned* Hugo Grotius. And ſtreightwayes the whole ſtream of the *Controverſie* is *diverted* into that one *narrow chanel*, removed from the *queſtion* of *Epiſcopacy*, to the inquiry into *Grotius*'s his opinions; and that is one *competent diverſion*. After this, when both in that my *Digreſſion*, and alſo in my ſecond *Defence*, I had confined my plea to *Grotius himſelf*, and thoſe writings publiſhed by him in his *life* time, and known to be *written*, and *perfected* by him, expreſly rejecting this book of *poſthumous Annotations* on the *Epiſtles*, the *Reviewer* is now pleaſed *principally* to inſiſt, and found his charge againſt *Grotius*, on thoſe his *poſthumous Annotations*; which is a perfect *diverſion* again, inſtead of a *reply*, and ſo, the *waving* evidently, becauſe *changing* of the *whole queſtion*.

6. *Secondly*, As *uneffectual* as this *plea* is, it is yet much more *unreaſonable*, if *circumſtances* be conſidered, being evidently *prevented*, and *ſuperſeded* by that which hath *paſt* in this *debate*. For if there were any truth in thoſe words of his *Epiſtle* to the *Oxford Heads*, [*My Defenſative as to my dealing with* Grotius's *Annotations, is ſuited to what the Doctor pleads in his behalf*] then certainly he muſt be *concern'd* in this, which yet he reſolves to be none of his *concernments*; For it is ſure, that my *plea* was framed in *Defence* of Grotius *himſelf*, (not of thoſe *incompleat*, if not *falſe images* of him, thoſe parts of the *Annotations*, which I profeſſed to *reject*, and not to *plead* for.) Accordingly my words in the firſt propoſal of this matter to debate, were theſe, [*This very pious, learned, and judicious man hath of late among many, fallen under a very unhappy Fate, being moſt unjuſtly calumniated ſometimes as a Socinian, ſometimes as a Papiſt* ---] And then, how can this *Defenſative* be, according to his promiſe, conformed or *ſuited to my plea*, if it refer not to the *ſame ſubject*, viz. to *Grotius*, or thoſe *Books* of his, which are acknowledged to be his *compleated*, genuine *writings*? ſuch alone being *competent* teſtifications of his ſenſe, and ſo, meaſures to judge of his *perſwaſions*, whether he were a *Socinian* or no.

7. A *ſecond* part of his plea is by reflecting again on that evidence, which, ſaith he, he had formerly offered from the *Printers Preface to the volume of Annotations on the Epiſtles*.] But here, in the very *entrance*, is a *miſtake*, which, for the *clearing* of my ſelf, more than on *apprehenſion* of any *advantage* the *Reviewer* can gain by it, I muſt firſt take notice of. The *Evidence* was by him † cited from ſome words of the *Preface to the laſt part of the Annotations*, *beginning* thus, *Jam vero ſciendum eſt* --- To thoſe words there found, I gave anſwer in my *ſecond Defence*, p. 7. and he now tells me, that a *ſlight inſpection will ſerve to manifeſt how ill it* (*i. e.* my *anſwer*, or the *ſenſe* I gave of the words produced) *agrees with the intention and words of the Prefacer, who* ſaith he, *tells us, that* Grotius *had himſelf publiſhed his Annotations on the Goſpel five years before, and* ſo *proceeds*, reciting the words of the *Prefacer* for eight lines together; and concluding, that if the *Apologiſt read this Preface, he ought to have deſiſted from the plea inſiſted on*; *If he did not, he thought aſſuredly he had much reaſon to deſpiſe them with whom he had to do.*]

† Epiſt. to the *Oxford* Heads.

8. Who would not think there were ſomewhat herein really *miſtaken* by me, which called for this ſo *ſolemn rebuke*? But the *Reader* is intreated to conſult the place, or if it be not *worth* his *pains*, he may *believe* me, who made the *inſpection* more than *ſlightly*, and can aſſure him, that there is no part of what he thus now recites, to be met with in that *Preface*, whence he hath formerly drawn his *teſtimony*. I ſay in that *Preface* to the *laſt part of the Annotations* under *Grotius*'s name, from whence it was, that the *words* [*Jam ver ſciendum* ---] were (truly) cited, and to which *words* it was viſible, that I gave that *anſwer*, which he now pretends to refute from the *intention* and *words of the Prefacer*.

9. The ſhort is, There being *two volumes* of *Annotations* ſet out ſince *Grotius*'s death; the *former* on the *Acts*, and ſo on through the *Epiſtles* of Saint *Paul* and Saint *James*; the *latter* on the other *ſix Catholick Epiſtles*, and the *Revelation*; and before the *former* of theſe, the *Printers Epiſtle*, inſcribed, *Typographus Lectori*; before the *latter*, a *Præmonitio ad Lectorem*: From the *latter* of theſe it is, that the words *formerly* by him produced, *Jam verò ſciendum* --- and to which (conſequently) I gave *anſwer*, were *cited*. And I, that *obediently* and *diligently* read over that to which I was *directed*, and

there

there *finding* the words which were cited, gave my *anſwer* to them, ſuch as I thought the words capable of; am now unexpectedly *rebuked* for not *reading* it, and more than ſo, for *deſpiſing thoſe with whom I had to do*; when indeed, what is now in the *Reply* cited from it, is not to be found there, but in the *Printers Epiſtle* to *another volume*. By what means he fell into this *miſtake*, and was by that led into this *cauſeleſs ſeverity*, I leave him upon *recollection* to conſider.

I need add no more for the *vindicating* my ſelf in this matter; yet if I ſhall now having till now 10.
no *occaſion*) attend to this other *teſtimony*, now newly alledged by him out of that *other Preface*, it will ſoon appear, that it neither (as is pretended) *diſproves* the *anſwer*, which I gave to the words *formerly* cited from the *premonition*, nor *refutes* what I had *firſt* ſaid concerning the *Poſthumous Annotations*; and then ſurely I ſhall not be much *concern'd* in it: Not the *firſt*; for my *Anſwer* being no more but this, that *Opus Integrum ſignified not that volume completed, and ſo made* integrum *intire by* Grotius's *own hand, but the whole volume or volumes which contained all his* ἀνέκδοτα Adverſaria *on the New Teſtament*.] This is no way *refuted*, but rather *confirmed* by theſe other words of the *Typographus Lectori*; for there alſo *Opus integrum* ſignifies the *whole volume* or *volumes*, as that is oppoſed to the *Magna pars voluminis* in the line before, without any reſpect to its being *compleated* or *made intire*; Which alone having been *denied* by me, my anſwer is ſtill ſecured from any force of this *Teſtimony*.

Not the *ſecond*; For if I ſhall now grant the *Printer* to have in that *Preface* delivered the *whole* 11.
and *naked* truth, (which I had no obligation to be confident of) and conſequently, that *Grotius committed* to a Friend thoſe *Annotations*, in order to *Printing*, yet this no way proves, that they were *completed* and *perfected* by him; There is a *middle*, truly ſuppoſable, betwixt theſe two, *viz.* that they were by occaſion of the *Authors* unexpected *diverſions*, delivered to him imperfect. This *Remainder* of *Annotations* now by the *Reader* had been long expected to follow thoſe on the *Goſpels*, and on the *Old Teſtament*; and the *learned Compiler* being now at ſome leiſure to ſet about it, was ſuddenly called back from *Paris* to *Sweden*, a long voyage, not certain whether ever he ſhould return again (as indeed he did not) or whether *God* would ſpare him life and vacancy to *perfect* that work: Having therefore *communicated* his Notes to a learned man (one by the way, much more addicted to the *doctrine* of *Calvin* than *Socinus*) going now thence, he left them in his hand, and committed the *publiſhing* of them to his care, taking only with him thoſe *ſheets* which were not *legible*, which he haſtily *tranſcribed* in his journey, and, as the *Printer* tells us, returned them from *Hamburge*; and theſe, as by his words appears, belonging to the *laſt volume*, that on the *Revelation*, which therefore had truly *thus much* of his *laſt hand*, as this *haſty tranſcribing* comes to; ſo *haſty*, that *M.* who was prepared to write them again for the *Preſs*, did almoſt deſpair of *decyphering* them. The reſt, thoſe on the *Epiſtles*, remained in the *firſt rude draught*, and are not pretended to have been (ſo much as *haſtily*) *tranſcribed* by him, and ſo never obtained that *perfecter growth*, that *fulneſs* of *limbs* and *lineaments*, which I did and do ſuppoſe his *ſtudiosi ocii*, and *greater leiſure*, would have afforded them. Which therefore cannot with any *juſtice* be *ballanced* againſt the *contrary* evidences and *plain* words either of his *Diſcuſſio*, (the laſt thing, as I ſaid, written before his death) or of his *letter*, dated after his reading of *Crellius*'s and the *Socinians interpretations* (to which his ſuppoſed change is imputed) and avowing his *continued* adherence to his *former* doctrine; much leſs, of the *ſeveral* paſſages producible out of his *undoubted* writings, *maturely* compoſed, and *publiſht* by him, which *poſitively* and *profeſſedly* ſet down his ſenſe, and cannot be *prejudiced* by ſuch *uncertain*, feeble *ſuggeſtions* as theſe, drawn from his ſuppoſed *miſunderſtanding* of ſome few *paſſages* in the *Epiſtles*. And let this ſerve for a ſecond ſtage in my propoſed *method*.

Thirdly, That adhering to my *former* method, and, upon the grounds *premiſed*, *abſtracting* from 12.
or *ſetting aſide* (as 'tis viſible I have done, from the firſt *riſe* of this *debate*) theſe *poſthumous Annotations*, upon account of ſome *heterodox mixtures* in them diſcernible, eſpecially in the matter of *our juſtification*, and the *ſatisfaction of Chriſt*, and ſome other particulars, *elſewhere* noted, and *confining* our diſcourſe (more reaſonably) to *thoſe Annotations*, which he *perfected* and *publiſhed* in his *life* time, *i. e.* to thoſe on the *Goſpels* and on the *Old Teſtament*, taking in alſo *all* his other *writings* whatſoever; There cannot be any ground of *ſuſpicion* concerning his *change*, nor want of *inſtances* (which the *Reviewer* now requires) to diſprove his *Univerſal Negative*, and to invalidate the *charge* brought againſt that *learned* man, of his *wreſting to another ſenſe every text of Scripture, wherin teſtimony is given to that ſacred truth, or at leaſt concealing and obſcuring the doctrine of them*.]

I ſhall therefore, being now admoniſhed of *Quintilians* rule of *aut negandum aut defendendum*, do my 13.
duty in obſerving it, and formally *deny* his *poſition*, of *every text*, &c. and for contrary *inſtances*, begin with *Matth.* 20. 28. where the *ſon of man is ſaid to give his life a* λύτρον, or *ranſom for many*. *Here*, ſaith *Grotius*, *Puto reſpici vaticinium*, Iſa. 53. 10. *ubi dicitur, ſi Chriſtus vitam ſuam dediſſet* אשם, *quod hic recte* λύτρον *vertitur, fore, ut ſui cognitione multos juſtificaret, & poſtea, ipſe peccata multorum tulit*. Here firſt, the *parallel* is ſet by *Grotius* betwixt the *Evangeliſt* and the *Prophet Iſaiah*, and ſo that 53. of that *Prophecy* is brought to this ſenſe, of *Chriſt's giving his life a ranſome for many*, *i. e.* of his *ſatisfaction*; and yet farther explained by that *other* phraſe of the *Prophet* there uſed, his *bearing the ſins of many*, and the like, *Heb.* 9. 28. his *being offer'd to bear the ſins of many*.

Secondly, The λύτρον or *ranſom* here, is interpreted by the *Hebrew* אשם or *ſacrifice for ſin* there, 14.
and after more fully, by *ſacrificium piaculare*, περὶ ἁμαρτίας, ἱλαστικὸν, an *expiatory*, *propitiatory ſacrifice for ſin*, *victima luſtralis* — and the *giving his life a ranſom*, the *offering* it up ſuch a *ſacrifice* for *many*, and this as the ground or condition of his *juſtifying many by the knowledge of him*; which what is it, but the *founding* of our *juſtification* in the *propitiatory ſacrifice of Chriſt's death*, i. e. in the *ſatisfaction* wrought by it for us?

So *Mat.* 26. 28. Where *Chriſts blood of the New Teſtament is ſaid to be ſhed for many for the remiſſion* 15.
of ſins. *Here*, ſaith he, *Puto Danielis oraculum reſpici, in quo de Meſſia dictum eſt,* חגבר ברות לרבים δυναμόσει διαθήκην πολλοῖς, *cum præceſſiſſet* לכפר העון *ad expianda peccata*. *Adde quæ* Rom. 5. 15. (it ſhould be, 10.) *ſic & in Barnabæ quæ dicitur Epiſtola,* οὐ δοῦλός ἐστι τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ σκεῦος τοῦ πνεύματος ἁγιάσματος θυσίαν. Adding, *Simul autem tranſit Chriſtus à comparatione fœderum ad*

comparationem ſacrificiorum piacularium, in quibus anima pecudis offerebatur, velut ſuccedanea animæ hominis qui mortem meruiſſet, unde victima ferre peccata dicebatur in lege. Hinc mori victima pro homine --- Here again, firſt, the words of *Daniel* of *making reconciliation for iniquity*, and *confirming the covenant with many*, c. 9. 24. 27. are ſet as a *Prophecy parallel* to this *Evangelical* truth of *Chriſts blood of the New Teſtament being ſhed for the expiating of our ſins*. So likewiſe *Rom.* 5. 10. of our *being reconciled to God, when we were enemies, by the death of his Son*. And all theſe three illuſtrated by the plain words of *Barnabas's Epiſtle*, that *Chriſt offered up himſelf the veſſel of the Spirit, a ſacrifice for our ſins*. Secondly, It is here affirmed of his *blood*, that it was an *expiatory ſacrifice*, ſuch as wherein one is *offered up in ſtead of the other which had deſerved death*, and is accordingly ſaid to *bear the ſin of the other*. And then, what could be more expreſs to the *doctrine* of *ſatisfaction*, than theſe *three* places of *Prophet*, *Evangeliſt*, and *Apoſtle*, thus interpreted, which being added to the former, and now laid before the *Reviewer* (willing to have perſwaded the *Reader* there were none ſuch, becauſe I formerly thought it needleſs to produce them) will ſure now paſs for ἴσα μαρτύεια, *inſtances* as *competent* as any *Quintilian* would exact, to diſprove the *Univerſal propoſition* of the [*not one text in the whole Scripture --- which is not wreſted to another ſenſe, or at leaſt the doctrine concealed and obſcured by theſe Annotations.*]

16. But here on this occaſion the place in his *Annotations* on *Iſa.* 53. is by the *Reviewer* reſumed, as hopeful to yield ſome *colour* to infer his *charge*; *Where*, ſaith he, *he gives ſuch an expoſition of the whole Chapter, as is manifeſtly and univerſally inconſiſtent with any ſuch deſign on the words, as that which he intends to prove from them in his Book* De ſatisfact. *and in particular tells you in his Annotations on the place, as alſo on* 1 Pet. 2. 24. *that* סבל *ſignifies* auferre, *which with all his ſtrength he had there contended againſt.*

17. To this I anſwer, Firſt (as to his *expoſition* of the *whole chapter*) that I have already told him, that *Grotius* endeavoured to find a *firſt ſenſe* of the words of that *Prophecy*, ſo as to belong *peculiarly* to the *Jews* uſage of the *Prophet Jeremy*, and that I acknowledge not to be appliable always to their uſage of *Chriſt*. But beſide this, ſaith he, there is a *more principal and ſublime ſenſe, and that of the more literal of the two, wherein the whole chapter belongs to Chriſt*; but this ſenſe being more *vulgarly* markt by others, is only in *general*, once for all, pointed at by him, in thoſe ſhort *Annotations*, being alſo more fully explicated elſewhere, in a ſet *diſcourſe* on that *ſubject*.

18. This *anſwer* being formerly given by me, the *Reviewer* is now pleaſed to *miſtake*, and to change it into a *diſtinction* betwixt the *literal and myſtical ſenſe of a place*, and then to undertake that his *perverting the firſt literal ſenſe of the chapter, or giving it a completion in any perſon but Chriſt, is no leſs than blaſphemy*. But to this I reply, that my words are *miſreported* by the *diſputant*, and agreeably, my *ſenſe* alſo. For I *diſtinguiſht* not betwixt the *literal* and *myſtical ſenſe* of the place (or if I had, I muſt much have wronged *Grotius*, who reſolved the words to belong oft *more literally or* καὶ λέξιν to *Chriſt*, than *to any other*) but betwixt the *firſt* and *literal interpretation*, which had its *immediate completion among the Jews*, near that time, wherein it was written, and the *more remote*, *concerning Chriſt*: that indeed *myſtical*, becauſe *veiled* under the *firſt*; but *literal* alſo, becauſe that to which the very words belonged as *properly*, oft more *properly*, than to the other; As when the λέξις or *plain word* without any *figure* belongs to *Chriſt*, and only the *figurative* interpretation of it, the μετωνυμία to *Jeremy*. Of theſe two ſenſes *Grotius* makes *frequent* mention in his *interpretations*. See the note on *Zach.* 9. 9. *Behold thy* King *ſhall come*, which, ſaith he, *primo & maxime obvio ſenſu, in the firſt and moſt obvious ſenſe, belongs to* Zorobabel; *but ſublimiore quodam ſenſu, in a more ſublime ſenſe, to the Meſſias*; And many the like.

19. If thus the *Reviewer* had underſtood my words (which I then thought *plain* enough, till I ſaw them *miſapprehended*) I am in *charity* to think he would not have deemed it *little leſs than blaſphemy*, thus to *interpret* words of ſome other in a *firſt*, but that *leſs principal* ſenſe, which belong to the *Son of God* in the *more principal* and *ſublime ſenſe*, more *remote* in time of *completion*, but not in reſpect of the *propriety* of the words.

20. This the *inſtance* did evince, which I gave from the words, [*out of Egypt have I called my Son*] which evidently had a *firſt ſenſe* in the *Iſraelites*, a *ſecond*, equally *literal* in *Chriſt*, and ſo 'tis applied in the *New Teſtament*; and many more might be brought of affinity with it, if there were need of them.

21. It will be more to the purpoſe of vindicating *Grotius's intention*, and clearing the whole matter, that I give the *Reader* one ſignal paſſage from him, by which his ſenſe muſt in all reaſon be judged, being by him premiſed before his *interpretation* of the *latter* part of this *Prophecy*, from *chap.* 40. which he generally interprets in a *firſt ſenſe*, of matters that belonged to the *Jews* from the time of their *deportation*, to the *Maccabees*, &c. but acknowledges to contain alſo, and that *more ſimply* and more *clearly* the matters of *Chriſt*.

22. The words are in the *proœme* to *Iſa.* 40. *Cum autem omnia Dei beneficia umbram in ſe contineant eorum quæ Chriſtus præſtitit, tum præcipuè iſta omnia quæ deinceps ab Iſaiâ prænuntiabantur, verbis ſæpiſſimè à Deo ſic directis, ut ſimplicius limpidiuſq; in res Chriſti, quam in illas quas primò ſignificare Eſaias voluit, convenirent. Whereas all Gods bleſſings have in them a ſhadow of thoſe things which Chriſt performed, this is eſpecially applicable to all thoſe things which in the enſuing chapters* (this of *chap.* 53. muſt needs be comprehended in that ſtyle) *are foretold by* Iſaiah, *the words moſt often being ſo directed by God, that they agree more ſimply and clearly to the matters of Chriſt, than to thoſe which* Iſaias *would firſt ſignifie by them.*

23. Here is the ground of what I ſaid of the *firſt ſenſe* of theſe *prophecies*, viz. that which *Iſaias firſt* meant to ſignifie by them, ſuppoſing that there was ſomewhat elſe, belonging to *Chriſt*, which in a *ſecond* ſenſe or *later completion* he ſignified alſo, and the words ſo *directed by God* the *wiſe* diſpoſer, that they *moſt ſimply* and *clearly*, *i. e.* without *figures* (which are uſual in *prophecies*) belonged to him. This being by him ſaid once for all, of all thoſe *prophecies* that follow, doth by perfect *equivalence*, (a *collective being as full and efficacious as a diſtributive*) conclude of every particular, and conſequently of this *fifty third* before us (of which he again gives the *ſame* account as hath been ſaid, particularly,

when

when he comes unto it) and of every verſe in it, that it *moſt clearly and literally belongs to Chriſt*, though in *Jeremy* he ſuppoſed it had *another interpretation*. And ſo this, I now hope, will be deemed ſatisfactory, as to the *general*, to vindicate his *expoſition* of the *whole chapter*; and the having mention'd it, may be in ſome degree neceſſary to the preſerving of them from *miſpriſions*, who read not thoſe *notes* intirely, that they may comprehend the ſenſe of the *whole prophecies*, (which is the proper'ſt uſe of them) but caſt their eyes upon ſome *particular texts*, to ſatisfie their preſent *wants*, or *curioſities*.

But then ſecondly, for the *partitular* verſe 11. I *anſwer*, Firſt, That in the *Annotation* on 1 *Pet.* 2. 24. I cannot be concern'd, having oft reſolved that, as the reſt on the *Epiſtles*, to be *unſufficient* to give us his ſenſe. As for that on *Iſaiah*, if it were true, that he had there interpreted סבל *auferet*, Firſt, This could not have been juſtly charged upon him, as a *Socinian* interpretation, *Tertullian* having given him authority for it, as he cites it, on *Mat.* 8. 17. and indeed that *Evangeliſt* too having there applied that *prophecy* to νόσους βαστάζειν, the *bearing their bodily diſeaſes*, which ſure was ſo to be underſtood, as ſhould denote his *curing*, (*i. e.* his *auferet*, *taking* them *away*) and not his *bearing* them in their ſtead, taking upon him all the *diſeaſes* which he *cured* in any. But then ſecondly 'tis clear, that he doth not ſo interpret it [*auferre*, *to take away*] as to *exclude*, but expreſly to *include* the *ferre*, or *bearing* alſo; *Auferet*, ſaith he, as applied to *Jeremy*, by a *metonymy*, but that founded in the other of *bearing*, as the *literal*, *quia qui ſordes auferunt*, *ſolent eas collo ſuppoſito portare*; ſo that the *literal* of *bearing*, or *carrying our iniquities*, is (by the former obſervation) left to be *compleated* in *Chriſt*, who did both *bear* and *take away the ſins of the world*, and nothing by *Grotius* is here affirmed, or interpreted to the *contrary* of that. And ſo much for the other part of the *Objection*, and ſo for the third part of my *method*. 24.

Fourthly, When I had propoſed to *conſideration two things* for the preventing all *jealouſie* of any *after change* in *Grotius*, and the *Reviewer* had taken notice of one of them, under the ſtyle of my *firſt obſervation*, and offered ſome ſemblance of *anſwer* to it, *pag.* 6. before he comes to the *ſecond*, he [illegible] *not*, as he ſaith, *but ſuppoſe*, *that he is already abſolved from a neceſſity of farther procedure*—] by that means *freeing* himſelf from giving any *heed* to that *argument* which I had laid greateſt weight on, as that which of all others was *moſt conſiderable* in this buſineſs, *viz. Grotius*'s own words (who certainly knew his own *heart*, better than any *accuſer*, or *diviner* can be ſuppoſed to do, and ought to be believed, rather than any *contrary ſurmiſes* concerning him) expreſly teſtifying his *conſtancy* in adhering ſtill (now after the time of his ſuppoſed *change*) to what he had delivered in his *Book De ſatisfactione*. Herein I ſhall leave the *Reader* to paſs the judgment, whence that *abſolution* was derived to the *Reviewer*, by which he *could not but ſuppoſe himſelf freed from any neceſſity of conſidering this evidence*, when yet he was at leiſure (by way of *commutation*) to heap up *contrary appearances* from the *Annotations* on the *Epiſtles*, which I profeſt not to allow to be his, and therefore could not be *concern'd* in the producing of them. 25.

Here only I had expreſt my opinion that the *Notes* on the *Apocalypſe*, had (as I ſtill think I have been informed, and have already premiſed ſome proof of it) received from *his own pencil the very lineaments*, *and colours*, *wherein they appear*; And therefore when he pitches on one *Annotation* on that *Book* Rev. 1. 5. *Chriſt's waſhing us from our ſins in his bloud*, where he thinks the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt* concealed, and the *Socinian* interpretation taken up by *Grotius*, contrary to his manner of *explicating* and *applying it in his Book De ſatisfactione*; This will require to be a while conſidered by me. 26.

The words of *Grotius* he hath rightly ſet down; but I ſuppoſe, not ſufficiently conſidered the *latter* part of them, which runs thus, *Dicitur Chriſtus ſuo ſanguine nos laviſſe*, *quia & ipſe omnia præſtitit*, *quæ ad id requirebantur*; *Chriſt is ſaid to have waſht us with his bloud*, *becauſe he performed all things which were required to it*, i. e. *to the waſhing of the ſoul*. Which words are certainly of competent *largeneſs* to contain (and ſo *exclude* not) the doctrine of *ſatisfaction*, that being of the number of thoſe things, which in *Gods counſel*, were appointed, and ſo *required* to the *waſhing of our ſouls*; This being conſidered, it will be no prejudice to that *learned* man, that in the *former* words he took in *Socinus*'s interpretation of [*morte ſuâ certos nos reddidit veritatis eorum quæ docuerat*, *quæ talia ſunt*, *ut nihil ſit aptius ad purgandos à vitiis animos* ---] For of that there is no *queſtion*, but that *Chriſt* by his *death* did give us *aſſurance of the truth of his doctrine*, and that this *aſſurance is very apt to purge us from our evil and vitious courſes*. In reſpect of which *purgation*, Saint *Paul* himſelf ſaith, *Tit.* 2. 4. that *Chriſt gave himſelf* (that is ſurely, even to *die*) *for us*, *that he might redeem us from all iniquity* (the *power* as well as *guilt* of it) *and purifie unto himſelf a peculiar people*, *zealous of good works*. And *Gal.* 1. 4. *he gave himſelf for our ſins* (and thereby, I ſuppoſe, made a *ſatisfaction* for us) *that he might deliver us from this preſent evil world*, from the *vices* and *abominations* thereof. And *Eph.* 5. 25. *Chriſt gave himſelf for the Church*, *that he might ſanctifie and cleanſe it*, *that he might preſent it unto himſelf a glorious Church*, *not having ſpot or wrinkle or any ſuch thing*. From whence I conclude, that the *Socinians* errour conſiſts not herein, that they *affirm* this; but that they ſay, *this* is *all* that *Chriſt* did by his *death*, and ſo exclude his *ſatisfaction*; which can by no means be affirmed of *Grotius*, who, as he wrote a *Book* in *defence* of it, ſo in this very place aſcribes to *Chriſt* the performing *omnia* all things, *indefinitely*, which were *required to the waſhing of our ſouls*, from which number his *expiatory ſacrifice* was never excluded by *Grotius*. 27.

And then it may be fit to be remembred, that as the *denying* the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt* is one great *errour* juſtly charged on the *Socinians*, ſo the *confining* the effects of the *death* of *Chriſt*, to that one *head* of *ſatisfaction*, is an *errour* alſo, very carefully to be averted by him, that deſires to reap *benefit* by *Chriſts death*. 28.

After his view of this place, he is pleaſed (to *prevent* the *Readers* farther *trouble*) to refer him to *Grotius*'s *Annotation* on one place more of the *Revelation*, chap. 13. 9. and I have obſerved his *directions*, and can aſſure him, there is not there *one* word to this matter. Only that *Arethas* rightly applies the phraſe [*from the foundation of the world*] to the word [*book*] not to the word [*ſlain*] evincing it from the *parallel* place, *chap.* 17. 8. where ſo it is joined [*Whoſe names are written in the* 29.

book of life from the foundation of the world] the *book of life*, in one place, and the *book of life of the lamb ſlain*, or the *ſlain lambs book of life*, in the other, being perfectly *equipollent*.

30. The remainder of the *Catalogue* of *Texts*, that is added, is all again out of the *Epiſtles*, and ſo hath already more than once been accounted for, by denying the *Annotations* on them to have been *perfected* by *Grotius*. And this is all that need to be conſidered, in reference to the *firſt* branch of the *ſuggeſtion*, that concerning the *doctrine* of the *ſatisfaction* of *Chriſt*.

31. On the *ſecond Socinian* head of *doctrine*, that concerning the *Deity of Chriſt*, whereon the *Diſputer* had affirmed [*that of all the texts of the Old and New Teſtament, whereby the Deity of Chriſt is uſually confirmed, — Grotius hath not left any more than one, if one, ſpeaking any thing clearly to this purpoſe.*] I thought I had given ſome matter of *conviction*, by referring to that *learned* man's *Annotations* on *John* 1. when both that *one* ſignal text is left by him ſpeaking clearly to this purpoſe, and many other places of *Scripture* are mentioned, and interpreted, and applied to the ſame ſenſe, as *parallel*, and anſwerable to that. To this he replies, that *this of* John 1. *was the one place by him expreſly excepted*, and therefore *this inſtance would not evade the charge*. And for the *other* places, *Prov.* 8. &c. he is pleaſed to *ſuppoſe, that on the view of my defence, men muſt needs ſuppoſe that in the Annotations on the places repeated*, Grotius *muſt give their ſenſe, as bearing witneſs to the Deity of Chriſt*; Hereupon he will *turn* to the *ſeveral places, and give the Reader an account of them.*]

32. But before he proceed to that, and to ſave the pains of many of them, it may be ſoon conſidered, that what *Grotius* doth in the *Notes* on *John* 1. is as truly his *act*, as any thing that is done by him in any *other* place, much more ſo, than what is publiſht under his *name*, in the *Annotations* on the *Epiſtles*; and conſequently, that as many places as he hath there affirmed to be *parallel* to *John* 1. 1. ſo many places he hath left *ſpeaking clearly to this purpoſe*. *Grotius* had not at that time publiſht any other Notes on any part of the *Bible*, but thoſe only on the *Goſpels*. On the reſt of the *New Teſtament* he never lived to *publiſh* any, yet here on *John* 1. hath affirmed the words of S. *Paul*, Col. 1. 16. [*all things were created by Chriſt*—] to be *agreeable* to the words of S. *John*, that *without him was nothing made that was made*. Is it not now as *viſible*, that he hath left *that* place of *Col.* 1. 16. *ſpeaking clearly to the Deity* and *creative* power of *Chriſt*, by *which all things were* at firſt *made*, as if he had lived to ſet out *Annotations* purpoſely on that place, and had therein ſo interpreted it? This certainly is ſo *clear*, that I cannot yet doubt (what ever the *Reviewers ſarcaſme* would ſuggeſt) of being a *ſucceſful advocate* in this matter.

33. The ſame is again as clear of 2 *Pet.* 3. 5. and of the *two* places brought by him, in concent with it, from the *Chaldee Paraphraſt* on *Iſai.* 45. 12. & 48. 13. to teſtify that by this ὁ λόγος, *i. e. by the word of the Lord, Chriſt*, the *whole world was founded*; which again (though he never ſhould mention them again in all his *writings*) are yet ſolemnly *left* by him, to *teſtify clearly* to the *Deity of Chriſt*; And ſo, *more* than that one of *John* 1.

34. But the place more largely recited by *Grotius* to this purpoſe, is that of *Prov.* 8. from verſe 23. *A ſeculo habui principatum, I was ſet up from everlaſting*, to verſe 27. *when he prepared the heavens I was there*; And this the *Reviewer* thinks fit to examine, by repairing to his *Annotations* on the *Old Teſtament*, and there 1. *he finds his note on the Wiſdom there ſpoken of, to be* [*Hæc de ea ſapientia quæ in lege apparet exponunt Hebræi, & ſane ei, ſi non ſoli, at præcipue hæc attributa conveniunt*] and this he thinks a very advantageous diſcovery; for if they *agree ſolely or principally to the wiſdom that ſhines in the Law*, how *can they be* the *attributes* of the *perſon of the Son of God?*

35. But I *anſwer*, that note of his, is on the *firſt verſe* of that *chapter*, far enough from *verſe* 23. where the citation in his *Note* on *John* 1. begins. And why might not many parts of the *character* of *wiſdom* be by the *Jews* duly applied to the *Law* (as will appear, if you read the former part of the *chapter*, for above *twenty* verſes together) and yet the *latter* and *ſublimer* part of its *character* be competible only to *Chriſt*, the *eternal wiſdom* of the *Father?* And why ſhould not *Grotius*'s [*hæc*] on verſe 1. rather belong to thoſe *former* 20. verſes, than to the 23. &c. which he there (as in the *Notes* on the *Goſpels*) expreſly interprets ſo, as that verſe 27. and 30. be all one with *John* 1. 1. and ſo *Prov.* 9. 1. *Wiſdom built her an houſe, i. e.* ſaith he, *corpus humanum*, a *mans body*, which is not applicable to any thing, but *Chriſt* in his *incarnation*. And ſo I hope this *artifice* hath ſtood the *Reviewer* in little ſtead.

36. But then, ſaith he, *On* verſe 22. *Grotius affirms* of קנני *that it is rendred not amiſs by the Chaldee* בלח and *by the Septuagint* ἐκτήσατο, *though he knew that ſenſe was pleaded by the Arians, and exploded by the ancient Doctors of the Church.*]

37. To this I anſwer, That *Grotius*'s words, [*ſenſu non malo, ſi creare ſumas pro facere ut appareat*] ſignify not, that *rendring is not amiſs*, for he had formerly expreſt his opinion of that, that *Aquila and Symmachus* and *Theodotion* their rendring it by ἐκτήσατό με, was *well agreeing* or *anſwerable to the Hebrew* קנני but that the other which was not the *right* rendring, might yet bear a *tolerable*, or *not ill ſenſe*, if it were *interpreted to ſignify no more than that which he there* names, *viz.* [*making to appear*] a ſenſe which the *Fathers* never *exploded*, nor was fit to be *pretended* by the *Arrians*, or favoured by any in *kindneſs* to them.

38. This therefore was but a *weak foundation* of that *confidence*, with which the *Reviewer* concludes, that *of the Son of God, the eſſential wiſdom of God, ſubſiſting with the Father, we have not one word*] eſpecially when he had himſelf confeſt that [on verſe 27. he adds, *aderam*, i. e. ὢν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ, *John* 1. 1.] for certainly if thoſe words of *wiſdom, when he prepared the heavens I was there*, and the ſame again verſe 30. (to which alſo he refers the *Reader*, though the *Reviewer* pleaſed not to ſee it) *When he appointed the foundations of the earth, then was I by him*] be all one with [*the word was with God*] *John* 1. 1. there is then *ſome word* of the *Son of God*, the *eſſential wiſdom*, in thoſe *Notes*, and perfectly as much as is *proportionable* to the manner of thoſe *very ſhort Annotations* on the *Old Teſtament*.

39. To which may be added, that by interpreting the phraſe [*his ways*] verſe 22. by *operationes Dei, the operations of God*, the ſenſe of that verſe (which the *Reviewer* thinks *perverted* or *obſcured*) muſt in his rendring run thus, *In the beginning of his operations God poſſeſſed this eternal wiſdom, the Son of God,*

which

which will be ſtill to the ſame ſenſe; And then the *Note* on *chap.* 9. 1. ſets down the *incarnation* of this *eternal word*, or *wiſdom*; And what could have been more punctual againſt the *Socinian* intereſt, than *all* this, being thus briefly amaſſed together, if the *Reviewer* would have but the *patience* to diſcern it?

What he adds by way of *wonderment*, *that I ſhould add the places of Iſa.* 45. 12. *and* 48. 13. *to the number of texts interpreted by* Grotius *to this matter of the Deity*, is ſoon ſatisfied, by remembring (what was viſible enough before) that the *Chaldee Paraphraſt* in thoſe and many other places rendring the word [*God*] by [*God and his word*] is fitly brought by *Grotius*, as a *witneſs*, that the *world was created by the word of God*, as that is *God*, and that that is the ſenſe of thoſe places. Which if it be, then are thoſe *texts* of *Scripture* left by *Grotius*, to teſtifie to this truth of the *Deity* of the *word of God*, *i. e.* of *Chriſt*. 40.

Now for the *principal* place that of *John* 1. 1. the *Reviewer* hath expreſt his *diſlikes* alſo to that, and mention'd ſome grounds thereof, firſt, that *Grotius is very careful of aſcribing an* ὑπόστασις τῷ λόγῳ] But if by this phraſe he would ſignifie him *unwilling* to *aſcribe* an *hypoſtaſis* to the *word*, this is miſrepreſented by him; for 'tis evident, *Grotius* expreſſes no *diſlike* to that ſtyle, all that he ſaith that way is, *vocem* ὑποστάσεως —— *non à primis Chriſtianis uſurpatam, cùm contra* μίαν ὑπόστασιν *dixerit Athanaſius, Synodus Nicæna, Sardicenſis, & Romana aliquot, that that word, and ſome others was not uſed by the firſt Chriſtians, that* Athanaſius, *and the Nicene, Sardicene, and ſome Roman Councils affirmed, that there was one hypoſtaſis.* And all theſe, I hope, are ſo contrary to the *Arian*, that if *Grotius* ſhould chuſe to ſpeak with them, he could with no juſtice be accuſed of that *hereſie*, or *obſcuring the Deity of Chriſt* by ſo ſpeaking. 41.

And yet it is farther clear, that from *Origen* and *others* after him, he cites the *diſtinction* of *hypoſtaſes*, and what could he have done more to obtain the *Reviewers* favour, than to cite it from them, that *uſed*, and not pretend it from them, that *uſed* it not? 42.

That he hath *interweaved many Platonick interpretations of* ὁ λόγος, is alſo in the *ſecond* place ſuggeſted, and at once, that *he hath darkened the whole counſel of God in that place.*] But I hope there is no *hereſie* in letting the *Chriſtian Reader* know, how much *Platoniſts* and *Heathen Philoſophers* have by *groping* diſcover'd of *divine truths*; and to me it is not imaginable, that when the *Chriſtian doctrine* is once declared, ſuch *additions* as theſe ſhould, by being ſubjoined *ex abundanti*, *obſcure* what was once made *clear*, and ſo *darken the whole counſel of God*. 43.

Thirdly, *It may not be amiſs*, ſaith he, *to obſerve, that not only the Arians, but Photinus himſelf acknowledged* that the world *was made* τῷ θεῷ λόγῳ] And to this I *anſwer*, that what is *wide* of the *mark*, to which it is directed, no way ſufficient to *infer* the deſired *concluſion*, is (in the managing of a *controverſie*) *amiſs to be obſerved*; And ſuch will this obſervation appear to be; For the matter of the *queſtion* being a *charge* againſt *Grotius*, of *Socinian* doctrine, what can be concluded (to that) from the bare mention of the *Arians*, and *Photinus* his *acknowledgments*, unleſs *firſt* it be proved, that *Grotius* was an *Arian*, or *Photinian*, and *ſecondly*, that all *Arians* and *Photinians* are *Socinians*? Either of which, as they have not the leaſt appearance of *truth* in them, ſo are they not ſo much as attempted here to be *proved* by the *author* of this *obſervation*. On the contrary, there are theſe five ſhrewd *prejudices* againſt it: Firſt, That what the *Arians* ſay in this matter, *Photinus* doth not ſay; and ſo they were not fit to be put *together*. Secondly, That what the *Arians* ſay, *Grotius* doth not ſay. Thirdly, That what the *Photinians* ſay, neither the *Arians*, nor *Grotius* do ſay. Fourthly, That the *Socinians* do in this differ much both from *Arians* and *Photinians*; and yet Fifthly, That *Grotius* differs as much (or more) from the *Socinians* herein, as he doth from either of the other two. 44.

All this will appear by viewing ſeverally the *Arians*, and *Photinians*, and *Socinians* doctrine in this point, and the *diſtance* of *Grotius*'s interpretation from each of theſe. For the firſt, *Arius* did indeed acknowledge in his * *Epiſtle*, that *God did by his only Son make* τοὺς αἰῶνας, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ, *the worlds and the reſt*, and in the words of the text, ὅτι πάντα δι' αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο, *that all things were made by him, and without him was nothing made that was made.* But ſure this was no part of his *hereſie*, (if it were, the *Scripture*, as well as *Grotius*, muſt be involved in it, who affirmed it *equally*) but that he firſt affirmed *Chriſt* to be himſelf a *creature*, κτίσμα τοῦ θεοῦ τέλειον, ſaith he, *he by whom God created the world, was a perfect creature of Gods, though created* πρὸ χρόνων αἰωνίων, *before all ages*; and again ſaith *Epiphanius*, Κἂν κτίσμα αὐτὸν λέγωσιν, ὁμολογοῦσιν αὐτὸν ὑπὲρ ὅλα τὰ κτίσματα αὐτῶν, *though they call him a creature, yet they confeſs him above all his creatures.* So again ſpeaking of the *Holy Ghoſt*, they will have him to be κτίσμα κτίσματος, *the creature of a creature*, where ſtill that is *Arius* his *hereſie*, in this matter, that he made *Chriſt a creature*, and to that applied the *Septuagints* rendring of the place, *Prov.* 8. of θεὸς ἔκτισέ με, *God created me*, and conſequently would not allow him to be ὁμοούσιος, *of the ſame ſubſtance*, or *equal* with the *Father*. And when *Grotius* ſaith any thing in favour of this *doctrine*, of *Chriſt*'s being a *creature*, or denies his *equality* with the *Father*, then he muſt paſs for an *Arian*; (Of which he hath not yet had the luck to be accuſed, that I know of;) But 'tis certain he hath not done ſo; nay on the other ſide, 'tis competently evident, if but by the notion which he applies to ἔκτισε in his *Annotations* on *Prov.* 8. (to reſcue that rendring from an *evil ſenſe*) that he utterly rejects that *notion* wherein the *Arian* took it, *viz.* for *creating*, and ſo that he is herein profeſſly free from that *hereſie*. 45.

* *Epiph. l.* 2. *Hær.* 49.

As for *Photinus* in the ſecond place, 'tis certain his *hereſie*, like that of *Paulus Samoſatenus*, conſiſted in denying that *Chriſt* had a *being*, or *ſubſiſtence* from the *beginning*, or before the *Holy Ghoſt's coming upon Mary*; ſo ſaith † *Epiphanius*, Φάσκει ὅτι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τὸ χρεὼν μὴ εἶναι, κατὰ δὲ Μαρίας τὸ θεῖον καὶ θεοῦ αὐτοῦ ὑπάρχειν, ἔξοδε φησὶ, τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπῆλθεν —— Now though this *heretick* was content to acknowledge that the *Father made the world* διὰ τοῦ ὅλου ἐν αὐτῷ λόγου, *by the* λόγος *which was in him*, yet that it was not *Chriſt* which he underſtood by that ſtyle, is moſt clear, both by his *denying Chriſt* to have had then any *ſubſiſtence*, and ſecondly by the *ſimilitude*, by which he expreſt himſelf, ὥσπερ διὰ λόγου ὁ ἄνθρωπος ποιεῖ ὃ βούλεται, οὕτως διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου λόγου, ὁ πατὴρ διὰ τοῦ ὅλου ἐν αὐτῷ λόγου ἐποίησε τὰ πάντα, *as a man by* λόγος *doth what he will* (by λόγος meaning a kind of *Idea* in the agents *mind*, by, or according to which he doth any thing) *ſo by his own* λόγος, or by the λόγος *which is in him, the Father hath made all things*; but eſpecially by *Epiphanius*'s way of *confuting him*, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τῷ λόγος ἐσθιάθεος 46. † *Hær.* 51.

θεὸς ἀεὶ, ἡ προφορικὸς ὑπάρχων, ὃ δύναται λόγος ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἀνθρώπου λόγος --- The λόγος *in man, whether the word of the mind within,* or *the word ſpoken, cannot be called man,* but the λόγος *of man,* whereas the λόγος in Saint *John* is ſaid to be *God.* And ſo, as *Photinus* ſaying [*all things were made by the* λόγος, *which was in God*] ſaid quite another thing from what *Arius* had ſaid (and therefore this *Reviewers* obſervation was in that reſpect guilty of that *fallacy,* which *Ariſtotle* calls *plurium interrogationum*) ſo is it moſt certain, that *Grotius*'s interpretation of the *Evangeliſt,* is no way conſonant to *Photinus* (any more than to *Arius*) his notion. For when to thoſe words of the *Evangeliſt* [*In the beginning was the word*] his note is, *Jam tum erat, ſic mos eſt Hæbreis æternitatem populariter deſcribere*] which defines the *eternity* of his *being,* he brings for explication of that form of ſpeech, the words of *Juſtine,* προϋπηρξε πρὸ τῶν αἰώνων, *he was ſubſiſtent before the worlds.* So again on thoſe words [*the word was with God*] he ſaith this *was in oppoſition to his being ſeen in the world in his incarnation, vult enim dicere, ante eum fuiſſe inconſpicuum, he would expreſs that before his incarnation, he was inviſible*; adding for proof, *Dicitur enim Deus ἀόρατος*; 1 *Tim.* 1. 17. *for God is ſaid to be inviſible,* and to *inhabit the light which none approacheth*; by all which it is clear, that by [*the word*] he underſtands *inviſible God* himſelf, being or *ſubſiſting eternally* with the *Father*; which is in every part contrary to *Photinus*'s doctrine, as hath been ſhewed.

47. *Thirdly,* For the *Socinians,* their *interpretation* is known to differ *toto cœlo* in this particular both from *Arius,* and *Photinus,* being after this manner; that * *In the beginning of the ſpiritual world,* or the *Goſpel, the word, that Son of God, which was born of* Mary *in* Auguſtus's *reign, ſo called in reſpect of his office, which was to make known Gods word to men, was with God,* i. e. *before* John's *preaching,* was, as the *word,* or in *reſpect* of this *office, known to none but to God*: That *this word is God,* i. e. that *Chriſt was ſo called* (as *Angels and Princes* are) in *reſpect of the great benefits which we receive from him, and the dignity to which he is by God advanced,* (diſtinctly denying that he is the *ſupream God,* the *author* of all things, or *creator* of the *world*) *that all things were created by him,* i. e. all *the new ſpiritual and divine things, which are under the Goſpel done in the world,* and ſo on, in *concordance* with this *Foundation* From every part of which, *Grotius*'s *explications* of that text are moſt *remote,* as hath already appeared, and have not the leaſt *infuſion* of this *leven* diſcernable in them, as will be evident to any, who ſhall but caſt an eye on his *Notes* on that place. Of the *Notes* on the *Epiſtles* which came out ſince his *death,* this cannot be ſaid; for there many of theſe, or the like *Socinian* interpretations are crept in, ſome words of the *Epiſtles* expounded in a ſenſe expreſly *contrary* to what he hath here incidentally ſaid of the *ſame* words. This I have pointed at in one *eminent* inſtance, the place to the *Coloſſians, chap.* 1. 16. of the *worlds* being made by *Chriſt*; and thereon founded my *reſolution,* that they were none of his, nor conſequently did I ever permit my *plea* for him, to be extended to the juſtifying of them. Thus much may ſuffice for the *ſupernumerary obſervation,* which being, ſure, meant to inſinuate ſomewhat, it now appears with what *juſtice* it was produced by him. By the way, I ſuppoſe my account alſo given, why the *interpretations* of *John* 1. and *Prov.* 8. of the *world being made by* ὁ λόγος *the word of God,* were by me formerly produced, as *irrefragable* evidences, that this *learned* man inclined not to the *Socinians* in this matter of the *Deity* of *Chriſt.* The *Reviewer* may now judge what *reaſon* I had for it.

* *Socin.* in *John.* 1.

48. *Laſtly,* There being a threefold λόγος, ὑποστατικὸς, ἐνδιάθετος, προφορικὸς, 'tis ſuggeſted that nothing but λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, was by *Grotius* intended in thoſe *Annotations on* John 1. 1. but withal 'tis *confeſt,* that *much from ſome quotations there uſed, may be ſaid againſt it.*] And if there may, and if thoſe *quotations* be ſo clear, as thoſe out of *Juſtin Martyr,* and *Athenagoras,* of *Chriſt's preſubſiſting before the worlds, of his being God before the worlds, that from the beginning God being an eternal mind,* εἶχεν ἐν ἑαυτῷ ὁ λόγον ἀΐδιος, *had the word in himſelf eternally*; and if the *negative* [*nothing but* λόγος ἐνδιάθετος] be not reconcileable with any *one* mention of any thing elſe, ſuch as *Chriſt*'s being *God,* and *with God from all eternity*; upon theſe *grounds,* I ſay, I ſhall confeſs it the *prudenteſt* courſe, which the *Reviewer* here hath taken, *viz.* to defer *the undertaking of this task,* and to add no more, than the *unproved* ſuggeſtion, till ſpace of *greater* leiſure.

49. In *reproaching* of me for a *triumphant cloſe,* he is now pleaſed to give an *Eſſay* of his own *humility,* in heaping theſe ſeverals into one period. Firſt, *That he ſaid not* Grotius *was a Socinian.* Secondly, That *in his Annotations on the ſix verſes in the* Proverbs, *two in* Iſaiah, *one in* Saint Peter, *one in* Saint Paul, *added to many in the beginning of* Saint John, Grotius *ſpeaks not one word to the purpoſe.* Thirdly, That he *doth not interpret Chriſt's eternal ſubſiſtence with God, ſo as to a perſonal ſubſiſtence.*

50. To theſe three I briefly *anſwer.* To the *firſt,* That the only thing that in my *firſt Digreſſion* (or *ſecond Defence* of *Grotius*) I undertook in behalf of that *learned* man, being the injuſtice of the charge, of his being *ſometimes a Socinian, ſometimes a Papiſt, ſometimes both*; This is by the *Reviewer* in his *Epiſtle* to the *Oxford Heads,* undertaken to be *refuted,* which can never be done, unleſs he both ſay and prove, that *Grotius* was a *Socinian.* To the *ſecond,* That, as hath now appeared, *Grotius* hath ſpoken to *the purpoſe of the Deity of Chriſt,* on the *eighth* of the *Proverbs* (as of his *incarnation* on the *ninth*) as well as on *John* 1. And for the other places, as it is ſufficient that he hath recited them to that purpoſe on *John* 1. ſo the account is clear why he is not found to do it elſewhere. On *Iſaiah* keeping himſelf to the literal *Hebrew,* he had no occaſion in thoſe conciſe notes, to take notice of that, which only the *Chaldee* there had ſaid. The other two are in the *Epiſtles,* on which the *Annotations,* which are publiſhed under his name, are by me deemed *imperfect,* and not to carry his *full ſenſe* with them. To the *third* as before, That he cites out of *Origen,* and *others* after him, the uſe of the word *hypoſtaſes,* and the *diſtinction* of them. Only he ſaith the word was not uſed *à primis Chriſtianis, by the firſt Chriſtians,* any more than ὁμοούσιον, *&c.* And ſo it is certain it was not.

51. In the *next* place, I am reproved that I *neither make inquiry into his Treatiſe,* for *the places in the Old Teſtament,* wherein the *Deity of Chriſt* is *teſtified to,* and *are corrupted by that learned man,* nor *yet will look into* Grotius's *Annotations* on *thoſe texts,* which *I remember at all times to be pleaded to that purpoſe.* To this I anſwer, Firſt, That I never undertook the *vindication* of all *Grotius's Annotations,* nor ever ſaid any thing, which ſhould ingage me in ſuch a *long* task as this. Secondly, The *diſcouragements,* which I mentioned to have already received from making *inquiry* into this *Reviewers* former *Treatiſe,*

were

were taken from what had appeared from *Grotius* on *John* 1. compared with, and found evidently to *ſuperſede* this Authors ſuggeſtions of [*but one, if one place, in all the Bible, left by* Grotius *clearly teſtifying this truth*] For when, beſide that of *John* 1. I found there ſo many more, put together, *particularly* Prov. 8. verſe 23.— largely ſet down, and in the *Annotations* on the *Proverbs*, found the ſame ſenſe adhered to, and a *reference* back again to *John* 1. where he had ſpoken ſo largely on this matter, what need was there of farther *inquiry* for that, which had thus readily *offered* it ſelf?

Now to my *two ſuppletory* conſiderations, he hath his replies alſo; To the firſt, by *confeſſing*, what I deſire, that *one expreſs text of Scripture, is ſufficient for the confirmation of a divine truth*] but then, *denying that five places have been by me produced out of the Annotations of* Grotius *for the confirmation of the truth pleaded about.*] 52.

To this I *anſwer*, 1. that if *any one be ſufficient to confirm* this *divine truth*, then *Grotius* hath been demonſtrated *ſufficiently* to have *confirmed* it, who hath evidently brought *John* 1. which is *one* ſuch *text*. Secondly, that that *Text*, and *Prov.* 8. 23— he hath certainly not *depraved*, nor kept back from *teſtifying* to this truth; So likewiſe *Col.* 1. 18. and 2 *Pet.* 3. 5. if we may judge by his own words on *John* 1. and not by the *poſthumous Annotations*, which I deem not *competent meaſures* to judge him by; and ſo there are *four* of the *five*. Thirdly, he hath there alſo applied to it the places of *Iſaiah*, in the *Chaldee* reading, and theſe ſuperadded to the former, are very ſufficient to *confirm a divine truth*, and that is all I ſaid in this matter. But then Fourthly, as the *conciſeneſs* of his *Notes* on the *Old Teſtament*, and his deſire to clear the *firſt*, and *neareſt* ſenſe of the *Prophecies*, ſuch as pertain'd to the then *approaching* affairs of the *Jews*, are a competent account of his not inlarging to the more *remote* and *ultimate* completions in *Jeſus Chriſt*: So his general advertiſements, more than once given (ſuch as hath been produced from his *Preface* to *Iſa.* 40. and to *Iſa.* 53.) are ſufficient to teſtify his acknowledgment of *Chriſt*'s being *predicted* in thoſe places of the *Prophets*, where his *Annotations* on the ſeveral *verſes* make no *particular* mention of him. And ſo, when he gives a ſenſe of *Iſa.* 9. 6. which immediately belonged (in his opinion) to *Hezekiah*, and according to that, interprets every part of that verſe, he yet thus *prefaceth* it, *ſic tamen ut multo excellentius hæc ad Meſſiam pertinere non Chriſtiani tantum agnoſcant, ſed & Chaldæus hoc loco*] thus giving only a *lower* notion of the words to *Hezekiah*, and reſerving the *ſublimer* and more *excellent* to *Chriſt*. So again chap. 11. 1. *Redit ad Hezechiæ laudes, ſub quibus ſenſu ſublimiore latent laudes Meſſiæ*; and many paſſages there are to the ſame purpoſe: As others alſo of referring to the *Annotations* on the *Goſpels*, wherein he hath ſpoken ſo largely of this *ſublimer completion* of the *Prophecies*, that he would not repeat them in the places of the *Prophets*, to which they belonged. 53.

In the next place he comes to the *compariſon* betwixt *Calvin*'s and *Grotius*'s dealing in this matter, and makes many offers of *anſwer*, to which I am concern'd to make *particular* replies. 54.

Firſt, he denies Mr. *Calvin equally chargeable, or in any degree of proportion with* Grotius. To which I *anſwer*, that whether he be, or be not *truly* chargeable, in *any* degree, I am not concern'd to examine, having not *accuſed* him, but only made the *parallel* betwixt that *learned* man and *Grotius*, in this, that each of them have by ſome been deemed *chargeable*. *Secondly*, The *compariſon* which I made, was not of the *equality*, or indeed of the *degree of proportion*, but expreſt with ſuch *caution*, as ſufficiently prevented that *reply*, my words being theſe, *that it will upon inquiry be found in ſome degree, if not equally chargeable, on the learneſt and moſt valued of the Reformers, particularly on* Mr. Calvin *himſelf*, &c. Here I ſaid, *in ſome degree*, but proceeded not to define the *equality*, or to conſider what *proportion* that *degree* held with that wherein *Grotius* was *chargeable*, not indeed believing that either *Grotius* or *Calvin* had given any reaſons for that *charge*, which I ſee lie *heavy* on *both* of them. 55.

Thirdly, The *compariſon* of *equality*, which I made between theſe two *learned* men, referred only to the *bitterneſs* and *injuſtice* of the *accuſations* and *contumelies* that fell upon them, on that account, in theſe words, [*Calvin himſelf hath been as bitterly and unjuſtly accuſed and reviled on this account, as ever* Eraſmus *was by* Bellarmine *or* Beza, *or as probably* Grotius *can be.*] And there will be no way to *diſprove* my *compariſon* in this, but by heaping far more *unjuſt* reproches on *Grotius*, than yet this *Reviewer* hath done; which if others are reſolved to do, yet ſhall I not thereby be *refutable*, who, as *juſtice* and *charity* obliged me, affirmed it only *not probable* that they would. 56.

In the next place he requires me to *prove of* Mr. Calvin, *that he hath in all his Commentaries on the Scripture, corrupted the ſenſe of any text, giving expreſs teſtimonies to the Deity of Chriſt, and commonly pleaded to that end and purpoſe; although he deny not, but that he differs from the common judgment of moſt, in the interpretation of ſome few prophetical paſſages, judged by them to relate to Chriſt.*] 57.

To this I *anſwer*, *Frſt*, That the *latter* part of this (his *not denying*, &c.) is in effect the *confeſſing* all that I had ſaid of Mr. *Calvin*, which was but this, that he was by *ſome charged of diſarming the Church of her defences againſt adverſaries, by diverting thoſe places of Scripture which had formerly been uſed to aſſert the great myſteries, to other inferior ends*; And then I need undertake no farther tasks of *ſupererrogation*, ſuch as the *proving* Mr. Calvin *to have corrupted the ſenſe of any text*, &c. which he knows I never *affirmed* of him. Yet remembring him that I am not now to ſpeak my *own* ſenſe, but only to juſtify the truth of my *report*, that Mr. *Calvin* and *ſome of the firſt Reformers have been ſeverely accuſed and reviled on this account*, I ſhall now, *Secondly*, (inſtead of * many) refer the *Reader* to *Schluſſeburgius a Lutheran ſuperintendent*, in his *Second Book* De Calviniſt. Theolog. *and* 6. *Article*; or to *Fr. Fevardentius, a Doctor of Paris*, either in his *Comment on S.* Paul to *Philemon*, or in his *Excerpta out of that Lutheran. Not in Iren. Var. Fragm.* p. 508, 509. In the latter of theſe he will find a *Catalogue* of twenty paſſages affixt to thoſe *eminent* firſt *Reformers*, eſpecially to Mr. *Calvin*; as Firſt, *that the enmity betwixt the Serpent and the ſeed of the Woman*, Gen. 3. *is ſimply to be interpreted of the hoſtility of Men and Serpents*; that the *prophecies of the Scepters not departing from* Judah *till* Shiloh *comes*, Gen. 49. *expounded of Chriſt, gives the Jews occaſion to ſcoff*; that the *words of* Balaam, *Numbers* 24. *A ſtar ſhall riſe out of* Jacob, *muſt not properly be expounded of Chriſt*; nor *that of the Lord by* Moſes, *Deut.* 18. 18. *I will raiſe them up a Prophet, which yet S.* Peter *Acts* 3. 22. and *S. Stephen Acts* 7. 37. *affirmed* to belong to *Chriſt*; that *Mich.* 5. 2. *Out of thee Bethlehem ſhall he come forth to me that is to be a ruler in Iſrael*] muſt *not be expounded preciſely and properly* 58.

* *Lutherani pene omnes Arianiſmi eum accuſant* Grot. Append. de Antich. p. 85.

properly of the divinity of Christ. That *Zach.* 9. 9. *Behold thy King cometh, lowly —— is by interpreters triflingly and in a false manner expounded of his entrance into Jerusalem, which yet* Saint Matthew *and* Saint John *have applied to it.* These are a few Essayes whereby to judge of many others. And the less Mr. *Calvin* and the *Reformers* are guilty of these, (as truly in many that I have had the convenience to examine, I cannot but think him guiltless) the more evident is the *parallel betwixt* Grotius *and them in this matter.*

59. *Thirdly*, He affirms that what the *Papists* raved against Mr. *Calvin, was chiefly from some expressions in the Institutions about the Trinity, (wherein he is acquitted by the most learned of themselves) and not from the expositions of Scripture.*] But first the truth of this will be judged by what was *last* said; for all those *twenty passages* are fetcht from the *expositions* of *Calvin*, &c. on those so many *places* of *Scripture*. And secondly, 'tis certain I specified not the *Book*, wherein he had written what was thus *chargeable*, and so had not been *reproveable*, if they had been *all out of the Institutions*, those being as acknowledgedly his, as the *Commentaries*, and both much more than the *Annotations* on the *Epistles* are *Grotius*'s; and thirdly, if *he stand by learned men acquitted of the charge*, then as I said, that may make the *parallel* more *exact* betwixt him and *Grotius*, though I undertake not that every *learned* man hath been thus *just* to acquit him.

60. But then fourthly, for *Calvino-Turcismus* by me mentioned in a *parenthesis*, he tells me, I have *forgotten the design of it, and that* Calvin *is no more concerned in it than others of the first Reformers; nor is it from any doctrine about the Deity of Christ in particular, but from the whole of the Reformed Religion, with the Apostasies of some, that they compare it with Turcism*; adding, that *something indeed in a chapter or two they speak about the Trinity, from some expressions of* Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, *and others.*

61. To all this I *answer*, First, That 'tis visible I speak not of Mr. *Calvin alone*, but of the *learnedst and most valued of the Reformers*, and of Mr. *Calvin* only, as *one* of them. Secondly, That although the *forgetting the design of Reynolds* and *Giffords Book*, would be far from a *crime* in me, had I been *guilty* of it, (the subject matter of it, is not so much *worth remembring*) much less any *indication* that *Grotius* were *insufficiently vindicated*; yet when the *Reviewer confesses*, that *in a chapter or two it speaks about the Trinity, from some expressions of* Luther, Melanchthon, *and* Calvin, and others; this clearly evidences, that these *Reformers* were there thus *accused* in the matter of the *Trinity*, as now it seems *Grotius* is; And thirdly, if *Hunnius's Calvinus Judaizans*, which is *home* to the business, be *answered by* Pareus, *and an account of the calumny given by him*] this still renders the *parallel* more *compleat*. An *account* of the *calumny* and the *first author*, and *grounds* of it against *Grotius*, being happily rendred by himself also in the *Discussio*, p. 17.

62. The *Reviewer* concludes this matter with a signification of his *constant adhering to his proposition* formerly asserted, *with one limitation expressed* (of *his own observation.*) But I that *first* gave the occasion of the *debate* in my *Digression* concerning *Grotius*, did never propose it with reference to that *limitation*, not being able to foresee, how much this *Reviewer* had read, or *observed* of *Grotius*'s writings; nor can I yet pass judgment, whether what hath now been offered to him by another, will be yielded to come within the compass of that *limitation*, or no. And so I must be content to leave it at this time.

63. On the *second sort* of suggestion, the *Reviewer* hath chosen to be *brief*, and hath well prepared for it, by expressing *dislike* and aversation to any such *undertaking*, that seemed incumbent on him, *viz. to prove that* Grotius *was a Papist.*] But to this I *reply*, as before, that this *task* is sure *incumbent* on him, if, as he said, his *defensative* be *suited to what I pleaded in his behalf*. For 'tis certain, that in the *Digression*, I had so proposed the *debate*, and undertaken to *vindicate* him from this *suggestion*, viz. that *he was a Papist.*

64. That he *closed with the Roman interest*, he is now willing to infer, from his *observation* on *Rev.* 12. 5. To that therefore I have turned, and there find no other *premisses* toward this *conclusion* than only these, First, That *Dispersi ex Judæis, instrumenta Ecclesiæ Catholicæ, multos de populo Romano Christo genuêre*, that *those that were dispersed from Judæa --- begot to Christ many of the people of Rome*, and that these are there called *partus masculinus* the *man-child* or *masculine birth*, in respect of the great *constancy* which appeared in the *Church* of *Rome* of *those* times; then secondly, that the *Church of* Rome *hath this above other Churches, that no Church subjected more people to the word of God, so that her victories by the weapons of Christ, were not inferiour to the martial successes of Old* Rome: thirdly, that *the regiment of other Churches after the Apostles death belonged to that.* Now this being clearly applied by him to the *infancy* or *first ages* of the *Church*, that which is *first* said of the *constancy*, is indeed much for the *honour* of the *Primitive Roman Church*, but no way for the *interest* of the *present*, which having much departed from the *Primitive*, cannot in any reason partake of those *Elogies*, which he there bestows on that *masculine birth*, at the *first* appearing of it in the world. So likewise secondly, of the *ancient Roman Church* it is, that he saith, it *converted so many to the faith*, which is a *truth* known, and acknowledged in *History*, but is not at this day assumed (witness *S. W.*) to be the *foundation* on which their *Supremacy is built.* Thirdly, That after the *Apostles death*, *Rome* being a *chief Metropolis*, and (as the *Imperial See*) the *most eminent of all others*, had the *dominion aliarum of other* (it is not *omnium, of all) Churches*, is not denied by any either *ancient*, or *modern*, that I know of. All the *suburbicarian Region*, and the *Churches* in that, were under the *Primate of Rome*, and that *Primate* was within a while lookt on, as the *Patriarch* of the *West*, and the *First Patriarch.* And the words of *Grotius* are not, by any circumstance of the place, inclined to any other sense. The *aliæ Ecclesiæ, other Churches*, being in no reason interpretable any farther, than those, which *Rome* had *converted* to the *faith*, nor necessarily to *all* them, but to the *oppida minora and Provinciæ*, the *lesser Cities and Provinces*, unto which (as he interprets) the *woman* is said to *flie* (and so *Christianity* to be *propagated*) when *Simon Magus* by the favour of the *Emperour* had opposed and much *oppressed* it at *Rome*, and drave the *profession* out of it, by which means those *aliæ Ecclesiæ* were planted. And it may be worthy to be *observed*, that when the *text* before him was *general*, for πάντα τὰ ἔθνη *all the nations*, he is not thereby moved to *interpret* it in that *latitude* of *all* simply, but (in a more *restrained* sence, wherein *all* in *Scripture*-style oft

signifies

ſignifies but a *great* many) only by the *nullæ plures*, and *aliarum*, *others*, *and none more than that.*

65. Here before he concludes, he is pleaſed to look back on a paſſage which he had uſed, [*that if men be drunkards, proud, boaſters*, &c. *hypocrites, haters of good men, perſecutors and revilers of them, yea, and if they be not regenerate and born of God, united to the head Chriſt Jeſus, by the ſame ſpirit that is in him, they ſhall never ſee God*] *for which*, he now ſaith, *he fears not what concluſion can regularly, in reference to any perſon living or dead, be deduced.*] To this I reply by acknowledging the certain truth of the *general Aphoriſm*, and only remembring him, that the *only queſtion* was, whether in a *particular* diſcourſe concerning *Hugo Grotius*, after the mention of his *eternal ſtate*, and *diſclaiming* all deſign of *begetting in others any evil ſurmiſes of it*, or of *judging him* himſelf; firſt it were ſeaſonably added, that *he was fallen to his own maſter*, when *falling* in the ſtyle of that *Scripture* (viſibly referred to) ſignifies *falling under condemnation*; and ſecondly, whether the applying this *general Aphoriſm* to this matter, were not apt to *beget* in others thoſe *evil ſurmiſes*, which he was willing to *diſclaim*: If in theſe he be not concerned, neither am I, and therefore I ſhall not further importune him in that matter.

66. To the *fragments* of *Grotius*'s *Epiſtles* to *Crellius*, I had formerly ſpoken, though they were not (poſſibly) *formerly printed*. But having no more in them than was *acknowledged*, ſomewhat of *civility* to a *civil adverſary*, *commendation* of ſome things truly *commendable* (ſuch ſure is the *care of good life*) acknowledgment of *advantage* received by his *writings*, readineſs of *performing* any *office* of *kindneſs* to him, and finally *praying* for him; All theſe are certainly no more than *due*, as by *Chriſt*'s *precept* to the *injurious*, ſo to a *learned man*, from whom he differed in *opinion*, and may only ſerve to *direct* us to the *Chriſtian* manner of *dealing* with *adverſaries*, that of never labouring their *ruin* or *hurt* in any kind, but doing them all *poſſible good*. And if in this matter the *Reader* will be moved with *probable* arguments; It is not well to be imagined, in caſe *Grotius* had at this time been *changed* from the opinion which he was of, at the writing of the *Book De Satisfact.* that having ſaid what theſe *fragments* ſignifie him to have ſaid, he would have *concealed* that; or that any ſuch paſſage, had it been in the *letter*, would have been left out of the *fragments*, or being in the *fragments*, would have been *ſuppreſt* by the *Reviewer*.

67. What in the ſecond *Epiſtle* is ſaid of *Crellius*'s notes on the *Epiſtle* to the *Galatians*, that *he had very happily found out the occaſion, and purpoſe, and whole contexture of the Epiſtle*, no way concludes his imbracing the *interpretation* of *each* brief *occaſional* paſſage in that *Epiſtle*, wherein the *Socinian controverſies* are concern'd, or renouncing that, which he had given in his *Book De Satisfact.* as his ſenſe of thoſe paſſages.

68. There is no more remaining now before me, which ſeems to exact farther *reply*. Thus much I have once more added, leſt the *Reviewer* may either think his *Animadverſions deſpiſed*, or conceive that they have *ſucceſfully* performed what they attempted; and moreover, leſt having once (though but ὡς παιδιᾷ) undertaken the *Defence* of this *learned* man, I ſhould now by my *ſilence* ſeem to *deſert* my plea, and be deem'd to have *conſented* to, and in a manner *confirm'd* thoſe *calumnies*, which on this ſcore of his *defection* to *hereſie*, I ſee from many Pens daily caſt out upon him.

69. And this, as it is an act of meer *juſtice*, and *charity* to the *dead*, and no leſs to thoſe, who by their ſin of *uncharitable* thoughts towards him, are likely to *deprive* themſelves of the *benefit* of his *labours*; ſo is it but a proportionable return of *debt* and *gratitude* to the ſignal *value* and *kindneſs*, which in his life time he conſtantly profeſt to pay to this *Church* and *nation*; expreſſing his opinion, that of all *Churches* in the world, it was the moſt careful obſerver, and tranſcriber of *Primitive antiquity*, and more than intimating his *deſire* to end his dayes in the *boſom*, and *Communion* of our *Mother*. Of this I want not *ſtore* of *witneſſes*, which from time to time have heard it from his *own* mouth, whileſt he was *Embaſſadour* in *France*, and even in his return to *Sweden*, immediately before his *death*; And for a *real* evidence of this truth, 'tis no *news* to many, that at the taking his journey from *Paris*, he appointed his *Wife*, whom he left behind, to reſort to the *Engliſh Aſſembly*, at the *Agents* Houſe, which accordingly ſhe is known to have *practiſed*. Which therefore may ſerve for a competent *addition* to, and *concluſion* of the *evidences* hitherto produced, (being in *perfect* accord and *harmony* with them) that as far as the *Engliſh eſtabliſhment* is removed from *Socinian*, and *Popiſh*, ſo far this *learned* man ſtands *vindicated* from *both* theſe *aſperſions*; which makes me the leſs *wonder*, that ſome others, who have endeavoured to maintain their *conſtancy* of adherence, and ſubmiſſion to the *Church* of *England*, are in like manner moſt *injuriouſly aſperſed* by thoſe who have *departed* from it; *Lord lay not this ſin to their charge.*

A POSTSCRIPT.

Numb. 1. HAving lately a ſight of a *new* piece publiſhed by the *ſame* Author, one of the firſt things I happened to fall upon, appeared to be mine *own* concernment. For having cited from ſome words of *Hegeſippus*, that *ſoon after the death of the Apoſtles and their Auditors, many falſe doctrines were preached and divulged in the Church*, he hath theſe words.

2. "I know who hath endeavoured to elude the ſenſe of this complaint, as though it "concerned not any thing in the Church, but the deſpiſers and perſecutors of it, the Gnoſticks. "But yet I know alſo, that no man would ſo do, but ſuch a one as hath a juſt confidence of his *own* "*ability*, to make paſſable at leaſt, any thing that he ſhall venture to ſay or utter. For why ſhould "that be referred by *Hegeſippus* to the ages after the Apoſtles and their Hearers were dead, with an "exception againſt its being ſo in their dayes; when if the perſon thus expounding this teſtimony "may be credited, the Gnoſticks were never more buſie nor prevalent than in that time which alone "is excepted from the evil here ſpoken of? Nor can I underſtand how the oppoſition and perſecu- "tion of the Church ſhould be inſinuated to be the *deflouring* and *violating* of its chaſtity, which is "commonly a great *purifying* of it: ſo that ſpeaking of that broaching and preaching of errours, "which was not in the Apoſtles times, nor in the *time of* their hearers, the chiefeſt time of the rage "and madneſs of the Gnoſticks; ſuch as ſpotted the pure and incorrupted virginity of the Church; "which nothing can attain unto, that is foreign unto it, and that which gave Original unto Sedition "in the Church; I am of the mind, and ſo I conceive was *Euſebius* that recited thoſe words, that the "good man intended corruptions in the Church, not out of it, nor oppoſitions to it.

3. What *juſt confidence* any man can have of his *own abilities to make any thing paſſable that he ſhall venture to utter*] unleſs it be founded in a *due* care never to adventure to *utter* any thing, which hath not perfect *truth* in it, I acknowledge my ſelf unable to apprehend. But how unjuſtly I am here charged of any kind of *confidence* of my *own abilities*, and how unſufficiently my *anſwer* in defence of the *ancient Church-writers* is here invalidated, will, I hope, ſoon appear, by a ſhort view, firſt of my *anſwer*, ſecondly of the *words* of the *teſtimony* it ſelf, on which it was clearly grounded, thirdly, of that which is here *objected* againſt the fitneſs of my *anſwer*.

4. For the *firſt*, It muſt be remembred (as the *original* of this debate) what from this *teſtimony* of *Hegeſippus* he had * formerly concluded, *viz.* the *corruption* of the *Church as to doctrine*, *immediately after the Apoſtles fell aſleep*, *whereof*, ſaith he, *whoſoever will impartially ſearch into the writings that of thoſe dayes do remain, will perhaps find more cauſe to complain, than is commonly imagined.*

* Pref. to his Book of Perſever. *p.* 5.

5. To which my *anſwer* was, † "that all that *Hegeſippus* there ſaith, is only this, that the poiſon of "the heretical or Apoſtatical, or Atheiſtical Gnoſticks, in expreſs words, the ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις, "the ſect of the Gnoſticks falſly ſo called, and ἀθεος πλάνη, the Atheiſtical ſeducers, did openly ſet up "againſt the truth of *Chriſt*, as ſoon as ever the Apoſtles were dead, which being by *Hegeſippus* ter- "minated in the known deſpiſers and perſecutors of the true Church, and Orthodox profeſſors, the "grievous Wolves that worried the flock, and thoſe conſtantly reſiſted and combated with, preacht "againſt and written againſt by the Fathers and ancient Writers, and never obſerved by any man to "have gained on them, or infuſed any the leaſt degree of their poyſon into them, or their writings "that are come to us: 'Tis a ſad condition, that the juſt and unjuſt, the falſe teachers and Ortho- "dox profeſſors ſhould fall under the ſame envy, that the ſhepherds which oft laid down their lives "for their ſheep, ſhould be defamed, and again martyred by us their unkind poſterity, under pre- "tence that they were in conſpiracy with the wolves alſo.

† Anſw. to Animadv. *p.* 13.

6. In this *anſwer* it is not poſſible I ſhould be ſubject to any miſtake, if this one matter of *fact* be true, that the *Gnoſticks* and *Atheiſtical ſeducers* were the *very* perſons, of whom alone *Hegeſippus* ſpake, (for that thoſe were the *wolves*, and that the *Church-writers* have conſtantly *refuted* and *deteſted* them, and not ſuckt any of their poyſonous doctrines from them, is ſo evident, that this *author* hath neither formerly nor now ſuggeſted the *contrary.*) And for this in the next place, I appeal to the expreſs words of *Hegeſippus*, there at large ſet down in *Greek*, but here only referred to, and more *briefly* toucht on by this *author*.

7. The words, as far as this matter is concern'd in them, I ſhall recite; They are theſe, *Euſeb. Eccl. Hiſt. l.* III. Κεφ. λβ. Ὡς ὑπὸ ὁ ἱεγὴς Ἀποστόλων χόρος διάφορον ἔιληφε τῦ βίυ τέλος, παρεληλύθη τε ἡ γενεὰ ἐκείνη τῶν αὐταῖς ἀκοαῖς τῆς ἐνθέυ σοφίας ἐπακῦσαι καλῃξιωμένων, τλωικαῦτα τῆς ἀθέυ πλάνης τλῶ ἀρχλω ἐλάμβανεν ἡ σύςασις. διὰ τῆς τῶν ἑτεροδιδασκάλων ἀπάτης, ὅτε μηδενὸς ἔτι τῶν Ἀποστόλων λειπομένυ, γυμνῇ λοιπὸν ἤδη τῇ κεφαλῇ, τῷ τῆς ἀληθείας κηρύγμασι τλῶ ψευδώνυμον γνῶσιν ἀνλικηρύτλειν ἐπεχείρυν. That there may be no place for *doubt* in this matter, I ſhall now give the *Engliſh* Reader a *full* view of them, thus. *But when the ſacred quire of the Apoſtles had ſeverally ended their lives, and the generation of thoſe that had been thought worthy to hear with their own ears the divine wiſdom, was now paſt, then the rout* or *riotous convention of the Godleſs ſeduction* or *ſeducers* (σύςασις ſignifies a *ſeditious aſſembling*, or *military preparation of confederates* or *conſpirators*, and ἡ πλάνη *deceit* or *ſeduction*, may be uſed for the men that *deceive* or *ſeduce*) *received its beginning, by the cunning* or *deceit of falſe teachers, who, now that none of the Apoſtles were left, avowed and openly attempted to preach or* promulgate *the ſcience falſly ſo called, in oppoſition to the preaching of the truth.*

8. What is here meant by the *ſcience falſly ſo called*, no man can be ignorant, that hath compared that

phraſe

phrase used expresly by the *Apostle*, 1 *Tim.* 6. 20. with the *writings* of the *Primitive Fathers*, or but lightly considered the very nature of *plain* words. The word γνωστικοὶ *Gnosticks*, literally signifies *knowing* men, so styled by themselves, but upon no grounds of truth, their *doctrines* being indeed directly opposed to the *knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*, and so, ψευδώνυμ& γνῶσις, *knowledge* or *science falsly so called*. This therefore must be the meaning of the *Apostles* words, ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμε γνώσεως, *the oppositions of the science falsly so called*, i. e. the *doctrines* of the *sect* of the *Gnosticks*, in direct *opposition* to the *doctrine* of the *Apostles*, and consequently the same must the importance of the like *phrase* in *Hegesippus*, in *consent* with the *Apostles dialect*; what the *Apostle* calls *science falsly so called*, *Hegesippus* must be believed to mean by the very same words, the *science falsly so called*, *i. e.* the *Gnosticks*; what the *Apostle* calls ἀντιθέσεις, *oppositions* or *contradictings*, *Hegesippus* expresses by ἀντικηρύττειν, *opposite* or *contrary preaching*; and these phrases are both farther cleared by a passage in the *ancient author* περὶ θείων ὀνόμ. *c.* 6. which tells us of ὁι τῆς παρανοίας τῆς Σίμων& ἀνλιβόλικοὶ λόγοι, *the contradictory discourses of the dotage* or *folly* or *madness of Simon*; by *contradictory discourses* certainly meaning the ἀντιθέσεις and ἀντικήρυγμα, *oppositions* and *antipreaching*, and by the *dotage* or *madness* of *Simon Magus*, the *knowledge* that he pretended to, and his *followers*, and which so *puft* them up in a *mad* conceit of it, but was indeed nothing else but *blasphemous folly*, far removed from all *degree* of *true science*.

From this short representation of this plain matter of *fact*, thus *visible* before our eyes, I shall now 9.
suppose it clear, that it was not *confidence* of my *abilities*, but a well grounded *perswasion*, that he that cited these words in *Greek*, understood the *plain* meaning of them, upon which I built my *hope*, that my answer to this passage of *Hegesippus* would approve it self to him. For if the *Gnosticks* and none else were the men spoken of by *Hegesippus*, then was there no place for *exception* against my *answer*; and if *Hegesippus*'s expres words might be believed, thus it was. And thus stands this matter betwixt me and my *Reprover* at this time; I have laid it before him, let himself now, if he please, be *party*, *witness*, and *judge*; I cannot think it possible I should need *other*.

But then in the *third* place, he hath an *objection* against this sense, which at least may have force 10.
against *me*; *For*, saith he, *if the person thus expounding this testimony* (i. e. I) *may be credited, the Gnosticks were never more busie nor prevalent than in that time, which alone is excepted from the evil here spoken of*.

To this I answer, first, that in case I had at several times spoken things *incoherent* or *contradictory*, 11.
this would be no *sufficient* proof, that what I now *recited* from *Hegesippus*'s plain words, was not contained in them. But then secondly, I have been far enough from having thus (any where) contradicted my self, or what I *affirm* in this *answer* of mine, nor (if I may be allowed the confidence to believe that I *know* and *speak* my own sense) did I ever let fall any thing which will not be exactly reconciled with it. The short is this. The Ringleaders of the *Gnosticks* were very busie in the *Apostles* times, but did at first more *clancularly operate*; from whence in my opinion (of which here it seems I must give an account) they are in the *Apostle* expres by μυστήριον ἀνομίας, *the mystery of iniquity*, *iniquity*, but that somewhat *disguised*, till at last in the *season* most for their turn, some of them put off their *disguises*; *Simon Magus* in the *Apostles* times; and though he *miscarried*, yet many of his followers afterwards, in a more *avowed* and *profest hostility* (the σύστασις in *Hegesippus*) when they had the *advantage* of all those being dead, who had received the *truth* from *Christ* himself: This is the sum of what I have elsewhere *frequently*, and more *largely* delivered, and this is exactly the sense of *Hegesippus* in that place, as will yet more clearly appear by the addition of some other words, not yet recited, and (I know not why) *omitted* by this *author* in his first producing of them, when yet both the *antecedents* and *consequents* were set down by him. They are these, ἐν ἀδήλῳ πῶ σκότει φωλευόντων τότε ἆρ', εἰ ἦ τίνες ὑπῆρχον, παραθείρειν ὅπως ἐπεχείρουν ἢ ὑγιῆ κανόνα τῆ σωτηρίε κηρύγματ&. Till those times he there speaks of, those *hereticks*, *though some there were, that endeavoured to corrupt the wholesome rule of saving doctrine*, *skulked in darkness undiscernable*, but *afterwards* (when the *season* better agreed with their *design*) they did it γυμνῆ κεφαλῆ *with bare head*, or *face*, putting off *disguise* or *care* of *secresie*; with this indeed it would not easily be reconcileable to say, that *the Gnosticks were never more busie nor prevalent*, *than in the Apostles times*; And this he is pleased to set down as *my saying*; but hath not intimated the *place*, where I said it (as easily he might have done, and I suppose would not have neglected to do, if he had known where.) For my part I *remember* not, neither *believe* any such words ever to have past from me; If he shall produce any that have the least *sound* that way, I shall not doubt to give him an *account* of them, such as shall sufficiently *supersede* the *conclusion*, which now he is willing to draw from them.

Mean-while I shall yet farther give thus much *over measure* of reply to his objection, that in case 12.
Hegesippus had not expresly named the *Gnosticks*, which yet expresly he names, and therefore *must* mean them if he *knew* and *considered* what he said, yet the ἄθε& πλάνη, the *Atheistical seduction* or *seducers*, and the σύστασις, the *riotous convention* or *confederation* of these, must needs signifie some *known sect* of *hereticks* in that age of the *Church*, be they *Cerinthians*, *Ebionites*, *Nicolaitans*, *Menandrians*, *Basilidians*, *Saturnilians*, or after them *Valentinians*, *Marcionites*, or who ever else can be supposed; And then, as it is certain, that all, or most of these, met and agreed in this common notion of the *Gnosticks*, so from the *poyson* and *taint* of all and *each* of them, 'tis still equally clear, that the *Church* of *God*, and the known *Governours* and *shepherds* thereof, by *Gods grace* and *blessing* preserved themselves, and expres their *constant opposition* and *detestation* of *them*, and *mark* them out to be *avoided* of *all Christians*; and so cannot be imagined to have been *corrupted* by them (but on the contrary, whosoever was discerned to be so *corrupted*, was *cast* out of the *Church*) and by their *contrary* doctrine, illustriously known in their *writings* against these *heresies*, long after the *Apostles* times, (*Irenæus* against the *Valentinians*, &c. *Tertullian*, &c. against the *Gnosticks*) have demonstrated themselves to have continued *stedfast* and *immaculate*, and not to have been in the least *corrupted*: And then what can be farther removed from *truth*, than this whole *suggestion* from *Hegesippus*, of the *infection* being diffused in the *Church*?

But he further objects, That the *opposing and persecuting of the Church, which is a great purifying of* 13.

it, cannot be insinuated to be the deflouring and violating of its chastity: To this I answer, 1. that if there were the least force in this *objection*, it would yet be unsufficient to disprove my *answer*; It might possibly infer the impropriety of *Hegesippus*'s expression, whereof I undertook not to be the *advocate*, but cannot conclude him not to have meant those to be the *corrupters*, whom he expresly *names* to be so. 2. That in respect of those *weak* or *deceiveable* members of the *Church*, that received the *heretical poyson*, (and then fell off from it, or were by just *censures* cast out of it) 'tis not improper to say, that the *Church* which once *contained* them, was *deflowred* and *violated*; though on the other side, in respect of the *constant fidelity* of others, who were not moved by all their *opposition*, the *Church* was still rather *purified* than *deflowred*, as *gold* by *trial* in the *fire* comes out more *pure*, whilest yet the *dross* is *discovered* by the same means, and declared to have no *purity* in it. The truth is, many *visible* and *temporary professors* were *infected* and *defiled* by the *Gnostick infusions*, as in all times of trial, befals those that forsake the *Faith*, rather than they will *endure persecution*; And that is the plain meaning of *Hegesippus*'s words, and hath nothing new or strange in it.

14. One thing by the way I shall farther observe, that in this *citation* he hath made some *change* in the words, from what *before* he had represented; to the *Apostles times*, adding, the *time of the Apostles hearers*, and not only the *Apostles* themselves, as if *Hegesippus* included that *second generation* in the space of the *virgin uncorrupted* age, after whose decease (and not till then) the *corruptions* by him spoken of, came in: But that I suppose will be found to be a *mistake* also.

15. In his former citing of the passage (in his *Preface* of *Animadversions*) he understood *Hegesippus* of the *corruption immediately after the Apostles fell asleep*. And indeed this is all that the words assure us [*when the quire of the Apostles*, saith he, *were dead, and the age past of those that were deemed worthy to hear with their own ears*, τῆς ἀνθέου σοφίας, *the divine wisdom*, or *the wisdom that had divinity in it* —] where, that *ages* being *past*, [and the *Apostles* being *dead*] sure signifies the same thing; and ἡ ἀνθεος σοφία, *the divine wisdom*] very fitly signifies *Christ* himself, the *wisdom* of the *Father*, and no way appears to be extended to the *Apostles* also; and then they that were the *hearers* of that *wisdom*, will be the men of the *Apostles age*, specially the *Apostles* themselves, and not the *subsequent generation*. And that indeed thus it was, appears by the *context* in *Hegesippus*, which evidenceth him to speak of *Trajans* times, wherein *Simeon Bishop* of *Jerusalem*, one of the ἀνεψιοὶ and ἀκηκοοι τῦ κυρίε, *seers and hearers of the Lord*, being *falsly accused* by *hereticks*, (συκοφαντηθεὶς ὡς ἐπὶ αἰρέσεων) was put to *death*. Now this we know, was but the conclusion of the *Apostles* age; (*John*, who was one of them, living till that time) and not of the *auditors* of the *Apostles*. But should it be granted according to his *desire*, that 'twas of the *latter* age that *Hegesippus* spake, it would, as hath appeared, stand him in *little* stead; and therefore I shall not spring *new* occasion of contention with him on *this* matter; Had not the honour of the *Universal Church* of *Christ* succeeding the *Apostles* (so nearly concern'd in this his *reinforced* objection) seemed to exact this just *tribute* from me, I had not *here* given him this *importunity*.

16. Whereon seeing I am thus far *entred*, It will not be amiss to pay him at once what he may expect of *return* to some *other* passages of this his last *piece*, wherein he is pleased to reflect on me.

17. And 1. occurs towards the beginning of it, *pag.* 33. a discourse of παροικὸς, παροικεῖν, &c. which he endeavours to apply to the *prejudice* of my *evidences* for the *Epistles* of *Clement*, and of S. *Paul* to the *Corinthians*, being written to *all* the *Churches* of *Achaia*: In return to this I shall note but these four things of very many that offer themselves.

18. *First*, That there is a *double* notion of παροικεῖν, &c. one wherein it is opposed to ἐνοικεῖν, (and is
* *De verb. sig.* all one with μετοικεῖν, or παρεπιδημεῖν, being *strangers* or *sojourners*) in which notion * *Pomponius* takes it, when by it he expounds the *Latin incola*, as that is all one with *inquilinus* a *stranger* in any place, *qui aliquâ*, or rather, *aliâ regione* (ἀλλαχῦ saith *Theophilus*) *domicilium suum contulit*. Of *this notion* of the word I spake not, nor could be imagined to speak, nor (whatever he thinks) is or can *parochia* or *parœcia* be taken in *this sense* in any *author*. *Another* notion there is of παροικὸς for *accola* a *neighbour*, as in *Thucyd. l.* 4. Σπαρτιάται καὶ οἱ ἐγγύτατα τῶν παροίκων, *the Spartans, and the neareſt of the neighbouring Cities*, (some of those παροικοὶ, *neighbours*, it seems, *nearer* than *others*) and so *Pomponius* also, *non tantùm qui in oppido moratur, sed qui alicujus oppidi finibus agrum habet*, a *borderer that lives and holds lands within the bounds*, i. e. in the *territories* of *any City*, whether *nearer* or *farther off*, or whether that *territory* be *wider* or *narrower*; *wider* as the *territory* of a *Metropolis*, *narrower* as of an *ordinary city*, or yet *lower*, as of a *town* or *village*; And *which* of these it is in any *author*, is not conclusible from the *nature* or *use* of the *word*, which *equally* belongs to *all* these, but from the *quality* of the place, to which in any *author* it is applied; If the discourse be of a *Metropolis*, then the *territory*, and so the παροικία is the *whole Province* or ἐπαρχία, as when *Mark* is said by *Eusebius* to have *constituted Churches* in the *plural* at *Alexandria*, the *chief Metropolis* of *Egypt*, these are by
‖ *Eccl. hist. l.* 11. Κεφ. κδ'. ‖ him all contained under the *phrase* ἡ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ παροικία, as by *Mark* committed to *Anianus*. And so the *Churches* that belong to the *chief Metropolis* of *Crete*, *Gortyna*, are by *Dionysius Bishop* of *Corinth*, called ἐκκλησία παροικοῦσα Γορτύναν, *the Church adjacent to*, i. e. the *Province* of *Gortyna*; If speech be of an *ordinary City*, then the *territory* of that, and so the παροικία, is that which we now call a *Diocess* (though διοίκησις *anciently* signified *otherwise*) *Territorium est universitas agrorum intra fines*
† *Ibid.* *cujusque civitatis*, saith † *Pomponius*, and is rendred by *Theophilus* Τερριτωρεῖον, πάντες οἱ ὑπὸ τὴν πόλιν ἄγροι, *all the region which is under a City*; And so farther downward to *Towns* and *Villages* also, as they are called παροικίαι, *parœciæ*, *Parishes*, the *whole territory* or *bordering neighbourhood* is comprehended under it. And so in summ, *Corinth*, otherwise appearing to be the *Metropolis* of all *Achaia* (as *Achaia* was one of the * *five* μοῖραι of *Peloponnesus*) and this both in the *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical Notitiæ*; in the *Civil*, as is evident by the *Proconsuls keeping* his *residence* there, *Acts* 18. 12. 15. (*Corinth* being before this time ‖ destroyed by *Mummius*, re-edified by *Julius Cæsar*, and now a † *Roman Colony*, and having a * *Province* belonging to it, called Κορινθία χώρα, the *Corinthian region*) and in the *Ecclesiastical*, as appeared both by the *general* σύγχυσις or *conformity* between the *City* and the *Church*, not only in *after* ages, but from the *first*, cited from a most *ancient* learned *Church-writer*, *Origen c. Cels. l.* 3. and more *particularly* as to *Corinth*, by the expres words of ‖ S. *Chrysostom*. All this, I say, otherwise largely

* *Pausan.* ἐλιακ. α.
‖ *Pausan.* κορινθ. *p.* 44. *l.* 19.
† *Mela. l.* 11. *c.* 3.
* *Pausan.* κορινθ. *p.* 44.
‖ *To.* 3. *p.* 343.

appearing,

appearing, and not deduced from the *bare style* [παροικοῦσα Κορινθον] this *Church* thus styled by *Clements*, and compared with *Pauls second Epistle*, which expresly comprehends the *Saints of all Achaia*, and yet (as is granted on all sides) no greater an *extent*, than what *Clemens* wrote to, is by me *regularly* affirmed to be that *whole Province* of *several Churches*, (for which 'twas not yet that ἐπαρχία grew to be the *Ecclesiastical* word) and not that *single Church* of *Corinth*, but all under that *Metropolis*.

Secondly, That it is most *unreasonable* to affirm that either 2 *Cor.* 9. 2. or any where else, *Achaia* and *Corinth* are all one, for that is all one as to say *France* and *Paris*, a *Region* or *Nation*, and a *City* in that *Region*, are *all one*. 'Tis true the *Church*, to which the *Epistles* of *Paul* were written comprehends under it all the *Christians* of *Achaia*; but then, my pretensions must have place, that those *Epistles* were written to all the *Churches* of *Achaia*, united in *Corinth*, the *Metropolis*; not that *Achaia*, which had *many* Cities in it, was *all one* with *Corinth*, that but *one*, though *Metropolitical City*. 19.

Thirdly, That, of the *Churches* of *Achaia*, beside *Corinth*, that of *Cenchrea* is *expresly* named, and though no other chances to be thus *explicitely* mentioned in *Scripture*, which was not obliged to write the full *Chorography* of the *Apostles plantations*, yet this *negative argument* gives us no reason to *doubt*, but there were more *Cities* in *Achaia* than these *two* (all *Geographers* assure us of many) and those in some *proportion* converted to the *faith*, and formed into *Churches*, in S. *Pauls* time, and before *Clements writing* to them. However, that one of *Cenchrea* concludes as much, as I want; *Cenchrea* being *another City Church*, different from *Corinth*, and παροικοῦσα *neighbouring* to it, part of its *territory*, and under it as a *daughter* under a *Metropolis*. 20.

Fourthly, That *Chrysostom*, that speaks of *Corinth* as a *Metropolitical Church*, speaks of it, not (as this *Author pretends*) *only in the political*, but *Ecclesiastical notion*, and not only as in *his own*, but as it *was in the Apostles time*: Else he could not say of S. *Paul*, as he doth, τῇ μητροπόλει γεγραφὼν *that he wrote to a Metropolis*; 'Twas certainly to the *Church* that S. *Paul wrote*, not the *City*; and 2. to that *Church*, in S. *Pauls age*. The testimony is as clear as the *Sun*, that * S. *Chrysostom* speaks of *Corinth*, *Thessalonica*, and the *Ephesians*, and *Galatians* to whom the *Apostolical Epistles* are directed, as *so many Metropolitcal Churches*, to each of which S. *Paul* wrote, and thereby in every of those *Epistles* wrote not μιᾷ πόλει, *to one City only*, (he adds, or *to two, or to three*) but τοῖς πανταχοῦ, *to all every where*, *in each* of those *regions*, relating to those *Metropolitical Churches*, to all the *Churches* of *Galatia*, or *Achaia*, &c. 21. * *Tom.* 3. *p.* 343.

And so much for that affair, on which five leaves were *providently* laid out at the *beginning* of his *journey*, to secure some *principles* which were after to be *improved* by him, which yet he cannot but know, are superseded by *many* other evidences of *Metropolitical Churches* planted in the *Apostles* times, at *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Ephesus*, *Thessalonica*, *Philippi*, *Alexandria*, and *Rome*, &c. every of which requiring his *answer*, as much as παροικοῦσα κορινθον. 22.

P. 87. He *minds me* of his *acknowledging* the *Catholick Church*, both the *invisible body of Christ*, his *elect*, &c. and the *Universality* of *visible professors*, and consequently, of the *injury* formerly done him, in *comparing* his expression [*that there was never any Church-Officer instituted in those first times relating to more Churches in his Office, or to any other Church than a single particular congregation*] with the *author* of the *Saints belief*, which instead of the *Holy Catholick Church* in the *Apostles Symbols*, substituted *this* very *hypothesis*; as if I either really *believed*, or was *willing* to *perswade others*, that he *denied* the *Catholick Church*. 23.

To this I *answer*, *first*, that I neither entred into his *secrets*, nor indeavoured to *infuse* any *jealousies* into others concerning his *latent undiscovered* thoughts, but only considered those words then *before* me, not being at that *distance* able to *divine* how far he meant to *acknowledge* the *Catholick Church* in a *tract* written *two* years after. 24.

Secondly, That his acknowledging now *two notions* of the *Catholick Church*, one of *all the elect*, the other of *all that are called*, doth not so certainly *difference* his *doctrine* from that of the *author* of the *Saints belief*; there being no reason to *doubt*, but that he that *compiled* that, did at that time acknowledge the *Catholick Church* in those *two* notions. The thing that he meant to deny, and *renounce*, *implicitely* by leaving out the mention of the *Catholick Church*, and *explicitely* by what he *substituted* in stead of it, was (I *supposed*) the *several degrees* of *associations*, each known among men by the name of a *Church*, 1. That of the *whole Christian world*, the *Universal Church*, either as it is by some pretended to be *Monarchically*, or by others *Aristocratically* governed. 2. That of each *National Church* under the *Primate* thereof. 3. That of each *Provincial Church* under the *Metropolitan*. 4. That of every *Diocesan Church* under the *Bishop*; and *lastly*, of every *Parochial Church* under the *Rector* thereof. And all these seem as avowedly to be denied by this *author* to have been instituted in *those* (*i. e.* in *Ignatius*'s) *times*, as by the *compiler* of the *Saints Belief* they were; And some of these being, to my understanding, thus *anciently instituted*, and expres mention made in *Ignatius*, not only of the πλῆθος or *multitude*, under a *particular Bishop*, which is *one* of these, but farther, of the *Church of Syria*, *i.e.* of that *whole region*, and the *Church of Syria which is at Antioch*, all joyned under *Antioch*, the *Metropolitical Church*, and the *Catholick Church*, wider than *either* of these, and comprehensive of *both*; this I deemed fit to be confronted to his *hypothesis* (and the *parallel* in the *Saints Belief*) of the *no other Church*, than a *single particular congregation*, which I supposed *narrower* than any *one* of these. And this is a *brief*, and I hope, *inoffensive*, *account* of that particular. 25.

Pag. 232. An *exception* is made to my *instance* in the *Bishop* of *Oxon*, and that from a supposed *exemption* of this *author*, at *the time* of his writing, from the *jurisdiction* of that *Bishop*. But 1. I proceeded not to the *naming* or *specifying* the *author* at all, when I spake of the *Bishop* of *Oxon*; much less, considered the *quality*, which was peculiar to him, from *other* men, or the *exemption* consequent to that *quality*, which whatever it can be pretended, is but *temporary*, and *personal*, and so not proper for any *special* consideration. 2. I *answer*, The *Bishop* of *Oxon* hath a *Diocess*, or else no man that *lives* in that, could by any *priviledge* of his *place*, be *exempt* from it. And then what I said of the *duty* owing to that *Bishop* (somewhat more than *styling* him a *reverend* and 26.

learned

learned perſon, and being *glad of his neighbourhood* and *acquaintance*; πείθεσθε ἡγουμένοις ſignifies *more* than that) regularly belongs to all ſuch as are in his *Dioceſs*, and are not *exempt* from his *juriſdiction*; and whatever he pleaſe to *imagin*, I never meant to *extend* it to any *other*.

27. *Pag.* 122. I find a *diſlike* of my *way* (he ſhould not have ſaid of *juſtifying our ſeparation from Rome*, but) of *defending* our *Church* from the *guilt* of *ſchiſm*, charged on us by the *Romaniſts*. But this is no *news* to me; he had once before *ſignified* thus much, and I was not then *ſurpriſed* with it; and ſhall only aſſure him, that now I have ſeen his *new way*, I am no whit leſs pleaſed with the *old*, than before I had the *confidence* to be.

28. The *laſt* that I took notice of to be my *concernment*, was *pag.* 229. where perhaps I may be the perſon, accuſed to have charged the *doctrines* (there named, as a *conſiderable portion of the doctrine of our Church*) of *everting fundamentals*. If it be ſo, I have then *two* things to ſay in this *haſte*, and no more; 1. that the *doctrines*, which I charge in the *tract* of *Fundamentals*, I charge not of *everting* of *Fundamentals*, but (as may be ſeen in the *title* and *contents* of the 12. *chapter*) of *aptneſs* to *obſtruct* and *hinder the ſuperſtructing of good life upon Chriſtian belief*. Of which, whether the *doctrines* by me ſpecified be *grilty* or no, I appeal to thoſe *indifferent Readers*, that ſhall *impartially* view what is there ſaid; and ſhall be content to be *concluded* by *that*, though not by *this Umpirage*.

29. *Secondly*, That no one of the *doctrins* thus accuſed by me, are the *doctrins* of the *Church* of *England*, as there are (as far as I ever heard it *doubted*) is *cleared* by me; whereas on the *contrary*, ſome of them, that particularly of *Chriſts redeeming none but the elect*, are as expreſly *renounced* by our *Church*, as any branch of *Atheiſm* or *Polytheiſm* is diſclaimed by the *Creed* of the *Apoſtles*.

30. And now I may be permitted to take my *leave* of him at this time.

THE

THE BAPTIZING OF INFANTS REVIEWED and DEFENDED FROM THE Exceptions of Mr TOMBES,

In his three last CHAPTERS of his *BOOK* Intituled,

ANTIPÆDOBAPTISM.

THE INTRODUCTION.

HAving, by Gods help, past through many *stadia* in these *agones*, and therein paid some degree of *obedience* to the precept of *Christ*, *Mat.* 5. 41. and withal to St. *Peters* directions of rendring an *account* of the *Faith which is in us*, παντὶ ἀπολογίαν even to him that most *unnecessarily requires* it; There is yet remaining one matter of discourse, wherein some seeming *ingagement* lyes upon me, occasioned by the *Resolution* of the fourth *Quære*, conerning *Infant Baptism*; For to this Mr. *Jo. Tombes* hath offered some *answers* in the *three last Chapters* of his *Book* Intituled *Antipædobaptism.* *Numb.* 1.

What I have thought meet to return to these, might, I supposed, have been not unfitly *annexed* by way of *appendage* to that of *Festivals*; the treatises of *Festivals* and *Infant Baptism* being so nearly conjoined in the first *draught* or *monogramme*, that the defence of them (which may in some degree pass for the ζωγραφίαι) ought in congruity to be contrived into the *same* table also. But the length of this *Answer* hath disswaded that, and the desire that the *Reader* may have no tasks *imposed* on him but by his own *choice*, hath advised the *publishing* this by it self, with some hope that this may conclude his *trouble*, and that this *new* year may not bring me so many occasions of such *contests*, as the last hath done. 2.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

Of Baptiſm among the Jews.

SECT. I.

Probations more and leſs perfect. The uſe of Circumciſion to this queſtion of Pædobaptiſm. As alſo of Chriſt's reception of children. Childrens coming and believing, Mat. 18. *Children ſinners.*

Numb. 1. THE *foundation* of Mr. *Tombes*'s *returns* to me, he is pleaſed to lay in ſome words, which he hath recited out of §. 23. of my *Reſolution* of the fourth *Quære*, where I ſay, that *there is no need of laying much weight on this, or any the like more imperfect wayes of probation, the whole fabrick being ſufficiently ſupported and built on this baſis (the cuſtomary baptiſms among the Jews) and that diſcernible to be ſo, if we conſider it firſt negatively, then poſitively.*

2. To this he begins his *Reply* with theſe words, I *like the Doctors ingenuity in his waving the imperfect wayes of proving Infant Baptiſm*, viz. *the example of circumciſion*, Gen. 17. *of baptizing a whole houſhold*, Act. 16. 33. *Chriſts reception of little children*, Mat. 19. 14. Mar. 10. 16. *and doubt not to ſhew his own to be no better than thoſe he relinquiſheth.*

3. To this *introduction* of his I ſhall make ſome *Reply*, in a general reflexion on the Treatiſe which he undertakes to *anſwer*, and begin with diſclaiming his *good words* and *approbation* of my *ingenuity*, aſſuring him that he is wholly miſtaken in theſe his *firſt* lines, and that I do in no wiſe *relinquiſh* thoſe ways of *probation* by him taken notice of, nor ſhall ſo far *deſpiſe* the *authority* and *aids* of the *ancient Church writers*, who have made uſe of them, as wholly to *neglect* the *force* and *virtue* of them. And I thought it had been to him viſible, that I have made my advantage of every one of them, §. 20, 21, 22. though I do verily think the *foundation* of this practice is more fitly laid in that other of *Jewiſh Baptiſm*, which belonged to all, both *Jews*, and *proſelytes Children*, *females* as well as *males*, whereas *circumciſion* belonging to *males* only, was in that and ſome other reſpects a *leſs perfect baſis* of it.

4. Meanwhile, for the clearing of this whole matter, it muſt be remembred that *probations* are of *two* ſorts, either *leſs* or *more perfect*; thoſe I call *leſs perfect*, which though they have full *force* in them, as far as they are uſed, yet are not of ſo large an *extent* as to conclude the *whole* matter in debate, which others that are *more perfect* may be able to do.

5. I ſhall apply this to the matter before us. The *inſtituting* of the *Sacrament* of *circumciſion* among the *Jews*, and the expreſs *command* of *God* that the *children* of *eight dayes old* ſhould by this *rite* be received into *Covenant*, is an irrefragable evidence that thoſe may be capable of receiving a *Sacrament*, who have not attained to *years* of *underſtanding* the *nature* of it, that *children* may be received into *Covenant* with *God* though they are not *perſonally* able to *undertake* or perform the *condition* of it; and then that argument will ſo far be applicable to *Pædobaptiſm*, as to evidence the *lawfulneſs* and *fitneſs* of it among *Chriſtians*, by this analogy with *God's inſtitution* among the *Jews*, and ſo certainly invalidate all the *arguments* of the *Antipædobaptiſt* (*i. e.* of Mr. *Tombes*) drawn from the *incapacity* of *Infants*, from the pretended *neceſſity* that *preaching* ſhould go before *baptizing*, from the *qualifications* required of thoſe that are *baptized*, &c. For all theſe *objections* lying and being equally in force againſt *circumciſing* of *Infants*, it is yet evident to be the *appointment* of *God* that every *Infant* of eight *dayes old* ſhould be *circumciſed*, *Gen.* 17. 12. and the *threatning* of *God* denounced againſt them as *tranſgreſſors*, in caſe it be *neglected*, *The uncircumciſed manchild ſhall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my covenant*, v. 14. And this the rather, becauſe the *Apoſtle* compares *baptiſm* of *Chriſtians* with *circumciſion*, Col. 2. 11, 12. *In whom ye are circumciſed* —— *buried with Chriſt in baptiſm*, Iſidor Peluſiote, l. 1. Ep. 125. ἀντὶ βαπτίσματος τῆ περιτομῆ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐκέχρηντο, *the Jews uſed circumciſion inſtead of baptiſm*, whereupon S. *Epiphanius* ſtyles *Baptiſm* μεγάλῃ περιτομῇ the *great circumciſion*, and S. *Auguſtine* to them that require a *divine authority*, whereby to prove the *baptiſm* of *Infants*, renders this of the * *Jewiſh circumciſion, ex quâ veraciter conjiciatur quid valeret in parvulis Sacramentum Baptiſmi, whereby true judgment may be made what force the Sacrament of Baptiſm may have in Infants.* And in like manner *Iſidore* l. 1. *Ep.* 125. where, upon conſideration of the *Angel* coming to kill *Moſes* becauſe of the *childs* not being *circumciſed*, he concludes, σπουδαίως τὰ παιδία βαπτίσωμεν, *Let us make haſte to baptize our children.*

* *De Bapt. contr. Donat. l. 4. c. 23.*

6. Yet becauſe what is thus *evidenced* to be *lawful*, and *agreeable* to *divine appointment* in the *old Teſtament*, is not thereby preſently proved *neceſſary* under the *New* (*Chriſt* might otherwiſe have *ordained*, if he had pleaſed; and from his *ordinance* only, as that was underſtood by his *Apoſtles* and by them *delivered* to the *Church*, the *neceſſity* of our *obedience*, and ſo of *Baptizing Infants*, is compleatly deduced) therefore it is, that I mentioned this, as a more *imperfect* way of *probation*, in reſpect of the *intire concluſion*, which I undertook to make, *viz.* not only the *lawfulneſs*, but the *duty* and *obligation*, that lies upon us to bring our *Infants* to *Baptiſm*; which by the way, was much more than was *neceſſary* (the ſhewing the *lawfulneſs*, being *ſufficient*, and the *example* of *circumciſion* being *competent*) for the diſproving the *pretenſions* of the *Antipædobaptiſt*, and ſo, *ex abundanti*, an act of *Supererogatory* probation, in relation to Mr. *T.*

7. The ſame is appliable in ſome degree to the other ways of *probation*, which he ſuppoſeth to be *relinquiſht* by me, eſpecially to that of *Chriſt's behaviour* to *little children*, commanding to *ſuffer* them to *come unto him* (who yet were no otherwiſe able to *come* than as they were *brought*, and as now they come to the *font* for *baptiſm*) and *embracing* and *laying on his hands and bleſſing them*: But this is competently ſet down, and the *force* of it, how far 'tis argumentative, §. 22.

8. Only I now add, that that other place of *Mat.* 18. 6. where *Jeſus* ſpeaking of *little children*, uſeth theſe

theſe words, *who ſo offendeth one of theſe little ones that believe in me, it were good for him that a Mil-ſtone*, &c. may tend much to give us the full importance and ſignification both of their *coming* to *Chriſt*, and of his commanding not to *forbid* them (ſuch as will nearly concern every *Antipædobaptiſt* to take notice of.) For as in other places of the *New Teſtament*, the *coming unto God* and *Chriſt*, is *believing* on him, ſeeking to receive *benefit* from him (as, *He that cometh to me ſhall never hunger*, and *Come unto me all ye that are weary*, and *If any man thirſt let him come unto me and drink*) ſo, it ſeems, by this place, that that coming of the βρέφη *little Infants* (for ſo they are called in the *Parallel* place, *Luk.* 9. 47.) which they were capable of, by the help of their *parents* or *friends*, is ſtyled by *Chriſt* the childrens *believing*, and ſo far imputed to them, as that upon that *account* the *ſentence* is very ſevere upon thoſe that ſhall *ſcandalize* them, *repulſe* or *diſcourage*, or any way *hinder* them in this their *progreſs* to *Chriſt*, though it be but in the arms of *other* men.

How fitly this is applicable to the ſtate of *Infants*, in reſpect of the guilt of *original* ſin, under which they are *born*, and for the *remiſſion* of which (and not onely for the entring into the *Kingdom* of *Heaven*) the *Fathers* defined againſt the *Pelagians*, that *baptiſm* was *neceſſary* for them, I ſhall not need here to inlarge, having formerly ſpoken to that head. Onely it may not be amiſs here to *advert*, that it was as *reaſonable* for the *children* to be called πιστοὶ *believers*, who yet had no *faith* of their *own*, but onely of their *parents*, &c. to bring them to *Chriſt*, as for the ſame *children* to be *accounted ſinners* (as undoubtedly they are) which yet never committed any *act* of *ſin*, which made S. *Auguſtine De verb. Apoſt. Serm.* 14. ſay, *Abſit ut ego dicam non credentes infantes, God forbid that I ſhould ſay that Infants are not believers, Credit in altero, qui peccavit in altero, He believes by another who ſinned by another, dicitur, Credit, & valet, & inter fideles baptizatos computatur, the Suſceptors ſay he believes, and ſo he is reputed among the baptized believers.* And this *reputative faith* the more reaſonably accepted by the *Church*, it being moreover evident by the *baptiſm* of *Simon Magus*, and of all *hypocrites*, that 'tis the *profeſſion* of *faith*, and not the *poſſeſſion* of it, which is required as the *qualification* which authorizes the Church to *admit* them to *baptiſm*; and that being performed by the *Infants proxies* in his *name*, the *Church* after the forementioned *example* of *Chriſt*, may very lawfully *accept* it of thoſe, who can perform no other, in *lieu* of a *perſonal* profeſſion. 9.

Meanwhile this paſſage of *Chriſt* concerning *children*, though it be a certain *evidence* again againſt the *Antipædobaptiſt*, as hath been ſhewed, and I need no more than this one proof, if I were deſtitute of all others, to refute his *pretenſions*; yet becauſe it contains no relation of *Chriſts*, or his *Apoſtles baptizing infants*, therefore I put it in the rank of the *more imperfect probations* (in compariſon with that other way of *probation*, which I conceive, *deduceth* and concludeth the *whole* matter more *intirely*) though, as 'tis evident §. 22. this was neither *waved* nor *relinquiſht* by me. 10.

To this if I ſhall now add, that it was my deſign in that *reſolution* of the *Quære* to inſiſt more largely on that way of *probation*, which I diſcerned to be leſs *conſidered* or inſiſted on by *others*, and yet to have *perfect evidence* in it, if it were duly explained and improved as it was *capable*; and on the ſame account, thought I might ſpare to *multiply* words, where others had often *inlarged*, and therefore ſaid but little of thoſe *common arguments* or heads of *probation*, and yet ſufficient to *teſtifie* my neither *waving* nor *relinquiſhing* them. It will then abundantly appear, how little I deſerved Mr. *T.* his *good words*, and how juſtly I renounce that title to *ingenuity* which he beſtows upon me, being better pleaſed with his animadverſions on my *dotages*, as he after phraſeth it, than theſe his δῶρα δῶρα, his *liberalities* to me by which he deſigned *advantage* to himſelf. 11.

SECT. II.

The neceſſity of Pædobaptiſm depending on the poſitive part of the probation. The ſeveral ſorts of Anabaptiſts. Teſtimonies the only proof of Inſtitutions.

BEfore I proceed I muſt deſire the Reader to conſider *two* things, Firſt, That the *Jewiſh baptiſm* is not by me ſet up as the competent *proof*, but only as the ground or *foundation* (which taken by its ſelf, is always very *imperfect* in reſpect of the whole *fabrick* or *building*,) Secondly, That the *perfect proof* being ſet down to conſiſt of *two* parts, a *negative* and a *poſitive*, the firſt only ſhewing the *no incongruity* or *unlawfulneſs* of *baptizing Infants*, and the ſecond adding thereto *duty* and *obligation*, theſe two muſt in all reaſon remain *conjoined* in our *diſcourſe*, and not be ſo ſevered, or conſidered aſunder, as if I thought the *former* way of *negative probation* ſufficient to do the whole work without the aſſiſtance of the *latter*; This I needed not have ſaid in relation to Mr. *T.* For the bare *negative* conſideration (that there is *nothing in the pattern whence Chriſts baptiſm is copied out, nothing in the copy it ſelf*, as far as *Chriſt's words* in the *Goſpel*, or the *Apoſtles practice* extend, *&c.*) is perfectly ſufficient to refute an *antipædobaptiſt* (ſuch as he profeſſeth to be) who undertakes to ſhew the *baptizing* of *Infants* to be *unlawful*, but cannot pretend to ſhew it by any other way, but by producing ſome either *law* or *practice* of *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles* to the contrary, which he muſt be concluded unable to do, if my *Negative* ſtand inviolate; But I thus interpoſe (and do it thus early) becauſe the *poſitive* part, being indeed the *principal*, eſpecially when it is alſo added to the *negative*, doth not only *demonſtrate* it *lawful*, but *duty*, to *offer* and *receive* our *Infants* to *baptiſm*, the *judgment* and *practice* of the *Univerſal Church* for 1600. years, (received, as the *Fathers* with one conſent teſtifie, from the *Apoſtles*, as the will of *Chriſt* himſelf) having this force and *authority* over every meek *ſon* of the *Church*, that he may not without incurring *God's* diſpleaſure, *oppugn* or *contemn* it. *Numb.* 1.

And ſo by this means there is much more performed than was *needful*, if Mr. *T.* had been the only *adverſary* foreſeen, even that which may convince all ſorts of *oppoſers* and *diſputers* in this matter, from * *Peter de Bruſe* and *Henry* his Scholar, and the *Petrobruſiani* and *Henriciani* that ſprang from them, to *Nicholas Storck* and *John Munzer*, *Melchior Rinck*, *Balthazar Hæbmaier*, *Michael Satelar* the *Switzers*, and ſo on to *Michael Hofman* the *skinner* in the *Low Countries*, to *Ubbo* and *Menno* of 2.

* *See G. Caſſan. in Præf. ad Duc. Jul. Cliv. ex Nichol. Bleſdick de Orig. Sect. Anabapt.*

of *Friſeland*, and *Theodorick Ubbo's* Son, and all their followers, which either then lived, and ſet up in *Germany*, or are now *revived*, or *copied* out among us; This one deduction of this *practice* (of *baptizing Infants*) from the *Apoſtles*, if it be ſolid, being abundantly *ſufficient* to make an end of all *controverſies* of this kind, It being highly *unreaſonable* that an *inſtitution* of *Chriſt's*, ſuch as each *Sacrament* is, ſhould be judged of by any other *rule* (whether the *phancies* or *reaſons* of men) but either the words wherein the *inſtitution* is ſet down, or (when they, as they are recorded in the *Scripture*, come not home to the *deciding* of the *controverſie*) by the *records* of the *practice*, whether of *Chriſt*, or (becauſe he *baptized* not himſelf) of the *Apoſtles*, however *conſerved* or made *known* unto us.

4. In a word then, the *cuſtomary baptiſm* among the *Jews* being firſt laid only as the *baſis* and *foundation* (which, as I ſaid, muſt be obſerved to *differ* from the *whole building*, being indeed only, the firſt and moſt *imperfect* part of it) and evidently brought home and *applied* to every branch of the *Chriſtian baptiſm*, I deſire Mr. *T.* will permit the *baptiſm* of our *infants* to deduce and *evidence* it ſelf from the conſiderations, which are thereunto annexed, both *negative* and *poſitive*, and then make trial how he ſhall be able to *demoliſh* that *ſtructure* which is thus *founded* and *ſupported*; Meanwhile I ſhall now conſider the *ſeverals* of his exceptions, having premiſed thus much in *general*.

SECT. III.

The Jews Baptiſm of natives as well as proſelytes. Teſtimonies of their writers in proof thereof. Baptiſm among the heathens taken from the Jews. Among both from Noahs *flood. The derivation of Chriſtian from Jewiſh Baptiſm how manifeſted. Chriſts anſwer to* Nicodemus. *Baptiſm ἀνάλογον to the deluge.* Gr. Nazianzen's *and* Macarius's *teſtimonies. The Fathers meaning in affirming the Chriſtians baptiſm to be inſtead of Circumciſion. The Lords Supper founded in the Jews Poſtcœnium, yet inſtead of their Paſsover.*

Numb. 1. AND firſt he will abbreviate and give the *Reader* the *ſubſtance* of my *proof*, which he conceives to be this, *that the Jews were wont when they admitted proſelytes, to baptize them and their children.* Here again at the *entrance* I muſt interpoſe, that his *Epitome* hath done ſome *injury* to the *Book*, left out one conſiderable, if not *principal* part, *viz.* that which concerned the *Native Jewiſh* children, who were *baptized* as ſolemnly, as the *Proſelytes* and their *children*.

2. This muſt be here taken notice of, becauſe Mr. *T.* makes haſte to aſſume the *contrary*, that the *Jews baptized not Jews by nature*, p. 306. that *after the baptiſm*, Exo. 19. 10. *the Jews did not baptize Jews but only proſelytes*, p. 307. and ſo makes a ſhift to conclude, that by my arguing, the *children of thoſe that were baptized in infancy ought not to be baptized*, and ſo that *no infant of Chriſtian race*, or *deſcended from Chriſtian anceſtors, is now to be baptized*, p. 308. *no infants but at the firſt converſion of the parent*, p. 309. And this I was many months before the *publication* of his *book*, warned to expect from Mr. *T.* as an irreſiſtible *anſwer* to my way of defending *infant-baptiſm*, mentioned by him in the *pulpit*, as ready to be *publiſht*, that by deducing the *baptiſm* of *Chriſtians* from the *Jewiſh cuſtom* of *baptizing* of *proſelytes*, I had excluded all the *children* of *Chriſtian anceſtors* from our *baptiſm*.

3. But as this was then a great *ſurpriſe* to me, who knew that I had cleared that *Judaical baptiſm* to belong to the *children* of all *native Jews*, as well as of *proſelytes*, ſo now I could not but wonder to find there was ſo perfect truth in that *relation*, which I had received, and have no more to ſay, but to deſire the Reader to caſt his eyes upon that *Treatiſe*, and inform himſelf whether I have not as punctually deduced from the *Jewiſh writers* the *cuſtomary baptiſm* of *native Jewiſh* infants, as I have done the *baptiſm* of *proſelytes* and their *children*, and indeed mentioned the former as the *original* from which the latter was to be *tranſcribed*, and ſo as the *foundation* and *groundwork* of that other.

4. 'Tis unreaſonable to *recite* here, what is there ſo *viſible*; yet becauſe I ſee it is not taken notice of, but the contrary aſſumed for granted, and the chief weight of his 24th *Chapter* laid upon that *ſuppoſition*, there is nothing left me to do in this matter, but to tranſcribe my words from that ſixth Section which are expreſly theſe.

5. Firſt then, *Baptiſm* or *waſhing* of the *whole body* was a *Jewiſh ſolemnity*, by which the *native Jews* were entred into the *covenant* of *God* made with them by *Moſes*, ſo ſaith the *Talmud. tr. Repud. Iſrael* or the *Iſraelites do not enter into covenant but by theſe three things, by circumciſion* ובטבלה *and by baptizing, and by peace offering.* So in *Gemara ad tit. Cherithoth*, c. 2. *your fathers*, i. e. the *Jews* of old time, did not enter into the covenant אלא בטבילה ישלה *but by circumciſion and baptiſm*, and in *Jabimoth*, c. 4. *Rabbi Joſhua ſaid, we find of our mothers that they were baptized* (שטבלו) *and not circumciſed*, ſo *Maimonides tit. Iſuri bia*, c. 13. *By three things the Iſraelites entred into the covenant, by circumciſion, baptiſm and ſacrifice*, and ſoon after, *what was done to you*, to the *Jews in univerſum, ye were initiated into the Covenant by circumciſion* וטבילה *and baptiſm and ſacrifice.* All theſe *Teſtimonies* there thus ſet down, and then how could I conclude leſs than there I do, that nothing can be more clearly affirmed by them, *i. e.* by the *Jewiſh* writings of the greateſt authority among them, the *Talmud*, *Gemara*, and *Maimonides*?

6. If this were not ſufficient, then follows §. 11. as a *third* thing obſervable in this *baptiſm* among the *Jews*, that the *baptiſm* of the *natives* was the *pattern*, by which the *baptiſm* of *proſelytes* was regulated, and wherein it was *founded*, and this made evident by the *arguing*, and determining the *queſtion*, in the *Gemara*, *tit. Jabimoth*, c. 4. after this manner, *Of him that was circumciſed and not baptized* Rabbi Eliezer *ſaid that he was a Proſelyte, becauſe*, ſaid he, *we find of our Fathers* (Abraham, Iſaac——) *that they were circumciſed but not baptized*; *And of him that was baptized and not circumciſed* Rabbi Joſua *ſaid, he was a Proſelyte, becauſe*, ſaid he, *we find of our Mothers that they were baptized and not circumciſed: But the wiſe men pronounced that till he were baptized and circumciſed he was not a proſelyte*, where the *example* of the *Jews* is the rule by which the *obligation* of the *proſelytes* is meaſured.

7. And the ſame is evident by the *reaſon* rendred by the *Jewiſh* writers of their *baptizing* the *proſelytes*, which

which is generally taken by them from that *command*, Numb. 15. 15. *One ordinance shall be both for you of the congregation, and also for the stranger* (i. e. הגר the *proselyte*) *that sojourneth with you, an ordinance for ever in your generations, as ye are, so shall the stranger be before the Lord, one law and one manner* (*i. e.* one ἐντολὴ and one δικαίωμα, *Luke* 1. 6. one *Law* for *moral* duties, and one *ordinance* for *rituals* or *ceremonies*) *shall be for you and for the stranger that sojourneth with you.* Thus the *Gemara tit. Cherithoth*, c. 2. foundeth the *circumcising* and *baptizing* of *proselytes*, upon those words, *As to you, so shall it be to the proselyte.* So *Maimonides tit. Isuri bia*, c. 13. *In like manner through all ages as oft as a Gentile will enter into the Covenant, and receive the yoke of the Law upon him, it was necessary that circumcision and baptism should be used for him, beside sprinkling of the sacrifice, and if it were a woman, baptism and sacrifice, According as it is said* (Numb. 15. 15.) *as to you, so also to the proselytes.*

8. And yet farther, as to the *original* of this *baptism* among the *Jews* themselves, the twelfth Section out of their *writers* deduceth it from the time of giving the *Law* in *Mount Sinai*, *Exo.* 19. 10. when *God*, to prepare them for the receiving it, commands *Moses*, *Go to the people and sanctifie them to day and to morrow, and let them wash their clothes.* So saith *Maimonides Isuri bia*, c. 13. *But baptism was in the desart before the giving of the Law, according as it is said, Thou shalt sanctifie them*— And that agreeable to what we read of *Jacob* to his *household*, *Gen.* 35. 2. *Put away the strange Gods that are among you, and be clean and change your garments* (where being *clean* is answerable to being *sanctified* or *baptized*, and *changing* to *washing* their *garments*) so that as the *covenant* made with *Abraham* was *sealed* by *circumcision*, so the giving of the *Law* which was the *Covenant* made by *God* with all the *people*, was thought to be *sealed* by *baptism*, and that the *washing*, if not of the whole, yet of some *parts* of the *body* (ordinarily called קדושין *sanctifications*) and the *washing* (or wearing *clean*) *garments* also.

9. And now I may, I hope, assume, that not only there is *perfect* truth in what I now affirm, that *baptism* among the *Jews* belonged to their *natives* as well as to *proselytes* (even to all that *entred* into the *Covenant*, and those evidently were the *Jewish children* as well as *men*) but also that this had before been evidenced in that *Resol.* of the fourth *Quære*, which here Mr. *T.* hath been pleased to *examine*, and consequently that it was no small *injustice*, and *unkindness* in him both to the *reader*, and to me, that he would omit to take notice of it, but *assume* and build on it as a thing yielded and *granted* him by my *discourse* that the *proselytes* only, and not the *native Jews* were *partakers* of that *Jewish baptism.*

This sure was a strange *infirmity* in an *answer*, and that which must needs have a special *influence* upon it, in any *impartial* weighing, even such an one, as will make it very *unnecessary* for me to consider any of his other considerations which he hath offered in that matter, which must certainly have no force in them, when that which is such a *principal* part of my *arguing*, is so perfectly *omitted*, and the *contrary* supposed by him.

10. However I shall not refuse to *attend* him in all his *motions*, and inquire whether there be any *particular* pitcht on by him, which may deserve our farther consideration, in order to the point in hand, that of *Infant-baptism* among *Christians.*

11. And first, saith he, *Baptism, it seems, was a custom of all nations as well as the Jews*, citing *Grotius* for it on *Mat.* 3. 6. and *Mat.* 28. 19.

12. Of the truth of this observation I shall raise no *question*, only I wonder what he could phansie from thence to conclude for his *advantage.* Certainly he will not hope by that *argument* to evince the *negative*, that it was not used among the *Jews*, for how can the *Gentiles* using it, conclude, against all other evidence, that the *Jews* did not use it? Nor can he pretend that *Christ transcribed* it from those *Gentiles*, and not from the *Jews*: for *Christ* preaching, as he was sent, *to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*, and ὑμῖν πρῶτον, *to them first*, *Act.* 3. 26. and if not to them *only*, yet in a far more *eminent* manner to them than to any others, and accordingly adapting his *Reformation* to the *Jewish Religion*, and lightly deducing so many other *customs* from the *Jews*, and none from the *Gentiles*, can with no probability be conceived to deduce this from the *Gentiles*, rather than from the *Jews*, especially when (as *Clement* observes, Ἕλλωες ἀεὶ κλεπται, the *heathens borrowed* or *stole* both their *learning*, and their *custom* from the *Jews*, so) it is very obvious to imagine, that this of *baptism*, *purgations* and *lustrations* might by those *heathens* be borrowed from the *Jews*, at least by both of them be derived from the same common *fountain*, the *sons* of *Noah*, in remembrace of the *deluge*, according to that famous verse among the *Greeks*, Θάλασσα κλύζει πάντα τ' ἀνθρώπων κακά, *the sea sweeps away all the evils of men*, to which S. *Peter* alludes in making *baptism* the ἀντίτυπον to *Noah's flood* (as he hath himself cited it out of *Grotius*,) and so in like manner some of the *Fathers*, as *Athanasius*, in his χρησ. εἰς ἐρημ. περὶ β. Tom. 2. p. 426. Πρῶτον βάπτισμα τὸ τῆ καλακλυσμῶ εἰς ἐκκοπὴν ἁμαρτίας, *The first baptism is that of the deluge for the excision of sins.* And *Optatus* l. 5. * *Erat quidem Cataclysmus imago baptismatis, ut inquinatus totus orbis, demersis peccatoribus, lavacro interveniente, in faciem pristinam mundaretur, The deluge was the image of baptism, that the polluted world by the drowning of sinners may be cleansed into the antient form.*

* *Edit. Casaub.* p. 127.

13. And if neither of these be hence *deducible*, then it matters little what else he can design to infer from it. And so sure there was some want of *answers*, when this (so nothing to the matter on either side) was thought fit to *march* in the *front* of them.

14. Under this head of *answer*, he presently adds, that he doth not know that Dr. *H.* or any other hath alledged one passage in *Scripture*, or any of the *Fathers*, that might evince that the *custom* of *baptising*, or *baptising infants*, was derived from the *Jews initiating Proselytes* by *baptism.*

15. To this I answer, 1. By asking Mr. *T.* Whether he be ready to pay that *reverence* to the *authority* of the *Fathers*, as to be concluded by their *affirmations?* If he be, I wonder why the *uniform consent* of them, that *infants* are to be *baptized*, should not prevail with him: If he be not, why doth he mention this as *useful* in this matter?

16. But then secondly, It must be adverted, that this *one* containing *two* questions in it, First, Whether this of *initiating* into the *Covenant* by *baptism* were a *Jewish custom?* Secondly, Whether from thence *Christ* derived this rite of *baptizing* of *Christians?* The former of these was that which alone required *proving*, the latter being of it self *evident*, without farther *probation*, supposing only that the *Fathers* testified that to be *Christ's institution* of *baptism*, which we find to have been thus agreeable to the *practice* customary among the *Jews.*

17. As for example, if it were made matter of *doubt* or *queſtion*, whether *Chriſt* derived the *Cenſures* of his *Church* from the *Jews*, It will ſure be a ſufficient *anſwer* to the *queſtion*, if we ſhall firſt find in the *Jewiſh writers* their *cuſtoms* of *Excommunication*, and then from the *Chriſtian* writers find the like *records* of the *Chriſtian cuſtom*, from the *inſtitution* of *Chriſt*, and the *practice* of his *Apoſtles*, delivered down unto us; For thoſe two things being done, what need we any *Father's* aſſiſtance or guidance, to ſecure us, that *Chriſt derived*, and lightly changed this *cuſtom* of *Eccleſiaſtical cenſures* in his *Church*, from what he found in the *Jewiſh Sanhedrim?*

18. In this matter 'tis eaſy and obvious to object (as Mr. *T.* here doth about *baptiſm*) that *excommunication* was a *cuſtom* among other *nations*, as well as the *Jews*, the deſcription of it among the *Druids* in *Cæſar's Commentaries* being ſo famous and notorious to every man: which yet will not ſure prevail with any *reaſonable* man, or make it neceſſary to produce the teſtimonies whether of *Scriptures* or *Fathers*, that *Chriſt* took it not from the *Druids* but the *Jews*. The like might be inſtanced again in the *inſtitution* of the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper* in the *Jews poſtcœnium*, from which it is by light *change* deduced.

19. And ſo it is in this matter of *baptiſm*, the *Jewiſh* cuſtom of *baptizing* (not only *proſelytes* and their *children*, but the *Jewiſh natives*) I thought neceſſary to clear from the moſt competent *witneſſes* of their *cuſtoms*, the *Talmud*, *Gemara*, and *Maimonides*, the ſobereſt of their writers; And ſo likewiſe in the ſecond place, the *practice* of the *Chriſtian Church*, as it is from *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles* deduced, and applied particularly to the *Reſolution* of our *Quære*, to the *baptizing* of *Infants*, I have cleared alſo from ſome footſteps of it in the *Scripture* it ſelf, and from the *concordant teſtimony* of the *Fathers* of the *Church*. And having cleared theſe two *particulars*, wherein all the difficulty conſiſted, I need not ſure inquire of the *opinion* of *antiquity* for the *dependence* betwixt theſe two, or the *derivation* of one of them from the other, the very *lineaments* and *features* acknowledging and owning this *progeny* to have come forth from that *ſtock*, this *ſtream* to have been *derived* from that *fountain*, without any *teſtimonials* to certifie it.

20. And yet thirdly, After all this I demand whether *Chriſt's* words to *Nicodemus*, *Joh.* 3. mentioned, §. 18. be not an evidence from *Scripture* it ſelf of this very matter, the *derivation* of the *Chriſtian* from the *Jewiſh baptiſm*; when upon *Chriſts* diſcourſe on that ſubject, *that except a man be regenerate of water and of the ſpirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, and on occaſion of *Nicodemus's* objection againſt this, *v.* 9. *Jeſus* anſwered, *Art thou a maſter in Iſrael, and knoweſt not theſe things?* diſcernibly intimating that this his *inſtitution* of *baptiſm* was ſo agreeable to the *Jewiſh* cuſtoms of *initiating*, and receiving into the *Covenant* by *baptiſm*, that a *Rabbi* among the *Jews* could not reaſonably be imagined to be *ignorant* of it.

21. And if the *baptiſm* of the *Jews* had (as Mr. *T.* cites it out of *Grotius*) its firſt *original* from the *memory* of the *deluge* purging away the *ſins* of the *world*, then ſure that place of St. *Peter* which affirms the *Chriſtian baptiſm* to be ἀντίτυπον, the *antitype* or *tranſcript* of *Noah's deluge*, is an expreſs *teſtimony* of it alſo. And this I hope might be a competent account of this matter.

22. And yet after all this, it is alſo clear, that the *Fathers* in their diſcourſes of *baptiſm* do ordinarily lay the *foundation* of it in *Moſes*, or the *baptiſm* of the *Jews*; witneſs *Gregory Nazianzen Or.* 39. Seeing, ſaith he, *it is the feaſt of Chriſt's baptiſm, let us philoſophize, diſcourſe exactly of the difference of baptiſms*; then after this preface, entring on the diſcourſe, he thus begins, Ἐβαπτίσε Μωσῆς ἀλλ' ἐν ὕδατι, καὶ πρὸ τούτου ἐν νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν θαλάσσῃ, *Moſes*, ſaith he, *baptized but in water, and before this in the cloud and in the ſea:* And then making that (with S. *Paul*) a *type* of the *Chriſtian baptiſm*, he proceeds to *John's baptiſm*, which, ſaith he, differed from the *Moſaical*, in that it added *Repentance* to *water*, ἐβάπτισε καὶ Ἰωάννης, ἀλλὰ δὲ Ἰουδαϊκῶς, *John alſo baptized, but not Judaically.*

23. So before him, *Macarius Hom.* 32. having mentioned the *circumciſion* which was *under the Law*, foreſignifying the *true circumciſion* of the *heart*, annexes thereto, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα τῆς νόμου, *the baptiſm of the Law*, which ſaith he, σκία δὲ τῶν ἀληθινῶν πραγμάτων *is a figure of true things*, ἐκεῖ γὰρ σῶμα ἀπέπλυνεν, ὧδε δὲ ἡ ἐρρυπωμένον νῦν βάπτισμα πνεύματι καθαίζει καὶ ἀποπλύνει, *for there that waſhed the body, but here the baptiſm of the holy Ghoſt and of fire purgeth and waſheth the polluted mind*, and ſo goes on to the parallel betwixt the legal *Prieſt* and *Chriſt*, making the ſame *accord* betwixt the *one* and the *other* pair; So *Hom.* 47. *p.* 509. ſpeaking of things under the *Law*, he firſt mentions the *glory* of *Moſes face*, a type of the *true glory* under the *Goſpel*; ſecondly, *Circumciſion*, a type of that of the *heart*; thirdly, παρ' ἐκείνοις βάπτισμα, ſaith he, τὸν σάρκα ἁγιάζον, *among them there is baptiſm cleanſing* or *ſanctifying the fleſh, but with us the baptiſm of the holy Spirit and of fire, that which John preached* — The ſame is intimated again, but not ſo *explicitely* ſet down *Hom.* 26. *p.* 349. Πάντες Μωσέα διεδέξατο, τὸν καινὸν ἐκκλησίαν χειροτονήσαντα, καὶ τὸν ἀληθινὸν ἱερωσύνην ἐγχειρισθέντες, νῦν γὰρ ὅτι βάπτισμα πυρὸς καὶ πνεύματος, περιτομή τις ἐν καρδίᾳ γινομένη, *Peter ſucceeded Moſes, having the New Church of Chriſt and the true Prieſthood committed to him, for now is the baptiſm of fire and the Spirit, and a kind of circumciſion placed in the heart*; where it ſeems the *Jewiſh baptiſm* was the *figure* of the *Chriſtian*, as the *Jewiſh Prieſthood* of the *Chriſtian*, and the *Jewiſh circumciſion* of the *circumciſion* in the *heart.*

24. So in *Athanaſius's* ῥήσεις καὶ ἑρμεν. παραβολ. εὐαγγ. *qu.* 103. * numbring up *ſeven* ſorts of *Baptiſm*, the
* *Tom.* 2. *p.* 426. *firſt* even now mentioned, τὸ τῷ καλαλυσμῷ εἰς ἐκκοπὴν ἁμαρτίας, *that of the flood for the cutting off of ſin*, the *ſecond* that of *Moſes*, in *paſſing the Red ſea*, which he calls, τυπικὸν, *figurative*; the *third* is τὸ νομικὸν βάπτισμα *the legal baptiſm*, ὅπερ εἶχον οἱ Ἑβρῶοι, *which the Hebrews had, whereby every unclean perſon* (ſo is every one by *nature*) ἐλούετο ὕδατι, ἐπλύνετο τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, καὶ ὅτως εἰσήρχετο εἰς παρεμβολὴν, *was baptized in water, had his garments waſht, and ſo entred into the camp*, this it ſeems the *ceremony* of his *admiſſion*. And then follows the *baptiſm* of *John* and *Chriſt*. So St. *Auguſtine* againſt *Fulgentius*, *Paganus baptizat, Judæus baptizat, Saducæus baptizat, & multi extra regulam legis latæ baptizare non ceſſant, ſed illud eſt unum quod verum, illud verum quod Chriſti.* So *Germanus* in his μυσικὴ θεωρία. Bib. Gr. Pa. p. 131. D. Τὸ βάπτισμά ὅτι, καθὼς ὁ θεὸς διετάξατο τῷ Μωϋσῇ, λέγων, καταβὰς διαμάρτυραι τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ, καὶ ἁγνίσον αὐτὸς, καὶ πλυνάτωσαν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν, &c. Other examples I doubt not the *Reader* may obſerve in the *Fathers* writings on this ſubject; theſe few may ſerve πρὸς δεῖξιν.

25. And therefore when Mr. *T.* adds, that ſome paſſages of the *Fathers* ſhew rather, that they took it as

as in ſtead of *circumciſion*, the anſwer alſo is very obvious, that the *Jews* cuſtom being to *initiate* by *circumciſion* and *baptiſm* both, and the former of theſe being laid aſide by *Chriſt's reformation*, and only the *ſecond* continued, and that ſo improved by *Chriſt*, as to have more than the whole *virtue* of both, and to be the only *initial* Sacrament, the *Fathers* might well learn of St. *Paul* to make this compariſon or parallel betwixt the *Jewiſh*, and the *Chriſtian Sacrament*, and ſo betwixt *baptiſm* and *circumciſion*, and indeed could not properly ſay that the *Chriſtian baptiſm* was in ſtead of the *Jewiſh baptiſm* being rather the continuance of it, adding ſome *ceremonies* and *virtue* to that which was formerly among them, not *ſubſtituting* ſomewhat elſe (as for *circumciſion* it did) in ſtead of it.

This is evident enough; and yet if it were not, we ſhould have little reaſon to be moved with this 26.
ſuggeſtion, knowing that in the other *Sacrament* which *Chriſt* viſibly *inſtituted* in the *Jewiſh poſtcœnium*, and imitated it in the delivering the *portions* of *bread* and wine, the *Fathers* generally lay the *compariſon* betwixt the *Paſchal Lamb* and that, and not without the authority of St. *Paul* himſelf, ſaying that *Chriſt our Paſsover is ſacrificed* for us, the plain meaning of it being this, that the *Jewiſh Paſsover* being *aboliſhed*, we have now the *Sacrament* of the *body* and *blood* of *Chriſt* (the true *immaculate lamb* of God) ſubſtituted in the ſtead of it, but that copied out not from the *Jewiſh* manner of eating the *Lamb* of *Paſsover* (for *Chriſt* did not eat it at that time, being put to *death* before the *hour* in which it was to be *eaten*) but of the *poſtcœnium* or *cloſe* of the *Jewiſh Supper*, *after* which *he took bread*, &c. conſecrating this ordinary *cuſtom* of theirs into an higher *myſtery*, than formerly it had in it.

SECT. IV.

The conceits of Pe. Alfunſus *and* Schickard *of the Jewiſh baptiſm.* Raf. Alphes. Mr. T. *his concluſion not inferred. The original of the Jewiſh Baptiſm (the only doubt) vindicated.* Jacob's *injunction to his family. Sanctifications* Exod. 19. 10. *differ from waſhing garments.*

WHat he next adds from Mr. *Selden*, of *ſome that conceived the Jewiſh baptiſm in initiating of proſelytes was in imitation of Chriſts example* (and ſo not *Chriſts* of theirs) and of *Schickard* that *conceives they added baptiſm to circumciſion, to difference them from Samaritans*, is too vain to deſerve any other reply, than what he himſelf hath annext concerning the former, *viz.* that Mr. *Selden* (naming only *Pet. Alfunſus* for this) *doth not give any credit to him in it* (but indeed diſproves it, and adds *antidotes* to that *poyſon*, that without them I ſhould not have thought likely to have wrought on any man.) And indeed ſo he doth alſo in plain terms concerning the latter, *de Syned.* l. 1. c. 3. *fateor me nondum illud aut eâ de re quicquam alibi legiſſe*, he *never read that or any thing of that matter any where elſe.* *Numb.* 1. *pag.* 41.

To which I add, that if the place in *Schickard* be examined, it will acknowledge it to be a *ſingular* conceit and *invention* of his, and nothing elſe. 2.

In his fifth *Chap. de Reg. Jud.* he hath theſe words, *ad differentiam Samaritanorum addiderunt baptiſmum quendam de quo Raf. Alphes, Tom.* 2. p. 26. *& ipſe Talmud Maſſ. Jefamos* fol. 47. citing the words at large in *Hebrew*. But in thoſe words, though they are by *Schickard* applied indefinitely, as if they were the teſtification of the *whole* foregoing propoſition, yet the reader ſhall find no ſyllable to that purpoſe of *differencing* from *Samaritanes*, more than from all other men, but only that *when a proſelyte is received he muſt be circumciſed, and then* נתרפא מטבילין אותו *when he is cured, they ſhall baptize him in the preſence of two wiſe men, ſaying, Behold he is an Iſraelite in all things, or if ſhe be a woman, the women lead her to the waters*, &c. A plain *teſtimony* (to the ſenſe of thoſe which we formerly produced) of *baptizing* both *Jews* and *Proſelytes* (for elſe how could the *Proſelyte*, upon receiving this, be ſaid to be an *Iſraelite in all things?*) but no leaſt *intimation*, that this was deſigned to *diſtinguiſh* them from *Samaritanes* peculiarly, but as that which was always *cuſtomary* among the *Jews*, at their entring into *Covenant* with *God*. 3.

And then the *premiſes* being ſo groundleſs and frivolous, I ſhall not ſure be concerned in any *concluſion* that Mr. *T.* ſhall infer from them, which it ſeems, is to be this, that *notwithſtanding the Doctor's ſuppoſition that the whole fabrick of baptiſm is diſcernible to be built on that baſis, the cuſtomary practice among the Jews, yet many will conceive it needs more proof than the bare recital of paſſages out of Jewiſh writers.* 4.

But Mr. *T.* would be much put to it, to ſhew in what *mode* and *figure* it is, that this *concluſion* is drawn out of theſe *premiſſes*: Certainly none that my *Logick* hath afforded me, for that hath no *engine* firſt to draw many out of *two*; nor ſecondly, to infer that thoſe that had miſtaken for want of *knowledge* (as *Alfunſus*) or *adverting* (as *Schickard*) of the *Jewiſh cuſtoms*, would need any more than the *recitation* of clear *teſtimonies* out of the *ſobereſt Jewiſh writers*, to diſabuſe him: or thirdly, that they that either through *prejudice*, or any other *principle* of *obſtinacy* ſhall reſiſt this *degree* of light thus offered them, will be convinced by any other ſort of *teſtimonies*, whether out of the *Fathers*, or *Scripture* it ſelf, being ſo well fortified and provided with *inclinations*, at leaſt, if not with *artifices*, to *reject* one, or *miſinterpret* the other. 5.

But, it ſeems, after all this, and to evidence to how little purpoſe he hath ſaid thus much, Mr. *T.* is well enough ſatisfied, at leaſt as far as to *baptizing* of *Proſelytes*, that there was ſuch a *cuſtom* among the *latter Jews* afore *Chriſts incarnation*; All the *difficulty*, ſaith he, is concerning the *original* of it among them, For that *either it ſhould begin from Jacobs injunction to his houſhold*, Gen. 35. 2. *or from Gods command*, Exo. 19. 10. *for the Iſraelites to waſh their clothes afore the giving of the law*, he *cannot conceive, thoſe places ſpeaking of waſhing Jews by nature, not Proſelytes, whereas the Jews baptized not Jews by nature* (*as Mr.* Selden *ſaith*) *but by profeſſion.* 6.

Here are many weak parts in theſe few words; For firſt, The *original* of the *cuſtom* among the *Jews* is but an acceſſary, wholly extrinſecal to the matter in hand, and in no reſpect neceſſary to be 7.

defined

defined by us: If the *cuſtom* be acknowledged, we need ask no more; and Mr. *T.* having acknowledged the *cuſtom*, grants all that in that matter we require of him, for on that, and not on that particular *original* of it, it is that we ſuperſtruct our whole *fabrick*, as far as belongs to *infant-baptiſm*, which is very fitly founded in the *Jewiſh cuſtom* of *baptizing*, from whence ſoever that *cuſtom* was derived to them; And ſo that one thing ſuperſedes and anſwers that whole difficulty, if indeed there were any ſuch in this matter.

8. But then ſecondly, for the two *originals* here ſet down, and both *rejected* by him, it is a little ſtrange that he ſhould think fit to do ſo, and not to ſubſtitute any *third* in the place of them; For 'tis certain that every *cuſtom* received *univerſally* into a *Church* or *ſociety* of men, muſt have ſome *original* or other, and conſequently this *cuſtom* being by Mr. *T.* acknowledged, muſt not in any reaſon be left ἀπάτωρ, ἀμήτωρ, *without Father, without Mother*, without any *original*; and therefore thoſe two that are alledged for it by the *Jewiſh writers*, being by him ſo *faſtidiouſly* rejected, it was very fit that he ſhould aſſign ſome other, and annex his reaſons of giving it the *deference*, upon which it ſhould be prefer'd before them.

9. And when he ſhall do ſo, I ſhall not doubt to *imbrace* it, and make the ſame *advantage* of it which hitherto I have done of either of theſe. But he is here pleaſed to be *reſerved*, and gives not the leaſt *intimation* of any other *reaſon*, which is more ſuitable with his *conceptions*. 'Tis true indeed he did before out of *Grotius*, mention *Noahs flood*, in memory of which this *cuſtom* aroſe among other *nations*; but, beſides that this *original* of it was not by him deemed ſufficient to appropriate it to the *Jews*, but leaves it common to them with *other nations*, thoſe other two, *Jacobs injunction*, and *Gods* command before receiving the *Law* (either one or both) are perfectly *reconcileable* with that, and the *memory* of the *deluge* being the more *remote* and *firſt original*, theſe may be the *nearer* and more *immediate*, and ſo are not prejudged by his *pretending*, or my *yielding* of that.

10. Thirdly, For *Jacobs injunction* to his *houſhold*, *Gen.* 35. 2. it is no where vouched by me as the *original* of this *cuſtom* among the *Jews*, but only an intimation given, that that other, the command of *God* before the *giving* the *Law*, *was agreeable to what we read of Jacob to his houſhold*; and ſo certainly it is; for as in the one the *ceremony* preſcribed them to uſe at the *putting away ſtrange Gods*, was this, to be *clean* and *change* their *garments*; ſo in the other they are injoined to *ſanctifie themſelves and waſh their clothes*, which is in other words directly the ſame thing; *waſhing themſelves*, and having *clean garments*, being among the *Jews* joined together, and the *whiteneſs* of their *garments* preſcribed in *baptiſm* לקבל פני שכינה (ſaith the *Gloſs* on *Gemara Babylon. tit. Jabimoth*) *to receive the preſence of the divine Majeſty* (juſt as in the *Chriſtian Church* the *Dominica in albis*, *white* or *Whitſunday* was a ſpecial day for adminiſtration of *baptiſm*, and the perſons *baptized* were *rhetorically* ſtyled ſometimes ἀστέρες ἐξ ὑδάτων ἀνατέλλοντες, *ſtars riſing out of the waters*, ſometimes ἀστράπτοντα τῆς κολυμβήθρας τὰ κρῖνα, *the bright lilies of the font*, as they are joined together in *Proclus Orat.* 12. *p.* 384. and in S. *Chryſoſtom*, *new lilies planted from the font*, *Hom.* 6. *de reſur.* and accordingly on *Conſtantine*'s great *coin*, ſtampt in memory of his *baptiſm*, was ingraven (on one ſide) a *pool* of *water* with a *lily grown* out of it; (ſee *Joſ. Scal. in Opuſc.*) and all theſe but *figurative* expreſſions of what *Chryſoſtom* more *plainly* ſets down by τὸ λαμπρὸν τοῦτο περιβολαῖον ἐνδυσάμενοι, their *putting on white garments* at the receiving of *baptiſm*, *Tract. de S. Pent.* for which *Jobius* in *Photius* hath λαμπροφορεῖν only.)

See §. 12.

11. And then as *Jacob vowed a vow to the Lord to give him the tenth of all*, and accordingly *God* after inſtituted the *tithes* for the *Levites* portion, and ſo the *latter* of theſe was *agreeable* to the *former*, but yet the latter, *viz. Gods inſtitution*, the *original* of the *cuſtom* of *tithing* among the *Jews*; ſo *Jacob* might injoin his *houſhold* that *ceremony* of *waſhing* or *baptiſm*, and after that *God* injoin it in giving the *Law*, and one of theſe be *agreeable* to the other, and yet the *cuſtom* of *baptiſm* among the *Jews* be derived only from the *latter*, as from the *peculiar original* of it.

12. Fourthly, The command of *God*, *Exod.* 19. 10. in which *baptiſm* is ſaid to be founded by the *Jews*, is not (as Mr. *T.* ſuggeſts) the *command to the Iſraelites to waſh their clothes* (nothing but the *cuſtom* of *changing* their *garments* can be founded in that) but the *command* to *Moſes* to *ſanctifie* them (*Go unto the people and ſanctifie them to day and to morrow*) in the *Hebrew* notion of the word קידושין, *ſanctifications*, for *waſhing*, either the *whole*, or ſome *parts* of the *body*, as is ſhew'd at large, Sect. 35.

13. And if in ſtead of this of *ſanctifying*, i. e. *baptizing* them, Mr. *T.* did *unwittingly* ſubſtitute *waſhing* their *garments*, then I hope, he may now be adviſed to *reform* that *miſtake*, and ſee more reaſon than hitherto he hath done, to aſſign that *command* of *Gods*, as the moſt agreeable *original* of this *cuſtom*, and no longer imagine that it was a *cuſtom of the latter Jews*, *taken up by themſelves without any ground of Scripture*; But if formerly he ſaw this, and was *willing* to *diſguiſe* it, and, on purpoſe to miſguide the Reader, left out the mention of *Moſes*'s *ſanctifying* or *baptizing* them, and only ſet down the *waſhing* of their *garments* (which was not at all proper for the turn) to be the *original* of *baptiſm*, wherein, as *Paulinus* tells us, they were rendred *nivei*, *white* as *ſnow*, *corpore* as well as *habitu*, in *body* as well as *garment*, I ſhall not then hope that even this length of words will be ſufficient for his *conviction*.

14. *Laſtly*, For his *reaſon* againſt deducing the *baptiſm* of *proſelytes* from this *original* [*becauſe the Jews baptized not Jews by nature but by profeſſion, whereas thoſe places ſpeak of waſhing Jews by nature, not Proſelytes*] it will preſently appear to be very *vain*; for firſt, The *Jews baptized Jews by nature*, and not *Proſelytes only*, as hath been both there and here ſhewed at large, out of the moſt *creditable* of the *Jewiſh* writers; Secondly, Their *baptizing* of *Proſelytes* was founded in their *precedent* cuſtom of *baptizing* of *Jews*, as hath been evidenced alſo from the *Rabbines* explication of *Num.* 15. 15. *One Ordinance ſhall be both for you of the congregation* of *Iſrael*, *and alſo for the ſtranger* or *proſelyte*. And ſo 'tis evident that of *Exod.* 19. 10. being the *original* of *baptizing native Jews*, may, and muſt be the *original* of *baptizing* the *Proſelytes*.

15. And this in each part being thus manifeſt, Mr. *Selden*'s Authority (if it ſhould be, as is pretended) can be of no force againſt thoſe *evidences* which I have here produced, the beſt he offers us at any time, to prove any thing concerning the *Jewiſh cuſtoms*. And I ſhall now

appeal

appeal to the *Reader*, whether Mr. *T.* could well have been expected to have made more *miſadventures* in ſo few words.

SECT. V.

Mr. Selden's *notion of the Sea. The defence of my notion of it. Learned mens affirmations to be judged of by their teſtimonies. Chriſt's baptizing of Jews as well as Gentiles no argument. Chriſt's vouching* Johns *baptiſm to be from heaven, no argument. No more, the pretended no intimations of it. The no conformity. The proſelytes children baptized, continually, not only at the firſt converſion. The baptiſm of a woman with child, ſerving for the child alſo, not argumentative. The Canon of* Neocæſaria *about it.*

NExt he proceeds to conſider the words of the *Apoſtles*, 1 *Cor.* 10. 1. of our *Fathers* being *baptized into Moſes* (as *in the cloud*, ſo) *in the Sea.* Where firſt, He tells me that he *doth not conceive* Mr. Selden's *Expoſition, that the ſea was ſome veſſel of waters —— but the red ſea*] And I that am as little of Mr. *Seldens* mind, but expreſly interpreted it, of the *Red ſea*, §. 7. and rejected Mr. *Seldens* interpretation, §. 8. (although I omitted to name the *author* of it) am not, he knows, concerned in that, but have from his rejecting Mr. *Seldens authority*, when 'tis not for his turn, his example for my not thinking my ſelf bound up by it at other times, either in that newly paſt, where he vouched his name as his only proof, that the *Jews* did not *baptize Jews* by *nature*, or in other particulars which I find afterwards vouched from him, the truth of which I as little *conceive*, as Mr. *T.* doth this of the *ſea* not ſignifying the *Red ſea*, which I acknowledge to be *unconceiveable.* *Numb.* 1.

But then ſecondly, he doth *not think my expoſition right* neither (though I interpret it of the *Iſraelites paſſing through the Red ſea*, as he acknowledges to do.) But what is my *interpretation?* why, that *their being baptized into Moſes in the Red ſea* (as alſo in the *cloud*) *ſignifieth their being initiated into God's covenant under the conduct of* Moſes, *as ſince they are wont to be initiated by baptiſm.* And why doth he diſlike this *interpretation?* why, *becauſe when it is ſaid, our fathers were baptized, it is not meant were baptized as ſince Proſelytes were baptized among the Jews, but as Chriſtians were baptized.* 2.

But certainly this is no *reaſon* of *exception* to my interpretation; For firſt, I compare not this *baptiſm* of our *fathers in the ſea* with the *baptiſm* of *Proſelytes* among the *Jews*, but annex it immediately to the *baptizing* of the *native Jews*, §. 6. before I proceed, §. 9. to the *baptiſm* of *Proſelytes.* And ſecondly, I do not lay the *compariſon* of the *Apoſtle* betwixt the *baptizing in the ſea*, and the *Jewiſh cuſtom* of *baptizing*, but acknowledge it to be betwixt the *baptiſm* of the *Fathers* under the *Law*, and the *baptiſm* ſince *Chriſt* among *Chriſtians*; All the uſe I make of the words of the *Apoſtle*, was to ſhew that *baptiſm* among the *Jews* was a *ceremony* of *initiating* into the *covenant*, and that upon that ſuppoſal it was, that the *Apoſtle* uſed the phraſe of the *Iſraelites* that came out of *Ægypt*, and *entred* into *Covenant* with him, under the conduct of *Moſes*, *God* giving them an eſſay of his *receiving* them under his *wings* (the phraſe to ſignifie *reception* into the *covenant*) by invironing them with the *ſea.* This I thought had been before intelligibly enough ſet down; I hope now he will no longer miſunderſtand it. 3.

What he adds out of Mr. *S.* that after *Exo.* 19. 10. the *Jews did not baptize Jews, but only Proſelytes*, hath already been evidenced at large to have no *truth* in it, the *cuſtom* of *baptiſm* continuing to all their *poſterity*, as well as that of *circumciſion.* And whereas this is ſaid to be *ſet down* thus out of *Maimonides* and *other Jewiſh Rabbines*, the *Reader*, if he will conſult the place in Mr. *Selden de Synedr.* l. 1. c. 3. will find there is no ſuch matter; That Mr. *S.* himſelf ſo affirms, *p.* 23. I willingly acknowledge; but in a matter of antient *ſtory*, ſuch as this is, neither he nor any elſe muſt be believed farther than the *teſtimonies* produced by him out of their *writers* exact, eſpecially againſt expreſs *teſtimonies* to the contrary. And ſuch he there produceth more than one, *p.* 34. out of *Gemara* מת אבותינם *What did our Fathers? truly they entred not into Covenant without circumciſion and baptiſm and ſprinkling of blood*, and again *p.* 35. *our mothers were baptized and not circumciſed*, and *p.* 26. out of *Victoria Porchetus*, that *our mothers* (though not as he ſaith, *Sara and Rebecca*, referring the cuſtom to a greater *antiquity* than that of the time of giving the *Law*) *were baptized and not circumciſed*, and *p.* 38. out of *Maimonides*, that *the Iſraelites entred into covenant by a threefold rite or ceremony, by circumciſion, baptiſm, and oblation.* And again, *p.* 39. *What was done to you? ye entred into covenant by circumciſion, baptiſm, and the ſprinkling of the ſacrifice, and therefore the Proſelyte* — the *cuſtom* of *baptizing* the *Proſelytes* founded in that of *baptizing* the *native Jews.* All theſe clear *teſtimonies* are by him produced directly to the proof of my *poſition*, that the *native Jews* (indifferently) were *baptized*, and not a word in any other parts of the *teſtimonies* to give reaſon to ſuſpect, that after that one time of *Ex.* 19. the *Jews* did not *baptize.* What he hath done in his other Book *de Jure Nat. ac Gent.* I need not apprehend (and have not commodity to inquire or examine) ſuppoſing that if there he had undertaken the *proof* of it, he would here, where he affirms it without *proof*, and againſt expreſs *teſtimonies* produced by him, have referred (according to cuſtom) to that place. 4.

And now what force againſt any pretenſion of ours is there in Mr. *T.* his obſervation, that *Chriſt and his Apoſtles baptized Jews as well as Gentiles?*] For firſt, ſo certainly they might, and yet derive their *baptiſm* from the *cuſtom* formerly in uſe among the *Jews*, for they, we know, *baptized native Jews:* nay ſecondly, ſo they might, though the *Jews* had *baptized* none but *Proſelytes*, for to that it would bear juſt proportion, that they ſhould baptize both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, in caſe both came in as *Proſelytes* to *Chriſt.* For it were a *fallacy* a little too groſs to deceive any man of *common* underſtanding, to argue thus, The *cuſtom* was to *baptize Proſelytes*, and not *natives*; therefore *Chriſt*, if he obſerved that *cuſtom*, was not to *baptize native Jews*; The anſwer being ſo obvious, by diſtinguiſhing of *Proſelytes*, that they are either ſuch as come in to the *Jewiſh* Religion, or ſuch as came into *Chriſt*, and that *Chriſt* was to *baptize* all that were *Proſelytes* to him, and that the *native Jews* as many as 5.

believed

believed on him, were ſuch, and as *believers*, i. e. as *Proſelytes* to *Chriſt*, not as *native Jews* were *baptized* by him.

6. Other reaſons he hath choſen to annex for confirmation of his *negative*, that "*Chriſts baptiſm* was not in *imitation* of, or in *conformity* with the *Jewiſh cuſtom*; *for ſecondly*, ſaith he, *Chriſt would not have avouched the baptiſm of* John *to be from heaven and not from men, if it had been in imitation of the Jewiſh cuſtom.* But I wonder what appearance of *concludency* there is in that *reaſon?* May not any thing be *from heaven*, or by *God's* appointment, which is derived from a *Jewiſh cuſtom?* may not *God* in *heaven* give commiſſion to *John Baptiſt* to preach *repentance*, after the ſame manner that others before him, *Noah* and *Jonah*, &c. had *preached repentance*, and to receive all that came in on his *preaching*, by the *ceremony* of *baptizing* ordinarily uſed, and known, to *initiate* men into *covenant* with *God*, among the *Jews?* I ſee not the leaſt incongruity in this, or that any obligation of *reaſon* can be pretended, why *God* may not appoint a *ceremony* known among men to be uſed in his *ſervice:* ſuch ſure was *impoſition* of *hands*, uſual among the *Jews* in *Benedictions*, which now is made uſe of by the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, in *ordaining Biſhops* over the *Church*. And ſo it may well be in this matter of *John's* or *Chriſt's baptiſm*, which though it were unqueſtionably *from heaven* in reſpect of the *Commiſſion* given to them by *God*, appointing them to do what they did, yet might the *ceremony* of *waſhing* uſed by them, be derived from the *cuſtoms* that were already *familiar* among them.

7. 'Twere eaſy to inſtance in the *Sacrament* of the *Lord's Supper*, the *power* of the *Keyes* (and many the like) which though brought into the *Church* of *Chriſtians* by *Chriſt*, and ſo *from heaven*, were yet *derived* and lightly changed from *Jewiſh obſervances*, and in that reſpect *from men* alſo.

8. His third reaſon, that *it is likely ſome where or other ſome intimation would have been given of that cuſtom, as the directory for Chriſtians in the uſe of baptiſm*] is too *frivolous* to require *reply*; for beſide that the *negative argument* were of no force, if it were as is pretended, It already appears that there are in the *Jewiſh writers*, more than *intimations* of this *cuſtom*, and ſome *indications* of it even in the *Scripture* it ſelf, as *John* 3. 5. 10. and for any plainer *affirmations*, what need could there be of them, when both the matter it ſelf ſpeaketh it ſo plainly, that there was no need of *words*, to thoſe that knew the *Jewiſh* cuſtoms, as the firſt *writers* and Readers of the *New Teſtament* did, and when *Chriſt's* ſole *authority*, and *practice* of his *Apoſtles* were ſufficient *Directory* for the *Chriſtians* in the uſe of *baptiſm?*

9. Fourthly he adds, that *the inſtitution and practice would have been conformable to it*; And ſo I ſay, and have made clear that i was, as far as to the *controverſie* in hand we are or can be concerned in it: But ſaith Mr. *T. the contrary appears*, adding one main inſtance of the *inconformity*, and *fourteen leſſer diſparities*, *The main diſparity*, ſaith he, *is in their baptizing no infants of the Gentiles at their firſt converſions, whereas the Jews baptized only the Gentiles Infants at their firſt proſelyting, not the infants of thoſe who were baptized in infancy.*

10. For the former of theſe he offers no manner of *proof* beyond his own *affirmation*, and therefore it is ſufficient to *deny* it, as he knows we do, and evidently *begs* the *queſtion* in *aſſuming* and not offering any *proof* for the contrary.

For the ſecond, that of the *Jewiſh practice*, he pretends no more than what he had before cited by *reference* (but now ſets down in *words*) *viz.* the *affirmation* of Mr. *Selden.*

11. But I have already ſhewed how groundleſs that *affirmation* of Mr. *S.* was, as to the *native Jews children*, who were ſtill *baptized* after the giving of the *Law*. And the ſame I now add for the *children* of thoſe *proſelytes* who had been *baptized* in *infancy*, there appears not the leaſt proof of this from the *Jewiſh* writers, who are the only competent *witneſſes* in it, but for the *contrary* I propoſe theſe two *teſtimonies* taken notice of by Mr. *S.* himſelf, *de Synedr.* c. 3. out of *Gemara Babylon* לטולם אין גר עד שימול וישביל. *He wants the rite of a proſelyte for ever, unleſs he be baptized and circumciſed.* Here *baptiſm* and *circumciſion* are joined together, as equally neceſſary to a *proſelyte*, and that *for ever*. And *circumciſion* there is no doubt was to be received by every *male*, not only at their *firſt* coming to the *Church* of the *Jews*, at their *firſt proſelytiſm*, but through all *poſterities*, every *child* of a *proſelyte* that was not *circumciſed* אין גר became ſtraightways *no proſelyte:* And then ſure this conjunction of *baptiſm* with *circumciſion* on theſe termes of *equality*, both of *perpetual* neceſſity to all *proſelytes*, muſt needs extend the *baptiſm* as well as the *circumciſion* beyond the *firſt proſelytes* and their *immediate children*, to all their *poſterity* that ſhall come from them afterwards, for to all thoſe belonged *circumciſion.*

12. So again in the ſame place, יכיון דלא טביל נוי תוא, *and if he be not baptized, he remains a Pagan* or *Gentile*; Here I ſhall ask, whether the *child* of a *proſelyte* who had been *baptized* in his *infancy*, were to be a *Pagan for ever?* I ſuppoſe it will be anſwered, no; And then by the force of that *teſtimony* of *Gemara* I conclude, therefore it muſt be ſuppoſed that he was *baptized*, for elſe he would be a *pagan for ever.*

13. Beſides this, two things I farther add, to remove all poſſible force of this *ſuggeſtion*; Firſt, That if it were granted in the full *latitude* wherein it is propoſed, that the *Jews baptized* no other *infants* of *proſelytes*, but thoſe whom they had at their *firſt converſion*; yet this would nothing profit Mr. *T.* For it were then obvious to affirm, that *Chriſt* who imitated the *Jews* in that, and ſo *baptized* the *children* of *Chriſtian Proſelytes*, did make ſome light change in this, and farther than the *pattern* before him afforded, *baptized* all the *poſterity* that ſhould ſucceed them, and were born in the *Church* in their *infancy* alſo, the *reaſon* though not the *pattern* belonging equally to them as to the *children* of the *firſt proſelytes*, and the *Jewiſh cuſtom* of *baptizing* their *natives infants*, being fully home to it.

14. Secondly, That it being by all parts granted, that the *children* which the *proſelytes* had at their *firſt proſelytiſm* were *baptized* among the *Jews*, this is as evident a *confutation* of the *Antipædobaptiſt*, and ſo of Mr. *T.* as it would if all their *infants* to all *poſterity* were *baptized:* For by that very *baptizing* of the *infants* at their *firſt proſelytiſm*, it appears that *infants* may be *baptized*, for I hope thoſe *proſelytes infants* are *infants*; And if any *infants* may, and ought to be *baptized*, then are all their *pretenſions deſtroyed*, whoſe only intereſt it is to evince, that *no infants* muſt or may be *baptized.* And I hope this will be of ſome uſe to Mr. *T.* when he ſhall have conſidered it.

The

The only way M. *T.* hath to confirm this of the *Jews not baptizing any infants of proselytes* born after their first *conversion* and *baptism*, is the *resolution* of the *Jews*, *that if a woman great with child became a proselyte and were baptized, her child needs not baptism when 'tis born.* And this I had cited, §. 109. out of the *Rabbines*, and so indeed I find it in *Maimonides*, *tit. Isuri bia.* c. 13. סע יברח שנתן יירה וטבלה אין בנה צריך טבלה But I cannot think that (whether true or false) a sufficient *proof* to infer the *conclusion*; For the *Jewish Doctors* might probably thus resolve upon this other ground, because the *mother* and the *child* in her womb being esteemed as *one* person, the *woman* great with *child* being *baptized*, they might deem the *child baptized* as well as the *woman*, and not account it needful to *repeat* it after the *birth*, which yet (by the way) it seems they would have done, if they had not deemed the *child* all one with the mother, and consequently they must be supposed to *baptize* those *children* which were begotten to the *proselyte* after the time of his or her first *conversion* and *baptism*. And accordingly the *Christian Doctors* in the *Council* of *Neocæsarea Can.* 6. having resolved the *contrary* to that *Jewish hypothesis*, *viz. that* οὐδὲν ποιοῦσι ἡ τικτοῦσα τῷ τικτομένῳ, the *mother* that *bears* the *child differs* from the *child*, or is not all one with it, and her *confession* in *baptism* is ἰδία *proper* or *particular* to her self, and *belongs not to the child in her womb*, give the [κυοφοροῦσα] the *woman* that is with *child*, and is then *converted* to the *faith*, leave to be *baptized*, when she pleases, supposing that the child which then she *carries*, shall, notwithstanding her *baptism* then, be it self *baptized* after its *birth*. 15.

Which as it is a clear *answer* to the argument deduced from the *resolution* of the *Jews* in that point, so 'tis moreover an evidence how little of *proof* Mr. *T.* had either from his own observation or Mr. *Seldens testimonies*, from all which he can produce no other but this, which in the sound is so far from *affirming* what he would have, and upon *examination* is found to conclude the *contrary*. 16.

SECT. VI.

Lesser inconformities no prejudice. Yet they do not all hold. Prayer the Christian sacrifice. בת דין. *The rule of judging in this matter. Baptizing in the name of the Father, &c. prescribed by Christ. So dipping or sprinkling. The Pract. Cat. misreported. Mr.* Marshals *covenanting.*

THIS *grand disparity* then being cleared to be Mr. *T.* his mistake, I shall not need to attend his other instances of *disparity*, this accord which hath been already mentioned and vindicated, being sufficient to my pretensions, and no concernment of mine obliging me to believe or affirm, that the *parallel* holds any farther than *Christ* was pleased it should hold, and of that we are to judge by what the *Scriptures*, or *ancient Church* tells us was the *practice* of him, or his *Apostles*; For 1. the *Jews* I doubt not, brought in many things of their own devising into this, as into other *institutions* of *God's*, and the latter *Jews* more, as of the *proselytes* being so born again in *baptism*, that lying with his *natural sister* was no incest, and the like: And 2. *Christ*, I doubt not, changed the *Jewish œconomy* in many things, as in laying aside *circumcision*, in *commissionating* his *disciples* to *baptize* (and they leaving it in the hands of the *Bishop*, and those to whom he should commit it, οὐκ ἐξὸν ἐστι χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου βαπτίζειν, *it is not lawful to baptize without the Bishop*, saith *Ignatius*) whereas it was not among the *Jews* any part of the *Priests Office*, any more than *Circumcision* was; And so in many other particulars. *Numb.* 1. *Ep. ad Smyrn. Edit. Voss.* p. 6.

But what prejudice is that to my *pretensions*, who affirm no more of the *accordance* betwixt the *Jewish* and *Christian* practice than either by some *indications* in the *Scripture* it self, or by the *Christian Fathers* deductions from the *Apostles* times, appears to be meant by *Christ*, and practised by the *Apostles*, and then by the *Jewish writers* is as evident to have been in *use* among them. 2.

And this is all the return I need make to his 14. *lesser disparities*, and all that he hath at large endeavoured to infer from them, supposing and granting them all to be such. 3.

But yet it is evident that some of them are not such; As when *First* he saith, *the baptism of males must be with circumcision and an offering*, 'tis clear that, though 1. *circumcision* be laid aside by *Christ*, and 2. when it was used, it had nothing to do with *baptism*, yet as to the adjoyning of *offering*, or *sacrifice*, the *parallel* still holds, the *prayers* of the *Church* being the *Christian sacrifice*, and those in the *Christian Church* solemnly attendant on the administration of *baptism*. 4.

So parallel to the *court* of *three Israelites*, by the *confession* or *profession* of whom (על עדת בת דין saith *Maimonides*) the *infant* was *baptized*, we have now not only the whole *Church*, in the presence of whom 'tis publickly *administred*, and when more *privately*, yet in the presence of some *Christians*, who are afterwards, if there be any doubt, to testify their knowledge to the *Church*, but more particularly the *Godfathers*, and *Godmothers*, being themselves formerly *baptized*, do represent the *Church* of which they are members, meaning thereby the *people* of the *Church*, and the *Minister commissionated* thereto by the *Bishop*, represents the *Church* also, meaning the *Governors* thereof. 5.

But I shall not proceed to such superfluous considerations, and so I have no need of adding one word more of reply to his 24. *Chap.* (as far as I am concerned in it) unless it be to tell him that the *Bishops Canons* are not the *rule* by which I undertake to define, wherein the *Jewish custom* must be the *pattern*, wherein not; but (as he cannot but know, if he had read the *resolution* of the 4. *Quære*) the *practice* of the *Apostles* of *Christ*, by the *testifications* of the *Fathers* of the *Church* made known unto us, to which as I have reason to yield all *authority*, so I find the *Canons* and *rituals* as of *this*, so of *all* other *Churches* in the world (no one excepted) to bear perfect *accordance* therewith, in this particular of *infant baptism* (though in other lesser particulars they differ *many* among themselves, and *all* from the *Jewish pattern*) And this I hope is a competent ground of my *action*, and such as may justify it to any *Christian artist* to be according to *rules* of right *reason*, of *meekness*, and sound *doctrine*, and no work of *passion* or *prejudice* or *singularity*, or (as Mr. *T.* suggests) of the *Doctors own pleasure*, as if that were the *mutable* principle of all these *variations* from the *Jewish pattern*. 6.

Of this score 'tis somewhat strange, which he thinks fit to add concerning the *form* of *baptism*, 7.

In the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, In this one thing, saith he, *which Christ did not prescribe, nor did the Apostles, that we find, so conceive it, yet, saith the Doctor, Christs prescription must be indispensably used.*

7. In reply to this I shall not spend much time to evidence this *form* to be *Christ's prescription*; If the *express* words at his parting from the world, *Mat.* 28. *Go ye therefore, and teach,* or *receive to discipleship, all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost,* be not a *prescription* of *Christs*, and if the *universal doctrin* and continual *practice* of the whole *Church* through all times, be not *testimony sufficient* of the *Apostles* conceiving it thus, and a *competent* ground of the *indispensable* continuing the use of it, I shall not hope to *perswade* with him; only I shall mind him of the words of S. *Athanasius* in his *Epistle* to *Serapion Tom.* 1. p. 204. Ὁ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ πατρὸς ὀνόματι βαπτιζόμενος, ἢ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ υἱοῦ, ἢ χωρὶς τοῦ πνεύματος, ἐν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ, οὐδὲν λαμβάνει, ἀλλὰ κενὸς καὶ ἀτελὴς διαμένει, ἐν τῇ τριάδι γὰρ ἡ τελείωσις ἐστι. *He that is not baptized in the name of all three, receives nothing, remains empty and imperfect, For perfection is in the Trinity,* no *baptism perfect*, it seems, but that. And if this will not yet suffice, I shall then only demand, whether he can produce so *express* grounds from *Christ*, or the *Apostles*, or the *Universal Church* of *God* through all ages, or from any one *ancient Father*, for his denying *baptism* to *infants*.

8. What in this place he adds farther from me, out of the *Practical Catechism*, that I *confess that by Christs appointment the baptized was to be dipt in water*, i. e. *according to the Primitive antient custom to be put under water*, is a strange misreporting of my words, I wonder Mr. *T.* would be guilty of it. The words in the *Pract. Cat.* are visibly these, *By Christ's appointment whosoever should be thus received into his family should be received with this ceremony of water, therein to be dipt* (i. e. *according to the Primitive antient custom, to be put under water (three times, or in stead of that, to be sprinkled with it*—— where 1. All that *Christ's appointment* is affixt to, is, the *receiving* all that should be *received* into *Christ's family*, with this *ceremony* of *Water*; 2. For the *manner* of that *reception* by *water*, 'tis set down disjunctively, *therein to be dipt three times, or in stead of that, to be sprinkled with it.* These are evidently my words; no way affirming either the *dipping* or *sprinkling* (one *exclusively* to the other) to be *appointed* by *Christ*, but only the *ceremony* of water, whether it be by *dipping* in it, or *sprinkling* with it, either of which may be signified by the word used from *Christ* by S. *Matthew*, βαπτίζετε, *baptize ye.*

l. 6. §. 2.

9. What ground the *Church* of *Christ* hath had to disuse *immersion*, and in stead of putting the whole *body* under *water*, only to *dip* the *face*, or *sprinkle* it with *water*, I shall not now discourse; all that I have to do in this place, being to *vindicate* my self, that I have no way affirmed the *putting under water* (used by the *Primitive Church*) to be *appointed* by *Christ*, exclusively to *sprinkling*, and that I hope I have already done by the exact reciting of my words, which had been so much misreported by him.

10. And so I have done with his 24. *Chapter.* For as to the *objection* against Mr. *M.* drawn from his *covenanting* to perform the *worship of God, according to Gods word*, and *admiring that ever mortal man should dare in Gods worship to meddle any jot farther than the Lord hath commanded, and yet in point of infant baptism following the Talmud*, I that am far from Mr. *M.* his perswasions, as well as *practices*, am not sure bound to give answer for him, *Ætatem habet, let him answer for himself*; and when he doth so, 'twere not amiss he would consider, whether *Episcopal government* stand not on as firm a basis in the *Church* of *God*, as *Infant baptism* is by him vouched to do.

CHAP. II.

Of Christ's words, Matt. 28. 19.

SECT. I.

The Doctors pretended concessions examined. Christ's institution of Baptism not set down Matt. 28. *but necessarily before that time.*

Numb. 1. THIS 25. *Chapter* is a view of my interpretation of *Mat.* 28. 19. which lies thus, *Go and disciple* (μαθητεύσατε, *make disciples, receive* into *discipleship*) *all nations, baptizing them in the name*, &c. *teaching them*, &c. thereby evidencing that the *making* or *receiving disciples*, not supposing any *precedent instruction*, but looking wholly on it as *subsequent*, can no way exclude the *Christians infants* from *baptism*, when they are thus brought to the *Church* to be entred into the *School* of *Christ*, and undertaken for, that they shall *learn* when they come to *years*.

2. And to this a long *proemial answer* he hath of many lines, which begins thus, *Though I conceive Dr.* H. *to ascribe more power to the Canons of the Prelates about the Sacraments, than is meet, being one who hath written in defence of the Common prayer Book, yet by this allegation of* Mat. 28. 19. *he seems tacitely to yield, that if the words there include not infants under the discipled, then there is something in the New Testament which excludes infants from baptism, although he say* §. 96. *I do not believe or pretend that that precept of Christ doth necessarily infer (though it do as little deny) that infants are to be baptized.*

3. Before I proceed to that which follows, 'tis not amiss to view in *passing*, how many *incongruities* are here amass't together in these few words.

4. For whereas my having *written in defence of the Common Prayer Book* is made use of as an evidence to infer that I *ascribe more to the Canons of Prelates, than is meet*, it is certain, 1. That the *Common Prayer book* stands not by the *Canons* of the *Prelates*, but by *Act* of *Parliament*, and consequently if I had

had been guilty of a confeſt partiality to the *Common Prayer book*, yet were this no evidence of my *aſcribing* any thing (therefore ſure not *more than is meet* or *too much*) to the *Canons* of *Prelates*.

Secondly, It never yet appeared, that by writing in defence of the *Common Prayer book*, I offended 5.
at all (therefore ſurely not about either, much leſs againſt both the *Sacraments.*)

Thirdly, The making my defence of the *Common Prayer book*, written long ago, a proof that I 6.
offend now in ſomewhat elſe; *viz.* in *attributing too much* to the *Canons* of the *Biſhops*, is, 1. The connecting together things that are moſt *diſparate*, concluding *quidlibet ex quolibet*; and 2. a plain *begging* of the *queſtion*, for ſuch certainly it is in reſpect of him, with whom he *diſputes*, and ſo muſt be, till he ſhall offer proof that I have erred in that *defence*, The ſame, as if he ſhould *conclude*, that he who hath once written the *truth*, were obliged the next time to *ſwerve* from it.

So when he mentions my *allegation* of *Mat.* 28. 19. the word *allegation* muſt ſignify that I produce 7.
and ſo *alledge* that *text* as a *proof* of my *poſition*: But this he knows I do not; But only ſuppoſe the *Antipædobaptiſt* to found his *plea* in it, and all that I have to do, is to ſhew how *uſeleſs* it is like to prove to him, *confeſſing* alſo that to me it is as *uſeleſs*, and ſo never attempting to draw any *argument* from it.

So again, when upon a ſuppoſition by him ſpecified, he aſſumes me to grant that which he acknow- 8.
ledgeth me *expreſly* to *deny*, this ſure is very incongruous: Tis viſible from the words by me produced §. 96. that I deny that that *text* of *Mat.* 28. 19. can prejudice the *baptiſm* of *infants*, and the only deſign I had in conſidering this *text* at all in this place, was to evidence the ſecond *branch* of the *negative* part of my *undertaking*, that there *appeared nothing in Chriſts inſtitution of baptiſm, or commiſſion to his Apoſtles, which was excluſive of infants*: How then can it be ſuggeſted with any ſhew of *truth*, that *I ſeem tacitely to yield, that if the words include not infants under the diſcipled, there is then ſomething in the New Teſtament which excludes infants from baptiſm.*

'Tis evident from whence it is that I infer, and poſitively define *Chriſts Commiſſion* for *baptiſm* to 9.
belong to *infants*, not from theſe words of *Chriſt* (which as I ſaid, I never propoſed to that end to prove my *poſition* from them, but only to anſwer the *Antipædobaptiſts objection* founded in them) but from the *practice* of the *Apoſtles* ſignifying their *ſenſe* and *perſwaſion* of *Chriſts* meaning in his *inſtitution* of *baptiſm*, which *inſtitution* we know from *John* 4. 1. had long *preceded* the delivering of theſe words *Mat.* 28.

So that whatſoever were the notion of *diſcipling* there, yet could not I deem *infants* thereby *exclu-* 10.
ded from *baptiſm*, whom by another *medium*, viz. the *Apoſtolical practice*, I ſuppoſed to be *admitted* to it by *Chriſts inſtitution*.

The ſhort is, *Infants* I ſuppoſe may be received into *diſcipleſhip* when their parents bring them, 11.
and if ſo, then they are or may be included in the words *Mat.* 28. but if they might not, and ſo were ſuppoſed not to be *comprehended* in theſe words of *Chriſt*, *Mat.* 28. yet that which is not included, is not preſently excluded, he that ſaith a *man* is a *living creature*, doth not thereby deny an *angel* to be ſo alſo: when *Chriſt* gives his *diſciples power* to *heal diſeaſes*, *Mat.* 10. 1. he cannot be deemed to withhold from them *power* of raiſing the *dead*, for that we ſee comprehended in their commiſſion v. 8. and ſo I could no way be inforced to yield that they were excluded from *baptiſm*, as long as from any other *medium* I were aſſured they were *admitted* to it.

And ſo ſtill μηδὲν ὑγιὲς, here is not the leaſt *appearance* of *truth* in this *diſcourſe*. 12.

He proceeds then to ſome other attempts of proving it *neceſſary* for me, if I will ſtand to my 13.
words elſewhere, *to acknowledge infants excluded by that text.* To which end he hath been very diligent in putting together ſeveral ſcattered paſſages in my *writings*, in hope to find ſome ἐναντιοφάνεια, and to raiſe ſome ſhew of *argument* out of my own words, and ſo from my *temerity* or *inconſtancy* (for want of ſolid proofs) to conclude, that if this *precept* of *Chriſt* doth not neceſſarily infer *infant-baptiſm*, then by manifeſt *conſequence* it doth deny it.

The paſſages he *gathers* up are theſe, "The Doctor ſaith, §. 55. that Chriſts inſtitution makes 14.
"dipping or ſprinkling with water a Sacrament, which inſtitution is *Mat.* 28. 19. and therefore the
"Doctor will have the words there indiſpenſably uſed in baptiſm, and §. 92. he ſaith baptiſm is a Sacra-
"ment, that Sacrament an inſtitution of Chriſts, that inſtitution not founded in any reaſon of im-
"mutable truth, but only in the poſitive will of Chriſt, and ſo that there is nothing conſiderable
"in this queſtion (or any of this nature) but how it was delivered by Chriſt; And §. 94. that which
"was done by the Apoſtles, if it were not a rule for ever, yet was an effect of ſuch a rule formerly gi-
"ven by Chriſt, and interpretable by this practice to be ſo. And, Pract. Cat. *l.* 6. §. 2. he expounding
"Chriſts inſtitution, ſaith that the words import that the perſon baptized acknowledgeth, maketh
"profeſſion of believing in three, delivers him to three as authors of his faith, and to be ruled
"by the directions of his Maſter, and this he will have to be meant by baptizing into the name of
"the Father, Son, and holy Ghoſt.

Theſe are the paſſages, *whence*, ſaith he, "I infer that if baptiſm be a Sacrament, and made ſo 15.
"by Chriſts inſtitution, and that inſtitution founded only in his poſitive will, and the will of
"Chriſt be, that baptiſm be in the name of the Trinity, and this is when the baptized makes pro-
"feſſion of believing in three, to be ruled by them, and the Apoſtles practice interprets Chriſts
"rule, no infant that doth not profeſs faith, is baptized into the name of the Trinity, nor was
"appointed to be baptized by Chriſt, nor did the Apoſtles baptize them, and therefore they are not
"baptized according to Chriſts inſtitution, and ſo no Sacrament to them.

Here is a very *ſubtile fabrick* and great pains taken to prove me to affirm *tacitely* what I expreſly 16.
deny: But herein though his pains be great, he hath much failed of the *ſucceſs*; it were too long to ſhew it at large, yet the reader that will be at pains to ſurvey his proceſs, will certainly acknowledge it, if he ſhall but remember theſe two things.

Firſt, That *Chriſts inſtitution* of *baptiſm* was not (nor is ever affirmed by me to be) ſet down in 17.
thoſe words of *Mat.* 28. that having been long before *inſtituted* and *practiſed*, as appears by plain words *Joh.* 4. 1, 2. *Secondly*, That though *Chriſts will* and *inſtitution* for *baptizing infants* be not ſo manifeſtly expreſt in thoſe words *Mat.* 28. 19. as ſhall be able by the bare force of the words to *con-*

vince any *gainſayer*, without any other way of *evidence* or *proof* added to it, yet by the *Apoſtles practice* of *baptizing infants* (appearing to us by other means) it is moſt evident that they who certainly did not *miſtake Chriſts* meaning, did thus underſtand and extend his *inſtitution* and *commiſſion*. The truth of this is there made evident §. 30, *&c.* I ſhall not here repeat it.

18. *Secondly*, That the *infant* when he is to be *baptized*, doth, though not by his *own* voice *perſonally*, yet by his *lawful proxies*, which the *Church* accepteth in his ſtead, *profeſs* the *believing* in *three*, the *Father*, *Son*, and *holy Ghoſt*, *deliver himſelf up to three*, &c.

19. By this clue the reader will eaſily extricate himſelf out of the *Labyrinth* there provided for him, if ſuch it appear to be, and diſcern a perfect *accordance* in all the paſſages, which with ſuch hope of *advantage* were ſo diligently *collected* by him.

20. But this is not all, he will yet drive the buſineſs ſomewhat higher in theſe words, *Yea, if the poſitive will of Chriſt, be the reaſon of baptiſm, they uſurp upon Chriſt's prerogative who baptize otherwiſe than Chriſt hath appointed, and then if the precept of Chriſt doth not neceſſarily infer infant baptiſm (which the* Doctor *ingenuouſly acknowledgeth) it doth by manifeſt conſequence deny it, ſith he forbids that to be done otherwiſe than he hath appointed when he hath determined how it ſhould be done. The* Doctor *when he ſaith above, the words,* [*I baptize into the name of the Father*, &c.] *muſt be indiſpenſably uſed, methinks by the ſame reaſon ſhould conceive Chriſts inſtitution ſhould be unalterably uſed in baptizing thoſe only whom he hath appointed to be baptized.*

21. To this the grounds of anſwer have been already laid alſo, *viz.* that they that *baptize infants*, *baptize* no otherwiſe than *Chriſt appointed*, and the *Apoſtles* appear to have underſtood his *appointment*. By *Chriſts appointment*, not meaning particularly his words, *Mat.* 28. but his *will* otherwiſe made known to his *diſciples* when and in what words ſoever it was that he *inſtituted baptiſm*, which muſt be long before this, even before his *Apoſtles* took upon them to *baptize* any, which yet they did in great abundance *Joh.* 4. 1. And of this *appointment* or *inſtitution* of *baptiſm* by *Chriſt*, it is moſt true, that if that *precept* of *Chriſt*, *whereby he firſt inſtituted baptiſm*, *did not indeed comprehend and ſo neceſſarily infer infant baptiſm*, and was ſo underſtood to do by the *Apoſtles*, it ſhall conſequently be *deemed to deny it*. But then herein lyes a great *fallacy*, when from another *appointment* of *Chriſts*, viz. that *Mat.* 28. which I acknowledge not to infer *infant baptiſm* neceſſarily, he aſſumes *in univerſum*, and reports it as my *confeſſion*, that *Chriſts precept* (*indefinitely* taken, and ſo extending to *all Chriſts precepts* at any time) doth not *neceſſarily* infer *infant baptiſm*. Which is that grand *illogical* fault in diſcourſe, of inferring an *indefinite* or *univerſal* concluſion from *particular* premiſſes.

22. As for the *compariſon* which he makes betwixt the *indiſpenſable* uſe of the words of *baptiſm*, *Mat.* 28. and the as unalterable obſervation of *Chriſt's inſtitution*, in reſpect of the *perſons* to be *baptized*, I willingly grant it, on the condition premiſed, that he miſtake not the text, *Mat.* 28. to be the words of that *inſtitution*, wherein *Chriſt* defined, who are the *perſons* to be *baptized*.

23. Thoſe words are a *commiſſion* to the *Apoſtles* to *go preach to*, or *diſciple all nations*, and thus far extends to point out the perſons, *viz.* that they ſhould (as *diſciple* ſo) *baptize Gentiles* as well as *Jews*, and again, they are expreſs for the *form* of *baptiſm*, that it ſhould be *in the name of the Father*, *the Son*, *and the Holy Ghoſt*, but they are not any kind of *direction* to that other matter of *receiving*; and *admitting infants* or not *infants*.

24. That I ſuppoſe ſufficiently notified to them before, both by the common *practice* of their *anceſtors* in the *Jewiſh religion*, by the vulgar notion of *baptiſm*, whileſt it was familiarly uſed among the *Jews*, both to their own and their *proſelytes children*, and alſo by *Chriſts* ſpecial *direction*, (though the *Goſpels*, which expreſs not at all the words of the *firſt inſtitution* of *baptiſm*, do not ſet that down) in the time of his *preaching* among them, ſome while before that paſſage of ſtory related, *Joh.* 4. 1, &c.

25. From both of theſe, I ſuppoſe, the *Apoſtles* learnt it (and not from *Mat.* 28.) and we learn it only from the *Apoſtles*, as ſhall hereafter appear. And ſo much for his *proœmial* reaſoning.

SECT. II.

Making diſciples, all one with receiving into diſcipleſhip. Baptizing, the act of the Baptiſt. Inſtruction ſubſequent to diſcipling. The pretended parallel between Mat. 28. *and* Mar. 16. Εὐαγγελίζεσθαι. Johns *diſcipling by preaching, excludes not infants. No more the Apoſtles,* Mat. 10. 5. *The notation of the word* μαθητεύειν. Mat. 13. 52. Act. 14. 21. *Infants both ſaid to come, and to believe. Inſtruction ſubſequent to baptiſm.*

Numb. 1. After this *præluſory* σκιαμαχία, he next proceeds to conſider, *what ſhift* (as he calls it) *the Doctor makes to elude the force of Chriſts inſtitution*, Mat. 28. 19. But I have already made it evident that that *Commiſſion* for *preaching* to, or *diſcipling all nations* (as for the *baptizing* them, and the particularity of the *form* to be uſed in *baptiſm*, &c.) was not the *inſtitution* of *baptiſm*, nor any *intimation* on either ſide, whether *infants* ſhould be *baptized* or not; and ſo 'tis manifeſt how little need I had to uſe any *ſhift*, or *artifice* to *elude* the *force* of it.

2. However in his view of my diſcourſe ſome *exceptions* he muſt find; And the *firſt* is that *though* μαθητεύσαλε *is well rendred, make diſciples, yet* μαθητεύσαλε βαπλίζονλες *is not well paraphraſed by, receiving into diſcipleſhip, baptizing them, making this form of baptiſm the ceremony of receiving them. For by this, ſaith he, the making diſciples is made the ſame with receiving them, and baptiſm the ceremony of receiving into diſcipleſhip, which is as truly an act of the baptized profeſſing, or avouching his diſcipleſhip.*

3. Here is another *ſubtlety* of a *refined* nature, making a difference betwixt *making diſciples*, and *receiving into diſcipleſhip*, or *receiving diſciples*; As if theſe two were not perfectly *ſynonymous*, and by me evidently uſed,

uſed, as ſuch. I ſhall not diſpute of *words*, when the *matter* is clear, and when it is equally to my purpoſe which phraſe is uſed, whether *making* or *receiving diſciples*.

Secondly, When he affirms of *baptiſm*, which I make the *ceremony* of the *Apoſtles receiving* them, 4.
that 'tis *as truly the act of the baptized*, this is no *ſubtilty*, but *groſs* and viſible enough; For certainly *baptiſm* in the *active* ſenſe (as it is plain I underſtand it in that place, where I *paraphraſe*, *go* and *make diſciples* and *baptize*) is not the *act* of the *baptized*, but of the *baptiſt*; The *coming* to *baptiſm* indeed, and the undertaking the *vow*, and making the *profeſſion*, is the act of the *baptized*, either *perſonally*, or by his *proxy*, which in *reputation* of *Law*, and in *acceptation* of the *Church*, is his alſo; but ſtill *baptiſm*, or (to remove all poſſible miſtake) *baptizing*, βαπτίζειν, *Mat.* 28. 19. is an *act* of the *baptizer* only, and ſo the *ceremony* of *receiving* into *diſcipleſhip*, whomſoever they thus duely *baptize*. I hope I need ſay no more of this.

His *ſecond* branch of *exception* is to thoſe words of mine wherein I ſay that the *making* or *receiving* 5.
diſciples, ſuppoſeth not any *precedent inſtruction*, but looks wholly on it as *ſubſequent*. This I there concluded not from the bare *negative*, becauſe there was no *precedent* mention of ſuch *inſtruction*, where *diſcipling* and *baptizing*, were both mention'd, but becauſe in that place, on which the *Antipædobaptiſt* ſo much relies, *Mat.* 28. 19. the [διδάσκοντες *teaching*] is expreſly mentioned *after diſcipling* and *baptizing*, and ſo is in reaſon to be deemed, and lookt on, as *ſubſequent* to both, and ſo the *receiving ad diſcipulatum* refer to that then *future* inſtruction.

And to this ſenſe I there made it manifeſt, that the definition of *baptiſm* 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. did refer, 6.
that *baptiſm* is ἐπερώτημα, *ſeeking* to *God*, as to the *oracle* to *inquire* for the whole *future* life, no way prerequiring *actual* inſtruction, but *coming* to *Chriſt* and the *Church* to receive it, and obey it for the *future* (and that done in ſome ſort by thoſe that are *brought*, when they are not able to *come*, and by the *charity* of the *Church* received there) And this farther illuſtrated as by the manner of *children* brought by *parents* to *School*, without either *knowledge* of *letters*, or choice, or ſo much as *wiſh* of *inſtruction*, ſo by the manner of *Chriſt's diſciples* being received by him, particularly of *Philip*, *Joh.* 1. 44. who was called, and received into *diſcipleſhip*, as ſoon as ever *Chriſt* met with him, i. e. before he was at all *inſtructed* by him; and ſo alſo by the *ſtory* of the *Jews*, *Exo.* 19. 8. who undertook to *obey* all the *Commandments* of *God*, which he *ſhould* give them, which yet were not *then*, but after *given* them, v. 20. and ſo *laſtly*, by the nature of *proſelytiſm*, which as it is all one with *entring* into *God's covenant* and (in the *Chriſtian* ſenſe) with *coming* to *Chriſt* and being *received* to *diſcipleſhip*, ſo 'tis that which *children* are known to be capable of, not only by that text, *Deut.* 29. 10. but by the *cuſtom* of *baptizing infant proſelytes* among the *Jews*, and by *Chriſt's* command to *ſuffer them to come unto* him, whenſoever they were thus *brought*.

Now to this thus evidenced (and much more largely in that place, §. 26. &c.) he is pleaſed to 7.
annex ſome *reaſons* of his *diſſent*, *For*, 1. ſaith he, *that which is expreſt in* Matthew *by*, *Go ye therefore and make diſciples all nations*, *is in* Mark, *Go ye into all the world and preach the Goſpel to every creature*, *which ſhews how they ſhould diſciple all nations*; *Now they who are made diſciples by preaching the Goſpel are made diſciples by precedent inſtruction*, *Ergo*, *the making or receiving diſciples*, Mat. 28. 19. *ſuppoſeth precedent inſtruction*.

But to this I anſwer, 1. That the words in *Mark* are no otherwiſe *parallel* to thoſe in *Matthew*, than 8.
as an *Epitome* is parallel to a larger diſcourſe, ſuch we know S. *Marks* for the moſt part is, an *abbreviation* of S. *Matthews Goſpel*, as in many others, ſo in this *particular*, ſome paſſages indeed there are in S. *Mark* in this place, which are not in S. *Matthew*, as ſhall anon be ſhewed, but in the particular now before us, S. *Mark* is, according to wont, more *conciſe*; there is no mention in him of *baptizing in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the holy Ghoſt*, nor conſequently of *diſcipling*, of which that was the *ceremony*, as in S. *Matthew* there is.

Secondly, That *Chriſts appointment* κηρύσσειν εὐαγγέλιον, *to preach the Goſpel*, in S. *Mark*, doth no 9.
way infer the *precedent inſtruction* of every *ſingle* perſon that was *received* to *baptiſm*: The phraſe ſignifies to *proclaim* or *promulgate* the *happy tidings* brought into the world by *Chriſt*, grace, and mercy, and eternal felicity to all that ſhould *come* in to him, and *take* his *yoke* upon them, and *learn of him*; And upon the *publiſhing* of this to *all the world*, to *every creature*, i e. to the *Gentiles* univerſally, as well as the *Jews*, I ſuppoſe 'tis very poſſible, that many of them ſhould make all ſpeed to *come* unto *Chriſt*, and *come* out at the *Apoſtles preaching*, they and their whole *houſholds* together (παυδίη, as the *oracle* commanded in *Homer*) and to bring their *infant children* with them, as they uſed to do, that became *proſelytes* to the *Jews* and then the *Apoſtles*, knowing their *Maſters* mind for the *receiving* of *Infants*, and that (as from the *inſtitution* I ſuppoſe them fore-inſtructed) to *baptiſm*, receive them *all*, and (as many as interpoſed no *voluntary* hindrance) *baptize* them, and having taken them into the *School* of *Chriſt* make good proviſion for the *future inſtruction* of them, as ſoon as ever they ſhould be capable of it.

That thus it was, I pretend not (ſtill) to *deduce* from theſe words, *Mat.* 28. but to infer from 10.
another *medium*, the *practice* of the *Apoſtles*, otherwiſe notified to us: All that I am now to manifeſt, is, that this paſſage hath nothing contrary to our *hypotheſis*, but is perfectly reconcileable with it, and this is done by the *ſcheme* thus laid: And ſo 'tis moſt viſible how no force there is in this firſt *reaſon* of *exception*.

The *ſecond* follows, that *ſuch as the making diſciples was Joh.* 4. 1. *ſuch is the making diſciples* Mat. 11.
28. 19. *For by the* Doctors *confeſſion they are all one*. *But that was by preaching*, *as is plain concerning John*, Mat. 3. 1, 2, 5, 6. *and concerning the Apoſtles*, Mat. 10. 5, 6, 7. *Ergo*.

To this I anſwer, that the *account* laſt given, is fully ſatisfactory to this *exception* alſo; For ſup- 12.
poſing the *Apoſtles* to *publiſh* whitherſoever they came, the Εὐαγγέλια, the *good news* that was come into the world by *Chriſt*, and the hearers not only to come in themſelves, but to bring their *whole families*, and ſo their *infant children* with them, there is no difficulty to imagin, that they that had thus made *proclamation*, *received all*, and made all *diſciples*, *young* and *old*, that either came or were brought, and ſo it being granted that they made *diſciples* by *preaching*, *preaching* being the *inſtrument* to draw the *parents* themſelves, and to move them to *bring* their *children* to *diſcipleſhip*, it is ſtill very viſible

how

how *children* ſhould be *diſciples*, and conſequently *baptized* by them, *baptiſm* being the conſtant *ceremony* of *diſcipling*. And though I am not able to affirm, how it was *actually* in *Johns baptiſm*, *yet* this I may ſay, that as far as can be diſcerned or inferred from the phraſe in either place, (μαθητεύειν and μαθητὰς ποιεῖν) thus it very poſſibly might be both in *Johns* and in the *Apoſtles baptizing*.

12. Firſt for *John*, 'tis true indeed that his *baptiſm* attended his *preaching*, yet doth it not thence neceſſarily follow that none were *baptized* by him, but thoſe who particularly *heard* and obeyed his *preaching*; For 1. Why might not thoſe that *heard* it, divulge it to others, and bring them *before* they *heard* him, to deſire to be *baptized*, and upon their *confeſſing* their *ſins*, and *profeſſing* amendment, he *baptize* them? 2. Why might not thoſe that *heard* it, or *heard* of it, give that heed to it, as to bring all that were *dear* to them, of what *age* ſoever, by that means to ſecure them from the *wrath to come*; when *Noah preacht repentance* to the *old world*, and upon the decree of ſending the *flood* upon the *world* of the *ungodly*, called all to come into the *Ark* to him to eſcape the deluge, ſuppoſe others beſides *Noahs family*, had hearkened to his *preaching*, or ſuppoſe he and his ſons had had *infant children*, can we imagine they would have left their *infants* to that certain *ruine*, and not have taken them into the *Ark* with them?

13. And *Johns baptiſm* was anſwerable to that *Ark*, in reſpect of that approaching ruine on the *Jews*, ſtyled the *kingdom* of *heaven* v. 1. and that evidenced to be a *bloody kingdom*, explicated by *caſting into the fire* v. 10. And can we imagine the *Jews* that believed *John* and came to his *baptiſm*, did not bring their *children* with them to *ſave* them from the *predicted evils*? And then I profeſs not to ſee any reaſon to render it incredible, that *John Baptiſt* ſhould thus *receive* and *baptize* thoſe *infants* (though the *Scripture* affirming nothing of it, and *tradition*, as far I know, as little, I ſhall neither affirm nor believe any thing in it) This only is certain, that among the *Jews* of that time *infant Children* were known to be capable of *entring* into *covenant* with *God* after this manner, and of being partakers of the *benefit* of the *Covenant* by that means.

14. And one thing more I may add, that *Chriſt* himſelf, who was by his *ſinleſneſs*, as *unqualified* for the *Repentance* which *John Preacht*, as the *infants* were by their incapacities, did yet come and was received to *John's baptiſm*, v. 13. and then in caſe *infants* were brought, why might not they be received alſo?

15. Then *Secondly*, for as much as concerned the *Apoſtles Mat.* 10. Firſt, 'Tis there evident that they were ſent to the *loſt ſheep indefinitely*, and ſure that phraſe comprehends the *Lambs* alſo, the *infant children* being loſt in *Adam*, as well as the *grown* men, by the addition of their *actual* to *original* ſin: And then why ſhould we doubt but the *Apoſtles miſſion* extended to *them* alſo?

16. And *Secondly*, for their *preaching*, it is juſt as *Johns* was, to warn them to beware of the *imminent deſtruction*, that *vindicative* act of *Gods kingdom* v. 7. that all that ſhould give *ear* and *heed* to them might haſten to get out of that *danger* by *reformation* and new life; and the *ruine* being impendent to the *young* as well as *old*, even the whole *nation*, why ſhould not the *infant children* be reſcued from that, by their *parents* care in bringing them to *baptiſm*, and timely ingaging them to *fly from the wrath to come*, as ſoon as they ſhould come to *underſtanding*, injoying in the mean time the benefit of others *charity*?

17. *Thirdly*, After their *Preaching* though there be no mention of *baptizing* (and ſo it was not ſo fit to be produced to our preſent *buſineſs*) yet other things there are appointed to be done, wherein *infants* were concerned as well as others, as *healing* of *diſeaſes*, &c. and if being incapable of receiving *benefit* from *preaching* ſhould be deemed an *obſtacle* to their being *baptized*, why ſhould it not to their receiving of *cures*? Nay I may add, How ſhould the *dead* in that place (who ſure were as uncapable of *hearing* or *underſtanding* as the *tendereſt infant*) be capable of being *raiſed* by thoſe *Apoſtles*, which yet is there affirmed of them, *v.* 8.

18. And ſo much for that *reaſon* alſo, and in like manner for the third, which is but repeating the laſt branch of this ſecond, that the *Apoſtles* were to *diſciple all nations by the ſame way that they diſcipled the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael*, *which was*, ſaith he, *by preaching and therefore ſuppoſed precedent inſtruction*.

19. In what ſenſe, I have now ſhewed, *viz.* by *preaching* to the *nations*, and *receiving* all that came in, to the *diſcipleſhip* whether on their *own legs*, or in others *arms*, whole *families* at once, the *parents*, and upon their *undertaking* their *infant children* alſo.

20. His fourth proof is taken from the *uſe and notation of the word*, *which is ſo to teach as that they learn*, *and ſo*, ſaith he, *is uſed* Mat. 13. 52. μαθητευθεὶς, *is rendred*, [*inſtructed*] *by our laſt tranſlators*, *and can be no otherwiſe rendred than* [*made a diſciple by teaching*] *ſo* Act. 14. 21. *it is ſaid*, *Having preached the Goſpel to that city*, καὶ μαθητεύσαντες *and having taught or made many diſciples*

21. For the *notation* of the word we have formerly ſaid ſufficient, that it ſignifies to *receive ad diſcipulatum*, as into a *ſchool* of Spiritual *inſtruction*, μαθητεύω ποιῶν to *make a diſciple*, and ſuch he is made, who by any *motive* or means either *comes* or is *brought* into the *ſchool*, this indeed in order to *teaching* in the *Maſter*, and to *learning* in the *ſcholar*, and the one ſo to *teach*, as that the other *learn*, but this *ſubſequent* to his being made a *diſciple*, the *youth* we know enters into the *School*, is admitted into the *College* and *Univerſity*, before he *learns* a word there, the *inſtruction* or *learning* is ſtill lookt upon as *future*, at his *entring* into *diſcipleſhip*.

22. And this is all the importance of the word μαθητεύειν *Mat.* 13. 5. only ſome *accidental* differences may be obſerved; 'tis in the *paſſive*, and in the *Aoriſt* in the *prater tenſe*, πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, *every Scribe which is* or *hath been entred as a diſciple unto the kingdom of heaven*, who ſince his *entrance* hath been *inſtructed* and (as real *paſſives* import) *received influence*, been really *affected* and *changed* by *diſcipleſhip*, ſtill no way ſuppoſing that he was *inſtructed* in the *learning* or *myſteries* of the *kingdom* of *heaven*, before he was thus *admitted* a *diſciple* to it; After his *admiſſion*, there is no doubt but he doth (or ought to) *learn*, nay being there γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς, a *Scribe diſcipled*, a *grown* man and *learned* among the *Jews*, before he came to *Chriſt*, I doubt not but ſome *knowledge* he had of it *before* he entred himſelf a *diſciple* (ſee *baptizing of infants*, p. 199.) but this not by force of the word μαθητεύειν, for ſtill a *diſciple* he may be before he *learns*, and is therefore *obliged* to *learn*,

becauſe

becauſe he hath aſſumed and undertaken to do ſo, either perſonally, or by others *ſuſception*, by his *coming*, or being *brought* to be a *diſciple*.

So in the other place *Act.* 14. 21. μαθητεύσαντες ἱκανοὺς] ſignifies no more than *having received*, or *initiated*, i.e. (I ſuppoſe) by this rite of *baptiſm*, made and *baptized* many *diſciples*, which though it be there ſet down as a *conſequent* of the *Apoſtles preaching* the *Goſpel* in that City (for otherwiſe it were not imaginable that they ſhould receive any *diſciples* there, they muſt firſt proclaim *admiſſion* to all that *come*, before any can be expected either to *come*, or be *brought* to them) yet may it very reaſonably be extended to more perſons than thoſe that underſtood their *preaching*, *viz.* to the *infant children* of their *proſelytes*, brought to them by their *parents* and dedicated to *Chriſt*. 23.

Thus *invalid* are his attempts from the *notation* of the *word*, and by conſequence his *inference* from thence (which is ſet down as his *fifth proof*) that *thereby it may appear how the Apoſtles underſtood the precept of Chriſt to preach the Goſpel to perſons and thereby make them diſciples.* For although the *practice* of the *Apoſtles* be indeed the means by which we may diſcern how they underſtood *Chriſts precept* (and thoſe two places cited by Mr. *T.* from *Mat.* 13. and *Act.* 14. do no way belong to that, they tell us not, whether they received *infants* to *baptiſm*, or not) yet I may very well ward my ſelf from any *inconvenience*, which this uſe of the word μαθητεύειν in other places can threaten, it being already vindicated from all neceſſity that it ſhould be confined to *grown* men, and not communicated to *infants* alſo. 24.

His *laſt* proof is by returning to the *firſt* again, comparing the words in *Matthew* with the *parallel* place in *Mark*, *Whereby*, ſaith he, *a diſciple and believer will appear to be the ſame, the diſciple to be baptized in* Mat. *being in* Mark *expreſſed by the believer, which is put before baptiſm.* 25.

To this I anſwer, 1. that that paſſage in S. *Mark*, *He that believes and is baptized ſhall be ſaved, and he that believeth not ſhall be damned*, and ſo on to the end of the *Goſpel*, is (as even now I intimated) added by that *Evangeliſt*, to the words, as they are ſet down in *Matthew*, and ſo being an *addition*, cannot be looked on, as exactly *parallel* to the words in *Matthew*, *Go and diſciple all nations baptizing them*— And this we alſo know is ordinary, for one *Evangeliſt* to ſet down more fully, what is omitted or more ſhortly ſet down in another, and S. *Mark* that in other things was willing to abbreviate S. *Matthew*, doth now viſibly inlarge; And ſo the *compariſon* cannot regularly be made betwixt theſe two *Evangeliſts* words, ſomething being *abbreviated* in *Mark* which was more at large in *Matthew*, and ſomething more *conciſely* ſet down in *Matthew*, and more largely in *Mark*. And then what neceſſity is there, that *Mark* not mentioning *diſcipling* but *believing*, and *Matthew* mentioning *diſcipling* but not *believing* the *diſcipled* and *believers* ſhould be deemed the ſame? 26.

'Tis true indeed of *grown* men, none can in reaſon be admitted *diſciples*, which are not alſo *believers* (the ground of which I have ſet down in the *Reſol.* of the *Quære* p. 199.) but of *infant children* this is not true, for thoſe, though they cannot *come*, may yet be *brought*, and though not upon their own *confeſſion*, yet by the *ſuſception* of others, made capable of the *Churches charity*, and ſo may be *diſciples* without *actual* or *perſonal* belief. 27.

Nay *Secondly*, if Mr. *T.* his argument had power to infer it, 'twere that which I might ſafely avouch, that *infants* may be comprehended under the ſtyle πιστεύοντες, they that *believe* and are *baptized*; ſo even now we had it in the *expreſs* words of *Chriſt*, the *little ones* (and S. *Luke* ſpecifies them to be βρέφη *little infants*) *that believe on him:* i. e. juſt as they are ſaid elſewhere to *come unto him*, when they are as uncapable, for want of bodily *ſtrength*, of *perſonal coming*, as for want of *ſtrength* of *mind* or *judgement*, *of perſonal believing*, and yet in reſpect of others *bringing* them to *Chriſt* (and ſo to the *Church* in *baptiſm*) they are by *Chriſt* himſelf ſaid to do both of theſe, to *come* in one place, and to *believe* in the other. 28.

But then *Thirdly*, I willingly acknowledge that the word [*believe*] in *Mark*, belongs peculiarly to the *grown* men and women, who are called by the *preaching* of the *Goſpel*, of whom though it be ſaid, that *believing* and being *baptized* they ſhall be *ſaved*, and *not believing* they ſhall be *damned*, yet it no way follows, that none but ſuch as thus *perſonally believed*, ſhould be *baptized*, or that being *baptized* they ſhould not be *ſaved*, but loſe all the *benefit* of their *baptiſm*. 29.

The latter part of the words is conſiderable, *He that believeth not, ſhall be damned*, *Infidelity* is pitcht on, as the thing peculiarly, that incurs the certain *damnation*, i. e. the *voluntary* reſiſting the *Faith*, when it is *preacht* convincingly to them, and of that none are capable, but thoſe that are arrived to years of *underſtanding*. Which as it is an indication that that *ver.* and thoſe that follow in S. *Mark*, of *believers caſting out devils*, &c. *v.* 17, 18. belong to *adulti* peculiarly; ſo it no ways hinders but S. *Matthews* words being different from them, and ſuppoſed to be *precedent* to them in *Chriſts* delivery, may comprehend *infants* alſo, as ſuch who are capable of *entring* into *diſcipleſhip*, and of being *brought* and preſented to the *Apoſtles* by *believing Parents*, This being the way whereby the *faith* of the *Parents* may be ſignally beneficial to the *child*, in bringing him thus early into the *School*, and ſo to the *benediction* of *Chriſt*, the *parents* together with the *infant children*, as among the *Jews* ſo among *Chriſtians*, entring together into *covenant* with *God*. 30.

In this matter Mr. *T.* is willing to find a difference betwixt *Teaching them to obſerve all things whatſoever Chriſt hath commanded them*, Mat. 28. 20. *and the preaching of the Goſpel in* S. *Mark*: thinking by that means to avoid the importunity of that *text* in *Matthew*, which evidently ſets *baptiſm* before *inſtructing*. But this can avail him nothing; For if by the *Goſpel* in *Mark*, we underſt and the *whole Goſpel*, as in reaſon we muſt, for that is it which muſt be *Preacht* to every creature (the *Gentile* world) then is that directly all one with *teaching them to obſerve whatſoever he hath commanded*; But if by *preaching* the *Goſpel* we mean no more than, as Mr. *T.* here ſaith, *that Jeſus is the Chriſt*, i. e. the propoſing him as a *Maſter*, and calling all to come to him as *diſciples*, then this being ſuppoſed precedent to mens *coming* to *diſcipleſhip*, or *bringing* their *infants* to it (for without this they cannot be expected to come themſelves, or to *bring* their *infants*) all the reſt is left to follow *baptiſm*, and ſo all particular *Chriſtian inſtruction* is *ſubſequent*, not precedent to *baptiſm*, an *effect* of their *diſcipleſhip*, attending it, no way neceſſary to *prepare* for it, which is the utmoſt τὸ ἐν δείξει, which from that *circumſtance* of that text I undertook to *demonſtrate*. 31.

SECT.

SECT. III.

Diſcipleſhip before inſtruction. What knowledge of the Maſter is required to diſcipleſhip. Two ſorts of diſciples, Some come, others are brought.

Numb. 1. HIS reaſons for the diſproving of my *interpretation* of *Mat.* 28. being thus evidenced to have no force or validity in them againſt our pretenſions, and ſo indeed his whole *fabrick* demoliſhed, (that place of S. *Mat.* being the one main (if not only) ground of *Antipædobaptiſts* ſtructure) I might well ſpare the advantages of the 26, 27, 28. *Sections* to which he makes ſome kind of anſwer in the remainder of his 25. *Chapter*: But there is ſo little weight in his *anſwers* that they will be ſpeedily diſpatched.

2. *Firſt* then to my 26. §. he ſaith, that *were it all granted me, yet it would no whit avail to prove that an infant may be a diſciple appointed by Chriſt to be baptized.* To this I reply, that the 26. §. being moſt of it ſpent for the explaining an *hard* place 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. concerning *baptiſm*, and for aſſigning the due notion to ἐπερώτημα, a *queſtion*, or *addreſs* as to an *Oracle*, for *inſtruction* for the *future* life, I pretended not to conclude *infant Baptiſm* from thence, nor any more than this, that *baptiſm* being the *entring* of a *diſciple*, and not *prærequiring actual inſtruction*, but conſiſting in *coming* to *Chriſt* and his *Church*, to receive it for the *future*, 'tis certain that by this account, *children* are capable of *baptiſm*, becauſe they may by the care of their *parents* be thus brought early to *Chriſt*, and *entred* into his *School* by them, before they themſelves, have faculties either to deſire, or *know* what is done to them, the proportion holding in this, betwixt *infants* and other *Scholars* that are entred by their *parents* in any *School* before they know one letter in the book, or have *actual* willingneſs to acquire any *knowledge*; And this is there illuſtrated by the example of *Philip*, *Joh.* 1. 44. and of the *Jews*, *Ex.* 19. 8. which have again been mentioned, and are clear evidences, that thoſe may be *received* into *diſcipleſhip* which have not yet had *precedent inſtruction*.

3. Againſt this, all that he hath to pretend, is ſet down by him in theſe words, *Let putting to ſchool be as early as the* Doctor *will imagine, yet none is put to ſchool till he doth know his teacher, and ſo none is Chriſt's diſciple in the Scripture language till he know Jeſus to be Chriſt, and take him for his Lord, which infants being not capable of, they are not diſciples, nor to be baptized according to Chriſt's appointment.*

4. To this I anſwer, 1. That the example which I had uſed of *children* being brought to *School* by the care of their *parents*, was deſigned to ſhew no more than this, that they may be *delivered* up to be *Scholars*, who as yet *know* nothing of what they are to *learn*, nor have *actual* willingneſs to acquire *knowledge*; and conſequently, that *entrance* into *diſcipleſhip*, refers only to *ſubſequent*, ſuppoſes not any *precedent* inſtruction.

5. And this is competently evidenced by that *example*, though it were ſuppoſed of the *child* that goes to *School*, that he *knows* his *teacher*, this *bare* knowledge of the *perſon* of his *teacher*, being none of the *documents* which he comes to *School* to learn, but the *good letters* that are profeſt and taught in the *School*; nor indeed is it imaginable why a *blind child* which is brought to *School*, or put to an inſtructer, and ſo cannot be deemed to know the *Maſter*, before *aſſuetude* hath acquainted him with him, ſhould not yet be ſaid, with as full propriety of ſpeech, to *come* to *ſchool*, as he that uſeth his own *eyes* as well as *feet* to direct him thither.

6. *Secondly*, It is as true, that *children* that are *brought* to *School*, do not always *know* their *Maſters* before their *entrance*, no not by the moſt *ſuperficial* knowledge; Many are brought to *publick* Schools, who never ſo much as ſaw their *Maſters*, till they are by their *parents* delivered up into their power and *diſcipline*; If this be not plain enough, then change the *ſimilitude* from the *Schoolmaſter* to the *parent* or *guardian*, or the very *nurſe*, every one of theſe are to feed and *nouriſh*, and, as he ſhall be capable, to *inſtruct* the *child*, and ſo doth *Chriſt* in a *Spiritual* ſenſe whoſoever is *intruſted* (by being *brought*) to him in *baptiſm*. And we know, *God* and *Nature* doth thus bring a *child* to the *parent*, to the *nurſe* or *Guardian* when the *child* knows none of theſe, nor *underſtands* any more of all theſe *tranſactions*, than the *infant* doth at the *Font* conceive what is done to it there. And ſo ſtill this evidenceth the *vanity* of this anſwer concerning the *childs knowing his teacher*.

7. But then *Thirdly*, This ſo *imperfect ſuperficial* knowledge of the *teacher*, is in no wiſe worth conſidering in this matter; For I ſhall demand, doth ſuch very imperfect *knowledge* of *Chriſt*, as a *Schoolboy* hath of his *teacher*, the firſt hour he comes into the *School*, qualify him for *diſcipleſhip* to *Chriſt*, or no? If it do, then his *countrymen* and *kinſmen*, before he revealed himſelf to be the *Meſſiah*, and the *Phariſees*, which believed not his *miracles*, were ſufficiently *qualified*, and then 'tis evident that thoſe might be *admitted* to *diſcipleſhip*, which were not *believers*, and ſo all Mr. *T.* his *hypotheſes* are deſtroyed, and then *infants* may be *diſcipled* and *baptized*, though they be not *believers*.

8. As for that which he here interpoſes [*the knowing Jeſus to be Chriſt, and taking him for his Lord*] this bears no *proportion* with the *childs* bare *knowing* of his *maſter*, but is far above it, equal to his making it his own *choice* to have this *Maſter*, rather than any other, and promiſing *exact* obedience to him, which is much more than is to be found in moſt *young Scholars*, or indeed in any that are brought by their *parents* or *guardians*, who alone are the *perſons* who bear proportion with the *infants* brought by others to *baptiſm*.

9. So that this reaſoning of his is ſoon ſalved by diſtinguiſhing of *diſciples*, that they are either ſuch as *come*, or ſuch as are brought to *School*, *proſelytes* of their own choice, or *children* under the care of *others*; of the former ſort there are none but ſuch as have ſome *rude imperfect* knowledge of *Chriſt*, upon which they make this *choice*, and without it, would not probably be expected to make it; But for *children* which as *minors* in their *guardians* hands, have no *will* of their *own*, there is no neceſſity they ſhould have *knowledge* to move their *will*, they may very *reaſonably* be acted by the *will* of *others*, and by their *charity* be made partakers of thoſe *priviledges* which are communicated from *Chriſt*, in his

Church

Church to all true members thereof, and to that end be *discipled* and *baptized*, entred by this *cere-* 5.
mony into the *Church* of *God*, where *instruction* is to be had, as soon as they are capable of it, and in the mean while partake of those other *advantages*, of which their *condition* is capable.

SECT. IV.

The difference of a disciple and proselyte examined. Christian as well as Jewish proselytes, Priviledges of proselytism. Disciples of the Pharisees. The Holy Ghost's not using the word proselyte of Christians, concludes nothing. Jehovah. Ὁμοούσιος. Infants qualified for baptism, As for entring into Covenant, Deut. 29. *Gods Oath. Infants adjured, Cripples capable of Christ's cures.*

TO my 27. and 28. *Sections* his *answer* is brief, that *what I say is not right*; And for proof, though *Numb.* 1.
he begins with a [For 1.] and so by his form of *branching*, promises *more* reasons than one, yet that *first* hath never a [*Secondly*] to follow or back it, and so 'tis all resolved into that one, *viz.* that *it is not true that a disciple and a proselyte are perfectly all one.*

To this therefore I must advert, and consider what nice *difference* he can spring betwixt a *dis-* 2.
ciple and a *proselyte*, whereupon to found *satisfaction* for conscience, why *infants* may be *proselytes* and as such, *come* unto *Christ*, and yet cannot be made *disciples*, or received in *baptism* to *discipleship*.

And his reason is, because a *proselyte*, saith he, *notes one that is by birth an alien from the Common-* 3.
wealth of Israel, and comes to the Israelites to own their God, and be part of their policy, and not to be taught, but enjoy priviledges with other Jews, whether Civil or Ecclesiastical.

But certainly this is no *reason* of *difference*; for besides that I, in that §. 27. acknowledged this 4.
accidental difference, that a *proselyte* denotes a *coming from some other nation* (as a *disciple* doth not) adding that *this difference* had *no place in this matter*, where the *disciples* are specified to be *received from all nations*; besides this, I say, it cannot be unknown to Mr. *T.* that I speak of *proselytes* in such a notion as is equally competible to all of what *nation* soever they are, that *enter* into *Covenant* with *God*.

Thus do we find a *proselyte* defined, *Heb.* 11. 6. by ὁ προσερχόμενος τῷ θεῷ, *he that cometh to God*; 5.
thus doth a *Jew* when *he enters* into *Covenant* of *obedience* to him, and thus did a *Gentile* when he undertook the *whole law* of the *Jews*, and was therefore גר צדקה and גר ברית a *proselyte* of their *covenant*, and a *proselyte* of their *righteousness*, and such is every one whether *Jew* or *Gentile*, that *cometh* to *Christ*; and as the two former of these were made partakers of *priviledges* by this means, particularly allowed freely to enter into the *congregation*, and *infants* as well as *grown* men, were thus among them admitted into *Covenant*; so it is not imaginable why it should not hold of the *Christian proselytes* also, nor why the *Christian infants* thus *received* into *Covenant* by *Christ*, after the same manner as *Jewish* and *Gentile Infants* were among the antient people of *God*, i. e. by *baptism*, should not as properly be called *proselytes* of *Christ*, though they neither come from any other *nation*, nor ever associate themselves with *Israelites* according to the *flesh*.

And whereas he saith of the *proselytes coming* to the *Israelites*, that they *came not to be taught, but* 6.
to enjoy priviledges, I cannot divine what *motive* he had to affirm it; for sure the *infant child* that was *baptized*, and so received into the *congregation* of *Israel*, did come to *learn* the *Jewish religion*, into which he was thus early initiated, and that was one special *priviledge* (the rest of the *heathen having not knowledge of* these *laws*,) the *immediate* end of his *proselytism*, yet not excluding those *other* ends of injoying all other *priviledges* both *Civil* and *Ecclesiastical* thereby.

And when he adds, *but a disciple of Christ is one that owns Christ for his teacher and Lord only for* 7.
spiritual benefits, I might well acknowledge it, and ask, why then an *infant*, who hath need of those *spiritual* benefits, assoon as he is born, should not be hastened to a *participation* of them? But it is farther evident, that *spiritual* benefits being *first* and *principally* designed, other even *secular advantages* may very lawfully be respected, and reaped by them that are thus early brought in, whether as *disciples* or *proselytes* to *Christ*.

Two sage observations he here addeth, 1. That *there is no mention of the disciples of the Priests, but* 8.
of the Pharisees and Sadduces, and I can very well grant it, who speak not of any *lower* kind of *disciples*, but either of *God* among the *Jews*, or of *Christ*, among us *Christians*, those being the only *discipleships*, to which they were *admitted* by the *ceremony* of *baptism*, the *disciples* of the *Pharisees* and *Sadducees* being but a *subdivision*, and *notification* of several *sects* among *Jews*, as there are different *denominations* of *Christians* (the more the *pity*) which divide *unity*, but use not new *baptisms*, to discriminate them, I am sure contradict the *Apostle* if they do.

His *second* observation is, that *the holy Ghost doth not at any time call Christians Christ's proselytes, but his* 9.
disciples, that, saith he, *we might not confound the notions of these terms*; But I answer, 1. that those *texts* that express the *Christians* entring into *discipleship*, by *coming* unto him (of which there are good store) do in effect call them *proselytes*, for a *Proselyte* is a *Greek* noun derived immediately from the verb προσέρχεσθαι *to come unto*.

And *Secondly*, that if this word, whether in it self, or in the verb from whence it comes, had ne- 10.
ver been used in the *New Testament*, yet would it not thence follow, *that we might not confound the notions of proselytes* and *disciples*: The word *Jehovah* is never used by the *Holy Ghost* in the *New Testament*, yet may we not thence conclude, that the notion of *Jehovah* and *God* are divers: Ὁμοούσιος, the *known style* of the *Nicene Fathers*, is never found used by the writers of the *Bible*, yet sure it no way follows thence, that the *notion* of that word, and of this phrase [*I and my Father are one*] are different and may not be *confounded*. 'Tis pity to lose time on such *fictions* of *scruple*, and *difficulty* as these.

What now is further said by him in this chapter, both concerning *little ones coming unto Christ*, 11.
and of their *entring into covenant*, Deut. 29. 10. is on both sides but a bare denyal of that which is

competently proved in that 28. §. For 'tis there evident, that *infant children* are and always were accounted capable of *proſelytiſm* and ſo of being entred *diſciples*, and particularly of being *entred* into *covenant* with *God*, and ſo of being *baptized*; and there is no reaſon imaginable, why the *infants* which were capable of *coming* to *Chriſt*, were *bleſſed* by him, were affirmed by him to be *qualified* for the *kingdom* of *heaven*, ſhould be denyed *water* to be *baptized:* The *Holy Ghoſt* being fallen on the *Gentiles* that came with *Cornelius*, *Peter* durſt not deny them *baptiſm*; And with what equity can the *Chriſtian Church* do it to thoſe, who are qualified for the receiving *pardon* of *ſin*, for being bleſt by *Chriſt*, for being *received* into *Covenant* with him, and may afterward be *inſtructed* in all things which are needful to be *learnt*; For that ſtill they are *unqualified*, till by *hearing* they own *Chriſt* as their *Maſter*, this is a *begging* of the *queſtion*, without any the leaſt tender of *proof*.

12. As for *entring into covenant*, when by the force of *Deut.* 29. 10. he is forced to yield it *competible* to *infants*, yet he will do his beſt to eſcape the *conviction* which it offers him, 1. by *modifying* the ſenſe, then by *invalidating* my *inference* from it.

13. *Firſt*, though he yield that they may *enter into Covenant*, *yet this*, ſaith he, *but in ſome ſenſe, by their fathers act ingaging them under a curſe or oath to own God as theirs, in which ſenſe the poſterity then unborn did enter into covenant*, Deut. 29. 15.

14. But if we examine the place, it will be moſt clear, 1. that the *Covenant* is entred into by the *infants*, juſt as by the *reſt* of them, the *wives* and the *ſtrangers* or *proſelytes*: On their part, *Ye ſtand this day all of you before the Lord, that thou ſhouldſt enter into Covenant with the Lord*; and on *Gods* part, *that he may eſtabliſh thee this day for a people.*

15. *Secondly*, Here is in the text no mention of any act of the *Fathers ingaging them under a curſe or oath*, but only of *Gods oath* which he maketh to them. *v.* 12.

16. *Thirdly*, If they had thus *adjured*, or laid *oath* or *curſe* upon their *children*, yet would this make no *difference* betwixt their and our *entring into Covenant*; we by the *oath* of *baptiſm* which is laid on the *child* (by him to be performed when he comes to ability, unleſs he will forfeit all the *benefits* of his *baptiſm*) do in like manner *adjure* our *infants*, though whilſt they remain ſuch, they hear it as little as the *Jewiſh infants* did.

17. *Fourthly*, Whereas from *v.* 15. he cites that *the poſterity then unborn thus entred into Covenant*, there is no ſuch word in the *text*, no mention of [*poſterity*] or of [*unborn*] but of them only, who were *not that day with them*, i. e. (I ſuppoſe) were at that time of *aſſembling abſent* from the *Congregation*. I wonder why Mr. *T.* ſhould attempt thus to *impoſe* upon the *reader*.

18. As for our *inference* (which is this, that by *parity* of reaſon, *infants* may be entred into *diſcipleſhip*, and accordingly *baptized*, as well as they then might be *entred* into the *covenant* of *God*) he ſimply rejects it, without any farther notice of his *reaſon* again, ſave only this, that *in baptiſm ſuch a diſcipleſhip is injoyn'd as is by preaching the Goſpel, and they only are diſciples that are believers, and they only are appointed to be baptized, who in their own perſons do enter into Covenant and ingage themſelves to be Chriſt's followers*, and this is again but a pitiful *petitio principii*, a denying our *concluſion* when the *premiſes* cannot be denyed, and ſo invincibly infer the *concluſion*, viz. that thoſe may be *brought* to and *received* into *diſcipleſhip*, *covenant*, *baptiſm*, which in their own perſons are not yet able to come to *Chriſt*, as thoſe *Cripples* may be born by others to *Chriſt*, who wanted ſtrength to *addreſs* themſelves, and be as really partakers of his *healing* miracles, as thoſe who came to him on their *own legs*. And ſo much alſo for the 25. *Chapter*.

CHAP. III.

Of the Apoſtolical Practice in this Matter.

SECT. I.

The interpretation of 1 Cor. 7. 12. *vindicated.* Ἁγια. *Sanctification uſed to denote Baptiſm, the uſe of it in the Fathers and Scripture. Tertullians teſtimony: deſignati Sanctitatis.* Origen. *Author Quæſt. ad* Antiochum. Cyprian. Chryſoſtom. Τεκνα *there, infant Children.* Ἁγιοι *in the Epiſtles.* S. Auguſtines *words examined.*

Numb. 1. IN his laſt Chapter he proceeds to the view of thoſe *Sections* which ſet down the *poſitive* part of our *baſis*, evidencing the *opinion* and *ſence*, which the *Apoſtles* had of *Chriſt's inſtitution*, and of his *intention* to *include*, and not to *exclude infants* from *baptiſm*.

2. The *Apoſtles ſenſe* muſt be judged by their own *uſage* and *practice*, and that is *teſtified* to us two ways, 1. by one *conſiderable remain* and *indication* of it in *S. Paul*, 2. By the *practice* of the *firſt* and *pureſt ages* of the *Church*, receiving *infants* to *baptiſm*, and ſo teſtifying the *Apoſtolical* uſage, and farther affirming that they received it by *tradition* from the *Apoſtles*.

3. The *remain*, and *indication* in S. *Paul*, is in the known place of 1 *Cor.* 7. 12. where ſpeaking of the *believers children* he ſaith v. 14. νυν δε ἁγια ἐστι, *but now are they holy*, i. e. it is the *preſent practice* of the *Church* (that *Apoſtolical Church* in S. *Paul's* time) to admit to *baptiſm* the *infant children* of *parents* of whom one is *Chriſtian*, though not of others.

4. That this is the meaning of [*holy*] is there made evident, as by other arguments, ſo by this, that the *ancient Fathers* who knew the ſacred *dialect*, call *baptiſm Sanctification*, *Eum qui natus eſt, baptizandum & ſanctificandum*, in *Cyprian*, and ἀναξίως ἁγιαζόμενοι *to be ſanctified when they have no feeling of it*, and ἐκβρέφους ἁγιαζήτω, *let him be ſanctified from the infancy*, i. e. *baptized* then, in *Gregory Nazianzen.*

To

To which *teſtimonies*, and the reſt which is there produced out of the agreement of the *Jewiſh* ſtyle (קדושין *ſanctifications* for *baptiſms*, to which agrees *Macarius's* ſaying of the *Jewiſh baptiſm*, σαρκα ἁγιάζει, *it ſanctifies the fleſh*, *Hom.* 47. p. 509.) becauſe the main *difficulty* of the *interpretation* conſiſts herein, I ſhall now add more, one very ancient before any of theſe (within leſs than a hundred years after the *death* of S. *John*) *Tertullian de Animâ*, c. 39. where ſpeaking of *infants*, and ſaying, *ex ſanctificato alterutro ſexu ſanctos procreari*, that when *either* the *Father* or *Mother* is *ſanctified* (i. e. received as a *believer* by *baptiſm* into the *Church*) the *children* are *holy*, &c. (clear evidences of the notion of the word) this he there proves by theſe very words of this *Apoſtle*, *Caterum*, *inquit*, *immundi naſcuntur*, *elſe* (ſo *caterum* in *Tertullian's* ſtyle is known to be put for *alioqui* or the *Greek* ἐπεὶ ἄν) *were your children unclean*, adding in ſtead of theſe other words [*but now are they holy*] *quaſi deſignatos tamen ſanctitatis & per hoc etiam ſalutis, intelligi volens fidelium filios*; *hereby willing that we ſhould underſtand that the children of believrs are the deſigned*, or *the ſealed of holineſs* (in the ſenſe, I conceive, wherein they that are *baptized* are by the *ancients* frequently ſaid σφραγίζεσθαι to be *ſealed*) *and thereby of ſalvation alſo*: And all this, ſaith he, thus urged by the *Apoſtle*, *ut hujus ſpei pignora matrimoniis quæ retinenda cenſuerat*, *patrocinarentur*, that this *hope* might be a *pledge* to ingage the *believing wife* or *husband* not to part from the *unbeliever*: And he yet farther adds (ſtill to the *confirming* of this *interpretation*) *Alioqui meminerat Dominicæ definitionis*, *Niſi quis naſcatur ex aquâ & ſpiritu*, *non introibit in regnum Dei*, i. e. *non erit Sanctus*. *Otherwiſe* (or if this *argument* of the *Apoſtle* had not been *ſufficient*) *he would have mentioned the definition of Chriſt*, *that unleſs one be born of water and the Spirit* (i. e. *baptized*) *he ſhall not enter into the kingdom of God*, i. e. *ſhall not be holy*, ſhewing ſtill of what *holineſs* he underſtands the *Apoſtles* ſpeech, that which the *child* of the *believer* is made partaker of by *baptiſm*, concluding, *Ita omnis anima uſque eo in* Adam *cenſetur donec in Chriſto recenſeatur*, *tamdiu immunda quamdin recenſeatur*, *Every ſoul is ſo long inrolled in* Adam *till it be enrolled anew in Chriſt*, *and is ſo long unclean till it be thus anew inrolled*; which as it ſuppoſes every *child* of *Adam* to be *impure*, till he be thus by *baptiſm* made a *child* of *God*, a member of *Chriſt*, ſo it gives a full account of that *uncleanneſs*, and that *holineſs* of which the *Apoſtle* ſpeaks, the former the ſtate of a *child* of *Adam unbaptized*, the latter of him that by *baptiſm* is *initiated* and *matriculated* into *Chriſt*. 5.

And to this agrees perfectly that of *Origen* (of the ſame age, a very *few* years after *Tertullian*) ſpeaking of the *Apoſtles* (from whom, ſaith he, the *Church* received by *tradition* that *infants* ſhould be *baptized*) *Sciebant enim illi quibus myſteriorum ſecreta commiſſa ſunt divinorum*, *quia eſſent in omnibus genuinæ ſordes peccati*, *quæ per aquam & ſpiritum ablui deberent*, *They to whom the ſecrets of the divine myſteries* or *Sacraments were committed*, *knew that there are in all the connatural pollutions of ſin*, *which ought to be waſht away by water and the ſpirit*, giving us to underſtand what *uncleanneſs* and *holineſs* it is, that *children* are capable of the *uncleanneſs* of their *birth* from *Adam*, and the *cleanneſs* or *ſanctity* of *Chriſtian baptiſm*. 6. *In Rom.* l. 5.

So *Athanaſius* * *Quæſt. ad Antioch.* 114. (or whoſoever it is under the *name* of that ancient *Father*) where the *ſalvation* of the *baptized infants* is concluded by him upon force of thoſe two *texts*, *Suffer little children to come unto me*; and, *now are your children holy*, whereto he there ſets *parallel*, τῶν πιστῶν βεβαπτισμένα νήπια, *the baptized infants of believers*, as the plain *paraphraſe* of the *Apoſtles* words. 7. * *Tom.* 2. p. 377. D.

To theſe I farther add another paſſage of * *Cyprian*, together with the 66. *Biſhops* that were in *Council* with him in their *Epiſtle* to *Fidus*, where ſpeaking of the *baptiſm* of *infants* and expreſly forbidding that any ſuch ſhould be *hindred* or *kept* from it, he brings for proof of it, the words of S. *Peter*, that the *Lord had ſaid unto him that he ſhould count none common or unclean*, where it appears what was that *Holy Fathers* notion of *common* or unclean, ſuch as might be *refuſed baptiſm*, and conſequently they which are not ſuch, but on the contrary ἅγιοι *clean* or *holy* (and ſuch ſaith *Paul* here, are the *believers children*) are to be *admitted* thither. 8. * *Ep.* 59. *Edit. Pam.* p. 80.

Upon which words of S. *Cyprian* * S. *Auguſtin* ſpeaking ſaith, he made *no new decree*, *but kept moſt firm the faith of the Church*, *Et mox natum rite baptizari poſſe cum ſuis coepiſcopis cenſuit*, *and he and his fellow Biſhops reſolved that a child might duely be baptized as ſoon as born*. 9. * *Ep.* 28. *ad* Hieron.

So * S. *Chryſoſtom* in his Κατήχησις to them that were to be *baptized*, ſpeaking of the ſeveral titles of *baptiſm*, applies unto it that of the *Apoſtle*, 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. ἀλλ' ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλ' ἡγιάσθητε, *but ye are waſhed*, *but ye are ſanctified*: ‖ and again, of thoſe that were *baptized*, ὁ λόγος οὐ καθαρὰς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δικαίους καὶ ἁγίους γενομένους ἀπέδειξεν, *the Scripture pronounces them not only made clean but juſt and holy alſo*. 10. * *Edit. Savil. Tom.* 6. p. 854. l. 16. ‖ *Ibid.* l. 19.

So * *Cyrill*, in like manner, *Glaphyr. in Exod.* l. 2. ſpeaking of him that defers *baptiſm* to old age, ſaith, ἀπέδειξεν μὲν, &c. *he is ſanctified indeed*, i. e. *baptized*, *but brings in no profit to God*. And ‖ *Comm. in Iſ.* l. 1. *Or.* 1. ſpeaking of *baptiſm* again, and the ſufficiency to *waſh* away *ſin*, he adds χεῖρας ἡμῖν τὰς ἅπαξ ἁγιασθείσας— *But they that are once ſanctified*, i. e. *baptized*— But I need no more ſuch like *ſuffrages*. 11. * *Tom.* 1. p. 273. ‖ *Tom.* 2. 18. C.

This I have both there (*Sections* 34, 35, 36, 37.) and here thus largely deduced, becauſe in this one matter all the *difficulty* conſiſts, and if it be once granted that this is the meaning of [*Now are your children holy*] then here is an evidence undenyable of the *Apoſtles practice* of *baptizing infants*, and conſequently an irrefragable *teſtimony* of their ſenſe of *Chriſts inſtitution*, *including*, not *excluding infants*. 12.

And ſo this is a ſhort and clear way of preventing all Mr. *T.* his indeavours and pains (ſo largely taken) to invalidate my *concluſion* from this place of the *Apoſtle*, and I need not now be farther ſollicitous for my *paraphraſe* on all thoſe 3. verſes, wherein he would fain find out ſome *exceſſes* and *defects*, ſome *inſertions* and *omiſſions*; If ſuch there were (as I doubt not to *evidence* there are none) it would be little for his advantage, as long as the *interpretation* of the *laſt* words [*but now are they* (i. e. *your children*) *holy*] appears to be this, [*but now are your infant children partakers of the priviledge of baptiſm*] for this one part of that verſe concludes all that I *pretend*, or he *oppugneth*: And this I hope is now cleared to be no *ſingular* interpretation of mine, but that which (beſide the τὸ λογικὸν, the *ra-* 13.

tional importance of the Context concluding it) the *ſtyle* of *Scripture*, and the *uniform* atteſtation of the *anncienteſt* writers aſſign to it, ſo that there can be no reaſon for doubting in it.

14. Yet becauſe this is one of the *exuberances* objected to my *paraphraſe* (and the only one which I can without *impertinence* take notice of) that the *term* [*young children of Chriſtians*—] is *more than is in the text, which hath only* [*your children*] *which*, ſaith he, *is not reſtrained to infancy*, I ſhall briefly remove this *exception*, 1. By the *authority* of *Tertullian* juſt now produced, who interpreted it of their *infant children*, as appeared both by the expreſs words [*ſanctos procreari*] and the [*caterùm immundi naſcerentur*] and by the occaſion of that diſcourſe in that place, which was the *immunda nativitas ethnicorum*, *the unclean birth of heathens* children, and the unlawfulneſs of *baptizing* them, unleſs one of the parents were *Chriſtian*. To which may be added alſo *Nazianzens* phraſe forementioned, ἁγιαζόμεναι ἐκ βρέφους, being *ſanctified from infancy* (for ſo ſure βρέφος ſignifies, ἔμβρυον, νήπιος, παῖς, a *child* before or ſoon after *birth*, ſaith *Heſychius*, and *Ariſtophanes* the *Grammarian* cited by * *Euſtathius*, τὸ ἄρτι γεγονὸς, *a child new born*) which in all probability refers to this place of the *Apoſtle*, and ſo renders, τέκνον by βρέφος, their *children* by their *infant children*.

* *In Iliad. Baſil. Ed.* p. 944.

15. *Secondly*, 'Tis as manifeſt by the *general* doctrine of the *Fathers*, when they ſpeak of the *faith* of *parents* profiting their *children*, meaning always their *infant children*, brought to *baptiſm* by the *faith* of their *parents*, before they are *perſonally* capable of having *faith* themſelves.

16. *Thirdly*, By the *inconveniences* which muſt follow in caſe it be interpreted of any other but *infant children*. For ſuppoſing them come to years of underſtanding and capacity, they ſhall then either be ſuppoſed to have received the *faith*, or to remain in *infidelity*: If they have *received* the *faith*, and then be *baptized*, 'tis evident that this *benefit* comes not to them upon any conſideration of the *faith* of the *parent*, but upon their own *perſonal* profeſſion, and conſequently that theſe cannot be ſpoken of by the *Apoſtle* in that place, where he makes the *ſanctification* or *baptiſm* of the *children*, a benefit of the *believing parents* cohabiting with the *unbeliever*, and as *Tertullian* ſaith, *patrocinium*, a *plea* to *move* the *believer* not to *depart*. But if they have lived to years and *not* received the *faith*, 'tis then certain that they may not be *baptized* at all; And ſo 'tis manifeſt it muſt be underſtood of the *infant* (uncapable) *children*, and none elſe.

17. 'Tis true that Mr. *T.* alſo excepteth againſt the *paraphraſing* of [*holy*] by [*admitted to baptiſm*] affirming this to be a *ſenſe of the word, no where elſe found*. But this I hope I have cleared already, both from the uſage of the word among the *Jewiſh* and firſt *Chriſtian* writers, and might farther do it even by this *Apoſtles dialect*, who in his *inſcriptions* of moſt of his *Epiſtles* to the *Churches*, calls all thoſe to whom he writes, i. e. the *baptized Chriſtians* of thoſe *Churches*, ἅγιοι *holy*, *Rom.* 1. 17. and ἡγιασμένοι *ſanctified*, and ἅγιοι *holy*, 1 *Cor.* 1. 2. and again ἅγιοι *holy*, 2 *Cor.* 1. 1. and *Eph.* 1. 1. *Phil.* 1. 1. *Col.* 1. 1. among whom no doubt there were many who were no otherwiſe *holy* or *ſantified*, than as all *baptized Chriſtians* are capable of that ſtyle. But I ſhall need add no more of that, to what hath been already ſo *largely* ſaid.

18. And the *parts* of my interpretation being thus cleared, that *their children*] were their *babes* or *infants*, and their being *holy*] their being *baptized*, 'tis ſure I cannot be concerned in his *concluſion*, that he *never read or heard any expoſition ancient or modern ſo expounding as this Doctor or Dictator doth, nor do I think he can ſhew any*] I hope now he will *alter* his mind, and acknowledge that it was his *own* fault, that this interpretation ſeemed ſo *new* and *ſtrange* to him.

19. As for the one place of S. *Auguſtin* produced by him (it ſhould be, l. 2. *de Pecc. Mer. & remiſs.* c. 26.) to the ſeeming *prejudice* of this *interpretation*, *Ac per hoc & illa ſanctificatio cujuſcunque modi ſit quam in filiis fidelium eſſe dixit Apoſtolus, ad iſtam de baptiſmo & peccati origine vel remiſſione quæſtionem omnino non pertinet*] it will eaſily be *reconciled* to it, if we but mark what *queſtion* it is, that there he ſpeaks of, even that which he had then in hand, *viz.* whether *baptiſm* were neceſſary to *remiſſion* of *ſins*, and *entring* the *kingdom* of *heaven*.

20. That this was the *queſtion* in hand, appeareth by the words immediately *precedent*, which are theſe, *ſanctificatio Catechumeni, ſi non fuerit baptizatus, non ei valet ad intrandum regnum cœlorum aut ad peccatorum remiſſionem*, *The ſanctification of a Catechumenus* (what that is, he had mentioned before, *Catechumenos ſecundum quendam modum ſuum per ſignum Chriſti & orationem impoſitionis manuum puto ſanctificari*, that *ſome kind of ſanctification which the unbaptized might have by prayer* and *impoſition of hands*, of which we ſometimes read in the *ancients*, as hath elſewhere been ſhewed) *profits him not for the entring the kingdom of heaven*, or obtaining *remiſſion of ſins, unleſs he be baptized. And therefore that ſanctification of whatſoever kind it is*, viz. if it be *without baptiſm, belongs not*, ſaith he, *to the queſtion* then in hand *concerning baptiſm and the original and pardon of ſin*.

21. Here then I ſuppoſe is S. *Auguſtins* meaning. The adverſaries with whom he diſputes (the *Pelagians*) to maintain the no neceſſity of *baptizing infants* for the *remiſſion* of *ſins*, made uſe of that *text*, and concluded from it the *ſanctity* of the *Chriſtian infants birth*, before, and without *baptiſm*: To this he *anſwers*, without any ſtrict examination of the importance of that *text*, that *whatſoever ſanctification* it can be imagined to be, that the *Apoſtle* ſpeaks of, except it be that of *baptiſm*, it cannot avail to the *remiſſion* of *ſins*, &c. Some improper kind of *ſanctification*, ſaith he, he may confeſs, *ſecundum quendam modum*, in him that is not yet *baptized*, but that without *baptiſm*, *non valet ad intrandum, is not of force for entring into the kingdom of heaven*, and therefore whatſoever *ſanctification* that is, (*viz.* whatſoever without *baptiſm*) it belongs not to his *queſtion* then before him, and ſo the *Apoſtles* words can have no force againſt him.

22. This I ſuppoſe then to be in brief S. *Auguſtines* meaning in that place, that 'tis not the *holineſs* of the *Chriſtian infants birth*, but of their *baptiſm*, which ſtands them in ſtead *toward the kingdom of heaven*: And then that, as it is no evidence on my ſide, that he interpreted that place to the *Cor.* as I interpret it, ſo it affirms nothing to the *contrary*, but leaves it *in medio*, having his advantages other ways againſt the *diſputers*.

23. However for the ſubſtance, his *accord* with us is evident, and his *concluſion* firm both in that place, and l. 3. *de Pecc. Mer. & Remiſs.* c. 12. *Illud ſine dubitatione tenendum, quæcunque illa ſanctificatio ſit,*

non

non valere ad Chriſtianos faciendos, atque ad dimittenda peccata, niſi Chriſtiana atque Eccleſiaſticâ inſtitutione & Sacramentis efficiantur fideles. It is to be held without doubting, that whatſoever that ſanctification be, it avails not to the making them Chriſtians, and to the obtaining remiſſion of ſins, unleſs by Chriſtian and Eccleſiaſtical inſtitution, and by the Sacraments they be made faithful.

This is all that I can ſeaſonably return for the vindicating of my *paraphraſe*; It would be too im- 24.
moderate an *excurſion* to take notice of all his pretended *objections* to the *former* part of it, which concerns the *cohabiting* of the *believer* with the *unbeliever*, which I aſſure Mr. *T.* were eaſy fully to *anſwer*, and ſhew his miſtakes in each particular, if the matter of our preſent diſpute did *require*, or would well *bear* a πάρεργον of that length, or if I thought it in the leaſt degree uſeful to the *reader*, that I ſhould farther explain the grounds of my *paraphraſe*, than as they are already laid before him, *Section* 31, *&c.*

Yet becauſe the reaſons which I there rendred for the *paraphraſe* taken from the notations of the word 25.
ἡγίασται, *hath been ſanctified*, and ὑπὸ γυναικὸς (not *to*, but) *by the wife*] and by the plain *conſequents*, *what knoweſt thou ô wife, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy husband*— are by Mr. *T.* examined with an endeavour to *confute* them, and ſo to overthrow the whole *paraphraſe*, it may perhaps be thought uſeful that I ſhould take a view of thoſe his *indeavours*, and therefore that I ſhall now proceed to do, and ſhall there meet with by the way what was moſt *material* in his former exceptions againſt my *paraphraſe*.

SECT. II.

The rendring ἡγίασται [*hath been ſanctified*] *defended.* S. Hieroms *teſtimony. Enallages muſt not be made uſe of without neceſſity. No advantage from it here. Feigned inſtances of Enallage.* Κλώμενον, ἀκήκοα ὅτι, δεδήλωται, Κέκρικα.

FIrſt then, to my firſt *evidence* taken from the word ἡγίασται, *hath been ſanctified*] referring to ſome *Numb.* 1.
paſt known examples and *experiences*, of this kind (of a *wives converting* the *husband*, &c.) he hath a double anſwer, 1. That as my *paraphraſe expreſſeth it, it ſhould ſignify not only that an unbelieving husband hath been ſanctified, but alſo that there is hope they will, and ſo it ſhould note not only ſome example paſt, but alſo ſome to come, of which there can be a leſs reaſonable account given than of putting it in the preſent tenſe in Engliſh.* 2. *That the Enallage or change of tenſe is frequent,* C. 11. 14. Κλώμενον *in the preſent tenſe for the future, and here* ἀκήκοα ὅτι *for* λῶ *or* οἶδα, *and in the next verſe* δεδήλωται *in the præter for the preſent, and ſo* ἡγίασται *here, not, hath been, but, is ſanctified, or if in the præter tenſe, yet that to be underſtood of a paſt thing yet continued, as* κέκρικα Joh. 3. 18. *notes an act ſtill continued in force.*

To theſe two I reply briefly, and firſt to the *former* (the ſame which he had mentioned before, 2.
and excepted againſt as an *exceſs* in my *paraphraſe*, but both there and here without the leaſt *cauſe*;) For in my *paraphraſe*, I look upon ἡγίασται as a *verb* of the *præter tenſe*, and as ſuch only adapt the *ſenſe* to it, referring it not to *future hopes* but to *paſt experiences* or *examples*; Only becauſe *examples* are *rhetorical ſyllogiſmes*, and what hath been frequently *experimented*, may alſo reaſonably be *hoped*, I ſuppoſe that the *Apoſtle* ſo meant theſe *examples*, as grounds of *hoping* the like for the *future*, not making this of the *future*, any part of the ſenſe of ἡγίασται in the *præter*, but explicating the τὸ λογικὸν or *rational* importance (which is ſomewhat more than the τὸ ῥητὸν) of the *Apoſtles* ſpeech, and ſuppoſing this *concluſion* to ly hid under this *premiſe*, as it is ordinary in all diſcourſe to ſet down the *premiſes* diſtinctly, leaving the *concluſion* by every ones reaſon to be *drawn* from thence, without ſetting it down *explicitely*.

Wherein that I was not miſtaken, I had all aſſurance from *v.* 16. where the argument is preſt, 3.
and the *concluſion* inferred more *explicitly*, *For what knoweſt thou, ô wife, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy husband* — and the like mentioned in the *Paraphraſe* from 1 *Pet.* 3.

And herein I have the *authority* of S. *Hierom*; as for my rendring ὑπὸ γυναικὸς *by the woman* (ſo I 4.
find it, *per mulierem*, in his 7. *Epiſt. ad Lætam*, and ſo *Marianus Victorius* in his *Scholia* aſſures us, all the *Copies* antient and printed, read it) ſo alſo for this part of my *Paraphraſe*, *exemplum refert* (ſaith he on the place) *quia ſæpe contigerit ut lucrifieret vir per mulierem, Unde & Beatus Petrus ait, ut ſiquis non crediderit verbo, per mulierum converſationem ſine verbo lucrifierent, id eſt, cùm viderint eas in melius commutatas, cognoſcant omnes Dei legem ita conſuetudine inveterata potuiſſe mutari: He produces an example, becauſe,* ſaith he, *it hath often happened that the husband hath been gained by the wife, according to that of S.* Peter, *that if any man believe not the word, he ſhould without the word be gained by the converſation of the wife, that is, that when they ſhall ſee them changed to the better, all may know that the Law of God might have been taken in exchange for ſo inveterate a Cuſtom.*

And ſo again *Ep.* 7. *ad Lætam*, ſpeaking of the like example, *Bene*, ſaith he, *felicitérque expecta-* 5.
vimus; *Sancta & fidelis domus virum ſanctificat infidelem, we have well and happily expected*, (i. e. not miſt of our *expectation*) *an holy and faithful houſe ſanctifies an unbeliever*, adding his conceit, *ipſum Jovem, ſi habuiſſet talem cognationem, potuiſſe in Chriſtum credere*; *that Jupiter himſelf if he had had ſuch a kindred, might have been brought to the faith of Chriſt.*

As for his *ſecond anſwer*, I acknowledge ſuch *Enallages* to be ordinary in the *Hebrew*, and ſometimes, 6.
but more rarely found in the *Hebraizing Greeks*, or *Helleniſts*, and conſequently that where the *context* will not bear the ſenſe of the *tenſe* which is uſed, there may be place for this *Grammatical figure*, which yet is not to be made uſe of *unneceſſarily*.

Accordingly, if there were any *convincing* reaſon offered, that ἡγίασται in the *præter tenſe*] could 7.
not be born, I ſhould not then doubt to *interpret* it by this *figure*, either in the *preſent* or ſome *other* tenſe: But when (as here it is evident) there is no ſuch *neceſſity*, then 1. I cannot think fit to do ſo, (tis dangerous to forſake the *literal* ſenſe, when it may be commodiouſly *retained*, and fly to either a *Rhetorical*, or *Grammatical figure*) and having no *motive* to do ſo, I am next to conſider, what is the

propereſt

propereſt importance of that *phraſe* in that *tenſe* wherein it is uſed, and then I could not (I believe) have fallen upon any thing more *natural*, than that the *præter form* of ſpeech referred to the *paſt experiences*, &c.

8. This is a full *ſatisfaction* to his *anſwer*; yet I may in the ſecond place *ex abundanti* add thus much more, that the utmoſt that he can pretend to by the *enallage* (whether of the *præter* for the *preſent*, or of the *præter* underſtood of a *paſt* thing yet *continued*) is as commodious for my *interpretation*, as the *præter* is: For if it be in the *preſent*, then the importance will be, that it is a matter of *preſent daily experience*; if in the *paſt continued*, then that it is matter both of *paſt* and *preſent experience* that the *unbeliever* is thus wrought upon by the *believer*, and brought into the *Church* by *baptiſm*, and this is a juſt ground of *hope*, that ſo it may be again in any *particular* inſtance, and ſo a *competent motive* that the *believing wife* ſhould abide with the *infidel husband*, and not *depart* as long as he will live *peaceably* with her; and this ſure was S. *Hieroms* underſtanding in the words newly cited, *exemplum refert, quia ſæpe contigerit*, &c. the *Apoſtle makes inſtance, produceth example*, that this hath (and doth) *ordinarily come to paſs*; And to that alſo exactly agrees the 16th verſe, *For how knoweſt thou*, &c.

9. As for Mr *T.* his inſtances of *Enallage*, though now I may ſafely yield them all, and rather *gain* than *loſe* by them, I ſhall yet in the laſt place add my ſenſe, that no one of them is any way *convincing*; that of κλώμενον is not, *c.* 11. 24. for his *paſſion* was now ſo near *approaching*, that it might very fitly be repreſented as *preſent*, and ſo that be the the force of the *preſent tenſe*.

10. That of ἀκάθαρτά ἐστι, is not *pertinent*; for certainly [ἐστὶν, *is*] is not for [ἦν, *was*] which is the *enallage* of *tenſes*, nor is there any neceſſity it ſhould be for [ἦν] (the *enallage* of *modes*) the rendring is proper, *elſe are your children unclean*, and exactly all one with *elſe were*, the change of the *mode* not changing the *ſenſe* in this matter; which was the cauſe why I followed the *Engliſh* rendring, and made no change in that *tranſlation*.

11. As for his third inſtance δεδούλωται, *v.* 15. which he ſaith is *manifeſtly put in the præter tenſe for the preſent*, I cannot be convinced of it; The *context* will well bear the *præter tenſe yet continued* [no *Law* of *Chriſt hath* or *doth* thus *inſlave* her] or the *præter* tenſe ſimply [ſhe by entring the bonds of *marriage hath* not thus *inſlaved* her ſelf] that ſhe ſhould think her ſelf *bound* to do any thing contrary to her *religion* in order to *continuing* with her *husband*.

12. As for κέκριται, *Joh.* 3. 18. I wonder it could be thought fit to be produced to the prejudice of the *præter* ſenſe, when the [ἤδη, *already*] which is preſent, is an evident proof of the *præter* ſenſe; and if it be *continued* as well as *paſt* (he that *hath been condemned* remaining *ſtill* under *condemnation*) this is ſtill perfectly agreeable to my notion of ἡγίασται, the *unbeliever* oft *hath been*, and daily *is converted*, and brought to *baptiſm* by the *believer*.

13. And ſo much for all the grounds of his *firſt* exception, and his two *anſwers* to my *inference* from [ἡγίασται.]

SECT. III.

The rendring ἐν γυναικὶ *by the woman*] *defended*, ἐν *for* εἰς. Κτισθέντα ἐν πάσῃ κτίσει, *Col.* 1. 23. Κτίσις δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, Act. 4. Irenæus *no Latine Author*, ἐν παρεφάσει, Act. 7. Gal. 1. 16. 1 Pet. 1. 5. ἐν σοὶ, Deut. 28. Ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώποις, Pſal. 68. *My proof of the interpretation from the context.*

Numb. 1. THE ſecond concerns the rendring of ἐν γυναικὶ, which I read, [*by the woman*] but he [*to the woman*] *as* [*to*] *is a note of the dative caſe, and ſo* ἐν *redundant*.

2. And the reaſon, ſaith he, that he ſtill adheres to his way, is, *becauſe this ſeems to* him *the faireſt, eaſieſt, and moſt congruous ſenſe then to expound it, The believer may abide with the unbelieving yoke-fellow, For though he be an unbeliever, and in himſelf unſanctified, yet in or to his wife he is as if he were ſanctified, it's all one in reſpect of conjugal uſe, as if he were ſanctified.*

3. To this *reaſon* I have many things to anſwer. Firſt, That the very *rendring* it, is the *begging* the *queſtion*, which is only this (in this mattr) whether this be *the faireſt, eaſieſt, and moſt congruous ſenſe*, and muſt not be here *ſuppoſed*, when it ſhould be *proved*.

4. Secondly, That if it were the *faireſt* ſenſe, yet if the words *bear* it not, it muſt not be affixt to them, if it be more capable of *another*; and whether they will *bear* it or no, is the *queſtion* again, on occaſion of which, this *inquiry* is made into the uſe of the *prepoſition* ἐν, and to *ſuppoſe* again that it will ſignifie [*to*] in the *dative* ſenſe, before it is proved it will, is a ſecond *begging* the *queſtion*, a *paralogiſm* in ſtead of a *reaſon*.

5. Thirdly, The *fairneſs* of the ſenſe (ſimply taken) is not attempted to be *proved*, which yet doth ſtand in great *need* of it; For beſide the *redundance*, or unuſual ſenſe of ἐν, ſome other parts of the *rendring* are none of the *faireſt*; As firſt, *the believer may abide*] as if it were ſimply *free* to *abide* or not abide, whereas in the preſent caſe (when the *unbeliever* is willing to abide with the *believer*) the *believer* is by the *Apoſtle* counſelled at leaſt, if not *commanded* (and that is more than a *liberty*, that he *may*) To him the *Apoſtle* ſaith (and his ſayings have ſure *authority* with them) μὴ ἀφιέτω, *let him not put away*. Nay the interdict of *Chriſt* belonging to all, but that one caſe of *fornication*, *Mat.* 5. and *Mat.* 19. it is evident, that by force thereof the *believing* man muſt not *put away* the *unbeliever*, that is guilty of no more but *unbelief*; And accordingly the *preface*, Τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς --- *But for the reſt* (or, *for the other* queſtions, *v.* 1. 6. 8. 10.) *ſay I, not the Lord*] muſt be applied not to the immediate conſequents, of the *believers not putting away* the *unbeliever*, that will ſtay with him (for that had been determined by *Chriſt* in the *Negative*) but to *v.* 15. *If the unbelieving depart*, i. e. if the *unbeliever* will not dwell with the *believer*, except the *believer* forſake his, or her *religion*, what ſhall be done then? And to that the *Apoſtles counſel* is, that *marriage inſlaves* not the *believer* ſo far.

6. All which, is a competent prejudice to that part of Mr. *T.* his ſenſe, *The believer may abide*; For if that

that be it, even when the *unbeliever* is willing to *abide*, then ſhe *may* alſo *depart*, if ſhe rather chooſe, which will be found *contrary* to *Chriſt's* precept, and ſo may not be admitted.

Secondly, in this rendring, ἡγίασται is *engliſhed*, (not by *is* or *hath been ſanctified*, but by [*is as if he* 7.
were ſanctified] which indeed acknowledgeth that he is *not* truly (in any reſpect) *ſanctified*, and then ſure this will be a ſtrange *conſtruction*, ὁ ἄπιστος ἡγιάσθη, *the unbeliever (is not ſanctified*, but) *is as if he were ſanctified*, when yet *literally* it muſt be rendred *the unbeliever hath been*, or (to gratify Mr. *T.*) *is* or *continues to be ſanctified*: For what is this but to interpret an *affirmative* by interpoſing a *negation*, *he is ſanctified*, by *he is not?* for ſo aſſuredly he is not, if he only *be as if he were*.

With this let any man compare the interpretation I have given, *the unbeliever hath been ſanctified* 8.
by the believer, i. e. *examples* there are of ſuch as have been thus *converted* from their *unbelief*, and this ſence inforced by the *interrogation*, v. 16. *For what knoweſt thou, ô woman, whether thou ſhalt ſave the man*, &c. and by S. *Peters aphoriſm* of daily obſervation, 1 *Pet.* 3. 1. *the husband that obeys not the word*, i. e. the *unbeliever*, may probably be *gained* by the *converſation* of the *wife*; and then let him impartially paſs judgment, which is the *faireſt* and *eaſieſt rendring*.

His *ſecond reaſon* is, becauſe *though the Dr. deny it*, *yet* (ſaith he) *I aver*, *that the notion of* ἐν *for to*, 9.
as a ſign of the dative caſe, *is found more than once in the New Teſtament*.

The truth of this I muſt now examine by the *proofs* offered for the *affirmation*. And his firſt proof, 10.
is from *Mat.* 17. 12. ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ, *This*, ſaith he, *cannot be eluded becauſe the ſame ſpeech is* Mar. 9.
13. ἐποίησαν αὐτῷ, *and rendred by* Beza *in the former place*, *fecerunt ei*, *they did to him*. 2. *Whereas the Doctor ſaith* ἐν *is uſed for* εἰς, *upon him or againſt him*, *It had been meet the Doctor ſhould have given one inſtance at leaſt of ſuch conſtruction*, *which*, ſaith he, *I do not believe he can do*.

To this I anſwer, 1. By *two* ready inſtances in one verſe, *Luk.* 23. 31. Εἰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ ξύλῳ ταῦτα 11.
ποιοῦσιν, ἐν τῷ ξηρῷ τί γένηται; *If they do theſe things* (our ordinary *Engliſh* reads *in a green tree* but the ſenſe and *propriety* directs us to) *on the green tree*, *what ſhall be done on the dry?* here is the very phraſe that is uſed in that place of *Matthew*, ποιοῦσιν ἐν ὑγρῷ, as ἐποίησαν ἐν αὐτῷ, and then for S. *Marks* uſing (in the parallel place) αὐτῷ for ἐν αὐτῷ] that proves not that ἐν was *redundant* in S. *Matthew*, or that it was a bare *ſign* of the *dative* caſe, it being free to S. *Mark* to uſe any other expreſſion, different from S. *Matthew*, ſo he retained the *ſenſe*, as it is clear in this place he doth, *doing injuries to him*, being all one in effect with *upon* or *againſt him*, though the *phraſes* are not the ſame, which no way infers that when the *change* of the *phraſe* changes the *ſenſe*, it were lawful ſo to vary it, as in the place we have in hand (ἐν γυναιξὶ) 'tis on both ſides ſuppoſed to do.

A *ſecond* inſtance which he *conceives cannot be eluded*, *is Col.* 1. 23. τῷ κηρυχθέντι ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει, 12.
which was preached to every creature; and this he *proves* to be the *only rendring*, 1. *Becauſe* κηρύσσω *to preach*, *is commonly with a dative caſe of the object*, *and though*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. *it is* ἐκηρύχη ἐν ἔθνεσιν, *yet our traſlators*, *and the vulgar*, *and* Beza *read it*, *unto the Gentiles*, *as if there it noted only a dative caſe*, *and if it were among the Gentiles*, *there*, *yet here* Col. 1. 23. *it cannot be ſo*, *becauſe the object is in the ſingular number*, *but* ἐν, *when it is for among*, *is joyned ſtill with a noun of the plural*: *and* 2. *That which*, ſaith he, *puts this out of all doubt*, *is*, *that the phraſe*, Col. 1. *anſwers*, Mar. 15. 16. κηρύξαι τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει.

But to this all the *anſwer* is ready, by obſerving the exact notation of πᾶσα κτίσις the *whole creation* 13.
(as we render it *Rom.* 8. 22.) as that ſignifies the *whole*, but eſpecially the *Gentile world*, and accordingly is expreſt by πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, Mat. 28 and farther explained by ὅλῳ κόσμῳ *the whole world*, to which in S. *Mark* they are appointed to *go*, when they were thus to *preach the Goſpel* πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει, *to this whole creation*. Now of κτίσις in this notion it is clear, that though it be in the *ſingular* number, yet that hath the power of the *plural*, as the word [*world*] and the like, which every body knows, is a noun of *Multitude*, and ſo is *creation*, when it is thus taken for the *whole created world*, meaning this *world* of *men*, the *nations* or *people* of the *world*.

And then there can be no doubt but κηρυχθέντι ἐν πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει] is moſt exactly thus to be rendred, 14.
preached in, or *among the whole creation*, as *Gal.* 1. 16. κηρύσσειν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, *preach in the nations*, or *among the Gentiles*, and ſo 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. alſo, though the ſenſe being no way altered by rendring it *unto the whole creation*, or *every creature*, and *to the Gentiles*, it matters little though it be *promiſcuouſly* thus rendred in all theſe places, which yet muſt not preſcribe for other places, where the ſenſe is ſo much *changed* by the divers rendring, as in this caſe ἡγιάσθη ἐν γυναικὶ] is obſervable, where therefore the *literal* rendring being retained, we are not reaſonably to conclude any more from it, than that *literal* rendring will afford us. As for the *parallel* phraſe *Mar.* 16. that doubtleſs can prove nothing, 1. Becauſe the places are not, nor can be thought *parallel*, 2. Becauſe if they were, (as of *Mat.* 28. and *Mar.* 16. hath been granted) yet the *parallel* lying only in the *ſenſe*, and that being all one, whether they *preacht to* or *among the Gentiles*, this no way concludes that the phraſes are the ſame, or the ἐν in one redundant, which is the only thing for the proving of which this *parallel* is produced, but of that I have formerly ſpoken.

His third inſtance is δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, *Act.* 4. 12. which he *cannot yet conceive*, *but that it is* 15.
better rendred, *to men*, *than among men*. And his *reaſons* are, 1. *Becauſe* δίδωμι *hath moſt regularly and conſequently a dative caſe of the perſon after it*. 2. *Becauſe if it had been among men*, *it had been to be placed after* ἕτερον, *other*, *there is no other name among men*, *given*, *but being placed after given*, *it is to be expounded as referred to given*, *not to other*, *and ſo muſt be read*, *to men*, *not among men*. 3. *It ſeems no good ſenſe*, *nor true*, *that Chriſt was a name given among men*, *for though he were among men*, *yet he was given from above*. To all which he adds the *judgment* of *Irenæus*, l. 3. c. 12. cited by *Beza*, and a *parallel* phraſe ἐν παλεάσιν for παλαίσιν, *Act.* 7. 44.

To theſe I anſwer, 1. That 'tis true that when δίδωμι hath any *caſe* of the *perſon* following and 16.
governed by it, that is conſtantly the *dative*, but that is no way applicable to this phraſe δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, for there the *perſons*, ἀνθρώποις are governed by the *prepoſition* ἐν not by δεδομένον.

To the ſecond, That the *conſtruction* by *among*, is very good, placing it after *given*, *there is no* 17.
other name given among men, i. e. no means of *ſalvation* afforded by *God*, and continued *among men*.

To

18. To the third, That *Christ's* being *given from above*, no way prejudges his being *given among men*, both becauſe the *benefit* of this gift is as a common *donative*, diſtributed *among men*, and alſo becauſe this *gift* is diſpenſt in form of *humane fleſh*, *Christ* is become *man*, and to be found and ſeen *among men*.

19. And to the laſt, for the place of *Irenæus*, 'tis ſtrange that neither Mr. *T.* nor *Beza* whom he tranſcribed, ſhould remember that *Irenæus* wrote *Greek*, and that as the *Latine tranſlation* [*datum hominibus*] is not written by *Irenæus*, ſo there is no queſtion but *Irenæus's Greek* was the ſame with the *text* in the *Acts*, δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις, and then the *Tranſlator* (*barbarous* enough through that whole book) is to be reformed by the *Author*, and not the *Author* judged of by the *Tranſlator*; Or if he were, and *Irenæus's Greek* did really read ἀνθρώποις, without [ἐν] as the *Tranſlator* doth [*hominibus*] without [*in*] then I muſt reſolve, that the *copy* of the *Scripture*, which he followed, did ſo read before him [δεδομένον ἀνθρώποις] and if ſo, then what proof can Mr. *T.* have from thence that in other places or *phraſes*, where ἐν is found in all *copies*, it ſhall be *redundant*, and ſignifie no more than if it were not to be found there?

20. As for ἐν πατράσιν, it muſt certainly be rendred, *among the Fathers*, thus, *the tabernacle of witneſs was among our Fathers in the wilderneſs*: 'Tis pity the Reader ſhould be exerciſed and detained with ſuch debates as theſe, with which yet in obedience to Mr. *T.* I muſt farther importune him.

21. For a fourth inſtance he again reſumes that of *Gal.* 1. 16. and 2 *Pet.* 1. 5. That *Gal.* 1. where of *God*, the *Apoſtle* ſaith, that *he was pleaſed to reveal his own ſon* ἐν ἐμοὶ, and when I had rendred that *by*, or *through me*, to *others*, *This expoſition*, ſaith he, *makes the Apoſtle tautologize ineptly.*

22. This ſtrange *undecent* expreſſion I wiſh had been ſpared; for certainly there was little *temptation* for it: why, I pray, might not the *Apoſtle* without incurring either part of that *cenſure*, ſay, *God was pleaſed through me to reveal his ſon*, and by way of *explication*, (and withal to denote the *deſignation* of that *Apoſtle* to his peculiar *province*, as the *Apoſtle* of the *uncircumciſion*) add, *that I might preach the Goſpel to the Gentiles.* Certainly every explication of an *obſcurer* or narrower, by a *clearer* or larger phraſe, is not *inept tautology*, but that which all writers which have deſired to ſpeak intelligibly, have always been full of.

23. And yet ſecondly, the *latter* part here, of his *preaching the Goſpel to the Gentiles* (he being peculiarly the *Apoſtle* of the *Gentiles*, as *Peter* and *John* were of the *Jews* whereſoever *diſperſed*) is more than was pretended to be ſaid by my rendring and *paraphraſing* the former *part* of it; for in that thoſe *others* had not been defined, who they were, or limited to the *Gentiles*.

24. This Mr. *T.* adverted not in his *objection*; I deſire he will now take notice of it. For that of ὀφείλετε συγκύπτειν ἐν τῇ πίστει ὑμῶν ἀρετὴν, I need add no more to what I had before ſaid, that it is moſt fully rendred thus, *unto* or *over and above your faith ſuperadd virtue*, or *fortitude*.

25. *Two places*, he ſaith, *he had formerly produced out of the old Teſtament*, Deut. 28. 60. *and* 2 Kin. 7. 27. *and now adds one more*, Pſal. 68. 18. But beſides that *three* only places in the whole old *Teſtament*, would never infer that ſo it muſt be in this place of the *new*, there being many more to *preponderate* for the contrary, and there being no pretence of neceſſity that thus it *muſt* be here, beſides this, I ſay, it will be found, that theſe three will be of no *avail* to him.

26. Of the two former, the ſecond *is not*; there be but twenty *verſes* in that *Chapter*, and therefore no ἐν in the 27. and for the former, we well read it, *unto thee*, where the 72. reads ἐν σοὶ, in the ordinary way of acception of ἐν for εἰς.

27. And laſtly, for his new ſprung *teſtimony*, *Pſal.* 68. 18. of ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώποις, *for which* ſaith he *the Apoſtle hath* Eph. 4. 8. ἔδωκε δόματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, which he takes to be *more than enough to refute the Doctor*, 'tis preſently viſible that it hath no manner of *force* in it; For though thoſe two places are perfectly *parallel*, as to the matter, yet for the *expreſſion* 'tis evidently very *different*; in one [*thou haſt received*] in the other [*he hath given*] and ſo [ἐν ἀνθρώποις *for*, or *among men*] muſt of all neceſſity differ from [ἀνθρώποις *to men*.] For how could it be ſenſe to ſay, *thou haſt received gifts to men?* yet ſo it muſt be, to make good Mr. *T.* his obſervation, that ἐν ſignifies *to*, or is *redundant*, or the note of a *dative caſe*.

28. And ſo he never had a more improper ſeaſon for his *triumphs*; never leſs cauſe to tell others of *talking ad randum*, when he himſelf was ſo far removed from all appearance of *demonſtration*. And ſo much for the *Grammatical* notation of ἐν γυναικὶ, very unfit to have exerciſed us thus long, but that Mr. *T.* would have it ſo, and *words* are the means of conveighing *realities* unto us, and miſtakes in them (though minute) may be of *ſubſtantial* importance.

29. My third *proof* produced for my *interpretation* of the firſt part of *v.* 14. which to me put it out of all doubt, by comparing it with the *reaſon* ſubjoined, *For what knoweſt thou, O wife, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy husband; or how knoweſt thou, O man, whether thou ſhalt ſave thy wife?*] he comes next to examine, and hath many *exceptions* againſt it, all which (without loſing time in repeating and viewing them ſeverally) will be ſoon diſpelled by a right underſtanding of the force of the *Apoſtles* argument as there I conceive it to ly, Thus *v.* 14. *It is matter of ordinary obſervation, that unbelieving husbands have been brought to the faith and baptiſm by the believing wife, therefore I now exhort and counſel the believer not to depart from the unbeliever, in caſe the unbeliever be willing to ſtay*, v. 13. *for this reaſon*, v. 16. *becauſe what hath been ſo oft, may very probably be hoped again*, and conſequently upon the *premiſes* the *believer* hath ground to *hope*, that ſhe may in time *gain* the *husband* to the *faith*, and that, being ſo fair a *reward* in her view (the *ſaving* or *reſcuing* him from *infidelity*, to *Chriſt*) may well inforce the *counſel* of the *Apoſtle*, *not* to *depart* from him, as long as, without *ſin*, ſhe is permitted to ſtay.

30. By which it appears that this *v.* 16. is not a bare *explanation* of ἁγίασται, *v.* 14. (on which Mr. *T.* his exceptions principally depend) but an *application* of the argument formerly propoſed, but now more ſignally brought home to them, under the form of [τί γὰρ *for what*---] by this means to reinforce his *concluſion* of their *not departing* for the cauſe of *infidelity*: If the Reader will but obſerve what is thus viſible, he will want no more help, to get out of the *intricacies*, and toils, which Mr. *T.*

hath

hath here *ſpread* for him in this matter, which is in it ſelf ſo manifeſt, as nothing can be added to it, if either the *text* or my *paraphraſe* may be permitted to ſpeak for it ſelf.

SECT. IV.

Mr. T. *his miſtake of my ſenſe. The argument* à genere ad ſpeciem. *Ἀκάθαρτα and ἅγια. How the husband is ſaid to be baptized by the wife.* נדושין *partial waſhings. The proportion betwixt legal holineſs, and baptiſm. Difference between relative and real ſanctification. The teſtimonies of the antient, for and againſt my interpretation.*

HIS exceptions to the *former* part of my *paraphraſe* being now ended, I muſt attend what he hath to ſay againſt the *latter* part of it, that which concerns our matter in hand more nearly; The words are ἐπεὶ ἄρα, *for elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy*, i. e. *upon that ſcore it is that Chriſtians children are admitted to baptiſm*, viz. *becauſe by their living in the family with the Chriſtian parent they probably will* (and ought to) *be brought up in the faith — and the Church* (requiring and receiving *promiſe* from the *parents*) reaſonably *preſumes* they will, and ſo *admits* them to *baptiſm*. *Numb.* 1.

This argument of the *Apoſtles* thus explained in my *paraphraſe* (or if he yet will have it more *plainly* thus, *The Church upon confidence that the believers children will be brought up in the faith, receives them to baptiſm when they are infants; And upon the ſame grounds of hope, that your abiding with the unbelieving husband may in time convert him (as by experience it hath oft been found) I adviſe you not to depart from him, if he will live with you; For what knoweſt thou whether thou ſhalt ſave thy husband*, &c.) Mr. *T.* hath made a ſhift not to underſtand, and *ſubſtituted* another way of arguing in my name, in ſtead of it, *p.* 331. And having done ſo, I muſt leave him to *combate* with the *ſhadow* of his own *creating*, no part of his *impreſſion* lighting upon that, which alone I profeſs to be my *meaning* in it; which I leave him or the Reader to ſee, in the particulars propoſed by him, but muſt not now be ſo impertinent, as to loſe time in the *purſuit* of them. 2.

But the *reaſons* produced for my thus interpreting, he next proceeds to *examine*, and I muſt take care to vindicate them. My firſt *reaſon* is, becauſe ἅγιος, *holy*, noting a *relative holineſs*, a ſetting apart to *God*, and the *loweſt* degree of that imaginable being the *initiating* into the *Church* by *baptiſm*, this muſt in reaſon be here noted by ἅγια *holy*, as all *viſible profeſſors*, *Ezr.* 9. 2. are the *holy ſeed*, and in the *Epiſtles* of the *Apoſtles*, ἅγιοι *holy*. 3.

To this he anſwers, that *it being all granted, confirms not the Doctors Expoſition, becauſe 'tis no good argument, à genere ad ſpeciem affirmative, and becauſe infants are not viſible Profeſſors.* 4.

But ſure when the *ſpecies* is ſuch, that he that hath not that, hath not any *part* of the *genus*, the *argument* will thus hold very *irrefragably*: Suppoſe that of the *Deacon* to be the *loweſt order* of *officers* of the *Church*, and that without which there is no *aſcending* to any *higher degree* in the *miniſtery*, will not then the *argument hold*; He hath ſome *degree Eccleſiaſtical* upon him, therefore ſure he is a *Deacon?* Thus ſure it is in this matter, the *relative holineſs* belongs to no perſon, that is not *baptized*, *baptiſm* is the *loweſt degree* of it, and all *ſuperiour degrees* of *Apoſtle*, *Prophet*, &c. in the *Chriſtian Church* are founded in that, therefore if the *infant children* be *holy*, the *infant children* are *baptized*. So again, *Baptiſm* is the *loweſt* degree of *viſible profeſſion*, therefore if theſe that are ſaid to be *holy*, are *viſible Profeſſors*, then ſure they are *baptized*; And ſo there is no force in that whether *anſwer* or *exception* to my *firſt* reaſon. 5.

My ſecond follows from the notation of ἀκάθαρτα, *Act.* 10. 14. for thoſe that muſt *not be received into the Church*, as on the other ſide *God's cleanſing* is *God's reputing him fit to be partaker of this priviledge*, whereby it appears how fitly, *receiving* and *not receiving* to *baptiſm*] are expreſt by [*holy* and *unclean.*] 6.

To this he *anſwers* by acknowledging the *concluſion*, *viz.* the *fitneſs* of the *expreſſion*, all his *exception* is againſt my *premiſſe*, the notion of *unclean*, Act. 10. *which*, ſaith he, *ſignifies there not only one out of the Church, but alſo one that a Jew might not go in to, or eat with.* To this I reply, that my *concluſion* being granted, I may ſafely part with that, which inferred it, as when I am arrived at my *journeys end*, I have no farther need, or uſe of my *horſe* or *guide* that brought me thither: Let it be remembred, that [*holy* and *unclean*] fitly expreſs thoſe that are *received*, or *not received* to *baptiſm*, and then I am ſure I have not offended againſt the *propriety* of the words, by *concluding* from this *text*, that in the *Apoſtles* time the *believers children* were *received to baptiſm*; And if I have as little offended againſt the *rational* importance of the words in that place (as I hope hath formerly appeared that I have) then I hope I am perfectly *innocent* in inducing my *concluſion*. 7.

As for the uſe of the *phraſe*, *Act.* 10. though now I need not contend, yet I may add, that the notion of *not entring to*, and *eating with*, containing under it this other of *not baptizing* (for ſure he might not *baptize* thoſe to whom he might not *enter*) and the *baptizing Cornelius* (and not only *entring* to him) being the end for which *Peter* received that *viſion*, I ſtill adhere that ἀκάθαρτα in that place ſignifies one peculiarly that muſt not be *received into the Church* by *baptiſm*; and the *holineſs*, on the contrary, *reception* to that *priviledge*. 7.

My third being taken from the uſe of the *Hebrew* קדש *to ſanctifie*, for *waſhing* any part of the body, and on occaſion of that, mentioning a conjecture that the uſe of *holineſs* for *baptiſm* might perhaps intimate that the *primitive baptiſms* were not always *immerſions*, but that *ſprinkling* of ſome *part* might be *ſufficient*; he hath a reply to each of theſe; To the former, that *if this reaſon were good, then the husbands being ſanctified by the wife, muſt ſignifie his being baptized or waſhed by her*; to the latter, that I *have in my writings ſo oft acknowledged the baptiſm of the Jews and Chriſtians to be immerſion of the whole body, that I ought to be aſhamed to ſay the contrary, and that I can hardly believe my ſelf in it.* 8.

To theſe I anſwer, firſt to the former, 1. That I that affirm *ſanctifications* among the *Jews* to ſignifie 9.

nify *waſhings*, do alſo know that it hath other ſignifications, and that that ſignification is in each *text* to be choſen, which ſeems moſt *agreeable* in all thoſe reſpects which are to be conſiderable in the pitching on any *interpretation*; Conſequently that the *wive's baptizing the husband* being a thing *abſurd*, and utterly unheard of in the *Church* of *God*, whether in the *Apoſtles* or *ſucceeding* ages, this ſenſe may not reaſonably be affixt to it, whereas the *baptizing* of *infants* being by the *ancients* affirmed to be received from the *Apoſtles*, it is moſt reaſonable to underſtand the words of *this*, though not of the *other* (and ſo to apply the *obſervation* (as it is viſible I did) to the *latter*, not *former* part of that *verſe*.

10. And yet 2. if we ſhall diſtinguiſh of the notion of [*by*] and expound [ὑπὸ γυναικὸς, *by the woman*] of the *perſwaſion*, that the *woman* hath uſed to bring her *husband* to *baptiſm*, and not of her *miniſtry* in *baptizing*, we may very conveniently ſo interpret the former part of the *verſe* alſo, that *by the woman*, ὁ ἀνὴρ ἄπιστος ἡγίασται, *the unbelieving husband hath been brought to baptiſm*, viz. by being brought to *faith*, to which this *priviledge* belongs.

11. As for his 2. *exceptions* to my conjecture, founded in the uſe of קדשין *ſanctifications* for *partial* not *total waſhings*, 1. I anſwer, that I mention it only as a *conjecture*, with a *perhaps*, and lay no more weight upon it: 2. That for *Chriſtian baptiſm* I no where *affirm* that it was *only by immerſion*, nor on the other ſide, that it was *always by ſprinkling*, but *disjunctively*, either by one or the other (as by the words cited by him from *Prac. Cat.* l. 6. *Sect.* 2. is clear) ſuppoſing indeed that *Chriſt's appointment* was not terminated to *either*, and ſo ſatisfied by *either*. To which purpoſe I ſhall now add, what Mr. *Pocock*, one moſt expert in the writings and Cuſtoms of the *Jews*, hath obſerved *Miſcell. not.* c. 9. p. 390, *&c.* that the difference between the *Hebrew* טבל and נטל being the ſame, as in the *Greek* between βαπτίζεσθαι and χερνίπτειν, yet none of all theſe four do neceſſarily belong to the waſhing of the whole body, but are all indifferently for the waſhing the hands, and ſo but of a part, only with this difference, that טבל and βαπτίζεσθαι ſignify immerſion of that part in the water, and נטל and χερνίπτειν imply no more than the affuſion of water upon the hands. This difference is taken notice of among the *Jewiſh* writers in the waſhing but of the hands. In the *Miſna*, *Chagigah* c. 2. §. 5. נוטלין לידים &c. *they waſh the hands by pouring water on them*, *for common meat*, &c. ולקודש טובלין *and to ſacred offices they immerſe them*, i. e. their *hands* again. Thus *Maimonides* ſets the difference (in *præfat. ad ſuos in tr. Tadaim*) betwixt נטילת ידים *waſhing the hands* by pouring water on them, and טבילת ידים *immerſion* of the *hands* in water, and both theſe equally עד הפרק *to the wriſt* and no farther. Conſequently hereto, the ſame muſt be reſolved of βαπτίζεσθαι, which is perfectly equivalent to טבל that that doth not neceſſarily extend to the waſhing the whole body but only to the *immerſion* (as that is oppoſed to *affuſion* of water) of any one part of it. Thus it is clearly uſed *Lu.* 11. 38. the *Phariſee* wondred ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου, *that he was not firſt waſht before dinner*, which yet extended no farther (certainly) than the *waſhing* the *hands*, which was all that was by them required before meat, *Mar.* 7. 3. and ſo the word is uſed alſo in that place, *Mar.* 7. 3. ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίζωνται, οὐκ ἐσθίουσι, *When they come from market they eat not*, *unleſs they waſh*, i. e. their hands, not their whole body, as learned Mr. *Pocock* hath alſo cleared it, *Not. Miſcell.* p. 398.

12. My laſt *reaſon* is taken from the *effect* of the *legal uncleanneſs*, contrary to thoſe their *ſanctifications*, *viz.* removing men from the *congregation*; agreeable to which it is, that thoſe ſhould be called *holy*, who in the account of *God*, ſtood ſo, that they might be *received* into the *Church*; To this he anſwers, that *it is ſaid without proof that the uncleanneſs excluding from, and ſanctification reſtoring to the tabernacle, are proportionable to the notion here given of the childrens being excluded or included in the Church, asking, why* Cornelius *ſhould be counted out of the Church, being a devout man.*

13. But to this I reply, that that which is ſo *manifeſt*, needed no farther *proof*; for what two things can be more *proportionable*, or anſwerable the one to the other, than the *Jews* calling thoſe *unclean*, and *holy*, who were *excluded* from, and *reſtored* to the *tabernacle*, and the *Chriſtians* calling them *unclean*, and *holy*, that were *excluded* from, and *received* into the *Church*, the *excluſion* and *reception* being the ſame on both ſides, as alſo the *uncleanneſs* and *holineſs*, and the *proportion* lying only betwixt the *Jewiſh tabernacle* and the *Chriſtian Church*, which ſurely are very fit *parallels* as could have been thought on.

14. As for his *queſtion* of *Cornelius*, it is moſt vain, the whole diſcourſe being not of *real* but *relative ſanctification*, and the *difference* moſt viſible betwixt that *ſanctity* which was *truly* in him in reſpect of his *devotion*, *fearing*, *praying*, &c. and that *outward* priviledge of *admiſſion* into the *congregation* of the *Jews*, which alone was the thing which in the account of *God*, or *ſober* men, was denied *Cornelius*.

15. Theſe be pitiful *ſophiſms*, and in no reaſon farther to be inſiſted on, And therefore it was but *neceſſary* that to *amuſe* the reader, he ſhould here add by way of *cloſe*, that *Auguſtine did diſclaim this interpretation*, Hierom *and* Ambroſe *gave another*, *and ſo did* Tertullian *De Anima*, c. 39.

16. The three former of theſe we muſt, it ſeems, take upon his word, for he cites not the places where they give that *other interpretation*, nor pretends he that they gave that to which he *adheres*: But for *Tertullian* the moſt antient of theſe, by the place here cited, I am aſſured what *credit* is due to his *citations*, having ſet down the words at large from that c. 39. *de Animâ*, and found it perfectly to accord to my *interpretation*.

17. The like hath appeared of S. *Hierom* in part (for the *former* and more *difficult* part of the *verſe*) *the man hath been ſanctified*, *exemplum refert*, ſaith he, *quia ſæpe contigerit*, juſt according to my *paraphraſe* of the place.

18. For S. *Auguſtin* alſo, l. 2. *de Pecc. Mer. & Remiſs.* c. 26. (which I ſuppoſe the place he means) I have already accounted. And for the *Annotations* on the *Epiſtles*, which go under S. *Ambroſe's* name, as I have not commodity to examin them, ſo they are *known* and univerſally acknowledged to be none of S. *Ambroſe's* writings; And then it is competently evident how little he hath gained by this unſeaſonable *appeal* to *teſtimonies*.

19. The deſign, I ſuppoſe, was to *prevent* the force of my *allegations*; For in that place as an *appendix*

to

to the use of the word, *holy*, among the *Jews*, I had added the *acception* of it among the *antient Christian* writers, S. *Cyprian*, *Ep.* 59. *Eum qui natus est baptizandum, & sanctificandum*, and the two places out of *Gregory Nazianzen*, of ἁγιασθῆναι ἁγιασθῶσι, being *sanctified* when they are *not* (through want of years) *sensible* of it, and ἐκ βρέφους ἁγιασθῆναι, *sanctified from infancy*. And before he chuses to take notice of these, he brings forth his names of *Fathers* too; with what success, we have seen, and shall not need farther to consider.

At length he descends to take notice of my *testimonies*, and to them he hath two answers, First, That for the *antients of the third or fourth Century, especially for the Latine Doctors*, he *thinks the Doctor knows them better than to assert that they knew certainly the sacred Dialect*, adding that *few of them had skill in Hebrew or Greek*. *Secondly*, That *if those Fathers knew the sacred dialect, then not holy but sanctified, must be as much as baptized, and then the sense is, that the unbelieving husband is baptized by the wife.* 20.

This *latter answer* was even now satisfied to the full; To the former then I reply, First, That of the two *antients* cited by me, the former was *crowned* a *Martyr* within 160. years after the *Apostles* Age, and the latter *flourished* about 110. years after him, and so that in respect of their *time* they are no way incompetent to *testify* what was the *sacred language*, the *writers* whereof were so lately gone out of the world. 21.

Secondly, That one of these being a *Greek* Doctor, and he agreeing exactly with the *other* (and more of the same kind I have now produced in this *Rejoinder*) there can here be no pretence for Mr. *T.* either to prejudice the *Latine* Doctors skill in this matter, or to say they had *no skill in Greek*. 22.

Thirdly, That the notion that they had of the word, being the very same, that the *Hebrews* were so lately shown to have had of it, there was as little *colour*, or *temptation* from the matter in hand, to except against their *skill* in *Hebrew*. 23.

Fourthly, That either of these *antient* Doctors knew as much (the one much more) of *Greek* as any of the *four* whom just now Mr. *T.* had vouched for the *interpreting* of the place; and for the *Hebrew* S. *Hierom*, who alone was better skilled in that, concurred with me in the main part (and *basis*) of my *interpretation*. 24.

Lastly, The Text to the *Corinthians* being in *Greek*, certainly *Gregory Nazianzen* was as great a *Master* in that *language*, as any that can be pretended fit to be confronted against him; and with that concurrence, which I have shewed he had of *Origen*, and others, both *Greek* and *Latine*, may be thought worthy to be heeded by Mr. *T.* for a matter of no greater *weight* than this, the *interpretation* of a word, especially when Mr. *T.* himself hath so lately joined his *suffrage* in these plain words, *I deny not the fitness of the expressing* [*receiving to baptism*] *by the term* [*holy.*] 25. Pag. 333.

And so much for those *exceptions* against the *latter* part of my *paraphrase* of that *verse*, and my *reasons* for it.

CHAP. IV.

An Answer to Mr. Tombes's *view of my Conclusion, and therein the sense of Antiquity in this Question.*

SECT. I.

Τέκνα, 1 Cor. 7. *infant children. The Jews practice. Their notion of* [holy] *Baptism a priviledge of believers children, yet is communicated to others whose guardians are believers. The several sorts of holiness all vainly mentioned by Mr.* T. *His denials of the Conclusion. The place in* Tertullian *vindicated.* S. Hieroms *answer to* Paulinus. Institutionis disciplina in Tertullian. Candidati Dæmoniorum. *A third denial of the Conclusion. The use of baptism to regenerate,* &c. *No prejudice to the founding it in the Jewish practice. His art of diversion to put off answering of testimonies. The way of Testimonies insisted on.*

After this examination of my *paraphrase* of this *text* to the *Corinthians*, he proceeds to the *conclusion* which I deduce from thence, which is no other than my *premisses*, (*viz.* my *confirmation* of that *interpretation*) had regularly inferred, that the *infants* of *Christian Parents* were by the *Apostles* received to *baptism*. *Numb.* 1.

But to this he will object also, not only by referring to his former *performances* invalidating the *premisses* (to which I shall not need now to advert, having refuted his *answers*, as they were produced) but by *denying the consequence in case my interpretation were granted*, and that upon these accounts, First, *Because it is not clear that* [*your children*] *are* [*your infants*] *the Corinthians having* (*for ought yet hath been shewed*) *other children besides infants, and the Jews baptizing Proselytes, children females under twelve, and males under thirteen years old, not according to their will, but of the Father or Court. Secondly, Because if the Apostle should by* [*holy*] *mean a priviledge whereupon they were baptized, he should conceive otherwise than the Jews did, who conceived all unclean whom they baptized, till by baptism they cleansed them, and made them holy. Thirdly, Because there is no priviledge attributed by the Apostle to the Christians infants, which would not belong to the infants of heathen, or if there were, yet it might not be baptism.* 2.

To the first of these I have *incidentally* answered already, by making it evident, not that 3.

the *Corinthians* had no other *children* beſide *infants* (I have no want of ſuch *ridiculous* evaſions) but that the *children* which are there ſpoken of, were *infant children*, as appeared both by the expreſs words of *Tertullian*, and the *Author* of *Anſwers ad Antiochum*, and the aggreableneſs of *Nazianzen's* expreſſions, by the *general* doctrine of the *Fathers* in this matter, and by the *inconveniences* which were conſequent to the interpreting it of any other but *infant children*, meaning by them ſuch as are either ſtrictly *infants*, *new born*, or ſuch as are *proportionable* to theſe, having not arrived to *maturity* of *underſtanding*, and *capacity* of profeſſing *perſonally* for themſelves. For this, I muſt refer the *Reader* to that place.

4. And for the *practice* of the *Jews*, which I acknowledge to be as is here ſuggeſted, not to *baptize* any *Proſelytes children* by their *own wills* or *profeſſions*, till they be, the *female* at the full Age of twelve, the *male* of thirteen years, ſure it makes nothing againſt me, for they that thus *baptized* the *Proſelytes children*, all under that Age, by the *profeſſion* of others, did alſo *baptize* their *infant children* in the ſame manner; and all that I pretend from that place is, that the *believers infants* were admitted to *baptiſm*, if *infants* they were, not doubting but if they were of *greater* years they were *baptized* alſo, if before they were fit to *profeſs* for themſelves, then by their *Parents* or the *Churches*, but if fit to *anſwer* for themſelves, then by their *own profeſſion*.

5. To the ſecond I ſay, that by [*holy*] the *Apoſtle* means the *priviledge* of admiſſion to *baptiſm*, becauſe in *baptiſm* they were received into the *Church*, and ſo made *relatively holy*; And the very ſame was the *Jews* notion of *holineſs*, when they called *baptiſms*, *Sanctifications*, and conceived thoſe that were *unclean*, to be made *holy* by that means, This *holineſs* is the *term* of the *motion* in both their uſages of the word.

6. To the third, Firſt, I ſuppoſe it evident by my *interpretation*, that the *holineſs* which belonged to the *believers children*, was a *priviledge*, and that not *common* to the *unbelievers children*, unleſs they were by the charity of the *Church* or ſome member thereof (having *power*, and aſſuming to make uſe of that power, to bring them up in the *knowledge* of their *baptiſmal vow*) brought to *baptiſm*, and then thoſe ſupplied the place of the *Parents*, and the *children* equally received the ſame *benefit* by that *charity*, as if their *own* Parents had done it for them; and there being no reaſon here offered to the *contrary*, but a *reference* to another place, which I have not *commodity* to conſult or *examine*, there is nothing that exacts any farther reply from me.

7. The ſame will ſatisfie the latter part of this laſt *ſuggeſtion*; for, to prove that if there were a *priviledge*, yet it might not be *baptiſm*, he produceth this reaſon, that *baptiſm according to the fathers opinion and practice belonged to unbelievers children alſo, if they were brought*: which being willingly granted, and ſo the matter cleared, that the *children* of *believers* were to be *admitted* to *baptiſm*, when the very *unbelievers children*, if *brought* and *aſſumed* for by others, which were not their *parents*, were to be *admitted*, It certainly follows not from thence, that the *believers children* were not *admitted*, or that their *admiſſion* was not a *priviledge* of *believers children*; For ſo ſtill it was, though by *parity* of *reaſon*, and by the *charity* of the *Church* it was *communicated* to ſome others; *viz.* thoſe that were brought by *friends* or *guardians*, though not by *Parents*, for ſo ſtill this *priviledge* belonged not to thoſe *unbelievers children*, who lived in their *Parents* power, and were not thus undertaken for by *believers*.

8. The ſhort is, *baptiſm* was a *priviledge* of the *believers infants* undertaken for by their *Parents*, and by *analogie communicated* to thoſe who were undertaken for by *others*, whoſe *charity* and *piety* ſupplied the place of *believing Parents*; but was not *communicated* ſimply or *indifferently* to all *children* of *unbelievers*, and herein the *priviledge* conſiſted.

9. As for the other imagined *priviledge*, which he names, belonging to *infants*, If it be that of *real*, *actual*, *inward holineſs*, I diſcern not Mr. *T.* hath any *kindneſs* to it, (nor can he, without deſtroying his own *hypotheſes*) and therefore it matters not what others imagine; If it be *federal external holineſs*, that I ſuppoſe to be the ſame with *baptiſmal holineſs*, *baptiſm* being the *entrance* into that *Covenant*; And for *holineſs* in *hope* and *expectation*; firſt, that cannot denote *actually holy* (as ἁγίων here notes) unleſs by *holy* we mean in the *relative* ſenſe, *conſecration* or *deſignation* to *holineſs*, and then it is all one with *baptiſm* again, the *ſolemnity* of that *conſecration*.

10. Before he leaves the ſurvey of my *concluſion*, he will again reſume what he had ſaid without all degree of *truth* in the *beginning*, and yet doth it with great *incitation*, *Firſt*, ſaith he, *it is falſe that Chriſt founded his inſtitution in the Jewiſh practice*.

11. But this I ſuppoſe in Mr. *T.* to be no other than a *Mentiris Bellarmine*, or that moſt *inartificial* thing, the *denying* a *concluſion* which had been inferred by competent *premiſſes*. And for the *reaſon* added to his *negation*, that *it would utterly overthrow all baptiſm after the firſt converſion of Progenitors*, that hath been largely *anſwered* here, and grounds laid for it in the *reſolution* of the *Quære*, by the *Jewiſh practice of baptizing the children of natives*, as well as of *Proſelytes*, and ſo of thoſe that are born never ſo many Ages *after* the firſt *converſion*. And I muſt not again ſo often *repeat* the ſame thing.

12. In the ſame *cauſeleſs* fit of *incitation*, he farther goes on, *Secondly*, ſaith he, *It is falſe that there is any evidence in the Apoſtles words*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *of ſuch a Cuſtom of baptizing Chriſtians and their children*. But that I humbly conceive, is the *denying* my *concluſion* again, having all this while laboured to clear this evidence in the *tract*, and here vindicated it from all *objections*, which ſeemed to have the leaſt force in them: And whereas he here adds no other *reaſon* to his *negation*, but his own *not thinking that ever any of the Fathers did interpret the Apoſtles words as this Doctor doth*, adding that *Tertullians words de Anima*, c. 39. *are not an exact parallel to the Apoſtles ſpeech* (which I muſt ſuppoſe I have now ſhewed it is) that *Ambroſe and Hierome interpret them of legitimation in birth*, *Auguſtine what way ſoever*, *not to baptiſm* (of each of which I have ſpoken already alſo) all that I ſhall need add, is only this.

13. Firſt, That ſtill if this argument were *exactly* true, yet it is but a *negative argument à teſtimonio*, which never was available in any diſpute: Secondly, That if the *Fathers* do not fully interpret this place as I now do, yet I have brought ſome *ſuffrages* and other competent grounds out of the *Fathers* for

for my way of *interpreting* it: Thirdly, That what he hath ſaid for the invalidating the *Teſtimony* out of *Tertullian*, hath certainly no force in it, as ſhall now briefly appear, by this view of what he ſaith.

It is this, 1. That *the terms candidati ſanctitatis, or deſignati ſanctitatis, or candidati fidei in* Hierom's *Epiſ.* 153. *to Paulinus, do note not that they were baptized, but that they were in deſignation of being believers and baptized, intended to be holy by the parents, to be bred up to the faith and ſo baptized.* 2. *That what the Doctor talks of* Tertullian *as ſaying they were holy,* i. e. *baptized, ex ſeminis prærogativâ, it is a manifeſt miſtake, for* 1. *The holineſs he aſcribes to believers children was not only by prerogative of birth, but alſo ex inſtitutionis diſciplinâ, by the diſcipline of their inſtruction which is afore baptiſm.* 2. *The prerogative of birth the very words of* Tertullian *ſhew to be no more but this, that believers children were born without thoſe idolatrous ſuperſtitions which were uſed in the birth of infidels children, which he there principally recites.* 14.

To this I *anſwer* by *degrees*, 1. By viewing the place in S. *Hierom*, to which he refers me for the explication of the phraſe, *candidati* or *deſignati ſanctitatis*. That *Epiſtle* to *Paulinus* is haſtily written in *anſwer* to two *queſtions* of *Paulinus* his propoſing. To the *latter*, being this, *quomodo ſancti ſint qui de fidelibus*, i. e. *baptizatis naſcantur* (which plainly refers the matter to theſe words of the *Apoſtles*, *how the children born of believing parents are holy*] he gives a very *ſhort* ſolution, being taken off by the *haſt* of the *Poſt*, and the multitude of other *letters*, he had to write. All that he is permitted to ſay is this: *De ſecundo problemate tuo Tertullianus in libris de monogamiâ diſſeruit, aſſerens ſanctos dici fidelium filios quòd quaſi candidati ſint fidei, & nullis Idololatriæ ſordibus polluantur. Simúlque conſidera, quòd & vaſa in tabernaculo legimus, & cætera quæ ad ritum ceremoniarum pertinent, cum utique ſancta eſſe non poſſint niſi ea quæ ſentiunt & venerantur Deum. Idioma igitur Scripturarum eſt, ut interdum ſanctos pro mundis & purificatis & expiatis nominent, ſicut & Betſabee ſanctificata dicitur ab immunditia ſua, & ipſum templum ſanctuarium nominatur. Of your ſecond problem* Tertullian *hath diſcourſed in his Books de monogamia, affirming the children of believers to be called holy, becauſe they were as it were candidates of Faith, and not polluted with any of the filth of idolatry. Withal conſider that alſo we read that the veſſels in the Tabernacle are holy, and the other things which belong to the rite of ceremonies, when yet nothing can* (really) *be holy but what have ſenſe, and worſhip God. It is therefore an idiome of the Scriptures, to uſe the word holy for thoſe that are clean, and purified and expiated, as* Bathſeba *is ſaid to be ſanctified from her uncleanneſs, and the temple is called the Sanctuary.* And ſo he is *abruptly* broken off, meaning to have ſaid much more on that *ſubject*, this, as he ſolemnly proteſts (*teſtis eſt mihi conſcientia meæ Deus*) being but the *procinctus & exordium*, the *preparation and beginning of his interpretation.* 15.

If he had gone on to have *perfected* his *anſwer* to *Paullinus's quære*, he would probably have more perfectly cleared the *whole* difficulty. As it is, here is nothing in the leaſt wiſe to our *prejudice*, nor to the *proving* that which Mr. *T.* undertakes, that *Tertullians words de Anima do not affirm the baptizing of the believers children.* 16.

For 1. This of *Tertullian* is not the place that S. *Hierom* refers to, but ſome other in his *Books de Monog.* that *one Book* which we now have under that title, affording us no ſuch diſcourſe on that *ſubject*, as S. *Hierom* mentions. 17.

Secondly, All that S. *Hierom* cites out of *that* (not this) place of *Tertullian*, is very reconcileable with what *Tertullian* ſaith in this place, and with his opinion that the *infants of Chriſtians were baptized*, for, ſaith he, they were *quaſi candidati fidei, as it were candidates of Faith? Candidates* were they that ſtood for any *office*, *qui candida ſumptâ veſte conſulatum, prætu*ram, &c. *poſtulabant, who putting on white garments ſued for* any *office*, and ſo *candidates of faith*, they that *ſue*, for this condition in the *Church* of *God*, that of πιστοὶ *believers*, to which by *baptiſm* they are aſſumed, and accordingly were to be brought to the *Font*, like ſuch *candidates*, in *white garments*, as they that were to be *ſanctified*, i. e. *baptized*, among the *Jews*, *Exod.* 16. 10. were alſo to *waſh* their *cloths*, or put on *clean garments.* 18.

Again when he ſaith of them that they were *holy as the veſſels of the Temple were holy*, though they had no *ſenſe*, this is the clear laying of a *ground*, whereby *children* may be deemed capable of this *relative holineſs*, which is to be had by *baptiſm*, though as yet they are not capable (for want of *underſtanding*) of *inherent holineſs.* 19.

Laſtly, when he mentions it as an *idiome* of *Scripture*, to call them *holy*, who are *cleanſed, purified, expiated*, ſpeaking of thoſe *legal luſtrations* or *purifications*, this gives an account of S *Pauls* uſing the word in the *Chriſtian Church* for the *Chriſtian luſtration, purification, expiation*, i. e. for *baptiſm.* 20.

And by the way, it appears by S. *Hierom* that he uſeth promiſcuouſly *ſancti* and *ſanctificati*, and ſo that gives us authority to interpret [ἁγιάσθαι] in the end of the verſe in the ſame ſenſe in which [ἁγιασαι] is uſed in the beginning, for thoſe that are *brought* and *received* to *baptiſm.* All which are far enough from ſerving any of Mr. *T.* his intereſts, and might have inclined him to have omitted that *teſtimony* of S. *Hieroms*, if he had more maturely conſidered of it. 21.

Nay Thirdly, I muſt add, that Mr. *T.* his rendring of *candidati* and *deſignati ſanctitatis*, and *candidati fidei*, by *being in deſignation of being believers and baptized, intended to be holy by the parents, to be bred up to the faith and ſo baptized*, is a moſt groundleſs inconvenient *interpretation*: For if by *holineſs* and *faith* be meant *inherent holineſs* and *faith*, then *baptiſm* it ſelf is the *ceremony* of *conſecrating* and *deſigning* them to this, and ſo *precedent* to that *holineſs* (not *ſubſequent* to it, as Mr. *T.* ſets it) and accordingly in the *Church writings*, the word πιστοὶ *believers*, is never beſtowed on any, though of *mature* age and knowledge, till after they be *baptized*, φωτιζόμενοι and πιστοὶ, *illuminate* and *believers* being all one, promiſcououſly uſed for thoſe that have *received Baptiſm*, in oppoſition to *catechumeni*, thoſe that have not yet attained it: But if *holineſs* and *faith* be the *relative holineſs*, then *infants* being as capable of that as *veſſels* in the *Temple*, they might be preſently *deſigned* and *conſecrated* to that, and not *firſt bred up* in the *faith*, before they were *partakers* of it. 22.

The *children* of *believers*, I willingly grant, are preſumed to be by them *intended to be bred up to the faith*; but if that *intention* of theirs bring forth no *preſent effect*, if they do not bring them thus 23.

early, and *enter* them into the *Church* by *baptism*, why should that *bare intention* of the *parents* give them the *style* of *holy* or *sanctified*, or how should these *infant children*, which may die before they come to those years, receive any *present priviledge* or *benefit*, by that which is thus far removed from them?

24. Now for the second part of this suggestion, that *what I say from* Tertullian, *that they were holy*, i. e. *baptized in seminis prærogativâ, is a mistake*, I must *answer* by viewing of the *proofs* of his *assertion*, First, saith he, *the holiness was not only by prerogative of birth, but ex institutionis disciplinâ.* This sure is a strange proof, It is *not* so, because it is *not only* so; 'Tis certain that *Tertullian* saith they are *holy ex institutionis disciplinâ*, and as certain that they are as much so *by prerogative of their birth*, the words are most clear, *tam ex seminis prærogativâ quàm ex institutionis disciplinâ*, and I that never *denied* the second could not be *mistaken* in *affirming* the first.

25. Some difficulty I suppose there may be, what *Tertullian* (who did not excell in *perspicuity* of expressions) meant by *institutionis disciplina.* My opinion (gathered from the observation of his *language* in other places) is, that he meant the *doctrine* of *baptism instituted* by *Christ* in his *Church*; for by this it is that *baptism* was allowed to those that were *ex alterutro sexu sanctificato procreati*, *born* of *parents* of which *either* of them was *Christian.*

26. Thus in his Book *De Bapt.* c. 12. he uses a like phrase *tingi disciplinâ religionis*, to *be sprinkled with the discipline of religion*, meaning evidently being *baptized.*

27. By this interpretation of that phrase, the whole place will be most clear, in reference to the *antecedents*, thus, *The birth of all men by nature brings impurity into the world* with them; the *children* of *heathens* have this mightily inhanced to them by the *Superstitions* that are used *before* and *at*, and soon *after* their *birth*, inviting the *devil* to *come* and *take possession* of them (who is himself very ready to *catch* them) and so making them as soon as born, *candidatos dæmoniorum, candidates of the devils*, ambitious to be *admitted* thus early into their service; Thus every one hath his *genius*, i. e. his *devil* assigned him from his *birth*, and so *no birth of any heathen can choose but be polluted: Hinc enim Apostolus— for from hence*, saith he, *it is that the Apostle affirms that whosoever is born from either parent Christian, is holy both by prerogative of seed, and by discipline of institution*, i. e. hath one *priviledg* by *nature*, by his very *seed* (by being born of a *Christian*, not an *heathen*) that he is not so *polluted* by their *idolatrous ceremonies*, and so is in some degree *holy*, in that respect, not so *polluted* as *heathen children* are; another *priviledge* he hath by the *orders* and *rites*, which *Christ instituted* and left in his *Church*, viz. that of *reception* to *baptism*, whereby he is *consecrated* to *God*, whereas *heathen children* are *desecrated* to *devils*, and in that respect also they are called *holy* by the *Apostle*, citing that place, 1 *Cor.* 7. *Cæterum, inquit, immundi nascerentur, else were your children unclean, but now are they holy*; adding that the *Apostle* in those words means, that the *children* of *believers* are *designati sanctitatis*, that sure must signify that they are *initiated* into *Christ* by the *Christian rite* or *sign* or *ceremony* of *baptism*, as those which had the *heathenish ceremonies* used upon them, were *candidati dæmoniorum, candidates of the devils*, in the former, thus early *admitted* and *initiated* into their *sacra.*

28. How far now this is from intimating any *discipline of their instruction* (the word *their* is clearly inserted by Mr. *T.* and *institutio* rendred *instruction*, and so *Christ*'s *institution* turn'd into *their instruction*) I shall not now need farther to declare, nor to add ought concerning his other reason taken from the *idolatrous Superstitions*, without which they that are born are said to be *holy*, for how far that hath here place, I have already *manifested* also.

29. In this fit of *incitation* he yet farther proceeds, Thirdly, saith he, *it is false that the Jewish practice in baptizing proselytes and their children, laid the foundation of infant-baptism:* But as this is like the former, a meer *denying* of my *conclusion*, and so against all rules of *discourse*, in the first place; so is it not attempted to be *proved*, save only by the *negative argument à testimonio, Neither the Scripture*, saith he, *gives any hint thereof, nor any of the ancient Christian writers, no nor any of those the Doctor cites, ever derives it from the Jewish practice.*

30. But certainly this is of no force; for first, so long as none of all these *deny* it, to be so derived, and when the *matter* it self speaks it, and the *agreement* between what we find in the *Christian Church* with what we find among the *Jews*, there is no want either of *truth* or *sobriety* in my *assertion*, that *Christs institution* of *baptism* was *founded* in the *Jewish practice* of *baptizing* their *natives* and their *proselytes*, and that their custom being to *baptize infant* children, *Christs institution* also being by the *Apostles* understood to belong to the *infant childrens baptism* was in that respect also conformable to the *Jewish copy*, and so still the *Jewish practice* the *foundation* of the *Christian.*

31. What he adds from several *ancient testimonies*, shortly pointed at, that they *shew that the Fathers took the baptism, of infants not to have foundation in the Jewish practice, but in the conceit they had that baptism did regenerate, give grace and save, and was necessary for them to enter into the kingdom*—— hath nothing of weight in it; For First, Their *conceiting* that *baptism* had this force from *Christs institution*, no way prejudges *Christs founding* his *institution* in the foregoing *Jewish practice.*

32. 'Tis as if he should thus argue, The *Fathers* conceived the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper* to be useful for the *confirming* of our *faith*, therefore they took that *Sacrament* not to be *founded* in the *postcœnium* of the *Jews*: They conceived *imposition* of *hands* to confer a *Character* on those that were thus *ordained* to *holy orders*, therefore this was not *founded* in the *Jewish custom* of *receiving Doctors* into the *Sanhedrim* by *laying* on of *hands.* The *foundation* of the *institution* is one thing, and the *benefits* of it being *instituted* is another, and yet both these are found to belong to the same thing.

33. *Secondly*, Their very opinion that *baptism* did *regenerate*, and was *necessary* to *enter* into the *kingdom*, as it is taken by the *Fathers* from the words of *Christ* to *Nicodemus Joh.* 3. *Except a man be born again*, v. 3. and that *of water*——v. 5. (by *baptism*) *he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, so was that speech of *Christ*, taken from the customary doctrine of the *Jews*, among whom *baptism* was said to *regenerate*, and to *enter* into the *Church*, as that was the *portal* to the *kingdom* of *God*, and accordingly

ingly when *Nicodemus* ſeems not to underſtand it, *Chriſt* appeals to the *Jewiſh doctrine* or *tradition*, *Art thou a Ruler, a Maſter in Iſrael, and knoweſt not theſe things?* and therefore again, thoſe *perſwaſions* of the *Fathers* are far from *unreconcilable* with that which I have affirmed of the *founding* the *Chriſtian* in the *Jewiſh baptiſm*.

Nay fourthly, That the *Fathers* in their diſcourſes of *baptiſm* do ordinarily lay the *foundation* of it in *Moſes*, or the *baptiſm* of the *Jews* (and ſo might as well found the *baptiſm* of *Chriſtian infants* there, the *Jews baptiſm*, as hath appeared, belonging to ſuch) hath formerly been evidenced from *Gregory Nazianzen*, *Orat.* 39. Ἐπειδὴ βαπτίσματα & πανήγυεις — ἐβάπτισε Μωσῆς — and ſo from others alſo. 34.

What he now adds of *womens baptizing among Papiſts* and the *allowance* thereof formerly among us, of *private baptiſm*, of the uſe of *propounding queſtions* to the *infant*, which he is pleaſed to ſtyle *ridiculous*, of the *ſureties anſwering* in the *childs behalf*, and *expreſſing their deſire to be baptized into the faith recited*, of the *cuſtom of baptizing only at Eaſter and Whitſontide*, *of ſprinkling or pouring water on the face*, of *a confeſſion in the Pract. Cat. that all men were inſtructed antiently before they were baptized*, is all *amaſt* together, if it might be, to make up one *accumulative argument*, but is utterly *inſufficient* to do ſo. All that he concludes from the mention of all theſe, is but his own *reſolution not to anſwer the teſtimonies which I had alledged* from the *Fathers*, to prove that *Infant baptiſm* was an *Apoſtolical Tradition*. His words are theſe, upon the mentioning of thoſe particulars. [*And therefore for the preſent I ſhall put by the anſwering of the ſtale and rotten allegations out of the Fathers for infant baptiſm brought by the Doctor, becauſe having ſaid ſo much.* 35.

Here indeed by his [*therefore*] I am told the *reaſon* why he was willing to mention thoſe other *particulars* ſo cauſeleſly and unſeaſonably, *viz.* by way of *diverſion* (as *dextrous* perſons are wont to do for the removing of *difficulties*) to *put by the anſwering of the allegations out of the Fathers*. 36.

But I muſt not thus far comply with Mr. *T.* The main iſſue of the whole *diſpute* muſt devolve to this, the *doctrine* of the *antient Church* in this matter; For, firſt, *baptiſm* being *inſtituted* by *Chriſt* long before his *crucifixion*, and ſecondly, The *form* wherein he *inſtituted* it, being not ſet down in the *Goſpels*, and ſo thirdly, The *Apoſtles practice* being our *only guide* for the *reſolving* ſuch *difficulties* as theſe, whether *infants* were *admittable* or no to *baptiſm*, (the *foundation* thereof among the *Jews* viſibly belonging to *infants*, but it being ſtill *poſſible* that this might be *changed* in *Chriſts inſtitution*) it is not now imaginable what way ſhould be open to us of *this* Age (ſixteen hundred years *after* thoſe times) to diſcern *Chriſts inſtitution* in this matter, but by the *words* or *actions* of (or ſome kind of *intimation* from) the *Apoſtles*, how they underſtood *Chriſts inſtitution*. 37.

Of this, one place we have 1 *Cor.* 7. which comes in *incidentally*, ſpeaking to *another* matter, and notifies the *Apoſtles* ſenſe by their *practice* viſibly enough, and defines for the *baptizing* of *infants* in thoſe dayes; But to them that will not acknowledge this *ſenſe* of thoſe words, how *fair* and *eaſy* ſoever, there is but one *poſſible* method remaining in this, as in all other *queſtions* of *fact*, (as evidently this is, whether in the *Apoſtles* times and by their *appointment children* were *received* to *baptiſm* or no) *viz.* to appeal to thoſe that could not be *ignorant* of this matter, who by *ſucceſſion* and *tradition*, the one from the other, had the *Apoſtles practice*, the interpreter of their ſenſe of *Chriſts inſtitution*, conveyed and handed down unto them, and are to us, their late *poſterity*, the only *competent* witneſſes of this matter of *fact*, and ſo are in all reaſon to decide the controverſie, and give a final *concluſion* to the debate between us. 38.

This therefore being the laſt part of my *method* in the *poſitive* part of the *Reſolution* of that *Quære*, I profeſs to have laid the moſt *weight* upon it (according to the grounds ſet down in the firſt *Quære* concerning the *deciding* of ſuch *controverſies*) and conſequently muſt ſtill *inſiſt* upon it, and not be put off by Mr. *T.* his *dexterity*; and that in this matter I may not fail of giving the *Reader* ſome evidence, I ſhall again *reſume* it, and give him a *competent ſeries* of *teſtimonies*, ſome formerly mentioned, and now put more into form of *evidence*, and other added to them, ſo as to infer an *uniform concordant tradition* of all the *Ages* of the *Church* of *Chriſt* even ſince the *Apoſtles* times unto this day, for the receiving *infants* to *baptiſm*; and that ſhall be the *laſt* part of this *Reply* to Mr. *T.* and the *Antipædobaptiſt*, whoſe pretenſions are the contrary, that *infants* muſt not be thus *admitted*. 39.

SECT. II.

A Catalogue of Teſtimonies of the firſt Ages for Infant baptiſm, and the Apoſtolicalneſs thereof.

FIrſt then I begin with the words of the *Apoſtle* ſo long inſiſted on, and *vindicated* from Mr. *T.* his *exceptions*, and by ſo *antient* a writer as *Tertullian*, *&c.* applyed to this matter. *Numb.* 1.

And that *firſt Epiſtle* to the *Corinthians* being written at the end of his *three years* ſtay in *Aſia*, Act. 20. 31. i. e. *An. Ch.* 54. I ſhall there place my firſt *teſtimony*. 2.

In the middle of the firſt *Century* S. *Paul* delivered theſe words, *Now are your children holy*, i. e. your children *new-born* (as appears by the *context* and *Tertullian*) are *ſanctified*, as that ſignifies *baptized*, in the ſtyle of the *New Teſtament* and the *antient Church*, ἀξιοῦνται καὶ διὰ βαπτίσματος ἀγαθῶν, *they are vouchſafed the good things* that come *by baptiſm*, ſaith the *Author* of the *Reſponſ. ad Orthod.* whether that were *Juſtine* the *Martyr*, who ſuffered *Anno* 163. or another very *antient* writer under that name; And this of that *Apoſtle* is an evidence of the *practice* of the *firſt*, or *Apoſtolical* Age, ſoon after *Chriſt*, and is not *contradicted* by any that wrote in that Age. 3.

In the next Age after the *Apoſtles*, flouriſhed S. *Irenæus*, ſaid to be *martyred* at *Lyons* (the ſeat of his *Biſhoprick*) the fifth of *Severus*, *An. Chr.* 197. he had been an *auditor* of *Polycarp Biſhop* of *Smyrna* (ſtyled 4.

(styled by that *Church* an * *Apostolical* and *Prophetical Doctor*) and is by † S. *Hierome* lookt on as a man of the *Apostolical* times, and by ‖ *Tertullian* as a most *accurate searcher of all doctrines*, and so is a most *competent* witness of the *Apostolical doctrine* and *practice*; and thus he speaks l. 2. *adverſ. hær.* c. 38. *Omnes venit Christus per semet ipsum salvare, omnes inquam qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, Infantes, & parvulos, & pueros, & juvenes, & seniores: Christ came to save all by himself, all I say, who are born again unto God by him, Infants and little ones, and children, and young men and elder men*; where it is evidently his *affirmation*, that *infants* (expresly) are by *Christ regenerate unto God*, and that must be in *baptism*, that *laver* of *regeneration*, and so they are not, in his *opinion*, *excluded* from *baptism*. And so this is a *testimony* of the *second Century*, not found or pretended to be *contradicted* by any other of that Age.

* *Ep. Eccl. Smyr. ap. Euseb.* l. 4. c. 15. Θαυμασιώτατος Ἀποστολικὸς καὶ Προφητικὸς διδάσκαλος.

† *Hieron. Ep. 29. Apostolicorum temporum vir.*

‖ *Doctrinarum omnium accuratissimus explorator. Tertul. adverſ. Valent.*

Immediately after *Irenæus* followed *Tertullian* in the end of the second, and beginning of the third *Century*, a man of great *learning*, and a *diligent* observer and recorder of the *customs* and *practices* of the most *antient Church*. And he *lib. de Animâ*, c. 39. affirms it from the *Apostle*, *ex sanctificato alterutro sexu sanctos procreari*, that when *either Parent* is *sanctified* or *believer*, i. e. *baptized*, the *children* that are *born* from them are *holy*, and this *tam ex seminis prærogativâ, quam ex institutionis disciplinâ, both by prerogative of their seed, and by the discipline of the institution*, i. e. (as hath been shewed) by *baptism*, adding from the same *Apostle* that delivered those words, 1 *Cor.* 7. 4. that his meaning was, that the *children of believers should be understood to be designati sanctitatis, ac per hoc salutis*, and evidencing what he means thereby, by the following words, of *Christ's definition*, Joh. 3. *Unless a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of God*, i. e. *non erit sanctus, shall not be holy*, where *baptism* is manifestly the thing by which these *children* are said to attain that *sanctity*; and more he adds in the beginning of the *next chapter* to the same purpose. And so he is a *competent* witness for the *beginning* of that *third* Age, and is not found *contradicted* by any other passage in his works, or by any of his time; But on the contrary,

5.

6. *Origen*, who died at *Tyre*, *An. Chr.* 254. hath three most irrefragable *testimonies* for it; first on *Luke Hom.* 14. *Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum, little ones are baptized into the remission of sins*; and *quomodo potest ulla lavacri in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi juxta illum sensum de quo paulò antè diximus, Nullus mundus à sorde*, &c. *How can the account of baptizing little ones hold, but according to that which before was said, none is clean from pollution, no not if he be but a day old*; and *per baptismi sacramentum nativitatis sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur & parvuli, by the sacrament of baptism the pollutions of our birth are put off, and therefore little ones are baptized.*

7. *Secondly*, on *Leviticus Hom.* 8. *Requiratur quid causæ est cum baptisma Ecclesiæ in remissionem peccatorum detur, secundum Ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari* —— *Let it be considered what the cause is, when the baptism of the Church is given for the remission of sins, that baptism should according to the observation* (or *custom*) *of the Church be given to little ones.*

8. *Thirdly*, on the *Epistle* to the *Romans*, l. 5. *Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare* —— *the Church hath received tradition from the Apostles to give baptism to little ones also*, such *little ones* still (as by the former words appears) as those of a *day old* and the like. And so here is a full *concord* of *testimonies* both for the *practice* of the *Church*, and *tradition* received from the *Apostles* for *baptizing* of *infants*, and so is a farther evidence of the *doctrine* of the *third age*, not *contradicted* by any of that time.

9. About the same time, or without question soon after, wrote the *Author* (under the name of *Dionysius Areopagita*) *de Eccl. Hierarch.* For, as by * *Photius* it appears, *Theodorus Presbyter* about the year 420. debated the *question*, whether that *writer* were *Dionysius* mentioned in the *Acts* or no. And of this no doubt hath been made, but that he was a very *antient* and *learned Author*. He therefore in his † 7. *chap.* of *Eccles. Hierarch.* proposeth the *question*, as that which may seem to *profane* persons (i. e. *heathens*) *ridiculous*, why παῖδες ὄντα τὰ θεῖα συσίνεσι δωρεάμενοι, τῆς ἱερᾶς μέτοχοι γίνονται θεογενεσίας, *children which cannot yet understand divine things are made partakers of the sacred birth from God, i. e.* evidently of *baptism* (περὶ τῶν τὰ βρέφη βαπτίζεσθαι, *concerning the baptizing of infants*, saith *Maximus* his *Scholiast*) adding to the same head also, that ἀντὶ ἀυτῶν ἕτεροι τὰς ἀποταγὰς φασι καὶ τὰς ἱερᾶς ὁμολογίας, *others in their stead pronounce the abrenunciations and divine confessions*, And his answer is, first, that πολλὰ δηλ. ὑφ' ὑμῶν ἀγνοημένων, αἰτίας ἔχει θεοπρεπεῖς, *many things which are unknown by us*, why they are done, *have yet causes worthy of God. Secondly*, Ὅτι καὶ ἐκεῖ τὰυτὰ φαμὲν, ἅπερ καὶ θεοπρεπῶς ἡμῶν ἱεροτελεσταὶ πρὸς τὰ ἀρχαῖα μυηθέντες παραδόσεως εἰς ἡμᾶς κατήγαγον, *that we affirm of this the same things which our divine officers* of the Church, *being instructed by divine tradition, have brought down unto us*, and again, τοῦτο τοῖς θείοις ἡμῶν καθηγεμόσιν εἰς νῦν ἐλληλυθὸς ἔδοξεν εἰσδέχεσθαι τὰ βρέφη κατὰ τόνδε τὸν ἱερὸν τρόπον --- *our divine guides* (i. e. the *Apostles*, τὺς Ἀποστόλους φησι, saith *Maximus*) *considering this, appointed that infants should thus be admitted according to the sacred manner*; Nothing can be more clear, than that the *Apostolical tradition* is by this *antient* and *elegant* writer vouched for the *baptizing* of *infants*, as a sufficient account of that matter, against the *reproaches* and *scoffs* of *profane*, or *heathen* men, who deemed it unreasonable. And so there is a most convincing *testimony* for that time, wherein that *author* wrote, which must needs be in the *fourth Century* before *Theodorus Presbyters* debating the *question* concerning him, but most probably more *antient*, and so to be placed in this *third* Age.

* *Biblioth. Cod.* 1.

† *Edit. Morel.* p. 233.

Pag. 119.

Pag. 234.

10. In the midst of this third Age, *An. Chr.* 248. was S. *Cyprian* made *Bishop* of *Carthage*, and *ten years* after he suffered *martyrdom*, i. e. 158. years after the Age of the *Apostles*. In the year 257. he sat in *Council* with sixty six *Bishops* (see *Justellus* in his *Preface* to the *African Canons*, p. 21.) and their decrees by way of *Synodical Epistle* are to be seen in his *Ep.* 58. *ad Fidum fratrem*, which is now among his works. *Pamel. Edit.* p. 80. The *Council* was in *answer* to some *questions* about *baptism*, and accordingly he there sets down his own *opinion*, together with the *decrees* of that *Council* of sixty six *Bishops* which were assembled with him; And so this, as it is an *antient*, so it is more than a *single testimony*, that of a whole *Council* added to it; and yet farther, to increase the *authority* of it, S. *Augustine* cites this *Epistle* ‖ more than once, and sets it down almost *intire*, as a *testimony* of great weight against *hereticks*, and so 'tis cited by S. *Hierom* also, l. 3. *dial. contr. Pelag.*

‖ *Ep. 28. ad Hieron. l. 3. de Pecc. mer. & Remiss. c. 6, 7, 8, 9. l. 4. contr. duas Ep. Pelag. c. 3. l. 2. contr. Julian. c. 3.*

In

In this *Epiſtle* the *queſtion* being propoſed by *Fidus*, whether *infants* might be *baptized* the ſecond or third day, or whether, as in *circumciſion*, the eighth day were not to be expected, he anſwers in the name of the *Council*, *Univerſi judicavimus*, 'twas the *reſolution* or *ſentence* of *all*, *nulli hominum nato miſericordiam Dei & gratiam deneganda*, *that the mercy and grace of God was not to be denyed to any humane birth*, to any *child*, though never ſo *young*, (by that phraſe [*mercy and grace of God*] evidently meaning *baptiſm*, the rite of *conveighing* them to the baptized) adding, that 'tis not to be thought that this *grace* which is given to the *baptized*, *pro ætate accipientium vel minor vel major tribuitur*, *is given to them in a greater or leſs degree in reſpect of the age of the receivers*; and that *God as he accepts not the perſon*, *ſo nor the age of any*, confirming this by the words of S. *Peter Act.* 10. that *none was to be called common or unclean*, and that if any were to be *kept from baptiſm*, it ſhould rather be thoſe of *full age*, who have *committed the greater ſins*, and that ſeeing thoſe when they come to the *faith* are not *prohibited baptiſm*, *quanto magis prohiberi non debet infans*, *qui recens natus nihil peccavit*, *niſi quòd ſecundum* Adam *carnaliter natus contagium mortis antiquæ primâ nativitate contraxit? qui ad remiſſam peccatorum accipiendam hoc ipſo facilius accedit*, *quod illi remittuntur non propria ſed aliena peccata*, *how much more ought not the infant to be forbidden*, *who being new born*, *hath no ſin upon him*, *but that which by his birth from* Adam *he hath contracted as ſoon as he was born*, *who therefore ſhould more eaſily be admitted to pardon*, *becauſe they are not his own*, *but others ſins which are then remitted to him.* Concluding that as *none were by* the *decree* of that *Council* to be *refuſed baptiſm*, *tum magis circa infantes ipſos & recens natos obſervandum atque retinendum*, *ſo this was the rather to be obſerved and retained about infants and new born children.* 11.

Thus much and more was the ſentence of that *antient Father* and that *Council*, and as the occaſion of that determination was not any *antipædobaptiſt doctrine* (there had no ſuch then ſo much as lookt into the *Church*, that we can hear of) but a conceit of one, that it ſhould be deferr'd to the eighth day, which was as much *infancy*, as the *firſt* (and ſo both parties were equally contrary to the *Antipædobaptiſts* intereſts, the condemned, as well as the *Judges*) ſo that it was no *new doctrine* that was then *decreed*, or peculiar to S. *Cyprian* (who had one *ſingular opinion* in the matter of *baptiſm*) appears alſo both by the concurrence of the *whole Council* that *convened* with him, and by the *expreſs* words of S. *Auguſtin Ep.* 28. *ad* Hieronym. *Beatus* Cyprianus *non aliquod decretum condens novum*, *ſed eccleſiæ fidem firmiſſimam ſervans —— mox natum rite baptizari poſſe cum ſuis quibuſdam coepiſcopis cenſuit*, *Bleſſed* Cyprian, ſaith he, *not making any new decree*, *but keeping the faith of the Church moſt firm*, *decreed with a ſet number of his fellow Biſhops*, *that a child new-born might firly be baptized.* Which ſhews it the reſolution of that *Father* alſo, that *baptizing* of *Infants* was the *faith* of the *Church* before *Cyprians* time, not only the *opinion*, but the *Faith*, which gives it the authority of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles.* 12.

In the next or *fourth* Century, about the year of Chriſt 370. flouriſhed *Gregory Nazianzen*, and dyed in the year 389. who though he be by Mr. *T.* affirmed to *diſſuade from it but in caſe of neceſſity by reaſon of apparent danger of death*, will yet give an evident *teſtimony* of the *doctrin* of the *Church* of that age in this matter. 13. p. 339.

In the * fourth *oration* written on this ſubject of *Baptiſm* having gone through all the *ages* of man (to demonſtrate a *propoſition* premiſed by him, ‖ πάσης ἡλικίας ἀπεῖναι, πάσης ἰδέας βίου, that it *belongs to every age and ſort of life*) he at length comes to the conſideration *of infancy*, in theſe words, Νήπιόν σοι, μὴ λαβέτω καιρὸν ἡ κακία, ἐν βρέφους ἁγιαζέσθω, ἐξ ὀνύχων καθιερωθήτω τῷ πνεύματι. *If thou haſt an infant*, *let not iniquity get time*, *let it be ſanctified* (certainly *baptized*) *in infancy*, *let it in the tender age be conſecrated to Gods ſpirit*, and whereas the *heathens* uſe *amulets* and *charms* to ſecure their *children*, ‖ δὸς αὐτῷ τὸ τριάδα τὸ μέγα καὶ παλὸν φυλακτήριον, *do you give it the Trinity* (the *Fathers* the *Son* and the *Holy Ghoſt* in *baptiſm*) *that great and good phylactery*, or *preſervative.* A plain *teſtimony* of the *Churches doctrine* at that time. 14. * *Paris. Edit. Tom.* 1. p. 648. ‖ p. 647. D. * (Juſt as Tertullian *de Ani.* had obſerved.) ‖ p. 643. C.

Afterwards in the * ſame *oration* he returns to this matter again, Τί δ' ἂν εἴποις περὶ τῶν ἔτι νηπίων ὄντων, *what*, ſaith he, *will you ſay concerning thoſe that are yet children*, *and neither know the loſs nor are ſenſible of the grace of baptiſm*, *ſhall we alſo baptize them?* And his anſwer is Παντί γε, εἴπερ τις ἐπείγοι κίνδυνος, κρεῖττον γὰρ ἀναισθήτως ἁγιασθῆναι, ἢ ἀπελθεῖν ἀσφράγιστα καὶ ἀτέλεστα, *Yes by all means*, *if any danger preſs*, 'tis better they ſhould be ſanctified (baptized) *when they have no ſenſe of it*, *than that they ſhould dy unſealed*, *uninitiated*; adding for proof of this, the ἀκμήμηνον περιτομὴν, *circumciſion* on the *eighth day*, which was, ſaith he, μυστική τις σφραγὶς, *an initial ſeal*, and yet τοῖς ἀλογίστοις προσαγομένη, *uſed to thoſe that had no uſe of reaſon*, and (in a lower degree) the *anointing* of the *Poſts*, which were *inſenſible* alſo, was yet a *means* of *ſaving* the *firſt-born.* 15. * p. 658. A.

After this, 'tis true that he proceeds to conſider thoſe *children*, that are not in any *danger* of *death*, and of them he gives his *opinion* (δίδωμι γνώμην, in the ſtyle which S. *Paul* uſeth, when he ſpeaks *his own* ſenſe, as that is other from the revealed will of *Chriſt*) that *ſtaying about three years*, *at which time they may be taught to anſwer ſomewhat*, though they *underſtand it not perfectly*, ἵνα ἁγιάσωμεν ψυχὰς καὶ σώματα τῷ μεγάλῳ μυστηρίῳ τῆς τελειώσεως, *by this means they may be baptized*, *ſouls and bodies*, *by this great Sacrament of initiation.* 16.

But of this, *Firſt*, It is clear that it no way *prejudges* the *doctrine* and *practice* of the *Church* formerly ſet down, and approved by him, that *infant children*, *indefinitely* conſidered, *might* be *baptized*, and if *danger* approched, *muſt*, how *young* ſoever they were; which is as contrary to the *Antipædobaptiſt*, and ſo to Mr. *T.* as any thing. 17.

Secondly, That it is but his γνώμη or *private opinion*, pretending not ſo much as to any part of the *Church* of that, or former ages to *authorize* it. 18.

Thirdly, That the *ſtate* of *children* being ſo *weak* and *uncertain*, that 'tis hard to affirm of any that they are not (for the firſt three years) in any *danger*, his *counſel* for *deferring* will hardly be ever *practicable* to any. 19.

Fourthly, That the *deferring*, of which *Nazianzen* ſpeaks, is moſt probably to be underſtood of thoſe whoſe *Parents* are *newly* converted, and themſelves *doubt* whether they ſhall be yet *baptized* or no, for to ſuch he ſpeaks in that place from p. 654. A. 20.

Laſtly,

21. *Lastly*, That the *deferring* till three years old, if it were allowed, would no way satisfie the *Antipædobaptists pretensions*; and so still the *former* passages ought to be of force with all, and no heed given to the *whispers* of Mr. *T.* and others, as if this *holy Father dissuaded baptism* in any Age, *unless in case of danger*, when he clearly saith, ἐξ ὀνύχων καθιερωθήτω, *let him in the tendrest Age be baptized* and *consecrated to the Spirit.*

22. In the same *Century* S. *Ambrose* must be placed, being a writer about the year 380. he in his tenth Book, *Ep.* 84. *ad Demetriad. Virg.* speaking of those that made *Adams sin* no otherwise *hurtful* to *posterity*, than by the *example* (*exemplo non transitu nocuisse*) he presseth it with this *principal* absurdity, *Hinc evacuatio baptismatis parvulorum, this evacuates the baptism of infants, which should then be capable of adoption only, but not of pardon.*

23. And in like manner on *Luke*, by *Jordans* being *driven back*, saith he, are signified the *mysteries* of *baptism*, *per quæ in primordia naturæ suæ qui baptizati fuerint parvuli à malitia reformantur, by which the little ones that are baptized, are reformed from their malignity to the first state of their nature.*

24. In the beginning of the next or *fifth* Age, flourished S. *Chrysostom*, that *famous Bishop* of *Constantinople*, whose death is placed in the year of *Christ* 407. he in his *homily* to the *Neophyti* hath these words, Διὸ τοῦτο καὶ τὰ παιδία βαπτίζομεν καίτοι ἁμαρτήματα οὐκ ἔχοντα, *for this cause* (*i. e.* because there be so many *benefits* of *baptism*, there recited, *ten* in number) *we baptize children, though they have not sins.*

25. Which words are the more worth remembring, because they had the hap to be made use of by the *Pelagians*, and consequently vindicated by S. *Augustine*; The *Pelagians* urged them in this form, *Hac de causa etiam infantes baptizamus, cum non sint coinquinati peccato, for this cause we baptize infants, when they are not polluted with sin*, understanding it of *original sin*, but S. *Augustine* appealing to the *Greek*, shewed that the right rendring was, *quamvis peccata non habentes, although they had not sins*, i. e. *propria*, their *own* or *actual* sins, of which these *infants* were not supposed to have any.

26. So in his * fourth *Homily* on *Genesis*, speaking of *baptism* as of the *Christian circumcision*, among other things he affirms of it, οὐδὲ ὡρισμένον ἔχει καιρὸν, ἀλλὰ ἔξεστι καὶ ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικίᾳ, καὶ ἐν μέσῃ, καὶ ἐν ἀκμῇ τῇ γήρᾳ, γενόμενόν τινα ταύτην δέξασθαι τὴν χειροποίητον περιτομήν, *it hath no determinate time but 'tis lawful both in the first Age* (the *childhood*, so ἀώρῳ ἡλικίᾳ signifies, with him, † elsewhere applied to the time of *circumcision* on the eighth day, ἵνα ἐν τῇ ἀώρῳ ἡλικίᾳ κυφότερον —) *and in the middle, and in old Age it self, to receive this circumcision made without hands.*

* *Edit. Eton. Tom.* 1. p. 328. l. 5.

† *T.* 1. p. 322. l. 11. So again, p. 327. l. 42. ὥστε ἐν ἀώρῳ ἡλικίᾳ τοῦτο ὑπομένειν τὸς παῖδας.

In the same *Century*, very few years after, if not before *Chrysostom*, S. *Hierom* must be placed, born in the year 342. and deceased in the year 420. And he in *Ep.* 7. to *Læta* telling her that whilest the *child* was young and not come to *Pythagoras's* Y. the *bivium* or *two wayes*, the *knowledge* of *good* and *evil*, *tam bona ejus quàm mala parentibus imputantur, his good or evil deeds are imputed to the Parents*, adds that this must needs be acknowledged, *nisi forte existimas Christianorum filios, si baptisma non receperint, ipsos tantùm reos esse peccati, & non etiam scelus referri ad eos qui dare noluerint, maximè illo tempore quo contradicere non poterant qui accepturi erant, sicut è regione salus infantum majorum lucrum est. Unless*, saith he, *you believe that Christians children, if they receive not baptism, are the only persons that are guilty of the sin, and that the offence is not charged on them which would not bring them to baptism, at that time especially, wherein they that were to receive could not contradict, as on the other side the salvation of infants is the gain of the elder*; adding that the *Parent* which was thus to *prepare his child for the Kings*, i. e. *Christs embraces*, *si negligens fuerit, punietur*; *shall, if he be negligent therein, be punished.*

27. Words of no very comfortable aboad to the *opposers* of *Pædobaptism*; I wish Mr. *T.* who thinks fit to make use of S. *Hieroms* name (it now appears how luckily) would be at leisure to consider them.

28. So *lib.* 3. *contr. Pelag.* the *question* being asked by *Crito*, *Quare infantuli baptizentur, why infants are baptized*, the *answer* is made by *Atticus*, *Ut eis peccata in baptismate dimittantur, that their sins may be pardoned in baptism*; and again, *qui parvulus est, parentis in baptismo vinculo solvitur, the infant is freed in baptism from the band* of *Adams* sin.

29. *Paulinus*, we know was his *Contemporary*, and from him we have this *testimony*, *Ep.* 12. *Inde parens sacro ducens de fonte sacerdos, Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu --- The Priest brings the infants out of the font white as snow in body, in heart, in habit.*

30. Next to these succeeds S. *Augustine*, who died in the thirtieth year of this fifth Age, and was the great *champion* of the *Church* against all the *invaders* of the *depositum* committed to it. His passages on this subject are too many to be enumerated, and some of them have already been set down in the *Resol* of the *Quære*, p. 217. making it the *perpetual doctrine* of the whole *Church* of all Ages before him, and expressly including that of the *Apostles.*

31. So *de Bap, contra Donat.* l. 4. c. 23. *Quod traditum tenet universitas Ecclesia cum parvuli infantes baptizantur, qui certè nondum possunt corde credere ad justitiam, & ore confiteri ad salutem --- & tamen nullus Christianorum dixerit eos inaniter baptizari. This is held as tradition by the Universal Church, when little Infants are baptized, which are sure yet unable to believe with the heart or to confess with the mouth, and yet no Christian will say that they are baptized to no purpose:* (a *severe* sentence again for the *Antipædobaptist*) adding the *Ecclesiastical rule* by which to judge of *Apostolical tradition*, and evidencing the *benefit* of *infant baptism* by the *example* of *circumcision*, that as in *Isaac*, *circumcised* the *eighth day*, the *seal* of the *righteousness* of *faith preceded*, and the *righteousness* it self *followed* in his *riper Age* by his *imitating* his *Fathers faith*, *ita & in baptizatis infantibus præcedit regenerationis Sacramentum, & si Christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur in corde conversio, cujus mysterium præcessit in corpore, so also in baptized infants the Sacrament of regeneration precedes, and if they hold fast Christian piety, conversion in the heart follows, the mystery whereof had been formerly received in the body.*

32. So *De verb. Apost. Serm.* 14. being come to handle this subject of the *baptism* of *infants*, he begins thus, *sollicitos autem nos facit non ipsa sententia jam olim in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ summâ authoritate fundata, sed disputationes quorundam --- The doctrine it self gives us no trouble, being long since founded in the Catholick Church by the highest authority* (that sure must be by *Christs* and the *Apostles*) *but the disputings*

of

of ſome men --- and *again*, *Non enim quæſtio eſt inter nos & ipſos, utrum parvuli baptizandi ſint; Baptizandos eſſe parvulos nemo dubitat, quando nec illi hinc dubitant, qui ex alterâ parte contradicunt* --- *the queſtion betwixt them and us is not, whether infants are to be baptized; Let no man make doubt of this, ſeeing neither do they doubt of this, which contradict us in the other queſtion concerning the benefit of it.*

And again, in a farther proceſs with thoſe *diſputers*, *Dic mihi, obſecro te, parvulis baptizatis Chriſtus* 34.
aliquid prodeſt, an nil prodeſt? Neceſſe eſt ut dicat prodeſſe, Premitur mole matris Eccleſiæ. Doth Chriſt profit infants that are baptized, or doth he not? He muſt needs ſay that he doth profit, he is preſt with the weight of the Church our Mother.

And again, *authoritate reprimuntur Eccleſiæ, ſi enim dixerint Chriſtum nihil prodeſſe baptizatis infanti-* 35.
bus, nihil aliud dicunt quàm ſuperfluè baptizantur infantes. They are repreſt by the authority of the Church, for if they ſay that Chriſt profits not infants baptized, they plainly affirm that infants are ſuperfluouſly baptized; but this thoſe very *hereticks* (the *Pelagians*) *dicere non audent, dare not ſay*, and ſo were fain to ſecure their *hypotheſis* by another *evaſion*, *viz.* that they were *baptized not for ſalvation, but for the kingdom of heaven.*

And yet farther, *Hoc habet authoritas matris Eccleſiæ, hoc fundatus veritatis obtinet canon, contra hoc* 36.
robur, contra hunc inexpugnabilem murum quiſquis arietat ipſe confringitur. Fundata iſta res eſt, ferendus eſt peccator errans in aliis quæſtionibus --- non tantum progredi debet, ut & fundamentum ipſum Eccleſiæ quatere moliatur. This the authority of our mother the Church is poſſeſt of, this the grounded Canon of truth holds faſt; againſt this Fort, this invincible Wall, whoſoever makes aſſault, is broken to pieces. This is a grounded thing: He is to be born with, who errs in other queſtions; but he muſt not proceed thus far (as the *Antipædobaptiſt* certainly doth) *as to indeavour to ſhake the very foundation of the Church, i. e.* certainly a *doctrine* laid by the *firſt planters* of the *faith*, *Chriſt* and the *Apoſtles* themſelves.

So *Ep.* 89. *Non eſt ſuperfluus baptiſmus parvulorum, ut qui per generationem illi condemnationi obligati* 37.
ſunt, per regenerationem ab eâdem liberentur. The baptiſm of infants is not ſuperfluous, that they who by their birth are bound to that condemnation which came by *Adam*, *ſhould be freed from it by regeneration*; and more to the ſame purpoſe in that place.

So in *Enchirid.* c. 42. *à parvulo recens nato uſq; ad decrepitum ſenem, ſicut nullus prohibendus eſt à bap-* 38.
tiſmo, ita nullus eſt qui non peccato moriatur in baptiſmo. From the infant new born to the decrepit old Age, as none is to be kept from baptiſm, ſo there is none who dyeth not to ſin in baptiſm. See *Aug. de nuptiis & concup.* l. 1. c. 20. Tom. 7. p. 822.

Which words are ſoon after tranſcribed by *Leo* (*ad Epiſc. Aquileg.*) who was advanced to the *Pa-* 39.
pacy about the year 440.

About this time was the *Epiſtle* of the *Council* of *Carthage* written to *Innocentius* (made *Biſhop* of 40.
Rome about the year 400.) In which theſe words we find by way of Decree, *Quicunq; negat parvulos per baptiſmum Chriſti à perditione liberari, & ſalutem percipere ſempiternam, anathema ſit. Whoſoever denies that Infants are by the baptiſm of Chriſt freed from perdition, and receive eternal life, let him be anathema.*

About the ſame time, whileſt *Innocentius* lived (and to the ſame purpoſe) was the *Milevitan Ca-* 41.
non, at which S. *Auguſtine* was preſent, a *Biſhop* in that *Council*. This hath been ſet down in the *Reſol.* of the *Quære*, p. 219. and is an evident *teſtimony* that this *doctrine* was ſuch as *Eccleſia Catholica ubiq; diffuſa ſemper intellexit, the Catholick Church every where diffuſed, always underſtood* and *aſſerted*, and ſo it is that *Councils* witneſs of the *Apoſtolicalneſs* of it.

To theſe it were eaſy to add *Theodoret* alſo, and *Leo* (already cited) ſoon after him, both falling 42.
within the former part of that *fifth Century*, and in every Age after this, ſtore enough. But the *queſtion* is not, and in any reaſon cannot be extended to thoſe times, the clear *definitions* through all thoſe *firſt* Ages, being all that could be *required* to decide the *controverſie* concerning the matter of *fact*, whether it were *practiſed* or not practiſed by the *Apoſtles*.

And having ſo largely *deduced* them, it is not imaginable what ſhould be now wanting to the com- 43.
pleating of the *evidence*, when I have only added, that there is no one *teſtimony* of *diſſent*, either *pretended* or *producible* from the *writings* of all thoſe *firſt* Ages, nor conſequently the leaſt *appearance* of obſtacle, why the *receiving* of *Infants* to *baptiſm* ſhould not be reſolved the *doctrine* and *practice* of the *firſt* and *pureſt* Ages of the *Church*, avouched and teſtified to be delivered to them by the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, who could not miſtake his meaning in the *Inſtitution.*

What *artifices* the *Antipædobaptiſt* can make uſe of to caſt a *miſt* before our *eyes*, in the midſt of ſo 44.
much *light*, I can no way *divine*: ſure I am that the *prejudices* which Mr. *T.* hath in few words indeavoured to *infuſe* (as that *ſome are counterfeit authors, ſome ſuſpected, ſome miſinterpreted*; that *ſome maintained infant baptiſm but in caſe of danger of death*, that *others which avouched this, avouched either Rebaptization or Communion of Infants alſo*) are all of them *unjuſt* and *cauſeleſs*, and have ſeverally and *punctually* been *prevented* in one or both of theſe *diſcourſes*, and ſo there remains not the leaſt ſcruple of *difficulty*, that I can foreſee in this *matter*, to add to the bulk of this vindication.

God aſſiſt it with his *bleſſing* to the *diſabuſing* thoſe that are *ſeduced*, and regaining them to the 45.
ways of *Peace.*

AN

AN ACCOUNT OF Mr. CAWDREY'S Triplex Diatribe CONCERNING Superstition, Will-Worship, and Christmas Festival.

A PREFACE TO THE READER.

THAT *Mr.* Cawdrey *hath taken great pains to shew me the infirm parts of* three *little Tracts of* Superstition, Will-worship *and* Festivals, *I am now obliged to take notice, and to design the vacancy of a few days to clear those brief discourses from all the* misprisions *and* exceptions, *to which some contrary* Hypotheses *of his (how true, shall in due place be examined) more than the want of* evidence *in the* Tracts *themselves, may have rendred them* liable. Numb. 1.

What on the two *former heads I wrote many years since, I confess, I expected not to see arraigned at this time, being designed as part of an* εἰρηνικὸν *or* διαλλακτικὸν, *which might help to repair the* breach, *at least molify the* Paroxysm, *by removing two of the* five *specious* charges, *under which the blameless* ceremonies, *and* customary practices, *and* observances *of the* Church *of* England *were by dissenters* oppugned *and rendred* odious. *And what was then said, as I could not discern wherein it came short of* Evidence *of* conviction, (*if I had, I should certainly either have* cleared *or suppress't* them) *so it was never my fortune in* nine *years space to hear from any, that it lay under an ill* character, *but on the* contrary, *that it had in some measure performed what it undertook, freed our* Church *from those* two *accusations, and* demonstrated *them, as applied to us, to be perfect* calumnies. *And I have but one* Petition *to the* Reader, *at his entrance on these debates, that he will calmly review those* two *Treatises, with* three *more designed to the same end, and upon his strictest* survey *advertise me, wherein I have* failed *in my undertaking.* 2.

But it is come to pass, what Arrian *long since taught me to expect, that as when* general discourses *come to be applied to* particular *cases,* τότε ἡ μάχη γίνεται, then the contention begins; *so when the grounds, more* universally *laid for the* justifying *our* Church, *were in a* tract *concerning* Festivals, *and especially the day of the* Nativity *of* Christ, *brought home to* 3. *Arr. Epict.* l. 1. c. 22.

the clearing that celebration *from either of thoſe two (as from all other) charges*, then *Mr.* Cawdry's hypotheſes, *in which, I ſuppoſe, his way of managing his opinion of the* morality *of the* Sabbath *had engaged him, found themſelves to be concerned*, then *the* commemoration *of the* birth *of* Chriſt, *though but by one* anniverſary *(being not eaſily reconcileable with the grounds which he had laid for the* Chriſtians one weekly Sabbath *in the Fourth* Commandment *of the* Decalogue) *was ſolemnly to be* indicted, *and, as in a* Chancery Bill, *all imaginable evil to be affixed on it, and the cuſtomary* riot *of* feſtivities *being not ſufficient to render it* odious, *the more* formidable *charges of* Will-worſhip *and* Superſtition *muſt be revived, and by the neceſſity of this* conſequence, *to ſalve his* φανόμενα *and* δουλεύειν ὑποθέσει, *all that I had ſaid on either of thoſe two* ſubjects, *though never ſo* clear, *muſt now be called to a* ſevere examen, *and ſo, ſtore of new tasks provided for me.*

4. *And methinks 'tis poſſible that old* * Nahum's *word may not here be unreaſonable* גַּם זוֹ לְטוֹבָה even this alſo for good, *To which purpoſe I am willing to remember what* Alexander Aphrodiſæus *told the* Emperours Severus *and* Antoninus, *in his Preface to the* Tract *of* Fatality *and* Free-will, *that whoſoever would point him out any* doubt *or* difficulty, *that remained in that matter, after the reading of his* treatiſe, *he would account it a great* favour *and* honour *to him, rendring this reaſon for it, becauſe it was not eaſy* ἐν ἑνὶ βιβλίῳ in one Tract, *to do* two *things exactly, both* dilucidly *to* expound *the matters of which he principally wrote, and all thoſe other things alſo, which were* uſeful *to the* explicating *thereof.*

* *Elias Lev. Thisb.* p. 49.

5. *And the ſame I deſire may introduce my addreſs to this* Diatribiſt, *and the tasks by him ſet before me, The ſubjects which he hath choſen to conſider with me being ſuch, as well deſerve ſome* care *from each of us, that we neither* deceive *others, nor our ſelves in them, I mean, perfectly* practical, *concerning a peculiar* Chriſtian duty *incumbent on us, in that of* Feſtivals, *and again a more* univerſal *duty, that of* obedience *to our immediate* Superiours, *and to the* univerſal Church *of* Chriſt, *from which we muſt not depart or be affrighted, upon pretence of* Superſtition, *&c. and yet ought warily to ſecure our* obedience *from that and the like guilts, when there is any* real *danger of them. And beſide theſe, there is ſomewhat of a more* ſublime *conſideration, (on occaſion of that of* Will-worſhip) *the* freewill offerings *which will very well become a* Chriſtian *to bring to* Chriſt, rewardable *in a* high *degree, though they are not under any* expreſs precept, *ſuch are all the higheſt* charities, *and* devotions, *and moſt* heroical Chriſtian practices, *which ſhall all not only be* degraded *but* defamed, *if every thing be concluded to be* criminous, *which is not* neceſſary, *if all* uncommanded *practice be* unlawful.

6. *Now this* Diatribiſt *having undertaken to* examine *what I then wrote, and done it with ſo little* partiality *to me, that I have no reaſon to ſuſpect he hath leſe any* minute difficulty *unmentioned; I ſhall hope that the deſcending to a* particular ſurvey *of all his* objections, *will probably prevent any* future *miſtake in theſe matters, and upon this ſcore, as St.* Auguſtine *thought it* neceſſary *for thoſe* heathens *which* deified *all their* benefactors, *to build one* altar *and pay ſome* homage *to their* Enemies, *becauſe they deſerved to be numbred among their* benefactors, *ſo have I not grudged the* tribute *of my* pains, *at leaſt that of a ready, though* laborious obedience *to this call of the* Diatribiſt, *but apprehended this* opportunity *of removing all* doubts, *which can recur and require ſolution; entertaining my ſelf with ſome* ſlender hope *that the* Reader *may reap ſome* ſmall benefit *thereby in order to* chriſtian practice; *the one thing which I deſire to propoſe, as the* end *of all my* meditations, *and never to be drawn by the importunity of thoſe which differ from me in opinion, into any* contention *or* ingagement, *which hath not this aim viſible before it, the* ſeaſonable checking *and* reformation *of ſome* vices, *(ſuch ſure are thoſe which here I deſire to* prevent *and* remove) *or the* confirmation *and* increaſe *of* virtue, *to the* glory *of* God, *and the* multiplying *of* fruit *to our* account.

7. *That this hath been the only aim of all hitherto* publiſht *by me, even of thoſe diſcourſes which are moſt* polemical, *I am ſo fully ſatisfied in my ſelf, that I doubt not to approve it to any, that can make queſtion of it; where* difference *of opinion doth not either by* cloſe conſequence, *or more* immediately, *lead into* vitious practice, *I ſhall never willingly* contend *with any man, or make reply to the* contentious: *But in* Doctrines *which have* immediate influence *upon* practice, *'tis* obligation *of* charity *to indeavour the* diſabuſing *of all, and not to permit or ſuffer any ſuch* fruitful, *and* noxious error *upon my* neighbour.

8. *Under which head becauſe I cannot but place the* rejecting *of* Children *from* Baptiſm, *and find ſome* objections, *offered by Mr.* Tombes, *to what I have written on that* ſubject, *I have therefore drawn a ſhort* defence *of that* Apoſtolical *practice, and vindicated my* former *diſcourſe from his* anſwers, *and* exceptions, *which being offered to the* Reader, *as ſoon as the* Printer *will permit, I ſhall not doubt of his leave to ſhut up the* Palæſtra *at this time, having ſufficiently* cloyed *him with theſe* Spectacles.

9. *And it is my wiſh for him, that he may continue to have the* eaſe *(at leaſt) of a* Spectator, *that it may be his lot, though for ſome months it hath not been mine,* ἐιρωνεύειν καὶ ἡσυχάζειν, *to live* peaceably *and* quietly *with all men, a felicity of which we are all to be* ambitious, φιλοτιμεῖσθαι, *and a* grace *that we are all, not in* prayer *only, but by* real *indeavours to contend*

1 Theſſ. 4. 11.

for,

for, and to hold *it* faſt, *until it be violently* wreſted *from us.*

As it is, I have with patience *fortified my ſelf for the* preſent *undertaking, and to make it* 10.
alſo as ſupportable as may be to others, *abſtained from* tranſcribing *the entire ſeveral* Sections *of his* Diatribæ, *and only repeated as much as* exacts anſwer *from me, not omitting (as far as my* wit *would ſerve me) any the* leaſt *particular, which can be thought to have* energy *againſt any of thoſe things, that are aſſerted by me in thoſe* Tracts, *ſave only when the ſame things once* anſwered, *have again, whether in* words *or* ſenſe, *been* repeated *by him.*

CHAP. I.

Of Mr C. *his Title Pages.*

SECT. I.

Philoſophy Col. 2. 8. *Fables and endleſs Genealogies,* 1 Tim. 1. 4. Tit. 3. 9. *The propriety of that Text* Col. 2. *to* Mr. C. *his diſcourſe.*

AND firſt the *Title page* will deſerve a *curſory* view, eſpecially the place of *Scripture*, where- *Numb.* 1.
with he hath choſen to *adorn* it, *Col.* 2. 4. 8. by which the *Reader* is directed to look on his *threefold exercitation* (as he is pleaſed to call it) *with* Dr. *H.* as an eſpecial *antidote* againſt that *Philoſophy*, &c. of which St. *Paul* forewarns men to *take heed* in thoſe two *verſes.*

On this occaſion I ſhall not need inquire, what provocation Mr. *C.* had to expreſs ſuch *unkindneſs* 2.
to, and *jealouſie* of *Philoſophy*, (certainly not the ſame that St. *Paul* then had among his *Coloſſians*) but only remind the *Reader* what is * elſewhere ſhew'd more largely, that the *Philoſophy* there branded * *Annot. on*
by the *Apoſtle*, was that which the *Gnoſticks divinity* was ſo full of, taken out of *Pythagoras* and the Col. 2. a. and
Greek Poets, Antiphanes, Heſiod and *Philiſtion*, and eſpecially *Orpheus* his *Theology* or *Genealogies* of 1 Tim. 1. a.
the *Gods*, and ſo promiſcuouſly ſtyled by the *Apoſtles* φιλοσοφία καὶ κένη ἀπάτη, *Philoſophy and vain deceit*, in this admonition to the *Coloſſians*; and μῦθοι καὶ ἀπέραντοι γενεαλογίαι *fables and endleſs genealogies* (how out of *Night* and *Silence* comes forth *Chaos*, &c.) in his directions to *Timothy*, 1 Tim. 1. 4. and μωρὰς ζητήσεις καὶ γενεαλογίας, *fooliſh queſtions and genealogies*, in his *Epiſtle* to *Titus*, c. 3. 9.

And then, how conveniently this was accommodated to any, or all thoſe *three* diſcourſes concern- 3.
ing *Superſtition, Will-worſhip, Chriſtmas Feſtival*, muſt be diſcerned by his anſwer to all, or any of theſe few queſtions, Firſt, Whether any *Gnoſtick* principle of *Theology* hath been diſcovered in any of thoſe *three Tracts* which he hath undertaken to chaſtiſe? Secondly, Whether it be a piece of *Apoſtatical* or *heretical pravity*, a branch of *heatheniſm* or *Gnoſticiſm*, to maintain the celebration of *Chriſts Nativity* to have nothing criminous in it, either under the head of *Superſtition* or *Will-worſhip?* Thirdly, Whether all *inſtitutions* of the *Church*, though in themſelves never ſo *blameleſs*, are yet to be lookt on, as συλαγωγία acts of *diſpoiling Chriſtians*, and little leſs than *Sacrileges*, and whether they are all comprehended under that ſtyle of *Traditions* of *men*, and *rudiments* of the *world*, in *oppoſition* to κατὰ Χριστὸν, *after Chriſt*, of which the *Apoſtle* ſo carefully warns the *Coloſſians?* Laſtly, Whether all *probable*, or *concludent*, nay even *demonſtrative* diſcourſe, be to be warded and averted, as *deceits* and *beguilings*, becauſe capable of that title of πιθανολογίαι, which the *Apoſtle* there uſeth, whether we render them literally *probabilities* of *ſpeech*, or with our *tranſlation*, *inticing words?*

When Mr. *C.* hath accommodated any ſatisfactory *anſwer* to theſe *few* queſtions (all, or at leaſt 4.
ſome one of them) he may then be qualified to attempt juſtifying the *charitableneſs* of his *title page*, and the *propriety* of his *ſelect Scripture*; but till then, he may give his *Reader* leave to *queſtion* one of them.

SECT. II.

Mat. 15. 8, 9. Gal. 4. 9, 10. *Deum ſic colere quomodo ſeipſum colendum præcepit.*
Chriſtmas no irrational cuſtom.

THE ſame reaſon I have to put in my *exceptions* to the *title pages* of his two other *exercitations*, *Numb.* 1.
and in like manner, firſt, to demand, how commodiouſly the words of *Chriſt*, *Mat.* 15. 8, 9. condemning their *worſhip* as *vain*, which *teach for doctrines the commandments of men*, are affixt to the ſecond *Diatribe* concerning *Will-worſhip*, when he cannot but know, that that *Text* is particularly handled in the firſt *leaf* of the *treatiſe* of *Will-worſhip*, and demonſtrated neither to belong to *humane laws* in *general*, nor to any *inſtitutions* of the *Chriſtian Church*, but only to the *dogmatizing* of *Phariſaical Hereticks*, and particularly, their urging ſome inventions of their own, as *commanded*, and under *obligation* by *divine* precept, now when the very *Judaical commanded* rites were ſo ſuddenly to be laid aſide, *nailed* to the *croſs*, ſolemnly *cancelled* and *aboliſht* by *Chriſt.*

And ſecondly (no farther to demand his reaſons, but) to admire his *conſtancy* to himſelf; that 2.
before the *Diatribe* of *Chriſtmas*, and other (ſure *Chriſtian*) *feſtivals*, he hath thought meet to prefix that *text*, *Gal.* 4. 9, 10. of *obſerving dayes, months, times, years*, ſo peculiarly reſtrained by all

circumſtances to the *Judaical Sabbaths*, *New Moons*, *Anniverſaries*, and *Jubilees*, but no more appliable to the *prejudice* of the *yearly* feaſt of *Chriſts birth*, than to the *weekly* of his *Reſurrection*.

3. To which if we ſhall *aſſociate* his two *Latin ſentences*, the one out of S^t *Auſtin* of *worſhipping God as he hath commanded*; the other out of S^t *Cyprian*, of the *vanity of irrational cuſtoms*, and remind him, that we deſign no other *worſhip* of *God* upon *Chriſtmas* day, but ſuch as we are ſure he hath *commanded* at *all* times, that of *prayer* and *thanksgiving*, &c. and that the *incarnation* of *Chriſt* was a competent *reaſon* to found a cuſtom of *commemorating* it after this manner, we ſhall find a perfect *harmony* and *conſent* in all his *diſcords*; and that is all I ſhall return to his *frontiſpieces*, deſigned to infuſe *prejudices* into the *Reader*, to *blaſt* before-hand, what he meant to anſwer.

CHAP. II.

Of Mr. C. *his Preface.*

SECT. I.

His diſcourſe of the cauſes of my miſtakes. Comparing of Superſtition and Will-worſhip to Hereſie. Accounting Superſtition our virtue.

Numb. 1. THIS now more than time that we think of *entring*, and yet there is a *Preface* ſtill behind, which expects to be taken notice of, as being a very friendly *recapitulation* of the *grounds* of my great *miſtakes*, the unhappy *cauſes* of thoſe my *miſcarriages*, which he hath diſcovered in the inſuing *Exercitations*.

2. But I that am not yet by all his *Diatribe* ſo *inſtructed*, or improved, as to diſcern one real *miſadventure* in thoſe diſcourſes, find it impoſſible for me to be *edified* by this his *charity*; I muſt be ſhewed my *diſeaſe*, before *Hippocrates* himſelf can point me out the *cauſes* of it, and therefore my briefeſt return to his *preface*, is but to beſeech him to reſerve his diſcourſe of *cauſes*, till the *effects* ſhall be ſo *viſible*, as to call for it; and if this be not a ſufficient *reply* to *all* of it, What is behind, will eaſily be referred to this one *head*, the *injuſtices* and *miſtakes* of the *author* of it, which I ſhall but briefly recite to him.

3. Firſt, That he hath thought fit to compare *Superſtition* and *Will-worſhip*, as they are the ſubjects of my diſcourſes, with *Hereſie*; whereas, firſt *Superſtition*, in the proper notation of the word, which firſt I ſpeak of, and *vindicate* our *Church*, whether in the *ceremonies*, or *obſervances*, from all appearance of guilt of it, is the *worſhipping* of *Dæmons* or *deified men*, and that ſure is *worſe* than *hereſie* in every *Chriſtians* account, and ſo, inconveniently *compared*, ſo as to be *equalled* with it. And ſecondly, whatever our *Church* hath admitted, is cleared to have nothing of *Superſtition* in it, in any other *ſecundary notion* or *acception* of the word; or if it had, yet as long as it is no more but *uncommanded Rites* or *Feſtivals*, which by the *Diatribiſt* himſelf are thus ſtyled, thoſe ſure, in any *reaſon*, will not be capable of this *compariſon*, or *accuſation* of being ſo *bad* as *hereſie*; and thirdly, *will-worſhip* in the one place where it is uſed in *Scripture*, hath no manner of *ill*, but *good* character ſet upon it, being joined ἐν σωφροσύνῃ with *humility*, which I hope is not yet condemned to be quite ſo *criminal* and *abominable* to *God*, as *pride* and *hereſie* is acknowledged to be; however in this *Preface*, before my interpretation of *Col.* 2. 23. hath been endeavoured to be confuted, this ſo eminent *criminouſneſs* thereof was not with more *reaſon*, than *charity* ſuppoſed by him.

4. Secondly, That he hath affirm'd, in a *parentheſis*, of ſome men that they account theſe (and *ſuperſtition* is evidently one of theſe) *their virtues rather than crimes*; which again if applied to me, or I think to any *Proteſtant* living, is very *unkind* and *unprovoked*, having no *ground* in any part of my *Diſcourſe*.

5. Thirdly, That *Will-worſhip* hath been by him elſewhere demonſtrated to be as *criminal* as *Hereſie*, which in what notion ſoever he hath expreſt himſelf to underſtand the word, is with no truth aſſumed by him, as far as refers to theſe *Diatribæ*; and if it be elſewhere attempted, Firſt, He ſhould have referred us thither, if but to *vindicate* his own *veracity*, or elſe have recited the heads of ſuch *demonſtrative arguments* in this place; or in the ſecond *Diatribe*; and yet neither of theſe are done by him.

SECT. II.

Of being too Religious; of the intenſion or degree. The Meſſalians. Neglect of Charity, of particular callings, Eccl. 7. 16. *Of multitude of Ceremonies. Too many Ceremonies no argument of too much, but of too little Religion.*

Numb. 1. HIS *fourth miſtake* is, that he hath recited it as one cauſe of my *miſcarriages* in this buſineſs, that I *affirm that a man cannot be too religious*, and that I atteſt this, both of the *intenſion* or *degree*, and of the *extenſion* or *number* of *Ceremonies taken into the worſhip of God*] Whereas that which I affirm, is evidently this, Firſt, That in reſpect of the *degree*, there is no ſuch thing as *nimiety* or *exceſs* in *Religion*; no *poſſibility* of being *Religious in too high a degree*, Sect. 33. and this is not denied by

by Mr. *C.* nor can be by any pious man; who knows that all his *faults* are *omiſſions* and *defects*, but never *exceſſes* of *piety* or *religion*.

Secondly, The main objections imaginable againſt this, from the practice of the *Meſſalians*, or the neglect of the *duties* of *charity* and the *particular calling*, incident to the *intenſe* practice of holy duties, were foreſeen and prevented there; the *Meſſalians* fault was not their *exceſſive* practice, but their laying that *obligation* on themſelves and others; the ſame that *Tertullian* and the *Montaniſts* were guilty of, in reſpect of other *auſterities*, and ſo 'twas their *dogmatizing*, in their *impoſition* of heavy *burthens*, wherein their *hereſie* (not their *ſuperſtition*) conſiſted: And the others crime is his *idleneſs*, and walking ἀτάκτως *diſorderly*, a crime cenſured by the *Apoſtle*, 2 *Theſ.* 3. 11. (yet far enough from *Superſtition* again) and in like manner his want of *charity*, and ſo not *nimiety*, but *unſeaſonableneſs* of *piety*, contrary to the expreſs words of Chriſt, *I will have mercy and not ſacrifice*. 2.

And if yet a third *objection* be offered from the words of the *Preacher*, *Eccl.* 7. 16. (which yet this *Diatribiſt* hath not thought fit to offer) *Be not righteous overmuch, why ſhouldſt thou deſtroy thy ſelf?* I ſuppoſe the *anſwer* is obvious, that thoſe words are the intimation of the *wordlings objection*, who taketh that for *exceſs* of *duty*, which brings any *damage* or worldly *deſtruction* upon him; and is anſwered in the *next* verſe with this ſolid *Aphoriſm* of eternal verity, *Be not thou overmuch wicked, why ſhouldeſt thou die before thy time?* The *fears*, and from thence the *prudential*, but oft-times very *impious* practices of the worldling, are far the more probable path to the moſt haſty *ruines*. 3.

And ſo ſtill this branch of my Doctrine, as far as aſſerted by me, was neither *untruth*, nor *miſcarriage*, nor cauſe of either, in my *diſcourſe*. 4.

As for the ſecond, that of the *extenſion* or *number* of *rites* and *ceremonies taken into the worſhip*, that there cannot be *too many* of them, is as far from being my *aſſertion*, as that which is moſt *contrary*. For upon that head my *concluſion* is, that as ſome *rites* or *circumſtances* of *time* and *place* and *geſture* are abſolutely *neceſſary* to *Religion*, and the *significativeneſs* of them is no manner of *prejudice* to the *uſe* or *inſtitution* of them, ſo if the *Diſputers* will yield but this, that even when they are *ſignificative*, the uſe of *Ceremonies* may be allowed among *Chriſtians*, I ſhall then in ſtead of pleading for the *multitude* of ſuch, give my vote to the confirming the old *Rule*, that they be *paucæ & ſalubres*, *few and wholſom*; and particularly *few* for five reaſons, ſet down in the following words, *Sect.* 39. and ſure that is contrary enough to his reporting of my *opinion*, that there *cannot be too many* of them; and ſo, that which was no part of my *belief*, could be no cauſe of any *miſcarriage* of mine in that *buſineſs*. 5.

To which if I ſhall now add, that my granting there ought to be *few* (and ſo that there may be *too many*) *Ceremonies* in a *Church*, is no way the yielding a *poſſibility* that a man may be too *religious*; but on the *Contrary*, when the *too many Ceremonies* either *cauſe*, or *occaſion*, or are accompanied with *inward neglects*, there is not *too much* but *too little Religion*, too much *formality*, but too little *devotion*, too much *outward Phariſaical waſhing*, but too *little inward Chriſtian fervor*; as there may be πολυλογία and βαττολογία, words too many, but too little *praying* (I may add, too many offers of *proof*, but too little *reaſon*) and remind the *Diatribiſt* that this was expreſly ſaid before in the end of *Sect.* 39. by the token of the *inſectile animals*, whoſe want of *blood* cauſed their multitude of *legs*, I ſhall then ſure have given him ground of *conviction*, that there were more than one *calumny* in his *aſſignation* of the *cauſes*, particularly in this of the *firſt cauſe* of my *miſcarriages*. 6. *Mat.* 6.

SECT. III.

Mr. C. *his diſtinctions of being too religious, multiplied unneceſſarily. Frequency of duty, if ſecured from other neglects, no exceſs, nor criminous. Prayer a branch of Natural worſhip,* Θεῦ τίμα. *Exceſs in truſt, &c. as well as in Prayer. The Species of worſhip, and the circumſtances thereof. The wide difference between theſe. Times of Prayer not limited by Scripture: Set days of worſhip, Geſtures, Proſtration. Mr.* C. *his three proofs examined,* Deut. 4. 2. *conſidered.* Apoc. 22. 19. *A view of* Aquinas's *doctrine in this matter.*

AS for his *diſtinctions*, by which he is willing to clear his way, that a man may be ſaid to be *too Religious, either becauſe he gives more to God than he deſerves, but ſo he cannot be too Religious*; or, *becauſe he gives more than God requires by the Rule of worſhip*. Secondly, *That in regard of worſhip commanded, eſpecially natural worſhip, a man cannot be too religious in reference to the intention* (I ſuppoſe it ſhould be *intenſion*) *of the devotion, as in love, fear, truſt in God* (adding in a cautious *parentheſis*, that *in inſtituted worſhip a man may be too religious, as if he pray or faſt to the waſting his health or neglect of his calling:*) *but in uncommanded worſhip, the leaſt addition to the Rule of worſhip is too much, and ſuch a man may be ſaid to be too religious.* I cannot imagine how he hath by either or both of theſe attain'd his end, but rather *perplexed*, than *cleared* the *way* for the *Reader*, which was perfectly *ſtraight*, and abundantly *explicate*, before he took upon him to be the *harbinger*. *Numb.* 1.

For *Firſt*, the two latter *members* of both his *diſtinctions* are directly the ſame, and ſo I am ſure there was *too much* of his *diſtinctions*; *tautology* I ſuppoſe is ſuch a *nimiety*, and ſuch ſure is this [*A man that gives more than God requires by the rule of worſhip, is too religious*] and [*in uncommanded worſhip the leaſt addition to the rule of worſhip is too much, and ſuch a man may be ſaid to be too religious.*] 2.

Secondly, For his *Parentheſis*, it was perfectly prevented in the *tract* of *Superſtition*, §. 33. and ſo, was a ſecond *nimiety*, being added without all *neceſſity* or *uſe*, it being there acknowledged that in a *frequent* or *intenſe* practice of *holy duties*, there might be ſome incident *fault*, viz. neglect of *duties* of *charity* or *particular callings*; and *waſting of health* through *faſting* immoderately, bears *analogy* with theſe. 3.

But then it was *forewarned*, that the *fault* herein was not the *exceſs* of *Religion*, but *omiſſion* of other *neceſſary duties*; and that demonſtrated by this, becauſe if that *frequency*, whether of *prayer* 4.

or

or *faſting*, wherein is the ſuppoſed *exceſs*, be either in *another* man, or in that man (whoſe *exceſs* is accuſed) at *another* time, *ſeparated* and *ſecured* from thoſe *neglects*, or *omiſſions* of thoſe other *duties*, the very ſame *frequency* and *intention* were his *virtue* not his *crime*, which therefore ſtill *prejudges* this from being an *inſtance* of the thing in hand, *that a man may be too religious*.

5. *Thirdly*, His *difference*, in this reſpect of *nimiety*, betwixt *natural* and *inſtituted worſhip*, is perfectly vain and uſeleſs to his *deſign*, even as he himſelf hath explicated it, placing *love*, *fear*, *truſt in God* under the firſt head, and *prayer* and *faſting* under the other.

6. For firſt, I muſt remind him, that *prayer* is as properly a branch of *natural worſhip*, as *love*, or *fear*, or *truſt* can be imagined to be, being, firſt inſeparable from *truſt*, ſecondly, a *neceſſary* and *natural* means of acknowledging *Gods fulneſs* and our *wants*, thirdly, containing under it *thanksgiving*, *praiſing God*, which is the prime way of *honouring God* (*He that praiſeth me, honoureth me*, ſaith *David*) and ſure that *honouring* of *God*, a moſt peculiar branch of *natural worſhip*, dictated by the *nature* of a *creature*, and taught by all *naturaliſts* that acknowledged any *God*, (Θεὸς τίμα, in the *Pythagorean* Verſes, *honour the Gods*, and Θεὸν *God* in *Phocylides*) and both the *petitory* and the *Euchariſtical* comprehended under the Θεοὺς σέβεσθαι, *worſhipping the Gods*, in *Plutarch*, which *Xenophon* tells us πρὸ πάσιν ἀνθρώποις νομίζεται *is the primeval law acknowledged among all men*, and *Hierocles*, having defined *Piety* to be the πασῶν δὲ ἀρετῶν ἡγεμών, *the captain of all virtues*, πρὸς τὸν θεὸν αἰτίαν τὸν ἀναφορὰν ἔχουσα; *as having reſpect to the divine cauſe*, he adds that the *precept* concerning that in the *golden verſes*, had juſtly the *precedence* and *deference* before all *laws*, to give the *Gods* that *honour which is due unto them, and all things elſe according to that order* * ὧν ὁ δημιουργικὸς νόμος ἅμα τῇ οὐσίᾳ αὐτῶν συμπεφύγαγε, *which the creative law* (that ſure is the *Chriſtians law* of *Nature*) *together with their being, had afforded them*. But perhaps ſuch evidences as theſe, are the *Philoſophy* againſt which the *Reader* was to be forewarned in the *title page*; and therefore,

Ἀπομνημον. βιβ. δ.

* Εἰς Χρυσ. Ετ. p. 10.

7. *Secondly*, I muſt add, to demonſtrate the *uſeleſsneſs* of his *diſtinction* in this place, that it is as poſſible to *exceed* in *truſt*, in *fear*, nay even in *love*, as it is in *prayer*; Thus he that ſo *truſts* in *God*, as not to *fear*; he that *truſts* him with the *end*, ſo as to neglect the *means*, parallel to him that *prays* and neglects his *calling*; he that *truſts* and *relies* and *hopes*, but doth not *purifie*, (performs not the *Evangelical* condition) every one of theſe is, in proportion with Mr. *C.* his inſtances of *prayer* and *faſting*, an *exceeder* in *truſt*; we are wont to expreſs it by *preſuming*.

8. Secondly, He that ſo *fears*, as not to *love*, that *fears where no fear is*, *that walks accurately* ὡς ἄσοφος *as a fool*, he will be as properly an *exceeder* in *fear*.

Thirdly, He that ſo *loves God* again, either as not to *fear God*, or as not to *love* his *brother* alſo; he that hath a *zeal* to *God*, but not according to *knowledge*; he is in like manner an *exceeder* in *love*. And yet all this while, none of theſe are *religious too much*, but *too little*; though they exceed the *bounds* of one part of *duty*, they are *defective* in another, and 'tis this *defect*, not that other *exceeding*, that is *criminous*, *Theſe things ought they to have done, but not to leave the other undone*; and theſe *omiſſions* are their *crimes*, and as truly ſo, in the *natural*, as in the *inſtituted* worſhip; though if the *inſtituted worſhip* in any branch be preferred before any branch of *natural* duty, or be more *intenſely* and *frequently* practiſed, to the *neglecting* thereof, this may be a greater *fault* than if one part of *natural worſhip* be intended to the *detriment* of another either *ſuperior* or *equal* to it, as if *Sacrifice* (which I acknowledge an *inſtituted worſhip*) be intended or preſt to the *omiſſion* of *neceſſary charities*, *ceremonies* to the ſlacking of the *inward fervor*, or the like.

9. So that ſtill all that this *Diatribiſt's ſubdivided diſtinctions* have done for us (beſide diſcovering his own *miſtakes*) is only this, to propoſe *one* ſort of things, wherein, in his *opinion*, a man may be *too religious*, viz. in *giving God more than he requires by the rule of worſhip*, or, as again he expreſſeth it, by the *leaſt addition to the rule of worſhip*, which, ſaith he, *is too much*, and *ſuch a man may be too religious*. And this being the only product of his *diſtinctions*, is, as I intimated, ſo far from *clearing*, that it is the *perplexing* and *intricating* the buſineſs, which was formerly clear enough, the leading the *Reader* not *out* but *into Meanders*, an *intanglement* of the *clue*, a *Sphinx* inſtead of an *Oedipus*.

10. For there was no ſuch ἀμφίβολον before, nothing ſo *difficult*, ſo *involved*, of ſo *incertain* and *dubious* ſignification, as this which now he calls [*giving God more than he requires by the rule of worſhip*] and explains by [*uncommanded worſhip*, and, *the leaſt addition to the rule of worſhip*.]

11. I ſhall evince the truth of what I now ſay, and with the ſame hand *clear* again what he hath *clouded*, by asking him but this one *queſtion*, Doth he mean in theſe words [*more*] and [*Addition*] any new *ſpecies* or ſort of *worſhip*, neither *preſcribed* by the *law* of *Nature*, nor *inſtituted* by any *poſitive law* of *God*? or doth he deſign only, ſome *circumſtance* only, or *ceremony*, which being not of the *intrinſick nature* or *eſſence* of *worſhip*, but only *accidental* to it, is not particularly *commanded* or *preſcribed* by the *word* of *God*, the *rule* of *worſhip*? ſuch are, the *time*, the *place*, the *geſtures*, and ſuch *outward*, but ſome of them *inſeparable attendants of worſhip*.

12. I ſhall deſire to ſecure my expreſſions from *obſcurity* and *miſtakes*, and therefore to be as explicit as may be; *Prayer* is a *ſpecies* of *worſhip*; *praying* on the *Lords day*, on *Chriſtmas day*, obſerving conſtant *hours* of *prayer*, *thrice*, *ſeven*, *ten* times every day, is each of them a *circumſtance* adherent to *Prayer*; ſome *time* is *neceſſary* and *inſeparable* from *Prayer*, but every of theſe times forementioned are not ſo, he that *prayes* but *thrice*, doth not *pray ſeven* or *ten* times a day; So again the *place* of *prayer* may give it a *different* denomination, either of *publick* or *private*; the manner may render it more or leſs *ſolemn*; the *geſtures* more or leſs *reverent* or *irreverent*, the *increaſe*, letting down of *ardor*, *devout* or *formal*; and there are many *ſorts*, and *degrees* of each of theſe, but theſe do not conſtitute *new* or ſeveral *ſorts* of *worſhip*, but all are *accidents* of one and the ſame *ſpecies* of *worſhip*, viz. of *Prayer*.

13. Here then is a wide difference, and if his meaning were of the *ſpecies* or ſorts of *worſhip*, then I never doubted to affirm with him, that all *uncommanded worſhip* is an *exceſs*, if he pleaſe, (an *error*, I ſhould rather ſay) a ſetting up that for *worſhip* of *God*, which is not *worſhip*, nay perhaps quite *contrary* to *worſhip*; and this ſure was never *juſtified* by me *explicitely*, or *implicitely*, in *concluſions*, or

in

in grounds and *principles* of thus concluding; and ſo ſtill this hath not been uſeful to me to diſcover any *miſtake* of mine.

The ſecond then is the only branch remaining, of which his words, as referring to me, can poſſibly be underſtood, and then 'twill prove ſo far from being any *miſadventure* of mine, that it will devolve all abſurdity upon the *Diatribiſt*. 14.

For I ſhall demand, Hath the *rule* of *worſhip*, i. e. the *Scripture*, any where preſcribed the *times*, the *places*, the *geſtures*, and all the *circumſtances* of the *worſhip of God*, and that both *poſitively* and *excluſively*, ſo that he that *prayes* oftener than the *Scripture* expreſly *commands*, or on any day not aſſigned to that purpoſe by *Scripture*, *ſins* in ſo doing, *adds* to the *rule*, *gives more than God requires*, doth *too much*, is *too religious*, is *criminous* and *abominable* to *God* in ſo doing? every of theſe muſt be the *affirmations* of this *Diatribiſt*, if this ſecond meaning be his; and the like he is obliged to ſay again of him that *prays* in any *place*, in any *manner*, in any *geſture*, which the word of *Scripture*, the *rule* of *worſhip* hath not commanded. 15.

And becauſe this is by all reaſon to be reſolved to be his meaning, or elſe his whole *Book* is perfectly caſt away, a meer σκιαμαχία or *beating the air*, without me or any man elſe to be his *adverſary*, I ſhall at the preſent ſuppoſe it ſo, and ſhew him, as *deictically* as he can wiſh, the *abſurdities* of it. 16.

And firſt for the *times* of *prayer*, I demand, What hath the *rule* of *worſhip*, the *Scripture* preſcribed? hath it preſcribed *morning* and *evening Prayer*, and that both *poſitively*, and *excluſively* to any more? If ſo, then by the *ſtandard* of this *Diatribiſt's* doctrine, *Davids* or *Daniels praying three times a day*, adding the *noon day* ſeaſon to the other *two*, muſt be *criminous* and *abominable*: or if he ſhall pitch upon any other *number* of times, as *preſcribed* by the *Rule*, then I ſhall add an *unite* more to that *number*, and demand, whether that *addition* will add *abomination* to his *performances*? If he ſaith it will, though I might preſs that *affirmation* with *abſurdities* enough, yet I ſhall ſpare it, and only demand the *proof* from the *Scripture* for this *aſſertion*, and when he gives it me, forfeit all my *pretenſions* to the *underſtanding* that *ſacred book*; but if he cannot produce any ſuch *Scripture*, then is my *Cenſor* the *guilty* perſon, the very *dogmatizer*, that *teacheth for Doctrines* or *Commandments* of *God*, his own *Dictates*, which I muſt ſuppoſe to be the *traditions* of a *man*, and the doing ſo, I cannot reſiſt to be a *nimiety*, but not of *religion*, that I yet diſcern. 17.

In like manner for *ſet days* to be *conſecrated* to the *worſhip* of *God*, for *faſting* or for *prayer*, I demand how many every *week* or every *year* hath the *Rule* of *worſhip preſcribed*? Or what *rule* of *worſhip* ſhall be appealed to? the *Law* of *Moſes*, or the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*? His *anſwer* to this queſtion will involve him in *intricacies* enough: If the *Law* of *Moſes* be the *rule*, then he knows all the *New Moons* and *feaſts* of the *Jews*, and *Sabbatick years* and *Jubilees* muſt return upon him: If the *Goſpel* of *Chriſt*, which hath certainly *aboliſht* all theſe, and, as he ſuppoſeth, ſet up the *Lords-day*, inſtead of them all, then firſt, I demand in what words of the *New Teſtament* the *weekly* obſervation of this is *commanded*? and ſecondly in what words the *obſerving* all others but that, particularly the *Feaſt* of *Eaſter*, the *annual* commemorative of the *Reſurrection*, is interdicted, and whether the *weekly* remembrance of ſo great a *mercy*, being ſo *acceptable* to *God*, it be reaſonable to think the *annual*, *abominable* before him? And the ſame *queſtion* ſoon extends it ſelf to the day of *Chriſts Incarnation*, *Paſſion*, *Aſcenſion*, *&c.* and if of each of theſe he ſhall define and pronounce them *unlawful*, without *teſtimony* and *verdict* from the *Rule* of *worſhip*, the *Scripture*, then he is the *Dogmatizer*, that hath added to the *Rule*, more *interdicts* than are there to be met with, and ſo ſtill he is the man *guilty* of the *nimiety*. 18.

So again for *geſtures* in the *worſhip* of *God*, I demand, What is the *geſture* of *prayer*, preſcribed by the *Rule*? Is it *ſtanding*, *ſitting*, or *kneeling*, any, or all of theſe, or any fourth ſuperadded to theſe? If the *Rule* have preſcribed none, then according to his *doctrine* again, any of theſe muſt be *criminous additions* to the *Rule*, *abominable*, &c. If the *rule* have preſcribed ſome *one*, then all others, beſide that one, muſt fall under the ſame *ſeverity*, that that *one* had done, if it had not been *preſcribed*: and if all three are under ſeveral *precepts*, and ſo the whole *Rule* obeyed by retaining theſe *three*, then ſtill I ſhall mention a *fourth*, that of *proſtration*, whether with the old *penitents*, in the *porch*, or on the *pavement*, every man in his *cloſet* and *receſs*, and ſtill the *queſtion* returns, whether this be *criminous*, and by what part of the *rule* of *worſhip* it appears to be ſo? 19.

Necdum finitus the *enumeration* of the *Diatribiſts* inextricable difficulties is not yet at an *end*, but infinitely *multipliable* by every act of *Religious Faſt*, and of *Almſgiving*, the *two* other ſorts of *Gods worſhip* (as *Aquinas* (owned here by the *Diatribiſt*) hath defined from the *ſixth* of *Matthew*) the *proportions* or *degrees* of each of which, are yet no where defined in the *Scripture*. But I ſuppoſe it cannot now be *neceſſary*, that I farther *confirm* what is ſo *evident* already. 20.

Elſe I might yet farther proceed from the *duties* of the *firſt* to the *ſecond Table*, and demand whether any thing that is done (out of the *ſervice* of *God*) for which there is no *command*, be a *criminous exceſs*? Certainly the *Analogy* will hold, *God* having given the *Rule* for *juſtice* and *charity*, as well as *worſhip*; and then, whatſoever of any kind is not under *precept*, muſt by this *argument* be under *interdict*, and ſo there will be nothing left *indifferent* in the world: A *concluſion* that ſome men, which have held Mr. *C.* his *hypotheſis*, have rationally *inlarged* to, finding it *neceſſary*, and *unavoidably* deduced from thence: But I diſcern not yet, that Mr. *C.* hath thus improved his *principle*, though ſure whenſoever it is for his *turn*, it is thus *improvable*. 21.

But Mr. *C.* hath added three proofs to his *affirmation*, and how *unreconcileable* ſoever with *common notions* that is, yet thoſe muſt deſerve to be *heeded*; And his firſt proof is this, *If a man or Church may add to the Rules of Religion, then he or they may be too Religious*: *But* Ergo. 22.

Here it muſt be remembred, that the thing which he had propoſed to himſelf to *prove*, was this, that *in uncommanded worſhip the leaſt addition to the rule of worſhip, is too much, and ſuch a man may be ſaid to be too religious*: *And this*, ſaith he, *I prove, firſt, If a man or Church may add to the rule of religion*, &c. Of this firſt, I deſire to be told, whether it be not a meer *idem per idem*, a proving a thing by *it ſelf*, and whether that be not contrary to all *rules* of *ſyllogizing*, where the *medium* of *probation* is never to enter the *concluſion*, as here moſt evidently it doth. 23.

Having

24. Having ſaid this to the *form*, tis not needful that I ſay any thing to the *matter* of this *proof*, it being the very thing that I have ſpoken to, all this while, and by that *diſtinction*, of the *ſorts*, and *circumſtances* of *worſhip*, I have competently ſhewed, that it hath no force againſt me; that indeed he that introduces any *new part* of *divine worſhip*, is a *preſumptuous aſſumer*, doth *more* than he ſhould, becauſe that which he ſhould *not* do, and ſo that the *Major* is *falſe*, inſtead of *clear*; he that thus *adds*, and impoſeth on *God* and his *word*, is not hereby *too religious*, but too *bold*, and was never pleaded for in the leaſt, by my *treatiſe* of *Superſtition*.

25. The *inconſequence* of this *Major* will more appear, by conſidering the *proof* of the *Aſſumption*, which he annexes, *The aſſumption*, ſaith he, *is proved by Deut.* 4. 2. *where all additions to the word are prohibited.*

26. But I pray, doth he that *proſtrates* himſelf in *prayer*, *add* to the *word* of *God?* then ſure he that *walks* in the *Garden*, doth ſo too; much more, he that makes any ſuch *deductions* from *Scripture*, as this *Diatribiſt* here doth, (for not only the *analogy* enforceth this, but it is alſo to be remembred, that the *laws* which had here been given by *Moſes*, were *all* ſorts of *duties* of common life, towards *our ſelves*, and our *brethren*, as well as of *worſhip* toward *God*, and ſo this Text muſt exclude all other *uncommanded* actions, as well as *worſhips*) The words in *Deuteronomy* are theſe, *Ye ſhall not add to the word that I command you, neither ſhall ye diminiſh from it*, לשמר *ad cuſtodiendum*, and in the ſame ſenſe the *Targum* לְמֶעְבַּד *to obſerve*, or *that ye may obſerve*, *that ye may keep the commandments of the Lord your God which I command you.* The meaning is moſt evident, that they were to perform *uniform obedience* to *God*, not to make any *change* in *Gods commands*, either to pretend more *liberties*, or *fewer obligations*, or again more *obligations* and fewer *liberties*, to be delivered them by *God*, than thoſe which he had then delivered by *Moſes*, but to ſet themſelves humbly to the *performance* of his *precepts*, and accordingly the *Septuagint* renders לשמר to *keep*] φυλάσσεσθε *ye ſhall keep*, the *Latine*, *cuſtodite keep*, and the *Syriack*, *ſed obſervate*, *but keep the commandments* by that *oppoſition* ſhewing that to be the meaning of *not adding* or *diminiſhing*, *viz. paying* an *obedience* to *Gods* commands. And the ſame ſenſe in the like words we have again *Apoc.* 22. 18, 19. to ſhut up the *great prophecy* in the *New Teſtament*; And then, I pray, is he that offends againſt either of theſe *two* Texts, *too Religious?* Is it not more true on the contrary, that he is a *falſe Prophet*, and a *ſacrilegious* perſon, that pretends the *word* of the *Lord* for that which *God* hath not ſpoken to him? But this *crime* I hope every man is not guilty of that *bows* or *kneels* or *proſtrates* himſelf in *prayer*, by ſuch *outward geſtures* both *ſignifying*, and *inflaming* the *inward fervor* of the *heart*, but not inſerting any *precept* of doing thus, either into the Book of *Deuteronomy* or the *Apocalypſe*. And this may ſuffice for his *firſt proof*.

27. His ſecond proof is from the *ſaying of the great School-man*, *that Religion is a moral virtue*, (*or very like it*) *and ſtands between two extremes*, *Ergo*, *a man may be too much religious*, *as well as too little*.

28. *Firſt*, I anſwer to the *antecedent*, that if it be remembred what the two *extremes* are, between which *religion*, in *Aquinas*, ſtands, the conſequent will never be inferred from it. The *extremes* are on one ſide *Superſtition*, on the other *irreligion*; *ſuperſtition* is again, ſaith he, of *two* ſorts, either *Firſt*, the *worſhipping* of a *creature* (of *falſe Gods*, or more *Gods* than *one*, as in *Tertullian adv. Marc.* l. 1. c. 5. ſpeaking of the *worſhipping* of *two Gods*, *Vererer*, ſaith he, *ne abundantia officii ſuperſtitio potiùs quàm religio crederetur*, *I ſhould fear ſuch abundance of officiouſneſs would be rather believed ſuperſtition than religion*; and S. *Auguſtine*, and out of him * *Aquinas*, *tangis primam chordam qua colitur unus Deus*, *& cecidit beſtia ſuperſtitionis*, *The beaſt of ſuperſtition is deſtroyed by the firſt ſtring of the Decachord*, *the firſt commandment of the Decalogue*, *preſcribing the worſhip of one God.*) or *Secondly*, *cum Deo illegitimus cultus tribuitur*, *giving undue worſhip to God*; and neither of theſe notions of *ſuperſtition* will be at all uſeful to the *Diatribiſt* to prove his *concluſion*.

* *Secunda ſecundæ qu.* 92. *art.* 1.

29. If from the *former* of theſe, he ſhould conclude that a man may be *too religious*, tis plain that this muſt be his meaning, that a man may be a *Polytheiſt*, a *worſhipper* of *falſe Gods*, but I hope, in this ſenſe, he that obſerves the *ceremonies* of the *Church* of *England*, he that *commemorates* the *birth* of *Chriſt* on the twenty fifth of *December*, will not be ſaid to be *too Religious*.

30. As for the *Second*, that of *cultus illegitimus*, or *indebitus*, *undue worſhip* of the *true God* (which alone can poſſibly be deemed for the *Diatribiſt's* purpoſe) my anſwer ſhall be more *particular*, by viewing and weighing the words in *Aquinas* which are here referred to: though the place be not ſet down by the *Diatribiſt*, I ſuppoſe it muſt be *ſecunda ſecundæ* either *quæſt.* 81. *Art.* 1. or elſe *qu.* 92. *Art.* 1. in *concluſ.* which indeed hath theſe words, *Religio eſt virtus moralis*, *omnis autem virtus moralis in medio conſiſtit*, *Religion is a moral virtue*, *and every moral virtue conſiſts in the middle*, citing it (with a *ſicut ſuprà dictum eſt*) from the former place *qu.* 81. *Art.* 5. Now the ſumm of that *Article* is this, that

* Reſp. ad 3. * *Religion* is neither a *Theological* nor an *Intellectual*, but a *moral virtue*, as being a branch of *juſtice*, in giving to *God* that which belongs to him, and that the *due medium*, wherein this, as all *moral virtue* conſiſts, is to be taken, not as the *middle* point between two *paſſions*, the * *medium rei* (as ordinarily *moral virtue* is the moderating of *paſſions*, reducing them to a *mediocrity*, or *temper*, or *equilibration* betwixt the *exceſs* and *defect*) but according to ſome *equality*, in reſpect of *God*, * *medium rationis*, interpreting what he means by that, *viz. equality*, not *abſolutely*, becauſe we cannot *give God ſo much as belongs to him*, but *ſecundum quandam conſiderationem humanæ facultatis & divinæ acceptationis*, by *conſidering what man is able to do*, *and what God will accept*; As for *ſuperfluity* in ſuch things as theſe, which belong to the *worſhip* of *God*, there can be none, ſaith he, *ſecundum circumſtantiam quanti*, as to the *circumſtance of quantity*, I cannot do *too much* in the *worſhip* of *God*, I cannot offend that way but, as * elſewhere he ſaith of this, and the like, *tanto eſt melius*, *quanto magis acceditur ad ſummum*, *it is ſo much the better*, *by how much it comes nearer the higheſt*. All the *ſuperfluity* poſſible is as to the other *circumſtances*, and he names but three, *Firſt*, *cui non debet*, by exhibiting *divine worſhip* to him *to whom* it *ought* not to be exhibited, *Secondly*, *quando non debet*, by giving it *at a time when it ought not*, (when having formerly been *acceptable* to *God*, tis now *outdated*) *Thirdly* in reſpect of other *circumſtances*, *prout non debet*, in a *manner wherein it ought not.*

* *Vid.* 1. 2. q. 64. *Art.* 2.

* *Ibid.*

* 1. 2. q. 64. *Art.* 4. *in corp.*

31. By this it appears already, how *incompetent* this *teſtimony* from *Aquinas*, is, to prove the *concluſion* propoſed by the *Diatribiſt*, that every thing in the *worſhip* of *God* which is *not commanded* by *God*, is *too much*. For ſure every thing that is *not commanded*, is not preſently *forbidden*, nor conſequently

offends

offends againſt the *prout debet, as it ought*, the *due manner, time*, or other *circumſtances* of it. If there be any difficulty in that phraſe [*prout debet, as it ought*] and it be conceived to ſignifie ſo as is *particularly commanded* by *God*, and *è contra*, that what ever is done, being not particularly *commanded* by *God*, is *prout non debet, as it ought not*, this is certainly a *miſtake*, and very diſtant from *Aquinas*'s ſenſe, who means by *cultus debitus, due worſhip*, any *acts* of *worſhip*, * *qui ad Dei reverentiam fiunt, which are done to the honour of God*, without conſidering whether they be under *precept* or not, and conſequently with him *cultus indebitus, undue worſhip*, is ſuch as is done to the *diſhonour*, at leaſt not to the *honour* of *God*, as when of *Idolatry* he ſaith, that it † *exhibits divine reverence, indebitè, unduly to the creature*.

* *Secunda ſecundæ* q. 81. *Art.* 5. *in corp.*
† Q. 92. art. 2. *corp.*

In full accord with this it is, that in that *other* text *qu.* 92. *art.* 1. *Superſtition* is by him defined to be a *vice oppoſed to religion in the exceſs, whereby a man gives worſhip to him to whom he ought not, or not in a manner that he ought*, meaning as he explains himſelf, not that of quantity, but in reſpect of other *circumſtances*, when either it is faſtned on a *wrong object*, *divine worſhip* to that which is not *God*, (which ſure is *againſt*, not only *without* the *command* of *God*) or done in a *wrong manner*, i. e. when any thing is done in the *divine worſhip*, * *quod fieri non debet, which ought not to be done*, and he † inſtances, *ſi quis temporibus gratiæ vellet colere Deum ſecundum veteris legis ritum, If any man under Chriſtianity would worſhip God after the rites of the old law*, which ſure are not only *not commanded* but *forbidden* under *Chriſt*, and ſo are a *proper* inſtance of the *quando non debet*, the *undue circumſtance* of *time*, mentioned *particularly* in the former place, and *convinces* that which I aſſigned, to be the *meaning* of it. I need add no more in this place concerning the *teſtimony* of *Aquinas*. Other mentions of his opinion in this matter, will hereafter occur, and then I ſhall have occaſion to ſpeak more to them. 32.

* In *reſp. ad tertium.*
† *Art.* 2. *in reſp. ad tertium.*

His third *proof* is from the Doctors *own conceſſion, who*, ſaith he, *grants there may be a nimiety or exceſs of religion*, and adds words in ſuch a *ſtyle* as are abſolutely *nonſenſe*, even when the [*not*] (which I ſuppoſe the *inſertion* of the *Printer*) is blotted out, thus, *there may be a nimiety in adding, and ſo is an exceeder in the fear and ſervice of God*. 33.

But to paſs by that, I *anſwer*, firſt that the Doctor no where uſeth that *phraſe*, a *nimiety* or *exceſs* of *religion*, the words [*of religion*] are inſerted by the *citer*, and honeſtly put in *different* letters, to note them to be his own. 34.

The matter is plain, I there ſpeak of an *exceſs* of *fear*, but not of *religion* (ſee the beginning of §. 46. of the *Tr.* of *ſuperſtit.*) and though I after ſay, that *he that thinks himſelf bound or obliges others, as from God, when God neither commands nor forbids, and ſo adds to the commands of God, and fears where there is no reaſon to fear, is an exceeder in the fear and ſervice of God*; yet neither is that, *exceſs of religion*, nor indeed *exceſs of fear* or *of ſervice of God*, but the meaning is apparently this, that in *fearing God*, and *ſerving God*, he is guilty of ſome other *exceſs*, not an *exceſs* of *fear* of *God*, but *fearing* ſomewhat elſe, which he phanſies to come from *God*, when it doth not, this fear of that *ſomething* elſe, is an *exceſſive fear*, more than *religion* ſuggeſts to him, and yet the unhappineſs of it is, this interpoſeth it ſelf in *religion*. 35.

This will be more evident by an *example*; ſuppoſe a man to phanſie that by *Gods law* he ought to *kill* his *Father*, and *fears Gods wrath* if he doth not, this mans *fear* is *exceſſive*, but his *religion* is not; he is an *exceeder in the ſervice of God*, if he do that in *Gods ſervice*, which is no part of it, but quite *contrary* to it, but doth not mean-while *ſerve God too much*, but *too little*, doth not *exceed* but fall *ſhort*, and ſo is far from being *too religious*.

There was certainly great need of *Arguments*, when this was thought fit to be produced to me, who ſure knew my own *meaning* when I thus ſpake, and was likely enough to be able to give this *account* of it. As it is, I have done with his firſt *diſcovery* of *cauſes* of my *miſcarriages*, and ſhall now haſten to the *ſecond*.

SECT. IV.

Exceſs of Religion. Super ſtatutum. Addition to the Rule. Doctrines. Δεισιδαιμονία, Act. 17. 22. Act. 25. 29. *Six conceſſions.* Superſtitioſus. *Worſhipping of Angels.* Superſtitum cultus. *Slaviſh fear. Religion in* Epicurus. *Fear of puniſhment in ſons; in wicked men. The neceſſity thereof. Dogmatizing. Placing more virtue in things than belongs to them.*

THE *ſecond cauſe of the Doctors miſcarriages*, ſaith he, *is his miſpriſion, That exceſs in Religion is not well called Superſtition, or that Superſtition is not exceſs of Religion*, Sect. 27. *&c.* *Numb* 1.

To this I anſwer, Firſt, That my *memory* not ſuggeſting unto me, that I was at all guilty of this *miſpriſion*, thus unlimitedly charged on me, I therefore read over that 27. and the two following Sections, to diſcern what it was that had given him *occaſion* to affirm this, and there I find no ſuch thing. The ſubject of Section 27. being the improperneſs of their *expreſſions*, who reſolve *Superſtition, ſimply* and *abſtractly* taken, in all *Authors*, to ſignifie *evil*; of *Sect.* 28. a ſecond *inconſequence*, that the uſe of *Ceremonies* not preſcribed by *Chriſt*, ſhould firſt be called *Superſtition*, then condemned for deſerving that *title*; of the 29. a third *inconſequent*, that men ſhould *abſtain* from ſome *indifferent Ceremonies*, as *Superſtitious*, and not expect to be counted *ſuperſtitious* for *obliging* themſelves to do the *contrary*. But ſure none of theſe, nor all together, do at all yield any ground for that *concluſion*, which he hath here *miſreported* from them, and that one would think, were a *competent* anſwer to this ſecond *diſcovery of cauſes*. 2.

But then ſecondly, till the ἀμφίβολον be explained, and agreed on, what is meant by *exceſs* of *religion*, 'tis not poſſible for me to *affirm* or *deny*, to *acknowledge* or *diſclaim univerſally*, what I am ſaid to *affirm*. To deal plainly then, and without all *ambiguity*, If by *exceſs* of *Religion* he underſtand the doing of any thing in the *worſhip* of *God*, which *Gods word* doth *not command* (which is the only thing which is of *controverſie* betwixt us, as hath already been manifeſted) then I ſtick not to deny that this is *Superſtition*, or that *ſuperſtition* in any *authentick* notion, or in the *origination* of the word whether 3.

Greek or *Latine*, doth import or comprehend this; and if he ſhall flie to any other ſort of *exceſs*, and contend that to be it, of which he ſpeaks, this will be then the *fallacy* or lying hid in *ambiguities*, which I took care to deprive him of in the laſt *Section*.

4. Fourthly, But he expreſſes ſufficiently what *exceſs* in *religion* he means, by the proof which he firſt offers to *confirm* his *affirmative*. For, for this he brings three proofs, and the firſt is this, becauſe it is an *addition* to the *rule* of *worſhip*, and ſo an *exceſs*, as *ſuper ſtatutum*.

5. Fifthly, Here though it be very hard to reduce this to any *formal* or *legal* proof of the *propoſition* for which it was deſigned (and beſides, it muſt be obſerved, in paſſing, that the *medium* here uſed, is no fitter for the proving of this, than of the *laſt propoſition*; for it is the *ſame* to *both*, and ſo indeed it is *equally* proper for *both*, or for what elſe he pleaſe) yet thus much is clear from it, that by *exceſs* in *Religion*, he means *addition* to the *Rule*, and that we formerly diſcern'd to ſignifie with him the doing any thing *uncommanded* in the *ſervice of God*, and to that we have replyed abundantly in the laſt *Section*.

6. But he adds for the *confirmation* of his proof, one thing not ſaid before, that all ſuch *addition* to the *Rule* muſt be *ſuperſtition* forſooth, becauſe it is *ſuper ſtatutum*, *above what is commanded*, ſuppoſing, it ſeems, that that is the *notation* of the word *ſuperſtition*. And then I deſire the *Diatribiſt*'s leave, that it may for once be my turn to make *diſcoveries* of *cauſes*, to propoſe to him, at leaſt for *conſideration*, whether this may not be his πρῶτον ψεῦδος *fundamental procreative miſtake*, the having inconſiderately in his youth ſwallowed this *etymologie* of the word *ſuperſtition* (I am unwilling to phanſie the *Diatribiſt* to be the *inventer* of it) as if it were ſo calledfrom *ſupra ſtatutum*, *above what is commanded*.

7. If this be not a right *conjecture*, I ſhall profeſs to be at an end of my *ſearch* of *cauſes*; But if it be, I deſire him to allow me the favour once to *diſabuſe* him, by *exacting* this *juſtice* from him to himſelf, to conſider whether any *Laws* of *derivation*, *compoſition*, or *analogie* can permit him ſeriouſly to believe that [*ſtatutum*] is ingredient in compounding *Superſtition*, or that it can be by any Rules deduced from any word in the *Latine* tongue, but *ſuperſtes*, *ſuperſtitis*, and the rather becauſe δεισιδαιμονία, which is reſolved to be the *parallel Greek* to the *Latine ſuperſtition*, and is viſibly ſo, if it be allowed to be deduced from *ſuperſtitum cultus*, hath nothing to do with *ſuper ſtatutum*, but is in plain words a *worſhipping* of *Demons*.

8. Of this ſure I have ſaid enough in the *Treatiſe* of *Superſtition*, to ſatisfie any Scholar, that knows in the leaſt, what belongs to the uſe or the *nature* of words, and ſo much, it ſeems, that Mr. *C.* confeſſes that the *original* of the word was *Heatheniſh*, to ſignifie *ſuperſtitum cultus*, and only adds (δικαίαν ὑποθέσιν, in civility or *fidelity* to his cauſe) that *though this be true*, *'tis well applied by Divines to thoſe additions made to the Rule of worſhip*. But I pray, what is this but to grant the *premiſes*, and deny the *concluſion*? 'Tis certain, and by him acknowledged, that the *original* of the word is another thing, not *ſuper ſtatutum*; what then can he tolerably mean by ['*tis well applied by Divines*]? can *Divines* do *well* to *apply ſuperſtitio* to *ſuper ſtatutum*, when that is no way the nature of the word? Or can any proof be brought from hence, to conclude *ſuperſtition* an *exceſs*, or *addition* to the *rule*, becauſe it is *ſuper ſtatutum*, when there is no affinity between *ſuper ſtatutum* and *ſuperſtition*? what is or can be *unreaſonable*, if this be not?

9. And ſo it appears, how little truth there is in that which ſhuts up this firſt reaſon [*That which the Old Teſtament calls addition to the word, the New calls doctrines, traditions of men, will-worſhip, ſuperſtition.*] In which few words as there be many *infirm* parts, Firſt, That *additions to the word* are in the *N. T.* called *Doctrines* (I ſuppoſe he means, *teaching* ſomewhat elſe *for doctrines*, Mat. 15. 9. *aſſuming* them to be ſuch when they are not: So again, *Mar.* 7. 7. where yet the word *Doctrines* ſignifies the *Scripture* or *Doctrine* of *God*, and ſo the *teaching* their own *traditions for doctrines*, is adding them to the *Scripture*, *Doctrines* there ſimply ſignifying not that *addition*, but that to which the *addition* is made) and ſecondly, that they are called *will-worſhip* (the contrary of which is proved in the *Treatiſe* of *will-worſhip*, and here to ſuppoſe it, is a *begging* of the *queſtion*) ſo ſure this is a third, that *additions* to the *rule* of *worſhip*, are any where in the *New Teſtament* called *ſuperſtition*; I deſire he will ſhew me one ſuch place, for my *Concordance* will not afford it me.

10. 'Tis but a δὶς λεγόμενον, only *twice* there uſed: Firſt, *Act.* 17. 22. by St. *Paul* of the *Athenians*, whom he *perceived* to be δεισιδαιμονεστέρους, *more ſuperſtitious* than others: But theſe ſure never medled with, and ſo *added* not to the *true rule* of *worſhip*, any otherwiſe than as all that *abandon* it, *add* to it, live by ſome other *falſe rule*, and mind not that; and if they are, for ſo doing, to be ſtyled *adders* to the *rule* of *Worſhip*, *adulterers* are ſo in like manner, and ſo by that meaſure or *ſtandard*, every *ſin* in the world is *ſuperſtition*.

11. Secondly, The word is uſed, *Act.* 25. 29. where *Feſtus* ſpeaks of *Pauls* ἰδία δεισιδαιμονία, *own ſuperſtition*, but ſure meant not to accuſe him of *adding* to his or the *Jews rule* of *worſhip*, but underſtood his *own Religion*, and nothing elſe by that *phraſe*. And ſo ſtill μηδὲν ὑγιές, here are as many *miſadventures* amaſt together, as could well be crowded into ſo few words.

12. His ſecond proof now follows, thus, Becauſe as the *defect* in *Religion* is called *profaneneſs*, ſo the *exceſs* is called *ſuperſtition*, as ſtanding in *oppoſition* to it. Alas, it ſeems there is great need of proofs, for this again, as the former, was the very *medium* to prove the firſt *propoſition*, and ſo either the firſt, and this ſecond *propoſition* of his are all one (and then why was it cut in two, by *Lucians beetle*?) or elſe theſe proofs are very *excellent* inſtruments, fitted for all turns *indifferently*. However it is, I ſhall not need provide *new* anſwers to it, but remand it to the former *Section*, where it was conſidered to the utmoſt it could pretend: Only if he pleaſe, I ſhall put it in *form* for him, thus, The *worſhip* of the many *falſe Gods* or *Demons*, is an *exceſs* oppoſed to *Religion*, or *worſhip* of the *one true God* of *heaven* and *earth*, in *Aquinas*'s opinion, and ſo alſo is the *worſhipping* the *true God* after an *undue* or *unlawful* manner, *ergo*, the uſing any *Ceremony* (in the *worſhip* of the *true God*) which the *Scripture* hath *not commanded*, is *ſuperſtition*, and *ſuperſtition* is that: As if he ſhould ſay, *ſuperſtition* is that, becauſe it is ſomewhat elſe, as extreamly diſtant from that, as that which is not *God* is from *God*, or as *unlawful* (for ſo is *ſuperſtition*) is from *lawful*, for ſuch is that which is not *prohibited*.

13. A *third* proof he now adds of his *affirmation*, and that after the manner obſerved in his former

argument,

argument, from the *Doctors* own *conceſſions*, and no leſs than *five*, nay the fourth number being *twice* repeated, no leſs than *ſix* of them: And if I have ſo liberally granted it, I wonder how it came to be my charge, and that as the *cauſe* of my *miſcarriages*, that I *denyed* it.

But 'tis ſtrange to ſee what ἀμελία ἀνθολκῆς can do, *phanſy* firſt, and next *accuſe* me of *denying* 14.
a thing *groſſo modo*, and to prove me to have *erred* in this *denying*, produce *ſix* ſeveral *ſenſes*, where-
in I have granted it, whereas there is in the whole *inditement* but one pretended, wherein I had *denied*
it. In all reaſon thoſe *ſix conceſſions* might have reconciled the *Diatribiſt* to me, and perſwaded him
that I was of his mind, rather than one ſingle appearance of *diſſenting* have thus *provoked* him.

The *Doctors Conceſſions*, ſuch as they are, are evidently reconcileable with all that he hath *propoſed*, 15.
in that *Tract* of *Superſtition*, and the deſcending to a *particular* view of them, as they are marſhalled up
by the *Diatribiſt*, will take away all doubt in this matter.

Firſt, ſaith he, *he grants that ſuperſtitious may denote ſuch an exceſs*, Sect 31. Here I demand what Mr. *C.* 16.
means by *ſuch an exceſs*? that indeed is thus far anſwered already, that he means an *exceſs* of *Religion*:
But what *exceſs* in *Religion*? The *ſuperſtatutum*, every *addition* to the *rule* of *worſhip*, *i. e.* every *uncom-
manded circumſtance*, or *Ceremony* in the *worſhip* of *God*? Thus he muſt mean, if he be *conſtant* to him-
ſelf, and if the *Doctors Conceſſions* yield him any appearance of proof for his *affirmative*. But to ſee the
luck of it, this firſt *citation* from the *Doctor* is ſo far from yielding him any ſuch *teſtimony*, that it is in-
deed the quite *contrary*; for that which the *Doctor* there obſerves *Sect.* 31. is this, that the word *ſuper-
ſtitioſus* may indeed denote ſuch *exceſs*, from the force of the *termination oſus*, but this no more than the
word *religioſus* alſo denotes, in the opinion of *Agellius* out of *Nigidius Figulus*, and conſequently, that
Firſt Superſtitio and *Religio* were all one, in that ſame *Author*'s opinion: and *Secondly*, that it is the ani-
madverſion of *Agellius* upon that *Author*, that all ſuch *exceſſes* are not culpable, or taken in *ill*, but *good*
ſenſes. And then, was not this a dangerous *conceſſion*, fit to be called out, in judgment againſt me, than
which nothing could be more direct to the *aſſerting* mine, and refuting the *Diatribiſts hypotheſis*?

If this account of the word *ſuperſtitioſus* were not ſufficient, to ſecure my pretenſions, which in that 17.
place were only this, that *ſuperſtition* among all *Authors* ſignified not any *criminous exceſs*. I might far-
ther add, that even when the word *ſuperſtitioſus* is but a bare *denominative* from *ſuperſtitio*, and yet is uſed
in an *ill* ſenſe, as when we *Chriſtians* ſay a *ſuperſtitious* perſon, the account is clear, that *ſuperſtition* there
ſignifies *Heathen-worſhip*, or ſomewhat proportionable to it, * *worſhipping* of others beſide the one true
God; and by analogy with that notion of the *ſubſtantive*, the *adjective* fitly denotes him that acts like
one of thoſe *falſe worſhipers*, or agrees with them in ſome eminent thing, which is a branch of their *falſe*
worſhip, as he that makes *obſervations* of *dreams*, and *ominous days*, or *occurrences*, is ſaid commonly to be
ſuperſtitious herein, *i. e.* to imitate the *Auguries* of the *Heathen*, and many the like.

* *Superſtitioſum eſt quicquid ab hominibus inſtitutum eſt ad facienda & colenda idola pertinens.* Aug. *de doctr. Chriſt.* l. 2. c. 20.

The *Second Conceſſion*, that the *worſhip of Angels is an exceſs or addition to the object of worſhip, and* 18.
by him ſtyled that crime of ſuperſtition] a man would wonder to ſee produced by the *Diatribiſt* againſt
me. Tis certain I make the *worſhip* of *Angels ſuperſtition*, *worſhipping* thoſe *fellow creatures*, which
a *Chriſtian* ought not to *worſhip*; But is this an *exceſs* of *religion*, or not rather of *impiety*? *wor-
ſhipping* of the *creature* παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα *beſides* or *over and above the Creator*. Tis true, this is an
addition to the *object* of *worſhip*, as *death* is an *addition* to *life*, *i. e. deſtructive* to the *oneneſs* of that,
which ought *alone* to be *worſhipt*, and admits no *rival* (*ye cannot ſerve God and Mammon*, nor *wor-
ſhip* the *one God*, if ye impart and laviſh out that *incommunicable* priviledge to any other) and ſo *adul-
tery* is an *addition* to the *object* of *marital love* and *fidelity*: But then what is this to the *prejudice* of
uncommanded ceremonies? the uſing of which *ſuper ſtatutum*, the *Diatribiſt* is to demonſtrate to be
ſuperſtition, for about that only, he knows, the *controverſy* is betwixt us.

The *Third Conceſſion* is juſt *parallel* to this, and in part the ſame, *ſuperſtitum cultus*, ſaith he, *the* 19.
worſhip of the Worthies by heathens, or of Saints and Angels by Papiſts, is called ſuperſtition Sect. 3. *moſt
properly, why? but that it adds to the rule of worſhip.*] I muſt not repeat what was ſo lately ſaid, though
the *Diatribiſt* will. Tis evident I affirm all theſe to be *ſuperſtition*, but the uſing of an *uncommanded
rite* is none of theſe; what *heathen worthy*, *Saint*, or *Angel*, is *worſhipped* or *idolized* by my *proſtra-
ting* my ſelf in the *worſhip* of the *true God*, by my *bowing* at the *name* of *Jeſus*, &c. As for the rea-
ſon why the *worſhip* of *heathen Worthies* and *Saints*, and *Angels* by *analogy*, is called *ſuperſtition*, it is
ſtrange again what care of *intereſt* can do. The reaſon, one would think, was viſible enough to the
Diatribiſt, in the very naming of *ſuperſtitum cultus*, theſe *Worthies* and *Saints* are *ſuperſtites*, ſup-
poſed to *live* after *death* (ſure that is the notion of *ſuperſtes*) and ſo the *worſhipping* of ſuch is *ſuperſti-
tion*, and as the *Angels*, ſo the *ſouls* of the *Worthies* that thus *ſurvive* the *bodies* and in the *heathens
theology* are removed εἰς μακάρων νήσους, *to the fortunate Iſlands*, in the *Chriſtians*, to *heaven* or *paradiſe*,
or *Abrahams Boſom*) are ſolemnly ſtyled δαίμονες, and ſo the *worſhipping* of them is δεισιδαιμονία, and
that is *ſuperſtition*. Is not this reaſon enough for the juſtifying the propriety of the uſe of a word,
that it perfectly accords with the *origination* of it both in *Greek* and *Latine*? and then what need of
his *capriccio*, [*why? but that it adds to the rule of worſhip*] Certainly ſo doth *ſacriledge* (even when
it *robs God*) add to the *rule* of *worſhip*, in this ſenſe, doing ſomething which the *rule commands* not, no
nor *permits*, and yet that is not *ſuperſtition*.

The *Fourth Conceſſion* produced is yet more *ſtrange*. *A ſlaviſh fear*, ſaith he, *of God, is granted to* 20.
*be ſuperſtition, becauſe fear of God being worſhip commanded in the firſt Commandment, ſlaviſh fear is an exceſs
of that*] and he hath adventured to cite the *ſections*, wherein tis granted by me, §. 24. 25. of the *Treatiſe*
of *ſuperſtition*. Herein the *Reader* will eaſily ſatisfy himſelf by his own *eyes*; In a word, thoſe *Sections*
ſay no *ſyllable* of *ſlaviſh fear*, or any ſuch matter (and yet the *Printer* hath not miſtaken his
figures) all that they ſay, is this, that *ſuperſtitio* ſometimes ſignifies in *authors* any part of *Divine wor-
ſhip*, which in *obedience* to his *God*, or for *fear* of *vengeance* from him, any *worſhipper* doth perform,
*a thing which every ſect likes in themſelves, but diſlikes in others of a diſtant worſhip, and ſo either ho-
nours or defames with the title as of ſuperſtition, ſo of Religion alſo.* Then, that it alſo ſignifies a *trem-
bling fear* of *Gods puniſhments* due for ſin, ſuch as the *Epicureans*, that denied all *providence*, were
willing to *ſcoff* out of the world. And of this notion of *ſuperſtition*, and equally of *religion* among
the *Epicureans*, and *Cicero* that took it from them, I had ſpoken there at large, from §. 14. to §. 20.
to which I muſt remit the *Reader*, and only add what there I omitted, that all that is there obſerved

would probably receive much light, if we could retrieve one *book* of *Plutarch*, which is loſt, and in ſtead of which I can now only give him the *title* of it, περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον *of ſuperſtition to Epicurus*, differing (it ſeems, both by the *addition* of πρὸς Ἐπίκουρον, and conſequently in the *ſubject* of it) from that which is now extant of *Plutarchs* περὶ δεισιδαιμονίας, which hath no conſiderable *aſpect* on *Epicurus*, or his followers and *Philoſophy*, either to *defend* or *accuſe* it. Of this ſee the *learned Gaſſend* in his *life* of *Epicurus*.

21. But to return, what pretence can there be thus to *change* my words in an *unprofitable* citation (when if it had been *ſlaviſh fear* in his notion of it, of which I ſpake, yet that had been far enough from the uſing of *uncommanded ceremonies* or *inſtituting* of *Feſtivals*) and in ſtead of [*that divine worſhip which any performs in obedience to his God, or for fear of puniſhment from him, and which* Epicurus *deſired to ſcoff out of the world*] to ſubſtitute *ſlaviſh fear* of *God*, or an *exceſs of that fear of God which is preſcribed as worſhip in the firſt commandment ?*] Can it enter into any *Chriſtians* heart to think or ſay, that *Epicurus* was in the right in that part of his *Theology*, and conſequently that it was an *exceſs* of *fear* which *Epicurus* deſired to exterminate? This is to ſay, that all *religion*, belief of *hell*, infinite *puniſhments* apportioned to ſinners in another world, are *exceſs* of *fear*, and (under the title of *ſlaviſh*) *criminous*, and to be *caſt out*. This certainly was *Epicurus*'s meaning, and the verſes in *Lucretius* demonſtrate it, where he thus argues,

> *— Nam ſi nullum finem eſſe putarent*
> *Ærumnarum homines, nullâ ratione valerent*
> *Religionibus atq; minis obſiſtere vatum.*

If men ſhould believe endleſs puniſhments, they could never reſiſt the religions, and threatnings of the Prieſts.

* *Quid enim intereſt utrum Deos neges an infames?* † *Superſtitio error inſanus, amandos timet, quos colit violat.* Seneca Epiſtol. 124.

And who would have expected the *Diatribiſt* a favourer of this *ſect*, as he muſt be, if this *fear* of *God*, which *Epicurus* called *Religion* or *Superſtition*, be by him lookt on as an *exceſs* of that *worſhip* of the *firſt commandment ?* for that was *Epicurus*'s very notion of it, placing his own opinion in the *midſt*; and as on one ſide, downright *Atheiſm*, denying any *God* at all, ſo on the other, *belief* of a *providence*, of *rewards* and *puniſhments*; which as the mother of *fear* or *perturbation*, and interrupter of the γαλήνη τοῦ βίου *quiet of life* (his great aim) and very * *injurious* to the *Gods*, he rejected as another *extream*, under the title of † *Superſtition*. But of this ſure I have ſpoken abundantly, and did not foreſee that Mr. *C.* was to be admoniſht of this worſt *principle* in all *Epicurus* his *philoſophie*.

22. Yet becauſe he is fallen into it, under colour of the ordinary *divinity* concerning *ſlaviſh fear*, and becauſe mention of this *ſlaviſh fear* as of a criminous exceſs, and a branch of *ſuperſtition* recurs very frequently in theſe *Diatribæ*, I ſhall not reſiſt the *invitation* of ſaying ſomewhat in this place, once for all, of *ſlaviſh fear :* By that I ſuppoſe he underſtands *fear* of *puniſhment*, as by *filial fear*, a *reverential obedience*, proceeding wholly from *love*, without any thing of *fear* in it. Concerning this *diſtinction* I ſhall firſt demand, whether it have any thing of *propriety* in it, *i. e.* whether *ſons* may not *lawfully* and *reaſonably fear puniſhment* from their *parents*, in caſe they ſhall deſerve it, even the *greateſt puniſhment*, *exheredation*, and caſting out of the *family*, upon their continuing *diſobedient* and *refractary* to their fathers *commands*, and whether this very *fear* be not ſo uſeful to reſtrain the *exceſſes* of *youth*, and keep them within that *obedience*, that no *parent* will ever think fit that the *child* ſhall know or think that his *diſobedience*, whatſoever the *degree* of it may be, ſhall not be thus *puniſht*, and laſtly, whether it be not *duty* in the *child* thus to *fear*, and proportionably whether this be not *applicable* to every *child* of *God*, eſpecially being exhorted to it, *Heb.* 4. 1. *Let us fear, leſt a promiſe being made of entring into his reſt, any of you ſhould ſeem to come ſhort of it* (adding thereto *Heb.* 12. 28, 29.) and this *diſtinction* being founded in the likeneſs between a *child* of *God*, and a *child* of an *human parent :* If this be ſo, then there can be no *fitneſs* or *propriety* in the *diſtinction* thus explicated, nor can the *fear* of *puniſhment* be *diſcriminatively* called *ſlaviſh*, nor with *juſtice* defined an *exceſs* of *fear*.

23. *Secondly*, The *ſlaviſh fear* I ſhall ſuppoſe in the *Diatribiſts* notion to be ſuch as is in a *wicked* man, and then it muſt be either the *fear* of *divine vengeance* for ſin committed *formerly*, or for ſin at the *time* of committing it, or for ſin *before* he commit it; and I demand how any of theſe three *fears* can by a *Chriſtian* duly be called an *exceſs*, or with any *propriety ſuperſtition ?* For ought not the *wicked* man to *fear puniſhment* for his ſins paſt, when *God* affirms ſolemnly there is *no peace, no peace* to ſuch? be not the *judgments* of *God* gone out againſt that man, and if that *Lyon roar*, ſhall not he *fear*, if *vengeance* be denounced from *God* againſt him, is it a ſeaſon for him to *caſt* off *fear ?* or if he doth, is not this *carnal ſecurity ?* and is not the *contrary* apprehenſion (i. e. *fear*) neceſſary to reduce him? in a word, are not the *terrors* of the *Goſpel* part of the *Goſpel*, and on purpoſe deſigned to bring ſuch a man to *repentance*, and can he be ſaid to *believe* the *Goſpel*, which believes not that part of it, or will they be motives of *Reformation* to him, if he do not *apply* them to himſelf, in reſpect of his preſent ſtate? and can he ſo *apply* them, who doth not *fear* the *execution* of *them ?*

24. So at the very point of *committing* any wilful *ſin*, ought he not to look upon it, as that againſt which the *wrath* of *God* is denounced, and can he do ſo, and *believe God*, and not *fear* that *wrath* may fall on him, and that as long as he remains under the power of ſuch *ſin*, he remains under the *wrath* of *God ?* Are all the evil *abodes* of an *accuſing conſcience* in a vitious perſon, *exceſs ?* nay is not the *contrary* the *higheſt* pitch both of *preſumption* and *danger*, the very *root bearing gall and wormwood*, to *bleſs himſelf in his heart, ſaying, I ſhall have peace, though I walk in the imagination of my heart*, Deut. 29. 19.

25. Laſtly, *Before* the commiſſion of ſin, when he enters into *temptation*, is not the *fear* of *hell* an uſeful *reſtraint* to him, is it not both his *duty* and his *bridle*, is there, or can there be any *exceſs* in that? ſhould he *fear*, or ſhould he *not fear ?* If he ſhould not, then what can keep him from *running* into all *exceſs* of *riot ?* ſhall *love* of *God*, or *virtue ?* but the *wicked* man, as *wicked*, is ſuppoſed to have none of that in his heart: But if he ſhould, if it be his duty to *fear*, and to *fear hell*, in caſe he ſhall *thus* go on, then ſtill how can it be an *exceſs ?*

26. The conſideration of theſe few things may perhaps give the *Diatribiſt* reaſon to change his mind concerning

concerning *ſlaviſh fear*, and no longer to think it an *exceſs* of *Religion*, nor, as ſuch, capable of the title of *Superſtition*.

The truth is, what is amiſs in ſuch *fear*, is a *defect*, not *exceſs*, a want of *love*, not any unproportionable *meaſure* of *fear*; *God* is made up of *goodneſs*, as well as *juſtice*, and the *Goſpel* compounded of *promiſes* as well as *threats*, and the *love* of *Chriſt* ought to *conſtrain* us, as well as the *terrors* of the *Lord* to *perſwade*; and he that hath a quick ſenſe of one, and none of the other, he is not an *exceeder* in *fear*, but *deficient* in *love*; and ſo ſtill the mention of *ſlaviſh fear* in this place, and frequently in the firſt *exercitation*, is very unapplicable to the purpoſe, for which it is brought, as an inſtance of an *exceſs* of *religion*, or *ſuperſtition*. 27.

Some little thing more I ſhall perhaps be forced to ſay to it hereafter, but this ſhall not be *repeated*, and ſo muſt be *remembred* from hence. 28.

The fourth *Conceſſion* of the Doctors is obſerved to be this, that to *affirm God to command, when he doth not, is granted to be ſuperſtition, under the notion of nimiety or exceſs, becauſe that man adds to the commands of Chriſt*, §. 46.] To this I anſwer, that for them who are reſolved to have *ſuperſtition* taken in the ſenſe of *nimiety*, and in that ſenſe to be oppoſed to *religion*, as an *extream* to the *mediocrity*, I did aſſign this of impoſing *commandments on God* (and ſo *obligations* on our ſelves, and others) which he never *gave*, as an *exceſs* of *fear*, a being *afraid* of *God*, when we need not, and ſo proportionable to one notion of δεισιδαιμονία, ariſing from the conſideration of the word δείδω (which may ſignifie perhaps a *trembling*, and ſo *cowardly fear*, δειλία) in that *compoſition*; And if hereby I have gratified the *Diatribiſt*, and yielded the *Dogmatizer* a *Superſtitious* perſon, I wonder why this might not have been taken notice of in my behalf, and ſo ſaved him the pains of *affixing* this *poſition* on me, that *exceſs* in *religion* is not well called *Superſtition*, which 'tis viſible, and by himſelf now confeſt, that in this ſenſe, I affirm it to be; ſee that 46. §. of *Superſtition*. 29.

Mean-while the *Doctors hypotheſis* is ſtill ſecure; for this no way belongs to the bare *uſing* in the *private* man, or the *Magiſtrates preſcribing Ceremonies* in the *worſhip* of *God*, neither of them doing it upon pretence of *Divine precept*. 30.

The very ſame reply belongs exactly to my laſt *conceſſion*, vouched by him, that to *place more virtue in things, than God or nature hath put in them, is granted to be an exceſs, becauſe it adds to the promiſes of Chriſt, and called Superſtition by me*, §. 45.] For this is another *particular*, which I allow to be an *exceſs*, and, when it is not meer *folly*, fit to be comprehended under the ſtyle of *Superſtition*, for this farther reaſon beſides thoſe which I there mentioned, becauſe ſuch *beliefs* as theſe, are moſtly borrowed from the *heathen* δεισιδαίμονες, and are *remainders* of their *practices*, as S^t *Auguſtine Ep.* 73. ſpeaks of the *ligatures*, *Execranda ſuperſtitio ligaturarum, in quibus inaures*, &c. *non ad placendum hominibus, ſed ad ſerviendum dæmonibus adhibentur, the accurſed ſuperſtition of ligatures, among which are the ear-rings*, &c. *uſed not for the pleaſing of men, but to ſerve devils.* This *teſtimony* the *Reader* may ſubjoin, if he pleaſe, to the *Supellex* already prepared for him in this kind §. 26. of *Superſt.* and diſcern how far I have been from *denying*, what I am accuſed here to *deny*, and yet as far from *yielding* him any *foundation* of *concluding*, that the *Ceremonies* or *Feſtivals* of our *Church* are in the leaſt degree guilty of *Superſtition*. 31.

And ſo much for his *ſecond diſcovery* of *cauſes* of my (*phanſied*, not *real*) *miſtakes*. 32.

SECT. V.

The innocence of Will-worſhip. Analogie with voluntary oblations under the law. Seeming Contradiction. The authority of Chryſoſtom *and* Theophylact. *The ſecond Commandment. Reducing all ſins to the Decalogue. Addition to the rule, Worſhip of Angels. Other ſins beſide that of Dogmatizing.*

THE third part of his *diſcovery* of *cauſes* belongs peculiarly to that of *Will-worſhip*, thus; *Numb.* 1.

The third, ſaith he, *is, that* ἐθελοθρησκία *or Will-worſhip, is nothing but voluntary worſhip, as innocent as the freewill offerings*, &c.] which *propoſition* of mine I muſt ſuppoſe made up of theſe *two* parts, firſt, that *Will-worſhip* is nothing elſe but *voluntary worſhip*; ſecondly that being ſo, 'tis *innocent*, and *as innocent* as *freewill offerings*: And in which part of theſe, *one* or *both*, the *miſtake* lyes, I am not told, but both together *indiſtinctly* are propoſed, as my third *fundamental miſcarriage*. 2.

And then, as to the firſt, I cannot begin without ſome *remark*, that it ſhould be poſſible to be lookt upon by this *Diatribiſt*, as a *paradox*, or *miſtake*, or *miſcarriage* in any man, and ſuch as is meet to be noted, as the moſt *fruitful* mother of many *more*, that ἐθελοθρησκία or *Will-worſhip* ſhould be affirmed to be nothing elſe but *voluntary worſhip*. Where I have no farther appeal to make, than either to the *ears* of all men of *common* underſtanding, or to the *Gloſſaries* and *Interpreters* of words. For is there any the niceſt *difference* imaginable betwixt *Will-worſhip* and *voluntary worſhip*, ſave that in the latter [*voluntary*] is of a *latter origination*, from *voluntas*, *voluntarius*; but [*will*] though perhaps from the *Latin originally*, is yet more antiently *infranchiſed* among us of *England?* I ſhall make ſhort work of this, if it be taken for any part of the miſtake, by deſiring one favour from Mr. *C.* viz. that he will *tranſlate* either the *Greek*, ἐθελοθρησκεία, or the *Engliſh*, *Will-worſhip*, into *Latin* for me; will it not ſurely be *voluntarius cultus*, and is not that, being turn'd again into *Engliſh*, *voluntary Worſhip?* What can be more *evident* than this? 3.

But it may be hoped that this was not my *miſtake*, but what follows, *viz.* that this *voluntary worſhip* is *as innocent* as the *freewill offering*. But it is not poſſible, that ſhould be the *miſtake* neither; for *freewill offerings* under the *Law*, were certainly one *ſpecies* of *voluntary worſhip*, and ſo known by the title of ἑκούσια, *voluntary*, and therefore thoſe being *innocent*, 'tis certain that all the other *fellow ſpecies* of *voluntary worſhip*, bearing *proportion* with theſe, and having no *circumſtance* to defame them, which the other had not, muſt needs be *innocent* alſo. 4.

That thus it is, and this is the notion of the word in the only place where it is uſed in the *New Teſtament*, 5.

Teſtament, Col. 2. hath already been largely vindicated in the *Tract* of *Will-worſhip*, which the *Reader* is requeſted to reſort to, and the *Annotation* on *Col.* 2. where many more evidences are added to it, which make it *ſuperfluous* to *add* yet more in this place; Only I muſt ſecure it from the *Diatribiſt's* ἀντιθέσεις or *objections*: And the firſt is by way of *velitation*, that it *ſeems a contradiction in adjecto, that voluntary worſhip and uncommanded ſhould be innocent.*

6. There is no end of diſputing about *appearances*; That may *ſeem* to Mr. *C.* which doth not to other men; and *Ammonius* tells me, this is very ordinarily obſervable in *this* very matter, τινές εἰσιν αἱ δοκοῦσαι ἀντιφάσκειν ὲ μέντοι ἀντιφάσκουσι, *many propoſitions ſeem indeed to be contradictory, but yet are not ſuch.* But I ſhall ask, Is it what it *ſeems*, or is it not? If it be not, why was this mentioned by one, who can diſtinguiſh betwixt *true* and *falſe*, *colour* and *varniſh*, *reality* and *appearance?* If it be, I deſire to be inſtructed, what *Logician* hath ſo defined *contradiction*, as will any way accord to this *expreſſion.*

Εἰς τὸ περὶ ἑρμην. f. 89.

7. The only *definition* or *deſcription* of *contradiction in adjecto* that ever I heard of, is, when that which is *added* is *contradictory* to that which was firſt ſet; and *contradictions*, we know, are *affirmations* and *negations* of the *ſame* thing in the *ſame* reſpect, either *formally*, which the *interpretcrs* of *Ariſtotle* all διαγωνίως *diagonial*, μαχομένας πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἀντιφατικῶς, *fighting one with another in direct form of contradiction*, ὴ πᾶς, τῷ ὲ πᾶς, the *enunciation* [*every man*] to the *negation* [*not every man*] or *interpretatively*, i. e. by certain *conſequence* or *implication*, as if I ſhould ſay, *Socrates is not a man*, here were a *contradiction in adjecto*, becauſe in the *ſubject* of the *propoſition*, he that had the appellation of *Socrates*, was ſuppoſed to be a *man*, and yet in the *predicate*, that is *denied* of him. But certainly here is no ſuch thing, either *formally*, or by *implication*, in this propoſition, *Voluntary*, or *uncommanded worſhip is innocent*;] Of *forbidden worſhip* this were true, for *innocence* to be attributed to that, were *contradiction in adjecto*; but there is a wide *difference* betwixt *forbidden* and *voluntary*, as wide as between *unlawful* and *lawful*, all being *lawful*, which is *not forbidden*, elſe there were not *univerſal truth* in the *Apoſtles maxim*, that *ſin is a tranſgreſſion of the Law.*

8. I ſhall convince what I ſay, by this plain inſtance, *Theophylact* ſaith of many men ὑπερβαίνουσι πολλὰ τῶν ἐπιλαγμάτων, that they *exceed* or *tranſcend many of the commandments*; I demand, Do they *offend* and *ſin*, and are *nocent* in ſo doing, or did that *holy* man think they did? Tis evident he did *not*; for he, after his manner, borrows from, and tranſcribes * *Chryſoſtom*, and in ſtead of πολλοὶ *many*, he reads πνευματικοὶ the *ſpiritual*; They, ſaith he, *do many things with deſire and appetite, and manifeſt it* πῷ τῷ ὑπερβαίνειν τὰ ἐπιλάγματα, *in that they do even exceed the commands*; It appears therefore, that to theſe two *holy* and *learned men*, it *ſeemed* not, what to Mr. *C.* it *ſeems*, that there is *contradiction in adjecto*, in affirming *voluntary* and *uncommanded worſhip* to be *innocent*. A multitude of the like *teſtimonies* are put together in the *Annotat.* on *Col.* 2. which may be ſufficient to juſtify me from *ſingularity*, that I diſcern not the phanſied *ſeeming contradiction.*

* In. Rom. 8.

9. But this *affirmation* again of the *Diatribiſt* will not want its *proofs*; *four*, that pretend to that title, are here annexed.

10. For *Firſt*, ſaith he, *It's expreſly againſt the Second Commandment, which forbids all worſhip not expreſly commanded by God.* I muſt not complain of my *eyes*, or other *faculties*, becauſe they are the beſt that *God* hath given me; but I may wiſh for ſuch ſupplies as Mr. *C.* hath met with, for elſe I am ſure I ſhall never ſee the leaſt *glimpſe* of that which he mentions ſo expreſly out of the *Second Commandment*. What is *expreſly againſt the Second Commandment*, ſhould, methinks, oppoſe ſome *expreſs words* in it, and then it muſt follow, that there are ſuch *expreſs words* there, which *forbid all worſhip not commanded by God*; and this, not only as by *worſhip* are meant the *ſorts* and *ſpecies* of *worſhip*, but the very *acceſſaries* and *ceremonies* of *worſhip*, and all the *expreſſions* and *emanations* of the *inward* fulneſs of the *religious* heart. But my *Optick Glaſs* will not afford me any ſuch *proſpect* in the *Second Commandment*: All ſorts of *Graven Images*, and ſuch like, I have there a fair *view* of, and an *expreſs* ſevere interdict of *worſhipping* them; but for all *kinds* and all *circumſtances* of *worſhip* which are *not commanded*, *kneeling*, *proſtrating* the *body* to the inviſible true *God*, the *times* and *degrees* of ardency of *worſhip*, the *abſtinences*, *ſelf-denyals* attendant on it, ſure there is nothing ſaid *expreſly* there, either to *command* or *forbid* them; and for any *general* comprehenſive *phraſe*, that can rationally contain a prohibition of all which is *not commanded*, I can ſay no more, but that the firſt verſe of *Geneſis* or any other in the *Bible*, hath as much of this to my eye, as the *Second Commandment.*

11. The buſineſs we are all this while upon, is, the *diſcovering* of *cauſes* of *miſtakes*, and therefore I muſt be excuſed again, upon the ſcore of the *example* before me, if I once more attempt to ſhoot my *ſhaft*, and by this firſt argument paſs my *conjecture* of the *cauſe* of the *prefacers miſtake* in this matter. It is the ſolemn *practice* of ſome *Caſuiſts*, to reduce all ſins in the world to ſome or other of the *Commandments* of the *Decalogue*; wherein I am not ſure that they have aim'd aright; for ſeparate *gluttony* and *drunkenneſs* (as ſure they may be *ſeparated*, and yet continue to be ſins) from ſome accidental *conſequences* of them, as *waſting* of *health*, which may aſſign either of them to the *ſixth Commandment*, and the like, and you will hardly tell whither to reduce the *intemperate* uſe of the *creature*; And ſo for that ſort of *lying* or *falſe ſpeaking* which is no way *hurtful*, or deſigned to be *hurtful* to the *neighbour*, and many the like inſtances might be given. But on this I inſiſt not with any *concernment*, but leave it to prudent conſideration, what *neceſſity* there is, that all *laws natural* and *poſitive divine* ſhould be reduced to one or more of theſe *Ten Commandments*. This is not that which I meant to ſay, but farther to offer it to *conſideration*, whether it be not viſible, that thoſe *Caſuiſts* which have *erred* in judging the *unlawfulneſs* of ſome things, have not eaſily been induced to *reduce* them to ſome or other of the *Commandments*, as offences againſt the *affirmative* or *negative* part, and if not againſt the *words* or *ſenſe*, yet againſt the *Analogie* of it.

12. According to this practice it is moſt neceſſarily *conſequent*, that he that hath been poſſeſt of the *unlawfulneſs* of *ceremonies* and *worſhip uncommanded*, and hath not ſo far conſidered, as to rectifie his *judgment* in that matter (by weighing this one thing, that whatſoever is not *forbidden* is *lawful*, not, whatſoever is *not commanded* is *unlawful*) muſt whenſoever he ſhall write *caſes* of *conſcience*, or *comment* on the *Decalogue*, reduce this to ſome *interdict* under one of the *ten* heads, and all the other *nine* renouncing it, force it in by ſome appearance of *analogie*, to the ſecond *Commandment*; And then

it

it falls out, that ſo many men, *diſaffected* to the *Government* and *Ceremonies* of the *Church* of *England*, have written on the *Commandments*, that it can be no more matter of *wonder*, that *uncommanded worſhip* ſhould be crowded into the ſecond *Commandment* (and there long agoe imbibed by the *Diatribiſt*, and never queſtioned ſince) than that Mr. *Brightman* ſhould find the *Church* of *England* of this age, among the ſeven *Cities* of *Aſia* in S^t^ *Johns* time, or that Mr. *Parker* ſhould make the *uſing* the *croſs* in *Baptiſm*, a breach of every one of the *ten Commandments*, and branch a book in *folio*, into the *Atheiſm*, as I remember, I am ſure, the *Idolatry*, the *&c.* till at laſt, the *concupiſcence* of the *Croſs*.

And then I ſhall but ask this *Diatribiſt*, whether he can heartily believe, that the uſe of that *cere-* 13.
mony was really guilty of all thoſe ſeveral *tranſgreſſions* of the *Law* of *God*; and if he ſhall ἀπέχειν, beſeech him to *examine* over again his own *affirmation* here, Firſt, Whether any one man hath ſaid ſo fully what here he hath, that *voluntary* and *uncommanded worſhip* is *expreſly againſt* the ſecond *Commandment* (they that only *reduce* it thither, fall ſhort of him.) Secondly, Whether they that have thought fit to *refer* it thither by *reduction*, have produced any *cogent* or ſatisfactory *reaſon* for ſo doing; and the next time he affirms this from them, annex the *reaſon*, ſuch as may juſtifie a moſt rigid *concluſion* to the *conſciences* of all others who may be concerned in it, either in order to their own *practice*, or the *judging* of others. And I ſhall not farther exagitate this his *firſt proof*.

The ſecond *proof* is the ſame we have had twice already, for the aſſerting the two former *affirma-* 14.
tions, *voluntary worſhip is an addition to the rule of worſhip*, *and eo nomine Superſtition and that is ſinful.*] But I have already ſhewed, that all *additions* to that *rule*, are not *Superſtition*, and that all that is by any called *Superſtition*, is not *eo nomine* ſinful; and ſo I am ſafe from that *proof* alſo.

So in like manner from the third, which is but another *repetition*, put in form of *queſtion* [*Why is* 15.
the worſhip of Angels and Saints criminal? but becauſe it was invented and added by the will of man?] This *queſtion* was anſwered long ſince, that the *worſhip* of all *creatures* is *criminal*; becauſe the *command* is *poſitive* and *excluſive*, that *God*, and *none* but the *one God* is to be *worſhipped*; and though the doing what is *not commanded*, is not a *ſin*, yet the doing what is *forbidden*, muſt needs be *ſinful*, and ſuch is the *worſhipping of Angels*, &c.

What he here adds in the cloſe of this third proof, that they (I ſuppoſe, who *worſhip Angels*) *do* 16.
not urge it as a commandment of God] was ſure very unneceſſarily inſerted; For I never doubted but there are other *ſins* beſides *dogmatizing*, and can now promptly ſuggeſt to him competent ſtore of *inſtances*; ſure the *murtherer* is a *ſinner*, though he *teach* it not for a *doctrine* from *heaven*, that it is *lawful* to *kill* his *brother*, &c. And then, why ſhould not the *worſhipper* of *Angels*, againſt expreſs *precept* (*Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me*, *Thou ſhalt not bow down nor worſhip*) be a *tranſgreſſer* of that *Commandment*, though he *oblige* not, as from *God*, any other man to do the like?

His laſt proof is *ab incommodo*, *If will-worſhip*, ſaith he, *be innocent*, *I cannot ſee how all that rabble* 17.
of Superſtitious worſhip at Rome *can be condemned*, *for they are not held out as Commandments of God*, *but traditions of men.*] The *anſwer* laſt given to the *appendage* of the third *proof* is ſufficient to this alſo. Other faults there may be in *worſhip*, beſide *holding it out as the Commandment of God*. It may for the *object* of *worſhip* take in ſomewhat beſide *God*, or for the *ceremonies* it may multiply them unprofitably, *ridiculouſly*, or it may be, pretend more *virtue* in them, than really belongs to them, and many the like. But theſe I mention, becauſe if it be true, what is here ſuggeſted, that the *worſhip at Rome*, is really *ſuperſtitious*, and that there is a *rabble* of that *worſhip* there, as is ſuppoſed in the *queſtion*, the *anſwer* is already given by the very *propoſal* of it, and that without any *violence* to my *hypotheſis*, which undertook not to juſtifie all, or any other *Churches* in their *worſhip*, but only that of *England*, which is known to be *free*, where *Rome*, I add, where the *Greek Church* in as high a degree as *Rome*, is guilty. And this may ſerve for the third grand *diſcovery* of *cauſes*.

SECT. VI.

The Lawfulneſs of inſtituting the Chriſtmaſs Feſtival. Of Church Laws.

THE laſt ground of *miſtake* aſſigned by the *Diatribiſt*, is, that the *Doctor takes for granted*, *That* Numb. 1.
a Church or particular perſon hath power to inſtitute and obſerve worſhip not commanded by God, *which remains upon him to prove before he can vindicate his Feſtival* (*as he and others maintain it*) *from the double crime of Superſtition and Will-worſhip.*

If this *differ* from the *third* (as in reaſon it ought, elſe why ſhould it be *added* to it?) then the 2.
miſtake is not *only*, or ſo much, that I *affirm*, as that I *take for granted*, when I *ought* to *prove*, *that a Church or particular perſon hath power to inſtitute and obſerve worſhip not commanded by God*. Now I ſhall at once *prove* my *affirmation*, and apply it to *my Feſtival* as he calls it, and ſhew that I have already *proved* it, and ſo not *taken* it for *granted*, as is here ſuggeſted.

For the former, I offer this *probation*, whatſoever is in it ſelf perfectly *free* or *lawful* by the *Law* of 3.
God, and that liberty no way *retrenched*, That a *Church or particular perſon hath power to inſtitute and obſerve*; But the *Chriſtmaſs Feſtival* or *annual commemoration* of *Chriſt's birth*, is in it ſelf perfectly *free* or *lawful* by the *Law* of *God*, and that *liberty* no way *retrenched*; *Ergo*.

Of the *major* I ſuppoſe there can be no doubt; if there be, theſe *three conſiderations* will clear it. 4.
Firſt, Becauſe whatſoever is perfectly *free* and *lawful*, that the *Church* or the *Chriſtian* hath *power* to do, unleſs that *liberty* be ſome way *retrenched* to him; Secondly, What every *particular Chriſtian* may freely do, that he may ſtill do, when it is by the *Church preſcribed* or *inſtituted*; elſe that *act* of the *Church preſcribing*, ſhall render that which it *preſcribes unlawful*, being perfectly *lawful* before that *preſcription* (and if upon the moſt *Anarchical* principles, that ſhould be ſuppoſed to have any *reaſon* in it, then ſtill that *liberty* is ſome way *retrenched*, the contrary to which is ſuppoſed in the *major propoſition*.) Thirdly, Becauſe the *Church*, meaning by that word the *Univerſal Church* of *God*, whether of the *Apoſtles* times, *including* them, *chief paſtors* thereof, or of the *purer* times *ſucceeding*, together with

with the *Governours* of each *Church* ſucceeding the *Apoſtles*, hath the power of *Stewards*, noted by the *Keyes* intruſted to it by *Chriſt*, and conſequently may *diſpoſe*, *order*, *inſtitute* for her members, in thoſe things which ſhe ſhall judge to tend to the *honour* of *God*, and to *edification*, though it be not immediately *commanded* (ſo it be not any way *prohibited*) by *God*.

5. As for the *minor*, that the *Chriſtmaſs Feſtival* is thus *free* and *lawful*, doth alſo appear by the no *prohibition* of *God's* in force againſt it, by the *lawfulneſs* of *praiſing God*, and *commemorating* the gift of *Chriſt* on *any* day (one or more) in the *year*, and conſequently on the 25. of *December*, by the *analogie* of other *Feſtivals* among the people of *God* in all ages, and by the *anſwer* to all *objections*, to the *contrary*, and the *evidence* of the matter, that this *liberty* hath no way yet been *retrencht* by *God*, that gave it. And all this ſeverally cleared in the former *diſcourſes*, and the chief of them again vindicated here, by anſwer to the *Diatribiſt's* pretended *diſcovery* of my *miſtakes*.

6. On which that I do not now think my ſelf obliged farther to inſiſt, by addition of *more evidences*, the reaſon will be ſoon diſcerned, by taking notice of the *one proof* which he here ſubjoins to this his *laſt* ground, in theſe words. [*Which I prove by this one argument, If all additions to the word in matter of worſhip be criminous and ſinful, as prohibited by God*, Deut. 4. 2. *and elſewhere, then no man or Church can without ſin add any worſhip to that commanded by God; But the firſt is true, Ergo.*] Where it ſeems the whole matter is devolved to that one iſſue, whether the *text*, *Deut.* 4. 2. and the ſecond *Commandment* (for there is not any *other* [*elſewhere*] any *other text* by the *Diatribiſt* produced to that purpoſe) be ſufficient to prejudge the *uſing* or *inſtituting* any *ceremony* or *Feſtival*, which is *not commanded by God*; And I hope this *ſuppletory* to thoſe former *diſcourſes*, which hath conſidered thoſe two *texts*, hath ſufficiently *convinced* that; And ſo there is no more now needful to be *added* to this matter.

7. • Thus have I traced this *Diatribiſt* through every branch of his *diſcovery* of *cauſes*, and ſhewed, I hope competently, on which ſide the *miſtakes* ly, and if there be no more *miſcarriages* in thoſe three *tracts* of *Superſtition*, *Will-worſhip*, and *Feſtivals*, than this *Preface*, aſſigned to that work, hath *diſcovered* to me, I ſhall have no need farther to importune the *reader* with a *Superfluous vindication*, unleſs upon this ſcore only, that 'tis poſſible that the *Diatribiſt* may not have ſummed up his *bill* aright, that there may ſtill remain ſome particular *miſtakes diſcoverable* by the view of the *particulars*, which are here omitted in the *foot* of the *account*, and then I muſt not take advantage of *falſe reckoning*. And upon this ſlender *account* I muſt now ſtill attend his *motions*, and ſhall do it, in confidence, that what hath been here, in *anſwer* to his *Preface*, ſaid ſo largely, will not be exacted of me again at every turn, by way of *Repetition*. On which ground it is evident, that I am to make no *return* to the remainder, which is the *recapitulating* of this *Preface*.

CHAP. III.

Of Superſtition peculiarly. And firſt of his Prolegomenon on that Subject.

SECT. I.

Anſwer to §. 1. *The method uſed to find the meaning of the word.*

Numb. 1. IN his *firſt Diatribe*, that of *Superſtition*, §. 1. I may lightly touch and paſs over the diſlike of my *method* in writing of *Will-worſhip* before *Superſtition*, together with the *reaſon*, that being more *general*, this a *ſpecies* under it; for though it be certain, that I am not of his mind, that the *former* is a *ſpecies* of the *latter*, and ſo that I cannot admit of his *reaſon* of *change*, or that his is, as he ſaith, a more *juſt methodical order* of *tractation*, yet I ſhall not ingage in a diſpute of their *precedence*, but only reply to the latter part of his *firſt* §. which directs the manner of inquiring, what *Superſtition* is, not *by ſearching into the monuments of heathen Authors Latin or Greek from the names or ſenſes by them given, as by the judgment of Divines*, &c.

2. In *anſwer* to this I ſhall need no farther *reply* than to *remind* him, that as there is no better way to underſtand the full importance of *words*, than to examine them in their *origination*, and their uſage among the *beſt Authors*, *Maſters* of *words*, not only *profane* but *ſacred*, ſo ſure this is the very *method* I have taken, for δεισιδαιμονία (and *Superſtition*) viewing it in the *antient heathens*, in the *parts* firſt, then in the *compoſition*, and ſo alſo in the *ſacred Scripture* (which I hope is no *heathen Author*) as oft as it is found there, in *Lactantius* and S^t *Auguſtine*, which ſure *knew what true Religion meant*, whatſoever he is pleaſed to ſuggeſt of my *way* and *Authors*, and are as competent *judges* of *Superſtition*, as his later *Divines*, that have reduced the uſe of all *ceremonies*, not *commanded* by *God*, to the ſecond *Commandment* (and to *Deut.* 4. 2.) under the title of *Superſtition*.

SECT.

SECT. II.

Anſwer to §. 2. Ameſius's *definition. The matter of the four firſt Commandments. The Affirmative part of the ſecond Commandment. The Diatribiſt's miſadventure about Duty in the midſt. No prohibition of other holy dayes in the fourth Commandment.* Jeroboams *act*, 1 Kin. 12. 32. *The Rubenites altar*, Joſh. 22. Naaman's *altar. Chriſtmaſs Feſtival parallell to it. The exceſſes in each Commandment.*

IN the ſecond §. where he ſhews out of Doctor *Ames*, how *Superſtition* may be fitly defined by *Aquinas*, *a vice contrary to Religion in the exceſs*, viz. *in order to the acts or external means of worſhip ſuperadded by the wiſdom or will of man, when a man tenders worſhip either to whom it is not due, or not in that manner which he ought*] he knows this, in the *obvious* ſenſe of the *words*, ſuch as from *Aquinas* was lately cited, is perfectly agreeable to my *affirmations*, who make the *worſhip* of all but *God*, and the *worſhip* of *God* in any *forbidden* or *aboliſht* manner, to be *ſpecies of Superſtition*. But if by the *equivocal* phraſe [*not in the manner which he ought*] he mean [*in whatſoever other manner, or rite, or circumſtance, which God hath not expreſly preſcribed*, any *appendant of worſhip inſtituted or appointed by man*] (and not only any *worſhip*, as he cites out of *Ameſius*, p. 4.) there is no truth in his *definition*, nor agreeableneſs to *Aquinas*'s ſenſe, as hath appeared formerly: 'Tis ſure, *Aquinas*, which is cited in the *margent*, hath not owned any ſuch *interpretation* of [*non prout debet*] to belong to all *uncommanded rites*. If *Ameſius* have (which I have not commodity to *examine*) then he was one of the *Caſuiſts* which I forementioned, as the derivers of this *prejudice* into the *Diatribiſt*, and if *Urſine*, Dr. *Fulk*, Mr. *Perkins* are rightly cited in his *margent*, and their words extended no farther than they deſigned them, then perhaps we have the full *catalogue* of them, and the *Diatribiſt* is now of age, to conſider whether they have *proved*, or only *dictated* in this matter. *Numb.* 1.

As for the grounds which are here laid by the *Diatribiſt* toward the evincing of it, they are no way *qualified* for ſuch a *ſtructure*. For when to the four *Commandments* of the *firſt Table*, he aſſigns theſe four things as the *ſubject* matter of them, *a right object of worſhip, God alone, of the firſt*; *a right matter, commanded worſhip, of the ſecond*; *a right manner, with all reverence, of the third*; *a right time, his own appointed day, of the fourth*; and thence concludes all *exceſs* in any of theſe, *Superſtition*; there is ſcarce any one minute part of ſound *doctrine* in all this. 2.

For in the *firſt*, which hath moſt of truth, yet this *failing* there is, that the right *object* of *worſhip* is not the principal matter of that *Commandment*, but the *worſhip* it ſelf, all the *parts* of that, having him for our *God*, treating him, *addreſſing* to him, as ſuch, and of this there is no *criminous exceſs*, which can be ſtyled *Superſtition*; the *Superſtition forbidden* in that *commandment*, is not any *extream* or *exceſs* of *worſhipping* the *true God*, but the taking in other *rivals* to that *worſhip*, which belongs to the *true God incommunicably*, and ſo, is the matter of the *negative* part of that *precept*, not the *nimiety* of the *affirmative*. 3.

In the *ſecond*, there is not a word to determine the matter of it to *commanded worſhip*, as hath been evidenced beyond all queſtion. The *Subject* of the ſecond *Commandment* is the *prohibition* of *Idol-worſhip*; And *bending* the *knee* to the true *God* and none elſe, obſerving of *Chriſtmaſs*, &c. are *remote* enough from that guilt. 4.

As for the third I had thought our *Saviour*, *Mat.* 6. had given us the *ſum* of it, *Thou ſhalt not forſwear thy ſelf, but perform unto the Lord thy oaths*, the *negative* and *affirmative* parts of it; and then, with what *propriety* can that be ſaid to denote the right *manner* of the *worſhip*, *with all due reverence?* Or if it ſhould be extenſible ſo far, then ſure all *ceremonies* that may expreſs that *reverence*, though not elſewhere *preſcribed*, will be here *commanded*, and then ſure not *forbidden* in the ſecond *Commandment*. 5.

Laſtly, For the *right time*, *God's own appointed day* (the *Sabbath*, I ſuppoſe, he means) though that be *appointed* in the fourth *Commandment*, yet ſure not ſo as to *prohibit* all others; we know there was a yearly *Sabbatick faſt* (the great day of *expiation*), ſo called, *Iſa.* 58. 13. and many other *feaſts* beſide that of the *weekly reſt* in the fourth *Commandment*, ſome of *Gods* own *inſtitution*, others, as the *feaſt* of *dedication* of the *Altar*, in memory of the *purging* by *Judas Maccabæus*, inſtituted by the *Jews* themſelves, and never mentioned in the *Canon* of the *old Teſtament*; and ſo the *faſts* of the *fifth* and *ſeventh month*, Zac. 7. 5. And under the *new Teſtament*, the *firſt day* of the *week*, that certainly was not the *laſt*, which the *Decalogue* preſcribed; and why the *Apoſtles*, that inſtituted that, proportionably to the *weekly Sabbath*, ſhould not (either they, or their *ſucceſſors*) inſtitute *other* days, *feſtival* or *faſting*, proportionable to the like among the *Jews*, ſure there is no manner of *prohibition* in the fourth *Commandment*, which *commanding* one day to be *hallowed*, and allowing the reſt for their ordinary labour, doth not yet *interdict* all others, or bind his own, or his peoples, and all *Chriſtians* hands from *preſcribing* or ſetting a part any other. 6.

And there being ſo little ſolidity in the grounds, how can it be expected, there ſhould be any in the *concluſion*, as he ſaith, *anſwerably erected* on them, that *Superſtition may extend to the whole firſt Table*, or that every *exceſs* which he will phanſie *reducible* to any of theſe, ſhall ſtraightway commence *Superſtition?* 7.

That he may farther perſwade this, one *obſervation* he commends to us *fundamental* to this *diſcovery*, but ſuch as I think never ſlipt from any man before him. His words are theſe, *The Commandments of God, having every of them a negative and affirmative part (expreſſed or underſtood) the duties of Religion do ſtand in the midſt, as virtues between two extreams.* Here I ſhall not queſtion the *corner ſtone* of this *foundation*, elſe I might demand, what is the *affirmative* part of the ſecond *Commandment*, or how can it be evidenced that there is any, or indeed any more than a *prohibition* of *idol-worſhip* appendant to the *no other Gods* in the *firſt Commandment*, which ſtill is but a *negative*, or an *interdict*, or if an 8.

affirmative be to be underſtood, muſt it not be *bowing down* to the *true God*, and ſo that will not *prejudge*, but *juſtify* all *outward decent geſtures* of *adoration*, aſſiſt, not oppugne our *pretenſions?*

9. But in ſtead of this nicer *inquiry*, and ſuppoſing with him that every of the *Commandments*, hath its *negative* and *affirmative* part, I only demand how he could think that the *duties of Religion ſtand in the midſt?* what I pray is the *antecedent* to which [*in the midſt*] relates? there is no other in the *period*, but [an *affirmative* and *negative part* of each *Commandment*] But do the *duties* of *Religion ſtand in the midſt of the affirmative and the negative part of each Commandment*, *as virtues between two extremes?* Then ſure the *affirmative* part of the *command* is one *extreme*, and the *negative* is the other; then, what is *commanded* in the *affirmative* part, that which is under *precept*, is an *extreme*, and ſo a *vice*, as far removed from *virtue*, as that which is *forbidden* in the *negative*; the *worſhip* of *one God*, a *vice*, as well as the *worſhipping* of *many*; *paying* to *God* our *oaths*, a vice, as well as *perjury*; *perfect chaſtity*, a *vice*, as well as the moſt *proſtitute adultery*, and ſo in the reſt of them: what could have been ſaid more unluckily than this?

10. I would fain believe that the *Diatribiſt* did not mean thus, and therefore would attempt to affix ſome other *poſſible* meaning to his words, as thus (without any retroſpect toward the *former* part of the *period*) that the *duties of Religion ſtand in the midſt between two extremes*, *as virtues ſtand in the midſt between two extremes*. But then to what purpoſe was the mention of the two parts, *affirmative* and *negative*, of the *Commandments*, premiſed? for this I am ſtill to ſeek, and therefore muſt miſdoubt my σοφὸν φάρμακον, that it is not ſo fit for the malady as I could have wiſht, and yet I have no *better* to ſucceed it.

11. The beſt of it is, he hath not purſued this *obſervation*, nor made this *Superſtructure* in his *exemplification* thereof; the groſſneſs of it would not permit that. But then to what purpoſe was his *obſervation?* ſure but to *amuſe* the *reader* and ſay ſomewhat demurely, which ſhould pretend to be a ground of his beloved *concluſions*, that *all additions to the rule of worſhip are exceſs againſt the Second Commandment*, *additions of ridiculous Ceremonies or geſtures an exceſs againſt the Third*, *men's inſtituting other holy days and times*, *an exceſs againſt the Fourth*. And truly what elſe he pleaſe, with as much appearance of truth, or *ſolidity* of argument, as theſe are inferred from either the *letter* of thoſe *Commandments*, or from the ſolemn *obſervation* concerning the *affirmative*, and *negative* parts of them, and the *duties* of *Religion* in the *midſt*.

12. Tis true, all *worſhipping* of *Idols* is forbidden in the *Second Commandment*; but how come all *uncommanded rites* to be *Idols?* All *perjury* (and (by *Chriſts* πλήρωσις) *voluntary ſwearing at all*) is forbidden in the *Third Commandment*; but how come *rites* and *ceremonies* and *geſtures*, though never ſo *ridiculous*, to be either *oaths* or *perjuries*, or to bear any *analogy* with, or by what means to be reducible to them? In the *Fourth Commandment*, the not *obſerving Gods* deſigned *Sabbath*, was a *defect*; but what words of that *Commandment* conclude againſt *inſtituting* other *holy days* and *times*, as an *exceſs*, and that *criminous*, not admittable among *Chriſtians*.

13. If any, it muſt be [*ſix days ſhalt thou labour*] but ſure that is not the meaning of them, but the *explication* is to be fetcht from the other part of the period [*and do all that thou haſt to do*] i. e. *all* thy *labour*, and *all that thou haſt to do*, ſhall be finiſht, as *God's* was, in *ſix days*, and no other day muſt be ſo ſet apart, as to take off from the *ſeventh* days *reſt* or *Sabbath*: but for ſuch *celebrations* as are reconcileable with that, there is no word nor appearance to the *prejudging* of them.

14. But the *unlawfulneſs* of this laſt, is confirmed by the *ſinfulneſs* of *Jeroboams act*, 1 *Kin.* 12. 32. *He ordained a feaſt like unto the feaſt that was in Judea*. But the *Diatribiſt* cannot but know what it was that made that *criminous* in *Jeroboam*, his appointing this *feaſt* to be kept with *ſacrifices* at *Bethel*, which, beſide the *ſacrificing* to *calves* which he had ſet up, was alſo quite contrary to the expreſs word of *God*, which had commanded that *all ſacrifice* ſhould be *offered*, and conſequently *feaſts* kept at *Jeruſalem*, and no where elſe, ſee *Deut.* 12. 5, 6. 11. 13, 14. 26, 27. and *Joſh.* 22. 16. 19. 29. and *Joh.* 4. 20. This ſure was the *ſin* of *Jeroboam*, to ſet up *Calves* in *Dan* and *Bethel*, to keep the people from *going up to Jeruſalem*, 1 *Kin.* 12. 28. 30. to make a *houſe of high places*, and *Prieſts* which were not of the *ſons* of *Levi*. *v.* 31. and ſo in like manner, a *feaſt like unto the feaſt which is in Judah*; and upon that *feaſt* day to *offer ſacrifice* upon that *Altar*, which he had made in *Bethel*, *v.* 33. All contrary to that *command* of making *Jeruſalem* the *only* place of *ſacrifice* and *publick* ſolemn *worſhip* to all *Iſrael*.

15. Nay, had that ordaining of a *feaſt* by *Jeroboam*, been ſeparated from that *appendant* ſin, of *ſacrificing* elſewhere than *God* had *commanded*, and drawing away the people from the *worſhip* of *Jeruſalem*, which was ſo ſtrictly under *precept*, I ſhall deſire to know, why that might not have been as blameleſs as the *Rubenites* erecting an *Altar* by *Jordan*, *Joſ.* 22. which though it were lookt on by their other *brethren* as an horrible thing, whilſt it appeared to be a *violation* of that *Law*, *v.* 12. and 16, 17. yet when it was truly repreſented to them by *Remonſtrance*, that this *Altar* was not built to divert them from *Jeruſalem*, or to offer *ſacrifice* on, *v.* 23. but only for a *memorial* to their *children*, that they belonged to the *Lord God* of *Iſrael*. *v.* 24. 27, 28. and a means to keep up *Religion* in their *childrens hearts*, *v.* 25, 26. then it was juſtified in the ſight of all *Iſrael*, *the thing pleaſed the people*, *and they bleſſed God*, *&c.* v. 33.

16. And why may not a *Chriſtian feſtival*, inſtituted in like manner as a *memorial*, not to *draw off* any mans heart from any *part* of *God's preſcribed worſhip*, be as *innocent* as this? And ſo our *jealous brethren*, the *Diatribiſt* and thoſe of his perſwaſion, that came out to *diſpute* againſt us, imitate them, and lay down that deſign, and *go back to their houſes in peace?*

17. To which purpoſe one thing more may yet fitly be added, that *Jeruſalem* being the *place* of *worſhip*, preſcribed by *expreſs precept* to all the *Jews*, but not ſo to all other *pious* people of the world, though even to them alſo, *to all people*, it was a *houſe of prayer*, if they would make uſe of it (and accordingly we read of *heathens* that came to *Jeruſalem* to *worſhip*) yet this *precept*, which, as ſuch, lay on the *Jews*, being not obligatory to the *Gentile proſelytes*, we know, *Naaman* built him an *Altar* in his own *country*, and there offered unto the *God* of *heaven*, and was ſo far approved in this, that the *Prophet* himſelf allows him the *mules loads* of *earth* to be carried out of *Judaa* to the *erecting* of it,

it, And I am perſwaded the *analogy* will hold exactly, as to the matter in hand, to a *Chriſtian feſtival* inſtituted in the *Church* of *Chriſt* which was never bound up to any *preſcript* number of days for the *worſhip* of *Chriſt*, whatſoever can be deemed of the *Jews*, who, though required to do all according to the *pattern* in the *Mount*, had yet the *liberty* of *inſtituting* a *day* for *God's* ſervice, as is evident by the ἐγκαίνια.

And ſo whatſoever the *Diatribiſt* can phanſy in the *concluſion* of his ſecond Section of the poſſibility [*that there may be Superſtition in or againſt all the Commandments of the firſt Table in the exceſſive part*, and that *it were eaſie to obſerve, that many (Divines eſpecially) do call the exceſſes of any Commandment by the name of Superſtition*] yet I hope the obſerving of a few *blameleſs, decent, uſeful ceremonies*, inſtituting a *Chriſtian feſtival* for the *commemorating* the *birth* of *Chriſt* (*deſcenſum venerabilis Dei ad humana conſervationis rerumque mortalium gratiam, the deſcent of a venerable God for the ſaving of mankind*, could a * *Philoſopher* ſay upon the obſervation of the *ſtar* at his *birth*) will not actually prove to be any of thoſe *exceſſes*. And then I ſhall not need enquire what thoſe *Reverend Divines* are, who have been ſo *liberal* of the *odious* title of *Superſtition*, as to impoſe it (very *diſcreetly* and *charitably*) upon the *exceſſes* of any *Commandment*. 19.

* *Chalcidius in Plat. Tim. p. 219.*

By the way, I am not ſure that in every *Commandment* of the Ten, there are ſuch *exceſſes*; I ſhall ſuppoſe *chaſtity* the *duty* of the ſeventh *Commandment*, and allowing *fornication*, *adultery* and *ſodomy* to make up the *extream* on one ſide, either in the *exceſs*, or in the *defect*, I ſhall give the *Diatribiſt* leave to chuſe which it ſhall be, and ſuppoſing it muſt be the *defect*, (the *want*, not the *abundance* of *chaſtity*) I ſhall deſire to know what is the *exceſs* or other *extream*, and whether that be, by the forenamed *Divines*, placed under the *head* of *Superſtition*, or indeed whether ſomewhat otherwiſe criminous; Thus it muſt be, if the *exceſſes of any Commandment* be ſo to be called, and if in every *Commandment*, not only in thoſe of the *firſt table* which had been *dilated* on before, there be ſuch *exceſſes*, (and however, the *analogie* holds for theſe of the ſecond *table* as well as for them.) Of theſe he hath oft told us, that the *duty* is in the *midſt* of the two *extreams*, how duly, will be diſcerned by *anſwer* to this *queſtion*, and others, which will be ſoon ready, when he pleaſes to call for them, of the *ſame* kind. 20.

SECT. III.

The ſpecies of Superſtition. Idolatry belongs to the ſecond Commandment. Superſtition to the firſt. It differs from Will-worſhip. The meaning of Illegitimate worſhip in Aquinas. *His opinion of Eccleſiaſtical rites. Barbarous ceremonies of* Baals *worſhip belong not to the ſecond Commandment. Holy days before Popery. Two antient Teſtimonies for them. The Jews ſcrupuloſity in not reſiſting on the Sabbath day.*

IN his third Section ſome few things may be briefly noted, Firſt, That he wrongs *Aquinas* in ſaying he makes but *three kinds* of *Superſtition*, *Idolatry*, *Illegitimate worſhip*, and *Divination*, whereas it is moſt evident to any that will turn to the place in *Aquinas*, *ſecunda ſecundæ qu.* 92. *art.* 1. and *art.* 2. in *corp.* that he adds a *fourth*, *Superſtitio quarundam obſervationum*, citing out of S^t *Auguſtine* the *Ligatures* and ſuch like; And I cannot gueſs to what purpoſe this was *miſreported* thus. *Numb.* 1.

Secondly, Where he ſaith of *Divines*, that they refer *Idolatry* to the *firſt Commandment*, the *Divines* he means muſt needs be thoſe that put the *firſt* and *ſecond commandment* into one (ſuch I ſuppoſe was *Aquinas*, and I had well hoped the *Diatribiſt* had not been of that perſwaſion) for elſe theſe words [*Thou ſhalt not make to thy ſelf any graven image*, &c.] being ſuppoſed to make a diſtinct and ſecond *Commandment*, no *Divine* can be ſo irrational, as to deny *Idolatry* properly ſo called to belong to, and to be *prohibited* in that. And if it were true, what the *Diatribiſt* adds, that *Divination* is the *worſt* kind of *Idolatry*, ſure that muſt be forbidden under the ſecond *Commandment* alſo; But in this I ſuppoſe *Aquinas* was in the right, that made it a *ſpecies* of *Superſtition*, not of *Idolatry*, and ſo it muſt more fitly belong to the *firſt Commandment*, and ſo muſt *Illegitimate worſhip*, being an offence againſt the due *manner* of *Gods worſhip*. But theſe are niceties that we are but little concerned in. 2.

Thirdly, This quarrel to his own Doctor *Ameſius* for reſtraining *Superſtition* to *one Commandment*, which he will have ly *common* to all the *four*, is certainly cauſeleſs; For the *worſhip* of *many Gods* (together with *Divination*, &c.) and the *undue worſhip* of the *true God*, do certainly belong to one *Commandment*, viz. the *firſt*, which by commanding to *have no other Gods but* that one true *God*, excludes the δεισιδαιμονία or *damon worſhip*, and by commanding the *worſhip* of that *one*, forbids all *undue manners* of *worſhip*. That he underſtood by the word *Superſtition* no more but the tendering *undue worſhip* to *God*, was indeed an error in *Ameſius*, ſufficiently prevented, and diſproved, by *Aquinas*, and by the nature of the *Greek* and *Latin* words, and ſo likewiſe that he confined it to the ſecond *Commandment*, when in all reaſon it belonged to the *firſt*; But that being acknowledged his *error*, this other of not extending it to *many Commandments* is no way imputable to him. 3.

Fourthly, When of that *ſpecies* of *Superſtition*, which he defines by the *vice of undue worſhip tendered to God*, he affirms that it is more properly *Will-worſhip*, this is but an *unproved* and improbable *affirmation*, quite contrary to *Aquinas* and his own *Authors* (as far as I can diſcern) *Ameſius* himſelf, and a *confounding* of things very diſtant. 4.

Fifthly, When of *Aquinas's illegitimate worſhip* he gives his own *gloſs*, that he means that which is *not commanded by God, but inſtituted and appointed by men*] this is great injury to that *School-man*; What he means by that phraſe, will be beſt learnt from * *Aquinas* himſelf, who ſets it down diſtinctly by diſtributing it into two parts; For thus that 93. *queſtion De illegitimo Dei cultu*, *Of the illegitimate worſhip of God*, begins, *Et ſuperfluitate & pravitate vitiatur divinus cultus*, &c. *The worſhip of God is vitiated both by ſuperfluity, and by pravity; by ſuperfluity, if to the worſhipping of God, ought be aſſumed, which neither by Divine nor Eccleſiaſtical appointment belongs to the glory of God, nor to the ſubjecting esther of the body or ſoul to the Creator; by pravity, if the external ceremony contain any thing of falſity in it;* 5.

* *Secunda ſecundæ, qu.* 93.

which may fall out, ſaith he, *two ways, either by the diſagreement between the ceremony and the thing denoted by it, or by the publick miniſters uſing any ceremony contrary to the cuſtom of the Chur*[illegible] Thus far are the words of *Aquinas*: and what could have been more deſtructive to the *Diatribiſts pretenſions*, than this deſcription and branching of *illegitimate worſhip*, if either here or before, when *Aquinas* was cited, this ſenſe of his, thus expreſt, had been *conſidered?*

6. That he may never cite *Aquinas* again in this matter, I ſhall deſire him to remember from that *School-man* theſe four things, his undoubted affirmations, by way of *Axioma*, Firſt, That *illegitimate*, is *vitiated worſhip*, and ſo more than *uncommanded*, certainly that which is *prohibited*, (and this according to the *propriety* of the word *illegitimum*, which ſignifies not *without*, but *againſt Law. Legitimum*, ſaith * *Chalcidius*, *eſt id quod legem ſequitur, legitime is that which follows the Law*, or as † *Plutarch* defines νόμιμον, πείσαγμα νόμε, and ὑπὸ τῦ νόμε δειδὲν, the *command of Law*, or that which is *determined or commanded by Law*, adding, that thoſe *good* things which yet are *not under precept*, are not to be called νόμιμα *legitime*; And ſo in *Leo ſerm.* 1. *de jejun.* 7. *menſ. legitima* are oppoſed to *voluntaria*, as *commanded* to *ſpontaneous*. Now *what is Law*, ſaith * *Chalcidius*, *niſi juſſum ſciſcens honeſta, prohibens contraria, but a command requiring honeſt things, and prohibiting the contrary?* And conſequently, *illegitimum* being the direct *contrary* to *legitimum*, will ſignifie, in the *contrary* ſenſe to that which is *commanded*, that which is *prohibited* by *Law.)* Secondly, That the *ſuperfluity* of it, conſiſts not in being *ſuperadded* to *God's commands* only, but to the *Churches appointment*; and ſo, that which is ordained by the *Church*, though not by *God*, comes not under that ſtyle of *ſuperfluous* or *illegitimate* upon that *ſcore*. Thirdly, That what tends to the *glory* of *God*, or to the *ſubjecting* of the *body* as well as the *ſoul* to the *Creator* of both, is neither *ſuperfluous* nor *illegitimate*, ſo it be ordained by the *Church*. *Laſtly*, That the *Miniſters publick* uſing any *ceremony* contrary to the cuſtom of the *Church* (ſuch is his *ſitting* at the *Sacrament*, and the like) is a *pravity*, and that is worſe than a *ſuperfluity* in the *worſhip* of *God*. I ſuppoſe this may now be ſufficient to arm the *Reader* againſt the *fallacies*, to which the frequent citations out of *Aquinas* might ſubject him.

* *In Tim.* p. 243.
† περὶ ἡμαρμ.
* p. 248.

7. *Sixthly*, That it is not to me imaginable how or why the *barbarous ceremonies* of *Baals Prieſts*, &c. ſhould be an *exceſs* againſt the third *Commandment*, or a *taking Gods name in vain*, which we know is by *Chriſt* rendred *forſwearing ones ſelf*, and when they that *cryed* nothing but *O Baal hear us, from morning till night*, never uſed the *name* of *God* at all (for ſure *Baal* and *God* are not *Synonyma's*) and ſo cannot be affirmed in *vain* to uſe it or take it.

8. *Seventhly*, That *dedicating holy days* to *Saints* (though *Chriſt*, whoſe *Feſtival* we treat of, be *more* than ſuch) is neither fitly parallel'd by the *Diatribiſt* with *Jeroboam's feaſt* day at *Bethel* (as we competently evinced in the laſt *Sect.*) nor appropriated by him to *Papiſts*, when we know ſuch days were dedicated to the memory of *Martyrs*, long before the *name* or *errors* of *Papiſts* were come into the world.

9. A competent evidence we have † formerly given from the *Epiſtle* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, written on occaſion of the *Martyrdom* of *Polycarp*, S^t *Johns* Auditor, where having deſcribed the paſſages of his *ſuffering*, they conclude with their wiſh and hope, that *God* will now permit them to *meet together with exultation and joy, to celebrate* τὴν μαρτυρίαν αὐτῦ ἡμέραν γενέθλιον, *the birth-day* or *natalitia* (ſo 'twas ſtyled) of his *Martyrdom*, adding the two great *ends* of ſuch obſervations, εἴς τε τὸν τῶν ἠθληκότων μνήμην, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἄσκησίν τε καὶ ἑτοιμασίαν, *for the commemorating of ſuch Champions conſtancy, and the exerciſe, and fitting* of others for the *future*. The *circumſtances* of that *Epiſtle* make it clear, that ſuch *celebrations* and *dedications* of *days* were then of uſe before *Polycarp's* death, and that they now expected that this of his ſhould be *added* to that number, and that ſo it was, I ſhall now add a ſecond *undoubted* proof or *teſtimony* of *Primitive Antiquity*, *antienter* than that of *Polycarp*, in the *Martyrdom* of *Ignatius*, written by them which were *preſent* at it, who ſetting down the day and time of his *Coronation*, ſay, they do it ſo preciſely, * *ut ſecundum tempus Martyrii congregati communicemus athletæ, that aſſembling together on the Anniverſary of his Martyrdom, they may communicate with his Martyrdom; commemorate his ſufferings and bleſs God for him*, &c.

† *Feſtiv.* p. 438.
Smyrn. Eccleſ. Epiſt. p. 28.
* *Martyrium Ignat.* p. 8.

10. Theſe *authorities* may, I hope, be of ſome credit with him, who can found *arguments* on paſſages in *Aquinas* and *Ameſius*; and if *Apoſtles*, as equitably as *Martyrs*, may thus be *commemorated*, the *Church* of *England* I hope (whatever become of the *Papiſts*) may be vindicated from all *Superſtition*, or *exceſs* againſt the fourth *Commandment*.

11. And then when I have added eightly, that the *Jews ſcrupuloſity* in obſerving their *Sabbath*, ſo that they would not *ſtand up to defend themſelves in that day*, is none of the *exceſſes* we are guilty of; and that this being by the *Diatribiſt* ſtyled *exceſs* of *Religion*, and that againſt the fourth *Commandment*, and *juſtly called Superſtition*, there is no need of making any *more ſpecies* of that *exceſs*, or forcing in all *dedication of holy days*, into that place; I ſhall not need look any more narrowly to ſpy out greater *ſtore* of *infirmities* in that third *Sect.*

SECT. IV.

The Diatribiſt's method and caution in ſetting down the ſpecies of Superſtition.

Numb. 1. BUT becauſe all the *former* methods were *imperfect* and unſufficient (even before they were *confuted*) to erect ſuch a modelled notion of *Superſtition* as would ſerve the *Diatribiſts* aims, he muſt now in his fourth *Sect.* become *humble*, in ſtead of *Magiſterial*, implore the courteous *Readers pardon, if he be not ſo logically accurate, to ſet down* (what he is reſolved is *not eaſie to diſcover*) *all the kinds and wayes whereby this ſin of Superſtition is committed in particular.*

2. And to what purpoſe all this *modeſty* is deſigned, will be eaſily gueſt, *viz.* to leave the word *Superſtition* in the *clouds*, to *involve*, inſtead of *explaining* it, that it may continue *uſeful* to him, as a *mor-*

mo,

mo, whenſoever he hath a mind to *affright* men out of their *obedience* to the *Church*, to which purpoſe it could not be ſo commodious, if it were once *defined* or *limited* to one or any *ſet* number of more *Commandments*. And though in the ten following *Sections* he reckon up pretty *ſtore* of *ſpecies* of it, yet he muſt here before-hand make ſure of a *reſerve*, proteſt his *liberty* to add more, whenſoever he ſhall have *need* of them [*we ſhall*, ſaith he, *labour to expreſs ſome of them, as we find them held out by Divines and others*] where it ſeems *Divines*, ſuch as *Ameſius*, *Urſine*, Mr. *Perkins*, &c. have not *held out enough*, but he muſt have a *ſupply* from *others*, which are not *Divines*, (and it would be an odd *queſtion* to be anſwered, who thoſe *others* are, when the *monuments* of *heathen authors*, *Latine* and *Greek* have been ſo ſeverely diſclaimed in his §. 1. and then none but the judgement of *Divines* thought fit to be *appealed* to in this matter) and §. 14. when he hath *completed* a large *Catalogue*, he concludes with [*Laſtly to add no more*] intimating that there are ſtill *more* to be added; of which he will ſerve himſelf, when he ſees good.

What now follows in the *ten* enſuing *Sections*, I ſhall reſolvedly paſs over, though there be many things very fit to be noted in them, partly becauſe he promiſeth they ſhall ſoon *recurr* again, and partly becauſe they belong to the other *tracts*, that of *Will-worſhip* and *Feſtivals*, where ſure we ſhall meet with them, and partly becauſe they have been ſpoken to *already*, and beſides, ſome of them are the *enumerating* of thoſe very *ſpecies* of *Superſtition* which I have ſet down in that *treatiſe*, as ſuch. And therefore ſo much (after his *Preface*) for his *Prolegomena*. 3.

CHAP. IV.

Of the Particular exceptions of the Diatribiſt to the Tract of Superſtition.

SECT. I.

Confidente of innocence, no argument of guilt.

I Am now more immediately *ſummoned* and called into the *liſts* by this *Diatribiſt* §. 15. and the ſeveral *Sections* of the *Treatiſe* of *Superſtition* muſt be brought to a ſtrict *examination*, and I hope they will not be unable to bear it. *Numb.* 1.

In my firſt *Section* there is nothing *diſliked*, but only that I will not acknowledge my ſelf or our *Church* guilty, before the *trial*, and to that purpoſe I am told [*commonly thoſe that are moſt Superſtitious, are moſt confident of their innocency and piety, and no marvel if they underſtand Superſtition as the Dr. doth.*] 2.

But to this I anſwer, that I hope this his *prudent Aphoriſm* is not *ſimply convertible*, viz. That they which are moſt *confident* of their *innocency* and *piety*, are moſt *Superſtitious* (for if it be, I muſt not be ſo unkind to wiſh, or ſo *uncharitable* to believe of the *Diatribiſt*, that he hath a *good conſcience*, nor any longer rely on that *Apoſtle* that hath taught me *Gods* method of *judging* of us, by the *verdict* of our own *accuſing* or *excuſing conſcience*) and ſo long 'tis poſſible that I may be *free* from that *guilt*, though I am never ſo *confident*. Mean while I that allow the *Diatribiſt* one *ſpecies*, that of *Negative Superſtition* for his *portion*, have his leave to *conclude* from hence, that this is the *reaſon* why he is ſo *confident* of his *innocence*. 3.

As for the *ſecond* part, my underſtanding of the notion of the word *Superſtition* in that Treatiſe, if I cannot juſtify it to be as good as Mr. *C.* his *ſuper ſtatutum*, I ſhall very much accuſe my ſelf, and in the interim be comforted with his *confeſſion*, that if I have not *erred* in the *notion* of *Superſtition*, of which he is no *competent* Judge, being a *party*, then both I and our *Church* (for the *Romiſh* I ſhall not be ſo ſollicitous) are far enough from this crime. 4.

SECT. II.

The nature of the word. *Exceſs of fear among the Epicureans*, Superſtitio *from* ſuper *and* ſto, *not* ſtatuo. Aquinas miſreported.

THE next or Sixteenth *Section* conſiders the notion by me given of the *Latine Superſtitio*, *Superſtitum cultus*, and having yielded it to be ſo defined by the *heathens*, yet he cannot think that I will ſay, *that this is the only Superſtition to be found in the world*, becauſe I *acknowledge an exceſſive fear of the Deity to have been another kind* of it among the *Heathens*, and other kinds alſo among *Chriſtians*, adding that *ſome there are, and they no mean ones, that derive it from ſuper and ſto or ſtatuo, as ſupra ſtatutum, worſhip inſtituted by men above the Statute Law of God*, but he rather reſts in the *definition* of the *Schools*, that it is *a vice contrary to Religion in the exceſs, which may extend to the other commandments, whereas this limits it to the Second*. *Numb.* 1.

To all this I need no farther to reply, but *Firſt* That my *Second Sect.* was not deſigned to give any *complete definition* of *Superſtition*, but to ſearch how much was to be concluded from the *Latine* word, as in the following *Sections* how much more from the *Greek*, and then to make uſe of all other proper means, the uſe of the word in *Scripture* and *Fathers*, to collect the *full importance* of it; and conſequently, if what I vouched out of the *Latine origination* be true, there is no more to be expected of my *Second Sect.* *Secondly*, That I no where grant an *exceſſive fear* of the *Deity* to have been *another* 2.

kind

kind of Superſtition, among the *heathens*, but only that *ſome heathens*, eſpecially the *Epicureans* which denyed all *providence* and *judgment to come*, and *ſcoft* at all *fear* of *puniſhment* for *ſin*, affixt to this the name as of *Superſtition*, ſo of *Religion* alſo, whereupon I thought it reaſonable that we ſhould *not* (not that we *ſhould*) take our notion of *Superſtition* from them, which yet it ſeems the *Diatribiſt* is content to do, and ſo with the *famiſhing prodigal* to herd himſelf among the *Epicureans*.

3. Having thus ſecured my ſelf (as far as pertains to this *Section*) I may now be allowed to conſider the *Diatribiſt*, and then I find in theſe few words a competent number of *infirmities*. Firſt, That mentioning their *Etymologie* of *Superſtition*, who will have it *ſuper ſtatutum*, he makes them derive it indifferently from (*ſuper* and) *ſto* or *ſtatuo*, as if thoſe two were *Synonyma*, whereas certainly [*to ſtand*] is competently diſtant from [*to make laws* or *ſtatutes*] and if it be derived from the *one*, it is not from the other.

4. Secondly, That deriving it from *ſto*, he doth not diſcern that this is my way of *derivation*, for ſure *ſuperſtes* is from *ſuper* and *ſto*, and ſo he confirms my *origination* of the word, whilſt he thinks he *confuteth* it, *abſolves* very frankly, whom he ſat down on purpoſe to *condemn*.

5. Thirdly, That his forſaking the *etymon* from *ſuper ſtatutum* to which ſo oft he had expreſt *kindneſs*, was again on an undirect aim, that he might get more *advantage* to his *hypotheſis* by that means, not moved with the *abſurdity* of the *derivation*, but meerly that he might have more *liberty* to range in, by ſerving himſelf on a notion of *Superſtition* qualified to extend it to all the *Commandments* of the *firſt table*, which how thoſe (*no mean ones*) whom for his own ends he hath now *deſerted*, will take at his hands, I leave him to conſider.

6. Fourthly, That having rejected the *derivation* from *ſuper* and *ſto*, or *ſtatuo*, he hath ſubſtituted no other, and ſo left a *rivulet* without a *ſpring*, a *compound derivative* without an *original*, a *monſter* in *art*, as well as *nature*.

7. Fifthly, That making uſe of the *Schoolman's definition*, he *extends* it much farther than he knows that *Schoolman extended it*; This he formerly confeſt §. 3. naming this *Learned Schoolman* as the *firſt*, who *came ſhort in aſſigning the ſpecies of Superſtition*, and here he more than *confeſſeth* it, extending *Superſtition* to all the *four Commandments* of the *firſt table*, when he knows *Aquinas* made it a *breach* peculiar to the *firſt* of them.

SECT. III.

Δεισιδαιμονία among the heathens for Religion, ſo in Heſychius *and* Phavorinus.

Numb. 1. THE *queſtion* of the ſeventeenth *Sect.* concerning δεισιδαιμονία, what kind of *fear* or *dread* of a *Deity* was among the *heathens* noted by it, I have anſwered already, even that which the *Epicureans* would have driven out of the world, as making the *Gods cruel*, *tyrannical*, &c. and accordingly in *Cicero*, *Superſtitione liberare*, to *free* men from *Superſtition*, and in *Lucretius*, *Religionibus*, from all *Religion* and *obligation* of *duty*, is explained by *metum omnem Deorum pulſum eſſe*, to have *all fear of the Gods baniſht* from us.

2. If there be any other *minute* difference obſervable, it is this, that it is ſuch a *fear* of the *Deity* as *wicked* men are in reaſon to have, (and that ſure, though a great *trembling*, was yet no *exceſs*, no
* *L.* 2. *p.* 779. more than was very equitably the *portion* of ſuch) ſo ſaith * *Diodorus Siculus* of *Bomilcar*, δεισιδαίμονίς εἰσι οἱ μάλιστες ἐγχειρῶν ταῖς παρανόμοις καὶ μεγάλαις πράξεσι, *they that are about to undertake any notable wicked actions, are generally afraid of the Gods or Dæmons*; and ſo ſtill that will yield our *Diatribiſt* no aid toward the ſupport of any of his *hypotheſes*; ſure the *inſtituting* of our *Chriſtmaſs Feſtival*, was no act of ſuch a juſt *dread* of *vengeance* for ſin, nor *effect* whether *immediately* or *remotely* produced by it.

3. As for his *affirmation* that the *former part of the word* δεισιδαιμονία *doth not ſignifie worſhip, but fear, and not that fear which is oft put for the whole worſhip of God, but ſlaviſh fear*, &c. this is a clear miſtake; 'Tis true indeed it doth ſignifie ſometimes a *trembling fear* (ſuch as I ſaid was the *wicked* mans *portion* and due lot, and ſo not an *exceſs*, or *unproportionable* to his *ſtate*) as when *Plutarch* ſaith of him, he *wiſheth there were no Gods*; but it doth not always ſignifie thus, but ſimply φόβος θεῶν καὶ δαιμόνων *the fear of Gods and dæmons*; and accordingly, as *Phavorinus* in the *Epicurean* notion of it, renders it περὶ τὸ θεῖον δειλία, *a cowardly fear toward God*, ἢ ὁ ἄλογος πρὸς θεῶν, *or an irrational fear of the Gods*, ſo *Heſychius* renders it φοβοθεία *fearing God*, or *Religion* in *univerſum*, and the ſame *Phavorinus* explains δεισιδαίμων by εὐσεβὴς, *Superſtitious*, by *devout* or *pious*, and adds, ὡς ὁ θεῖος Παῦλος, *as Saint Paul* uſeth the word *Act.* 17. 22.

SECT. IV.

Falſe worſhip is not Will-worſhip. Impoſition of hands.

Numb. 1. HIS eighteenth *Sect.* being but an *approbation* of my *concluſion*, that δεισιδαιμονία refers to the *Poetical Gods*, *Angels*, or *dead men*, or indeed *any thing but the only true God*, muſt not be reſiſted by me; I am glad I have once gratified him.

2. But when he adds, that this clears what he had ſaid, that this is *rather idolatry againſt the firſt Commandment, which is Polytheiſm, than any kind of Superſtition, which is the giving of falſe*, i. e. *uncommanded worſhip to the true God againſt the ſecond Commandment*, this is but a heap of *incongruities*; for firſt

Idolatry,

Idolatry, as hath been evidenced, is a ſin againſt the ſecond *Commandment*, though *Polytheiſm* be againſt the *firſt*.

Secondly, Though *Superſtition* be the giving of *falſe worſhip* to the *true God*, as well as *worſhip* to *falſe Gods*, *Damons* and *Superſtites*, the *ſouls* of men departed (or a *dread*, which is not a *worſhip*, to the *true*) yet this *falſe worſhip* is unfitly explicated by *uncommanded worſhip*; For certainly all ſuch is not *falſe*, as out of *Aquinas* was cleared, eſpecially if the word *Worſhip* be extended, as this *Diatribiſt* extends it, to *rites* and *obſervances*, as well as to the *ſubſtantial* parts of *worſhip*; ſuch were *impoſition* of *hands* in *benediction* among the *Jews*, continued alſo for many uſes among *Chriſtians*, yet never *preſcribed* or *commanded* by God; and many the like elſewhere mentioned. 3.

And this therefore *Thirdly* cannot be truly affirmed to be againſt the *ſecond Commandment*, which alſo being ſpent upon the *worſhip* of *Idols* (all for the interdicting of that) cannot be properly ſaid to conſider the *worſhip* of the *true God*, (unleſs it be the *external* part that of *bowing down*, &c. in the *affirmative* branch of it) which had been the ſubject of the *firſt Commandment*; and to that in all reaſon all *falſe worſhip* of the *true God* muſt be reduced, and not to the *ſecond*. 4.

SECT. V.

Δεισιδαιμονέστερους *Act.* 17. 22. (*The Athenians the moſt devout of all the Greeks.*)

WHat he ſaith by way of *dilemma Sect.* 19. concerning the uſe of the word δεισιδαιμονέστερους *more Superſtitious*, of the *Athenians*, Act. 17. 22. [*If*, ſaith he, *they were ſo called becauſe they worſhipt more Gods, then they were Polytheiſts; If becauſe they were devout or pious, rather impious in worſhipping the true God ignorantly in a falſe manner, then their ſin was againſt the ſecond Commandment*] though *true*, in ſome ſenſe, is yet nothing *gainful* to his deſign, which can thrive by no other means but by getting δεισιδαιμονία or *Superſtition* to denote *all uncommanded rites in the worſhip of the true God*. *Numb.* 1.

This it no way ſignifies in that place of the *Acts*, but only their *worſhipping* a *multitude* of *Gods*, *more* than any other nation did, and the ἄγνωστῳ θεῷ, or *unknown God*, for one, and ſo their being more *pious* in their courſe, than other their *heathen* country men were, or indeed than the *Romans*, or any elſe. 2.

That this is the truth, and the whole *truth*, hath ſufficiently been evidenced in the Treatiſe of *Superſtition*, *Sect.* 11. and I now add three *teſtimonies* more, to that heap, one out of *Joſephus*, *l.* 2. *Contra Ap.* Ἀθηναίους δ' Ἑλλήνων εὐσεβεστάτους ἅπαντες λέγουσι, *All men affirm the Athenians to be the moſt pious of the Greeks.* A ſecond out of *Sophocles*, *Oedip.* 3.

Ὅθ' ὅντιν' ἔστι γῆν θεὸς σέβισμα
Τιμαῖς σεβίζειν, ἥτις τῶνδ' ὑπερφέρει,

If any know how to worſhip the Gods with honours (*ſacrifices* and *offerings* to their *Temples*) *Athens excels them all*; The third even now intimated out of *Phavorinus*, but here more fully to be expreſſed, who having explicated δεισιδαίμων *ſuperſtitious* by εὐσεβὴς *pious*, ſubjoins this *teſtimony* of the *Acts*, ὡς ὁ θεῖος Παῦλος, δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ, *as S.* Paul *ſaith*, *I ſee that you are more Superſtitious*, the very place which we have now before us, brought by that *learned Grammarian* as an inſtance, that the word is there taken in a *good*, not *ill* ſenſe, yet not of any *uncommanded worſhip* of the *true God*, but a *pious*, though *Ethnick devotion* toward the *multitude* of their *falſe*, *ſuperadded* to the *one true God*; which though in a *Chriſtian* ſcale or judgment it cannot be *approved*, becauſe it is *Polytheiſm*, yet *in compariſon* with other *heathens* (which was S. *Pauls* buſineſs in that place) it was truly by him lookt on as a greater meaſure of *devotion*, than the reſt of the *heathen* world were guilty of, and that is all that was meant by that *phraſe*, and ſo 'tis not at all uſeful to the end, to which the *Diatribiſt* would have inclined it.

SECT. VI.

Ζητήματα περὶ τὴν ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας, *Act.* 25. Feſtus's *ſcorn falls on the Jews, not on* Paul. Τῆς ἰδίας *his own, not theirs.* Ζήτημα *an accuſation. Jeſus put under the notion of a* δαίμων *by* Feſtus. Ἀνάστασις *taken for a damon.* τεθνηκότος. ἔφασκε ζῆν. *The Diatribiſts objections anſwered. Superſtition for Religion ſimply.*

HIS twentieth Section is an arraignment of Section 12. of *Superſt.* concerning the place, *Acts* 25. 19. ζητήματα περὶ τὴν ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας, &c. which I had rendred, *queſtions* or *accuſations concerning his own Religion* or *Superſtition* or *Worſhip*, and (to explain what was meant by the word δεισιδαιμονία) *of one Jeſus that was dead, whom* Paul *ſaid to be alive, putting him under the notion of a dead Heros, and ſo meaning the worſhip of him by* δεισιδαιμονία. *Numb.* 1.

Againſt this the *Diatribiſt* excepts in three particulars. Firſt, *It is like*, ſaith he, Feſtus *ſpake in ſcorn, not of* Pauls *only, but of the whole Jewiſh Religion, as*, ſaith he, *the words may import, and are tranſlated by ours.* Secondly, That what I ſaid of *putting Jeſus under the notion of a dead Heros or* δαίμων, *is a ſtrein of Criticiſm, compounding things which are in the Text diſtinct, for* Feſtus *ſayes* (ſaith he) *they had many queſtions both concerning their own Superſtition, and alſo concerning one Jeſus*, &c adding 2.

ding (to *confirm* this) that he was *accuſed of queſtions of their Law*, c. 23. 29. *and of ſedition, ſeducement, profanation of the Temple*, 24. 5, 6. Thirdly, That *Paul affirmed Jeſus to be alive, not in part, as the Dæmons were ſuppoſed, but in the whole man, as raiſed from the dead.*

3. To theſe I briefly anſwer, and firſt to the *firſt*; For the *ſcorn*, it no way appears to be meant by *Feſtus* againſt S. *Paul* or his *Religion*; for *Feſtus* is at this time ſpeaking in *favour* of *Paul*, and ſlighteth the *Jews accuſations* of him, as matters of no *conſiderable* moment, and ſo, if there be any thing of *ſarcaſme* in the ſpeech, it falls on the *Jews*, not on *him*, and ſo cannot ſet any *ill character* on the δεισιδαιμονία, in caſe that be S. *Paul's*, and not *theirs*

4. As for the *Diatribiſt's phancy*, that the *ſcorn ſhould fall not on* Pauls *only*, *but on the whole Jewiſh Religion*, that cannot hold; for when he ſpeaks of the *Jews* charge *againſt Paul*, he cannot ſpeak of that wherein *Paul* and they *agreed*, but wherein they *differed*, and that muſt either be *their* way, which *Paul* oppoſed, or *Paul's* way, which they now *accuſed* him of.

5. Now which of theſe two it was, is not determinable by the words in *Greek*, for the ἡ ἰδία may either be rendred *his own* or *their own*: Yet that it muſt be interpreted *his*, I offer this *reaſon* to perſwade, (whereas the *Diatribiſt* pretends to none for the *contrary*, but only that *ſo the words may import*, and that *our Engliſh hath ſo tranſlated*) The *Jews accuſation* or *charge* againſt S. *Paul* is plainly mentioned in this place; That is the meaning of ζητήματα εἶχον πρὸς αὐτὸν, *they had queſtions* or *laid charges againſt him*; the word ζήτημα ſometimes ſignifies a *charge*, *complaint*, *inditement*, ſo c. 18. 15. εἰ δὲ ζήτημά ἐστι περὶ λόγου, *but if the accuſation* or *charge be of a word*; Thus *Satan*, who is ſo called, as ἀντίδικος an *adverſary in foro*, διάβολος an *accuſer*, is ſaid ζητεῖν *to ſeek*, 1 *Pet.* 5. 8. (and *Luk.* 22. 31. ἐξαιτήσασθαι *to require*) i. e. to *accuſe* and *charge* men, that ſo they may be *delivered* up to him as an *executioner*, to *winnow*, in one place, and to *devour*, in the other. So to *queſtion* a man among us vulgarly ſignifies to *accuſe* him, and that ſo it ſignifies here, appears by *v.* 18. οἱ κατήγοροι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἐπέφερον, *the accuſers brought no accuſation of the things which I ſuppoſed*, ζητήματα δέ τινα, *but ſome queſtions*, that muſt be *accuſations* again, αἰτιάματα, v. 7. &c.

6. Whence, I ſuppoſe, it will follow, that the ἰδίᾳ δεισιδαιμονία περὶ ἧς *of which* he was *charged*, which is the *matter* of the *accuſation*, or that wherein the *offence* conſiſted, was *his*, not *their Superſtition*, for how could their *own Superſtition* be the *matter* of their *charge* againſt him?

7. To the *ſecond*, that what I ſaid of *Feſtus* putting *Jeſus* under the notion of a *dead Heros* though it be of that nature that I ſhall not, becauſe I need not, make it a matter of *controverſy* with any, yet I had this conſideration to incline me to it, the immediate ſubjoyning of *one Jeſus* whom *Paul* ἔφασκε ζῆν *contended to live*, to be *ſuperſtes*, as of their *Dæmons Feſtus* and thoſe of his perſwaſions ordinarily *affirmed*. To which purpoſe I remembred what the *Athenians* ſurmiſed, when *Paul* preacht to them *Jeſus and the Reſurrection*, Act. 17. 18. *He ſeems*, ſay they, ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελεὺς εἶναι, *to be a proclaimer of ſtrange* or *new Dæmons*, where S. *Chryſoſtom* judges it ſo manifeſt that thoſe *Grecians* thought *Jeſus* to be a *Dæmon*, that he adds, καὶ γὰρ τὴν ἀνάστασιν θεόν τινα εἶναι ἐνόμιζον, ἅτε εἰωθότες καὶ θηλείας σέβειν, *they took alſo Anaſtaſis (Reſurrection) for ſome Goddeſs, as being accuſtomed to worſhip females alſo.* And then why *Feſtus*, an *heathen* likewiſe, and which underſtood none but *heathen Theology*, ſhould not thus mean in words of ſo near an *importance* that will bear it ſo fitly, I can yet ſee no *reaſon* to doubt.

8. Of this I am ſure, that in the *one* proof offered to the *contrary*, the *Diatribiſt* hath ſtrained more, than I have in my *Criticiſme*; For *Firſt*, When he thus reads the *text*, *they had many queſtions*, that ſo he might make it neceſſary to diſtinguiſh the *queſtion* concerning *his Superſtition* from that of *Jeſus*, he hath inſerted the word *many*, there being neither in the *Greek* nor in our *Engliſh* any ſuch word, but only τινὰ ζητήματα *ſome* or *certain accuſations*. *Secondly*, When (on the ſame deſign) he again reads [*both concerning their Superſtition, and alſo*] there is no ſuch word, nor any thing, either in the *Greek* or our *Engliſh*, anſwerable either to [*both*] or to [*alſo*] but only thus, περὶ—καὶ—*concerning his own Superſtition* or *Dæmon worſhip*, *and one Jeſus*, *which was*, or *had been dead*, ſo τεθνηκότος ſignifies, *whom Paul affirmed to live*; and *Thirdly*, When he adds that he was *accuſed of queſtions of their Law*, c. 23. and of *ſedition*, &c. c. 24. this proves nothing, which the *Diatribiſt* would have, for though the *Jews* had thus *accuſed* him, yet he had *anſwered* for himſelf in the latter part of c. 24. and cleared himſelf perfectly from thoſe *two* charges, from the *firſt*, v. 12. and from the *ſecond*, v. 18. and ſo again, c. 25. 8. and ſo ſtill it remains that in *Feſtus's judgement* (to which *Paul* appeals for the *knowledge* of it, telling him that he knew he was *guiltleſs* from having done any wrong to the *Jews*, v. 10.) *Paul* was not guilty, nor ſtood charged of any thing, but only of his *own Religion*, *and one Jeſus*, i. e. I ſuppoſe by way of explication (as [καὶ *and*] is frequently *exegetical*) of believing and *proclaiming Jeſus* and the *Reſurrection*, c. 24. 15. which laſt alſo being *common* to him with the *Jews*, as there he conteſts, could not by them duely be charged upon him, and ſo the whole *charge*, and that which is the *characteriſtick*, diſtinctive note of *his Religion*, is his contending that *Jeſus was alive*, *who had died*, which how agreeable it is to *Feſtus's* notion of a *Dæmon*, I ſhall not need farther to declare.

9. As to the laſt, it is evident that he that affirms *Jeſus* to be *alive*, both *ſoul* and *body*, doth to a *heathen* ear as much define him to be a *Dæmon*, as if he ſaid nothing of his *body*: However all that *Feſtus* here ſaith is, that ἔφασκεν ζῆν, he *affirmed him to live* now after he had *been dead*; and if to that we add, that *Paul* preached his *aſcenſion* to *heaven*, what could a *heathen*, according to his *perſwaſions conclude* from thence, but that he had *attained* his ἀποθέωσις, which was all that they required to his being a *Dæmon*. And ſo much for theſe *objections*.

10. Meanwhile, if all were granted that is here deſired by the *Diatribiſt*, that the *Superſtition* ſpoken of, was not S. *Pauls*, but the *Jews*, this could no way incommodate me, or hinder my *pretenſions*, in order to the main; for then, ſay I, it ſhall ſignify the *Jews Religion* ſimply, without any character of *ill* or *good* laid on it, as in * *Quintilian*, *Primus Judaicæ Superſtitionis author*, *the firſt author of the Jewiſh Superſtition* or *Religion*, and in * *Ulpian*, that *Severus* and *Antoninus* permitted thoſe to be *capable of dignities*, *qui Judaicam Superſtitionem ſequuntur*, *who follow the Jewiſh Superſtition* or *Religion*, and many the like.

* *L.* 3. *c.* 8.
* *Leg. Qui ad Temp. D. Decurion.*

SECT.

SECT. VII.

The method of ſearch for the original notion of the word. Mr. Cawdries *collections from the heathens. Among them Superſtition all one with Religion.* Plutarch *of the Sabbatick reſt. Sacrificing children to* Moloch, *was not to the true God,* Jer. 32. 35. Lev. 20. 2. nor *a bare uncommanded worſhip. The gloſſes of the Etymologiſt and* Phavorinus.

THE 21. Section is a ſhort diſpatch of all that I had ſaid of the uſe of the word among other *Authors* from Section 14. to Section 27. All which *Sections*, though intirely deſigned to the *diſcovering* the true notion of the word, by that *norma loquendi*, the beſt *rule* to judge of words, the *uſe* of it among *writers* of all ſorts, are ſhortly *cenſured* as [*a great deal of reading and learning to little purpoſe, except to cloud the buſineſs, to lead men away in a miſt from the true and proper ſenſe of the word among Chriſtians.*] *Numb.* 1.

It ſeems they which receive benefit by being in the *dark*, are apt to miſtake *light* for *miſts*, and the *Apoſtle* hath given the reaſon, ἐλέγχονται ὑπὸ φωτὸς, *they are reproved by the light.* 'Tis certain the *Chriſtians* took the word whether *Greek* or *Latin*, from the *heathens*, which were before them; and accordingly, to judge of the *propriety* of the uſe of it, I thought my ſelf obliged to ſearch to the *original*, *i. e.* to the uſe of it among the *heathens*; and finding the *Scripture* uſe of it exactly agreeable to their acception of it, from whom the *Scripture* had it, and ſo likewiſe the *Chriſtian Gloſſaries*, that of *Heſychius*, *Suidas*, *Phavorinus*, the *Etymologiſt* and others, I thought this had been to ſome other *purpoſe* than only to *cloud the buſineſs*; And becauſe I continue ſtill in the ſame opinion, I refer the *judicious* Reader for three eminent teſtimonies more to the ſame purpoſe (out of *Diod. Siculus* of *Iſmeto*, out of *Heraclitus*, περὶ ἀπίστων, out of an *edict* of *Tiberius* ſet down by *Joſephus*) to the *Annotations* on *Act.* 17. By which, and thoſe already produced in the *Sections*, here thought fit to be deſpiſed by the *Diatribiſt*, it is moſt evident, that *Religion* and *Superſtition* were by them who were guilty of *dæmon worſhip*, or when uſed of them by *others*, taken, as exactly *Synonyma*, words importing the ſame thing. 2.

But againſt this the *Diatribiſt* conceives himſelf out of theſe very *Sections* to have gained ſomewhat to *object*, "It ſeems, *ſaith he*, the heathens did oft take the word in an ill ſenſe, and branded Reli- "gions which they did not like, by that name. *Plutarch* taxes the Jews for their Superſtition in "two things remarkable. Firſt, That when invaded, they would not riſe from their ſeats on the "Sabbath day, which was exceſs againſt the fourth Commandment, and groſs Superſtition. Second- "ly, Their killing and ſacrificing their children to *Moloch*, which being an horrid Superſtition, was "(as the former) intended as a worſhip to the true God, and yet was interpreted no better than ſa- "crificing to devils, *Pſal.* 106. 37. which though in other reſpects it was againſt the firſt Command- "ment groſs Idolatry, ſo in making it a worſhip of the true God (when he commanded it not, nei- "ther came it into his heart, as ſomewhere he ſayes) it was a kind of Superſtition againſt the ſecond "Commandment; *concluding in a* word, *that the* Etymologiſt ſpeaks fully his ſenſe, the word among "the heathen is taken for a good thing, but among Chriſtians for impiety. 3.

How ſolid this way of *objecting* is, will now ſoon be diſcerned, Firſt, By remembring in the gene- ral, that at the beginning of the Section the *teſtimonies* brought by me in thoſe Sections, were judged to be *to little purpoſe but to cloud the buſineſs, and lead men away in a miſt*, and yet now he can expreſs kindneſs to ſome of the *teſtimonies*, as thinking they may be uſeful to his pretenſions; which aſſures me, all the other might have been capable of the like *favour* and friendly *reception* from him, if they could any way have been perſwaded to do him ſervice. 4.

Secondly, To the *heathens* taking the word in an *ill ſenſe*, the *anſwer* is moſt obvious, ſo they did *Religion* too, and indifferently *either*, when either they that ſpake were *Epicureans*, *enemies* to all *Religion*, or when the *Religions* they ſpake of, were *diſliked* by them; and ſo ſure that proves nothing for the *Diatribiſt*. 5.

Thirdly, This is the *anſwer* alſo to what is obſerved from *Plutarch*, for he ſpeaks of the *religions* which he *diſliked*; the *Jewiſh* was one of them, and particularly their *obſervation* of *Sabbatick reſts* to the ruining their City, which he thought their *Religion* had bound them to, and never dreamt that they had miſtaken their *Religion*, or that their fourth *Commandment* allowed them greater *liberty*. 6.

Fourthly, That *Plutarch* mentions the *killing* and *ſacrificing* of *children*, he took that alſo for a part of ſome mens *Religion*, and thought he had reaſon to be diſſatisfied with it, and to make it an inſtance of the *Quantum Religio potuit*, *how much evil Religion did in the world*, ſtill making no *diſtinction* betwixt *Religion* and *Superſtition*. But here by the way the *Diatribiſt* hath a little miſtaken, in thinking that this *bloody worſhip* in *ſacrificing* their *children* to *Moloch*, was, as the former (*i. e.* as that of the *ſtrict Judaical reſt* in time of *invaſion*) intended as a *worſhip* to the *true God*. 7.

Certainly *Moloch* was no *true God*, but *a falſe*, the *abomination of the children of Ammon*, 1 *Kin.* 11. 7. and 2 *Kin.* 23. 13. thought by *learned* men to be a deified *King* of the *Ægyptians*, and ſo a *dæmon*, placed among the *ſtars*, the ſame that others make the *planet Mars* (ſee *Kircheri Prodromus, Coptic.* 1. 5.) and that *ſacrifice*, was the giving their *ſeed* to *Moloch*, that *falſe God*, *Lev.* 20. 2, 3, 4. or the *making their ſons and daughters paſs through the fire to Moloch*, *Jer.* 32. 45. and ſo no way intended to the *true God*. 8.

And whereas he ſaith this was *interpreted no better than ſacrificing to devils*, Pſal. 106. 37. 'tis ſtrange he ſhould not ſee or acknowledge that it was a *downright ſacrificing* to *Moloch*, a *Dæmon*, and not as to the *true God*; but then he could have had no pretence to make it an *act* of *uncommanded worſhip*, and ſo ſuch a kind of *Superſtition* as is chargeable on our *Chriſtmaſs Feſtival*; and then he had loſt all the *advantage* which this inſtance was to bring in to him. 9.

Toward this he thought to reap ſome *benefit* by that *text* of *Scripture*, *He commanded it not, neither* 10.

came it into his heart, as he ſomewhere ſayes] But why did he not tell us where *God* ſaith this? If his *memory* had failed, his *Concordance* would ſoon have helpt him to ſet down the *place*. But it was not for his turn it ſhould be examined. The place is *Jer.* 32. 35. and again *Jer.* 7. 31 and truly, belongs to theſe *ſacrifices* to *Moloch*; but then, *God's not commanding*, &c. ſignifies not only *uncommanded worſhip*, but by the *figure* μείωσις, ordinary in the *Scripture*, *worſhip directly forbidden*, under threat of *exciſion*, Lev. 20. 2. *Whoſoever he be that giveth any of his ſeed to* Moloch, *he ſhall ſurely be put to death, the people of the land ſhall ſtone him with ſtones, and I will ſet my face againſt him, and cut him off from among his people*, v. 3. *And if the people of the land do any way hide their eyes from the man, when he giveth of his ſeed to* Moloch, *and kill him not, then will I ſet my face againſt that man and family, and will cut him off, and all that go a whoring after him*, v. 4. and accordingly we ſee it in the *Execution*, Jer. 7. 31, 32. *The valley of* Tophet *where they burnt their ſons and daughters in the fire, ſhall be called the valley of ſlaughter, for they ſhall bury in* Tophet *till there be no place.*

11. And ſure this was not the manner of proceeding againſt thoſe that obſerved any *feaſt* or *ſacrifice* to the *true God*, which was not *commanded* or *preſcribed* by *God*; they that kept the *Encænia* were not thus *judged*; and therefore this was very little to the *Diatribiſt's advantage*, as now appears by examining the place; it is pity Mr. *C.* would not *conſider* it.

12. Laſtly, For the words in the *Etymologiſt*, which he ſaith are *fully his ſenſe*, 'tis again a miſtake, they are directly the contrary, Ἰσέον ὅτι παρὰ μὲν τοῖς Ἕλλησι, &c. *It muſt be known that the word Superſtition is among the Gracians* (or *Gentiles*) *taken* ἐπὶ καλῷ *for a good thing, but among us Chriſtians* ἐπὶ δ' ἀσεβείας *for impiety, i. e.* evidently the *heathens* and the *Chriſtians* uſe it for the ſame thing, the *worſhip* of *dæmons*, but that the *Gentiles* commend and account *good*, who uſe it, but we *Chriſtians* juſtly deem it the greateſt *impiety*.

13. Agreeable hereto again is that of *Phavorinus* a *Chriſtian* alſo. Δεισιδαιμονία τὸ πάντα σέβειν καὶ μὴ σεβάσμια, *Superſtition is the worſhipping all things, even thoſe which are not to be worſhipt*, and that δεισιδαίμων ſignifies ἀμφίβολος περὶ τὴν πίστιν, ἢ καὶ ὁ δεδιὼς τοὺς δαίμονας, *one that is dubious concerning faith* (as the *Iſraelites* betwixt *God* and *Baal*; or as *Tertullian* ſaith, *if there were conceived more Gods than one, cultura ejus in anceps deduceretur, he ſhould not know whom to worſhip, whether one only or both, adv. Marc. l.* 1. *c.* 5.) *or he alſo that fears* (or *worſhips*) *dæmons*, as the *Aſſyrians* in *Samaria*, that *feared the Lord and ſerved their own Gods*. And ſo ſtill this is as *contrary* to the *Diatribiſts* pretenſions as might be. And ſo much for that *Section*.

SECT. VIII.

Superſtition always ill, but not always exceſs. Probations from the uſe of words among heathens. The Quære of Divorce vindicated. Superſtitions not reproacht in the Romans by Polybius. *Ignorance not preſently Superſtition.* Ἀγνοοῦντες ἐυσεβεῖτε, *Act.* 17. *The Iſraelites worſhipping the Calf.* Δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ. Superſtitioſus *noting exceſs.*

Numb. 1. THE twenty ſecond Section makes a leap from the fourteenth to the twenty ſeventh, over twelve not very brief Sections; I ſuppoſe it is, becauſe he hath no leaſt *objection* to make againſt them (being not elſe very ſparing in this kind) and yet in them is contained my *enumeration* of all the *notions*, wherein the word *Superſtition* is or can be taken in the *antient heathens*, *Scriptures*, and *Chriſtian gloſſaries*, and the *premiſſes* on which the ſubſequent *concluſions* are founded, and cannot be *denied* while the *premiſſes* are *granted*, and the whole matter made clear, that none of the notions of the word is applicable to the benefit of the *Diatribiſt's* pretenſions.

2. Now in Section 27. it ſeems ſome flaws are to be found, as firſt, When I ſay 'tis inconſequent that *Superſtition ſimply and abſolutely taken ſhould be reſolved in all Authors to ſignifie ſomewhat that is ill, particularly falſe worſhip, this*, ſaith he, *is not the queſtion, but whether in Scripture and Orthodox Divines it do not always ſignifie ſomething evil, particularly exceſſive and falſe worſhip*. To this the anſwer is eaſie, that I am far from doubting that *Superſtition* is an *ill* thing, and therefore never meant to make that the *queſtion*; This appears of me, becauſe I every where acknowledge the word, *Greek* and *Latin*, to ſignifie the *worſhip* of *dæmons* or *falſe Gods*; only I could not but obſerve in the firſt place, that the *heathens* who are known to *worſhip* ſuch *dæmons*, and not to think that a *fault* in themſelves, did mean no *new* ill by that word (whether *exceſs* or other the like) either more or worſe than they ordinarily meant by *Religion*, this being indeed their *Religion* to *worſhip many Gods*.

3. This they muſt have done, if they had by that word underſtood an *exceſs* of *Religion*; and by their taking it in a *good* ſenſe, as *Synonymous* with *Religion*, it appears that this of *exceſs* was not eſteemed the due *notion* of it.

4. This I thought uſeful to be ſaid, that the very title of *Superſtition* might not defame every thing as an *exceſs* in *Religion*, and *criminous*, to which it was affixt, unleſs it might otherwiſe appear that there was really any ſuch *evil* in it; and this I ſaid πρὸς ἔνστασιν (to ſhew the *abſurdneſs* of their concluding, who taking the word *Superſtition* for a word of an *univerſal ill ſavour*, as ſignifying *exceſs* of *Religion*, firſt affix it to *innocent ceremonies* and *inſtitutions*, to which it no way belongs, and then infer them *nocent*, as being *Superſtitious*, without proving any charge of *malignity* againſt them) and as *preparative* to the diſcovery of the following *miſtakes*, rather than that I ever imagined *Superſtition* truly ſo called, to have no *ill* in it.

5. And therefore of this, any otherwiſe, than as I now ſay, and then meant, I ſhall make no *queſtion*, and on condition he will never apply the word *Superſtition* any otherwiſe, than the *Scripture* and *antient Chriſtian writers* apply it (*i. e.* to *dæmon worſhip*, or to *undue worſhip* of the *true God*, in the notion of *indebitus* or *illegitimus cultus* in *Aquinas*, not to each ſuch *Super ſtatutum* as he will call an *exceſs*, the uſing of each *uncommanded ceremony* and the like) I ſhall acknowledge the word always to ſignifie that, among all *good writers*, *Heathen* or *Chriſtian*, which we *Chriſtians* juſtly deem *evil*, and that

was

was clearly the *Etymologiſt's* meaning, as we ſhewed in the laſt *Section* and againſt that, there is no colour of *argument* offered in all this long *Sect.*

For what if the *vulgar tranſlation* (which he ſets as the *only* inſtance of *Popiſh Commentators*) render δεισιδαιμονία by *Superſtitio*? what if the *Papiſts* pretend it not to be taken in a good ſenſe (whom I ſuppoſe far enough from yielding themſelves to be *Superſtitious*) doth that prove that *Feſtus* meant any *exceſs* by that word, or indeed any more than *Religion*? 6.

Next when he makes his *obſervation*, that in all my *large diſcourſe I bring only heathens to ſhew the meaning of the word, and not one Divine, Greek or Latine Father, &c. who take it in a good ſenſe*] this is neither true in the *affirmation*, for I bring the *Scripture* and the *Chriſtian gloſſaries* to *teſtify* all that I pretend to; nor yet in the *application*, for I do not pretend the word to ſignify that which a *Chriſtian* counts *good*, but among the *heathen* the *worſhip* of *many Gods*, which none but *heathens* can think to have no *ill* in it, and conſequently I pretend it only of them, and of thoſe that ſet down the uſe of words among them, and of S. *Paul* when he is not a finding that *fault* in them, *Act.* 17. 22. and ſo ſtill this is ſufficient to prove that the word *originally* ſignifies not any *exceſs* of *Religion* or any other *evil*, abſtracted from that of the *Dæmon worſhip*, *&c.* which was all that I had in deſign to conclude. 7.

And in making this uſe of *heathen* Authors, ſure I have done nothing which I ever blamed in any man elſe, as the *Diatribiſt's margent* accuſeth me, citing the *Quære* of *Divorce*, *Section* 58. where I thought it unreaſonable that all the *antient Chriſtian writers* ſhould not be as competent to give us the ſignification of πορνεία as *Demoſthenes* and *Philo* (and yet made no *ſcruple* to acquieſce in the *notion*, which either *Demoſthenes* or *Philo* gave us, *Section* 57.) 8.

For if he pleaſed to mark, there is here no *difference* between the *heathen* writers and others, *Scripture* and *antient Chriſtians*, concerning the meaning of the word *Superſtition*, all yielding it *equally* to ſignify the *worſhip* of *many Gods* (whereas there that other perſon whom I *oppoſed*, profeſt a *contrariety*, and then preferred the one before the other) To which yet it is neceſſarily *conſequent*, that in another inquiry, whether *Superſtition* were among *Authors* taken in a *good* ſenſe, ſome difference ſhould be obſerved between *Authors heathen* and *Chriſtian*, becauſe it is certain the *heathen worſhip* is by us *Chriſtians* moſt juſtly lookt on as an *ill* thing, being the *worſhip* of *creatures*, but by the *heathens* thought *well* of, as the *Diatribiſt* here confeſſeth, *practiſed* and *commended*, and ſo not lookt on any otherwiſe than *Religion* it ſelf, ἐπὶ καλῷ λεγόμενον, in the *Etymologiſt*, *uſed for a good* thing; conſequently, the thing which I conteſt, is not this, that the *worſhip* of *Dæmons* is or ever was *true* or *lawful*, but that beſides this, ſuppoſed by *Chriſtians* but denyed by *heathens*, to be *evil* (adding the like of *illegitimate worſhip*) there is nothing elſe which hath been lookt on as *ſimply* bad in *Superſtition*, particularly not the *exceſs*, as that ſignifies *unpreſcribed uncommanded worſhip*, which is the only matter of the preſent *conteſt* with ſuch as the *Diatribiſt*. 9.

And he doth but *perplex* and *diſturb* the matter when he ſaith the *queſtion* is, whether it doth not always in *Scripture* and *Orthodox Divines* ſignify *exceſſive* and *falſe worſhip*, for he muſt ſet the *queſtion*, as elſewhere he doth, of *exceſſive*, as that ſignifies no more than *uncommanded* worſhip, without the addition of being *falſe*, it being evident that I defend not *falſe worſhip* of any kind to be *good*, but that *ceremonies* or *inſtitutions not commanded* by *God*, may yet be perfectly *lawful* and *blameleſs*, and that that is the only *queſtion* between us. 10.

For the *text* of the *Acts*, *c.* 25. 19. I have anſwered already, and evidenced that *Feſtus* meant nothing *ill* by *Superſtition*; and the Doctors words cited from *Sect.* 24. of the *ordinary practice of every Sect to diſlike the diſtant worſhip of others, and defame it under the title of Religion*, doth no way prejudge this; becauſe it is certain *Feſtus* was no way *factious* for the *Jews* againſt *Pauls Religion*; No more doth the *marginal* citation from *Sect.* 22. where I have ſaid that *Superſtition* was made matter of *reproach* to the *Romans*; where *Firſt*, It was not *Superſtition* ſimply, but the μὴ καλαλιπεῖν ὑπόβολῆς, *not coming ſhort of exceſs*, of which that was ſaid that it was παρὰ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὀνειδιζόμενον, *reproached by others*, and yet as much *commended* by the *Author Polybius* in that place, and Secondly, That the *old rule* in *Logick* will always hold, there is no *ſyllogizing* from *particulars*, nor can this ever be formed into a *regular ſyllogiſm* or *valid* probation, ſome there were that *reproacht* the *Romans Superſtition*, therefore *Feſtus reproacht Paul's Act.* 25. 19. or ſpake of it by way of *defamation*. 11.

What remains of this *Sect.* belongs to the place *Act.* 17. 23. of which I had ſaid, *Firſt*, That *the Apoſtle ſpeaking of thoſe whom he calls* δεισιδαιμονίστερους, *more Superſtitious than other men, tells them that they did* ἀσεβεῖν *worſhip the true God though ignorantly*, Secondly, *That he ſtiles them more religious than other men, meerly in relation to their worſhipping the unknown (which was the true) God, which others worſhipt not, and ſo meant no more by that phraſe than that they were more religious than other men, no way appearing to accuſe them of that as of their fault, but preparing thereby to declare to them that true God whom they worſhipt ignorantly.* 12.

To this many things are here *objected*, *Firſt*, That their *worſhipping the true God ignorantly with their own deviſed worſhip, was a Superſtition juſtly to be condemned, it being groſs Idolatry and ſinful Superſtition in the Iſraelites to worſhp the true God in the golden Calf.*] 13.

I anſwer, their *ignorance* of the *true God* was juſtly to be condemned, according to that of *Minutius Felix*, *Non minoris eſt ſceleris Deum ignorare quàm ladere, it is as great wickedneſs to be ignorant of God as to hurt him*; or that of *Triſmegiſtus* (as I remember) ἄγνοια μανίας ἐστὶν, *Ignorance of God is a ſpecies of madneſs*, and in another of the *ancients* ſtyle, τις μέθη a kind of *drunkenneſs* of the *ſoul*; But that being granted, *Firſt*, This *ignorance* was not the thing that *denominated* them *Superſtitious* but their *worſhipping many Gods*, *Secondly*, their *worſhipping* the *true God*, though they *knew him not*, was no *new ſpecies* of *Superſtition*, wherein they *exceeded* others, *Thirdly*, Their *worſhipping* him with their *own deviſed worſhip*, was not it which is meant by their *worſhipping* him *ignorantly*, the words in the *original* are ὃν ἀγνοοῦντες ἐυσεβεῖτε, literally *whom ye not knowing*, or being *ignorant* of him, *worſhip*, i. e. *worſhip* him whileſt ye *know him not*, which no way refers to the *manner* of their *worſhip*, as *deviſed by themſelves*, but only to their *ignorance* of the *God* whom they thus *worſhipt*, which therefore the *Apoſtle* applies himſelf to cure, and *accordingly* it follows, *him declare I unto you.* 14.

Laſtly, Their *worſhipping* him as *dwelling in Temples made with hands*, i. e. in little *Chaplets*, or *Shrines* 15.

or *Images*, &c. *v.* 24. is not their *Superſtition* but *Idol-worſhip*, and is very much more than the *uncommanded ceremonies* will amount to, and ſo cannot be a proper inſtance of their *own deviſed worſhip*, in the *Diatribiſts* notion of the phraſe for all *uncommanded worſhip*; and ſure the *Iſraelites worſhipping* the *true God* in a *golden Calf*, is as little pertinent to that buſineſs; for if it be true, that they *worſhipt* none but the *true God*, then was that only *Idolatry* againſt the ſecond *Commandment*, not *Superſtition* or *dæmon worſhip* againſt the *firſt*; or if they *worſhipt* the *Gods* of the *Ægyptians*, or any one of them, *Apis* in that *figure*, then what was that to the *worſhipping* of the *true God* in an *ignorant*, or by *themſelves deviſed manner?*

16. Secondly, He ſaith my rendring the place *more religious* than *other* men, *in relation to their worſhipping the unknown God, which others worſhipt not, is my gloſs, begs the queſtion, is againſt the text it ſelf, I perceive that in all things ye are too Superſtitious, both in their worſhipping many falſe Gods, and in their ignorant worſhip of the true, and in their vitious rites of worſhip*, adding that *this ſenſe the Doctor himſelf gave Sect.* 11. *I conſider and behold you in all things* (or *in all that I ſee of you*) *as men more Superſtitious than others.*

17. Here I perceive my words are *miſtaken*, and therefore ſhall firſt anſwer to that; then, to the former parts of the *objection*. The *Greek* is διὰ πάντα ὡς δεισιδαιμονεστέρους ὑμᾶς θεωρῶ, literally, *in all things*, or *in all reſpects, I look upon you as more Superſtitious*, i. e. (I take it, and I thought I had ſufficiently expreſt it before) *conſidering all the altars and inſcriptions, i. e.* the *names* of your *deities*, which I ſee or behold, I conclude that you are *more Superſtitious* or *religious*, *worſhip more Gods* or *dæmons*, than other men.

18. That this is the ſenſe, I am inclined to believe by the *reaſon* of his ſpeech rendred in the *next*, διερχόμενος γὰρ, &c. *for paſſing through and contemplating your worſhips*, i. e. the *Gods* which you *worſhip*, *I found alſo an altar on which was inſcribed, To the unknown God.* The ſum of which is, that in the ſurvey of their *altars*, which contained the *names* of their *Gods*, he found one *altar* remarkably more, than is uſual among *other* people, that *to the unknown God*, the *true God* of *heaven*, which others in their πολυθεότης or *worſhip* of *many Gods*, did not *worſhip*; which being the *proof* or *reaſon* (expreſt by the γὰρ *for*) of the former ſpeech, muſt needs give me authority to interpret it in *proportion* thereto, that *conſidering* all that he had *ſeen* of them, peculiarly that *altar* to the *unknown God*, he concluded them *more Superſtitious*, i. e. *worſhippers* of *more Gods* than *other* folks.

19. That the *Athenians* truly were ſo eſteemed, appears evidently by what was ſaid in the Treatiſe of *Superſtition*, Section 11. and hath here formerly been added to that head, and therefore that will very fitly be the notion of the word, not *too Superſtitious*, but literally *more Superſtitious* than others; eſpecially if it be remembred, that the bare addition of the *worſhip* of the *true God* (however *unknown* to them) to their other δεισιδαιμονία or *worſhip* of *many Gods*, cannot be a *new fault* in them, diſtinct from the other, or a *ſuperaddition* to the guilts of *other* men.

20. All which being conſidered, it now appears, Firſt, How far from truth it is, which is here ſuggeſted, that *Pauls* ſpeech of δεισιδαιμονεστέρους θεωρῶ (however rendred) *belongs both to their worſhipping ſo many falſe Gods, and to their ignorant worſhip of the true, and to their vitious rites of worſhip*; when it clearly belongs but to *one*, their *worſhipping* the *unknown God*, which others *worſhipt* not. Secondly, How far my words Section 11. were miſtaken or perverted by him; Thirdly, How far my *interpretation* hath been from oppoſing the *text* it ſelf, being the clear importance of the *text* conſidered with S. *Pauls reaſon*, as the *key* by which to enter into the *true* meaning of it; and laſtly, how far this is from any *begging* the *queſtion*, when I *proved* ſo largely whatſoever I ſaid, and when no *anſwer* is here offered to thoſe *proofs*, and yet, if there were any need, here have been added farther convincing *confirmations* of the ſame thing, if yet they may deſerve to be taken notice of.

21. And this is all that is in the leaſt degree needful to be ſaid to this Section 22. unleſs I yet add, that thoſe words in the cloſe of it, cited from me, that Section 31. *Superſtitioſus in the poſitive ſignifies exceſs more than in the comparative*, are not very intelligible, which they would ſurely have been, to me at leaſt, if they had rightly reported my *ſenſe*.

22. That which I ſaid is no more than this, that *Superſtitioſus* by force of the *termination*, *oſus*, may ſignifie an *exceſs*, and that ſo *Religioſus* may alſo; but what is that to the uſe of the word, whether in the *poſitive* or the *comparative*, when it is the bare rendring of the *Greek* δεισιδαίμων, as here it is, which no way ſignifies thus?

SECT. IX.

The Diatribiſt's conceſſion of the innocence of unpreſcribed ceremonies, and ſo of all that is demanded. His cenſure of himſelf and Chamier. *Authority in a Church to inſtitute Ceremonies. Abſtaining from ceremonies, becauſe commanded by men, or abuſed by Papiſts.*

Numb. 1. THE next or 23. Section is very brief, but yet ſeems to me to be very *conſiderable*, and that in ſuch a degree, that it might well make an end of this *debate* betwixt the *Diatribiſt* and me; for having exactly ſet down a ſecond *inconſequence* (by me *noted* and *concluded* to be ſuch, from the opening of the *Greek* and *Latin* words) *viz.* "*that* the uſe of ceremonies or rites in the worſhip of God, "if not diſtinctly preſcribed by the example or precept of Chriſt, ſhould be called Superſtition, and "for that condemned] *he anſwers no more but this.* [I believe this is a miſtake; none that I know, "make ſuch a conſequence, but rather thus, that what rite or ceremony ſoever is made a part of "worſhip, without ſuch example or precept of Scripture, is Superſtitious and therefore con-"demned.

2. I ſhall not here indeavour to perſwade the *Diatribiſt*, that he *knows* ſome who *condemn uncommanded rites* as *Superſtitious*, becauſe *Super ſtatutum*, ſuch as *kneeling* at the *Euchariſt*, uſing the *croſs* in *baptiſm*, *bowing* at the *name* of *Jeſus*; but taking him at his word, I beſeech him to tell me, why then he

he undertook the *confutation* of the *Treatiſe* of *Superſtition*, which, he muſt know, contended no more than this, being deſigned to this *only* end, the averting that *envy* and *calumny*, that was then frequently but unjuſtly caſt upon our *Church*, upon the account of *ceremonies*, and which was ſince in the *Tract* of *Feſtivals*, no farther applied, than as that *analogie* would juſtly bear, which was betwixt *uncommanded rites* and *uncommanded dayes* of *worſhip*, betwixt *unpreſcribed geſtures*, and *times*, both which are known to be but *circumſtances* and *acceſſories*, no *eſſential* parts or *branches* of *worſhip*.

This truly were very ſtrange for him to be *ignorant* of; As it is, 'tis the *yielding* me the whole 3.
cauſe, and I have no more to *contend* for, but only *peace*, and what by *perfect analogie* from one *circumſtance* of *worſhip* to another, will irrefragably be concluded from that which is here *granted* by him.

'Tis now pitty that we that are thus ſuddenly *pieced*, ſhould ever *fall* out again; Nay we are like- 4.
ly, if words may be *believed*, to be yet more *firmly knit* together and *conſolidated*, for Section 24. in anſwer to the third *inconſequence* noted by me ["that men on pretence and in the name of piety, "ſhould abſtain from ſome obſervances (indifferent) as Superſtitious, either becauſe commanded by "lawful authority, or abuſed by Papiſts] *he ſpeaks clearly that it is a* worſe miſtake, *and that he* be- "lieves I cannot give an inſtance of one underſtanding Chriſtian, that ever did abſtain from obſer- "vances indifferent, becauſe commanded by lawful authority, but rather that they were thought not "indifferent, but obtruded on them as parts of worſhip, and ſo likewiſe for the other, that they "have been uſed by Papiſts, is not all, but that by them they have been abuſed and counted parts of "worſhip, and may eaſily return to be ſo accounted by others.

But to this I muſt reply, leſt by *ſilence* I incur the guilt of *ſcandal* of having *wronged* others, and 5.
of writing all that hath been written on this Theme, without any *adverſary* to provoke me to it. Firſt then, I profeſs to be able to give inſtance of *many*, that were *baptized* into our *common faith*, and ſo were *Chriſtians* (how deeply *underſtanding* I pretend not to judge) who have abſtained from the *uſe* of *ceremonies* meerly upon this *ſcore*, becauſe commanded by their *Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical Superiours*, the *King* and *Biſhops*, by *Canon Eccleſiaſtical*; This, ſaid they, was laying more *burthens* on them than *God* had laid, and ſo uſurping on their *Chriſtian liberty*. And in ſtead of naming thoſe men, without their conſent, for that muſt now be the *vilifying* them, the involving them under the *Diatribiſts cenſure*, that they are not *underſtanding Chriſtians*, I ſhall name one on whom he may paſs what judgment he ſhall pleaſe, having full power to do it, this very *Diatribiſt* himſelf, *p.* 31. Where firſt, He hath theſe words, *If men may be Judges what are fit for number and wholeſomeneſs, every after comer will think himſelf as wiſe as he that went before, till they have loaded the Chriſtian above the Jew.* Secondly, That the *learned* Chamier *hath well obſerved, that there may be many miſchiefs in a few ceremonies, if the authority to inſtitute them be in the Church, or any man or men.*

The *former* of theſe ſpeeches is pretty home to the point in hand, for if the *objection* to the *number* 6.
or *wholeſomneſs* of *ceremonies* be this, that *men* are *judges* of them, as they always are when *men command* them, then ſure it is the *power* of the *lawful magiſtrate* (for he is a *man* or *men*) to *command*; which is the *ground* of the *quarrel*; and they that quarrel thus, and abſtain from *indifferent ceremonies* upon this ſcore, muſt *abſtain* becauſe *commanded* by *lawful authority*. As for example, I ſuppoſe *bowing* when *Jeſus* is *named* in the *publick worſhip* (or when *Chriſt*, or when the *Holy Ghoſt*) to be in it ſelf *lawful* or *indifferent*, becauſe no where *forbidden* by *God*; I ſuppoſe farther, that being ſo, *this* and a *few* other ſuch *ceremonies* may very ſafely be uſed by a *Chriſtian*, though they were not *commanded*; I now demand, may a *few*, namely, *three* or *four* ſuch *ceremonies* be lawfully *preſcribed* or *commanded* by the *Supream power* in any *Church* to all under that authority? And may all under that *authority* ſafely *obſerve* ſuch *ceremonies* ſo *commanded?* If they may, then *men* may be *judges* what *ceremonies* are fit both for *number* and *wholeſomeneſs*, which is contrary to the direct words of the *Diatribiſt*, in the former part of this *ſpeech*; If they may not, then it ſeems what was before *lawful* and *indifferent*, is now, ſince it was *commanded*, and by no other *change*, become *unlawful*, which was the *inconſequence* I pointed at, and it ſeems miſtook not in thinking ſome body (it now ſeems this *Diatribiſt*) to be the very perſon *guilty* of it.

But then the *latter* ſpeech is as punctual to it as could be well imagined (and if the *Diatribiſt* have 7.
cited duly, *Chamier* and he are both of this *opinion*) For it being certain, that nothing can be *commanded* by *lawful authority*, unleſs the *authority* of *inſtituting* it be either in the *Church*, or *man*, or *men*; it muſt neceſſarily follow upon the aſſerting of the many *miſchiefs* in a *few ceremonies*, if the *authority* to inſtitute them be in the *Church*, or *man*, or *men*, that there muſt be *many miſchiefs* in their being *commanded* by *lawful authority*; and then, no *underſtanding Chriſtian* can think it fit for him by *obſerving* ſuch *commands* to be *acceſſory* to or guilty of the *introducing* thoſe *miſchiefs*, and ſo muſt *abſtain* on that one account of the *Churches* exerciſing ſuch an *authority*, which was the very thing I deemed, and noted to be ſo *inconſequent*.

Nay the very words of the *Diatribiſt* in this place, when he charges me of *miſtake*, being theſe 8.
[*that they that abſtain from indifferent obſervances, do it becauſe they were thought not indifferent, but obtruded on them as parts of worſhip*] are either a *calumny* againſt the *Governours* of our *Church*, or elſe they aſſert what he diſclaims ſo ſolemnly.

For I ſhall demand, Is his meaning this, that the *Governours* of the *Church* thought the *ceremonies* 9.
ſimply *neceſſary* and not *indifferent*, *antecedently to the command of the Church*, i. e. *neceſſary* by the *Divine Law*, though the *Church* had never *commanded* them? If that be his meaning (as ſeems moſt probable by what follows [*obtruded on them as parts of worſhip*] for all *parts* of *worſhip* are *neceſſary* by *divine Law*, though never *commanded* by *man*) then this is a direct *calumny* againſt the *Governours* of the *Church*, who never thought all *ceremonies* to be *preſcribed* by *God's Law*, and therefore *preſcribed* them by *Canon Eccleſiaſtical*, which argues that they eſteemed them not as *Divine* but *Human Laws*, never *obtruded* them as *parts* of *worſhip*, but as *ceremonies* for *uniformity* and *decency*, and as uſeful toward *aſſiſting*, *inciting*, and *expreſſing* of *piety* outwardly.

But if his meaning be, that being in themſelves *indifferent*, they became *neceſſary* and not *indiffe-* 10.
rent by the *intervening* of the *Churches command*, and ſo were *obtruded* on men as *parts* of *worſhip* (as

that

that may poſſibly ſignify with him *parts* of *obedience* or *duty* to *God* by *virtue* of his *command* to *obey* our *Superiors*) and if this were the thing *diſliked* in the *ceremonies* preſcribed by the *Church*, then again tis evident that their being *commanded* by *lawful authority*, is the only *objection* to them, and *ground* of *abſtaining* from them, in the judgment of this *Diatribiſt*, at the very point of time, when he ſo ſolemnly diſclaims it.

11. So likewiſe may be ſaid to his account of thoſe things which are *abſtained* from, becauſe they have been uſed by *Papiſts*, *This*, ſaith he, *is becauſe they have been by them abuſed and counted parts of worſhip*. But truly I cannot with truth thus affirm of the *Papiſts*, that any of the *ceremonies* which we uſe from them, were ever by them accounted *parts* of *worſhip*, but only as *uſeful wholeſome ceremonies* appointed by the *Church*.

12. Of the *difference* between *parts* of *worſhip*, and *circumſtances* of *time*, *place*, *geſture*, *acceſſaries*, of *worſhip*, I have ſpoken at large, c. 2. §. 3. And though hereafter §. 28. this *difference* be fully conſented to by the *Diatribiſt* in theſe words [*ſome rites and ceremonies of worſhip are rather called circumſtances of worſhip, time, place, geſture, which are common adjuncts of Religious and Civil affairs, than properly Religious, much leſs to be accounted parts of worſhip*] yet by what hath here been ſaid by him, it appears that all his skill lies in managing that one *fallacy*, putting all *ceremonies* and *inſtitutions* of the *Church* under that one *ambiguous* phraſe, *uncommanded worſhip*, perſwading himſelf or others that we introduce *new parts* of *worſhip*, and ſo do contrary to *God's command*, who hath ſet down the *rule* of *worſhip*, i. e. preſcribed all the *parts* and *ſpecies* of *worſhip*; whereas he cannot but know, that all that we ſay in aſſerting whether of *Ceremonies* or *Feſtivals*, is no more but this, that each of theſe, not as *parts* of *worſhip*, but as *decent attendants* of it, though not *inſtituted* by *God*, have yet been *lawfully* and *orderly* appointed and obſerved by the *Church* of *God* in general, and are to us become matter of *obligation*, by that means, and as *preſcribed* by the *Governors* of our *particular Church*, to which our *obedience* is due, and ſo that there is no degree of *Superſtition* in us in doing that which is thus *required* of us, nor in thoſe that *require* it, in laying this *obligation* upon us.

13. And ſo much for his *animadverſions* on the *three inconſequences*, from which if he would really and in earneſt clear himſelf, theſe *debates* were *certainly concluded*.

SECT. X.

Strictures on ſome particulars in the remaining Sections. What exceſs Divines mean by Superſtition. What S. Auguſtine. *Obligation to performance, without being parts of worſhip. Obſervers of order more Religious, more acceptable than others. The reaſon why Jewiſh ceremonies are interdicted. The Church of* England *ſparing in Ceremonies. Ceremonies not foreſhewing Chriſt, lawful to be retained by Chriſtians. The abſtinence from blood, long continued in the Church. The* Saturday *Sabbath. Negative wholſomeneſs not ſufficient to recommend Ceremonies. All folly in worſhip, is not Superſtition. The opinion of the Antient Church worth conſidering. No duties appointed for the circumſtances ſake. Time or place inſtituted by God, is a circumſtance, as well as when by man. Apoſtolical Divine.*

Numb. 1. THAT which follows *Section* 25. &c. is for the moſt part but *revolving* the ſame things again that have hitherto been ſpoken to, or the hiding himſelf in thoſe *obſcurities* which have now been explained, ſometimes *granting* all that I aſſert, ſometimes *denying* it in *ambiguous phraſes*; as, that all *exceſs* in *worſhip* not *preſcribed*, is a *nimiety* and *culpable Sect.* 25. that *rites* be they never ſo *few*, if introduced as *parts* of *worſhip*, are *Superſtitious* v. 28. and the like; And the Reader muſt not be condemned to the *penance*, of having all that hath been ſaid on theſe heads, *repeated* again, and therefore I am both in *juſtice* and *charity* obliged to omit particular replies κατ' ἀδρα to the remaining *Sections*, yet ſhall read them over as carefully as I can, and obſerve whatever I diſcern may be thought *pertinent* to his *cauſe*, which hath not hitherto been ſpoken to.

2. As *Firſt*, When he ſaith *Section* 26. that *all Divines generally condemn it*; I anſwer, they *condemn Superſtition*, but mean not by it, every *exceſs* in *worſhip* not *preſcribed*, as that phraſe comprehends all *ceremonies* and *feſtivals* not *commanded* by *God*; and thoſe *Divines* that *condemn* this under the name of *Superſtition*, are the men of whom only my words are to be *underſtood*, that they are ſo *few* and ſo *modern*, *and of ſo ſmall authority*, *that they were ſcarce worth producing*, no *antient* writer having ever *condemned* all *ceremonies* and *feſtivals*, which are not *commanded* by *God*, under the title of *Superſtition*; and that * *Aquinas's* words are no way appliable to it, hath been already ſhewed.

* *Secunda ſecundæ qu.* 92. *art.* 1.

3. As for S. *Auguſtines* place produced by me *Section* 33. from whence he collects that an *inſtitution* of *worſhip* by *men* may be *Superſtitious*, I anſwer, that that Father ſpeaks there of thoſe *qui inſtituerunt Deorum ſimulachra*, *who inſtituted images of Gods*, which the *Diatribiſt* could not but ſee, if he had pleaſed, and of ſuch *inſtitutions* I grant that they not only may be, but are *Superſtitious*, but our *ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* are no *Deorum Simulachra*, *images of the Gods*, and ſo ſure not lyable to his *cenſure*.

4. *Secondly*, When *Section* 29. he affirms of *uſages in themſelves lawful and allowable*, that *if they were taught or practiſed as neceſſary*, *or as making the obſervers more Religious than others*, *or more acceptable to God*, *then they would be parts of worſhip*] (and then I muſt ſuppoſe by his tenure of *doctrine*, *Superſtitious*) I anſwer. *Firſt*, That *decency*, or *uniformity*, or *obedience* to *Superiors* may be a *competent* ground to turn *lawful* ceremonies into *neceſſary*, and on thoſe grounds joyned together, I may *kneel* and *teach kneeling* at the taking of the *Euchariſt* to be *neceſſary*, viz. not by any *neceſſity* of *divine precept* terminated *immediately* in this *geſture*, but by ſuch *neceſſity* as *Humane Laws*, by force of the *fifth Commandment*, and πείθεσθε ἡγουμένοις, *obey thoſe that are placed over you*, lay upon me; and this is far from making this *kneeling* a *part* of *worſhip*, when we know it is but a *geſture*, and *circumſtance* of it. *Secondly*, That they which *pray reverently* and *decently*, obſerve *uniformity*, *obey* the *lawful commands* of the *Church*, are in ſo doing *more Religious* and more *acceptable* to *God* than others, who *cæteris paribus*, do it not;

pray

pray irreverently, act *undecently*, obſerve not *uniformity*, diſobey the *lawful commands* of their *Eccleſiaſtical Superiours*, or than they which perform the *ſame* things upon their own *choices*. So ſaith *Leo de jejun. 7. menſ. Serm. 3. Divinarum namq; reverentia Sanctionum inter qualibet ſpontaneæ obſervantiæ ſtudia habet ſemper privilegium ſuum, ut ſacratius ſit quod publica lege celebratur, quàm quod privatâ inſtitutione penditur. The reverence of the Divine*, i. e. *Eccleſiaſtical ſanctions have always this priviledge among ſpontaneous obſervances, that whatſoever is performed by publick law, is more ſacred, than what is done upon private inſtitution.* This I hope I ſhall not need farther to prove; and if not, then ſure the *teaching* this or *acting* on theſe grounds, will not make my *allowable action criminous* or *Superſtitious*.

Thirdly, When Section 31. he finds fault with men for ſaying that the *ſole reaſon why old Jewiſh ceremonies are interdicted us Chriſtians, is, becauſe the obſerving thoſe which foreſhewed Chriſt, and teaching the neceſſity of them, would be the denying Chriſt to be come*, parallelling this with an *anſwer* of *Bellarmine*'s, and rendring an account from *Chamier*, that there was *another reaſon* of their *abrogation, becauſe they did load the conſcience with a yoke of a multitude of ceremonies, and that this is common to thoſe, and to the traditions of men*] I anſwer, Firſt, That it is one thing for *Jewiſh ceremonies* to be *interdicted Chriſtians*, another for them not to be *impoſed*; the *weight* of the *yoke*, was the reaſon why they were not to be *impoſed*, and to that the *Diatribiſts reaſons* in the concluſion of Section 31. do *all* belong; but my ſpeech was evidently of their being *interdicted*, and that meant not only of the *multitude* of them, but of *every* or *each* of them, and the ſole *reaſon* of that was this which I aſſigned; for if the *weight* of the *multitude* were at all *conſidered* in that, then any *one* of them, which ſure was not a *multitude*, would have been *lawful*, by name *circumciſion*, or *ſacrificing*, or the like, againſt which yet the *Chriſtian* interdict lies, as well as againſt the whole *number*. 5.

Secondly, 'Tis certain that in the *application* of this inſtance to *ceremonies* (not *preſcribed* by *God* in a *Chriſtian Church*) there is great *difference* betwixt the *Church* of which *Bellarmine* was an *advocate*, and that which I undertook to *defend*. In the *Church* of *Rome* there is a great *multitude* of *ceremonies* and *feſtivals*, which may be capable of the title of *weight* and *yoke*, but the *Church* of *England* is far more *ſparing*, and I had fully conſented to the rule of *paucæ & ſalubres, few and ſalubrious*, and was now diſputing for the *lawfulneſs* of *ſome ceremonies, uncommanded* by *God*, not for the *expedience* of near *ſo many*, as other *Chriſtians* both of the *Weſtern* and *Eaſtern Churches* have received into their *Canons*, and proportionable to that, was any *one*, or never ſo *few old Jewiſh ceremonies*, for the *abrogation* of which I was therefore obliged to give ſuch an account, as was not founded in the multitude of them, and conſequently could not take either *Chamier*'s or the *Diatribiſt*'s advice, to render any other than what I rendred, as I thought, from ſuch like plain words of the *Apoſtle*, *We have an altar, of which they have not power to eat, that ſerve the tabernacle*, Heb. 13. 6.

In this matter the *Diatribiſt* asks a *ſubtle queſtion, Whether if a Chriſtian had obſerved ſome Jewiſh ceremony, which did not foreſhew Chriſt to come, but ſignificant only of ſomething paſt (though they had not taught it neceſſary) the Apoſtle would not have blamed them for that as ſuperſtitious; and ſo for any new rites and ceremonies?* To which I anſwer confidently, and to the latter firſt, that he would *not*, and the very asking or *queſtioning* it in that *form*, as if it could not be *denied* but the *Apoſtle* would have *blamed* them, is the known *fallacy* of *begging* the *queſtion*: For the whole matter of *controverſy* betwixt me and the *Diatribiſt* is this, whether every *deviſed rite or ceremony* not *commanded* by *God*, be *ſuperſtitious?* 7.

And to the *former* part of the *queſtion* I *anſwer* as *confidently*, and ask him *firſt*, what he thinks of the *abſtinence from things ſtrangled*, and all *eating* of *bloud*, was not that a *Jewiſh ceremony?* and was not that obſerved by *Chriſtians*, *Act.* 15. and did the *Apoſtles* blame it as *ſuperſtitious?* Certainly they did not. Nay, did not this *obſervance* continue among *Chriſtians* for *many* ages? *Ne animalium quidem ſanguinem in epulis habemus, ſuffocatis & morticinis abſtinemus, we have not the bloud of any living creatures in our feaſts, we abſtain from things ſtrangled, and that die of themſelves?* ſaith *Tertullian*, *Apol.* c. 9. And *Lucian* tells us how his *Peregrinus* was rejected by the *Chriſtians*, ὤφθη γάρ τι, ὡς οἶμαι, ἐδίων ἀπορρήτων ἀυτοῖς, *for eating ſome of their forbidden meats*, which ſure belongs to this matter; and in *Euſebius*'s *Hiſtory*, l. 5. c. 1. *Biblis* thus vindicates the *Chriſtians* from the accuſation of *eating* of *children*, becauſe, ſaith ſhe, μηδὲ ἀλόγων ξώων αἷμα φαγεῖν ἐξὸν, *we count it not lawful to eat the bloud of unreaſonable creatures.* If this be not perfectly home to his *queſtion*, I ſhall then proceed, and alledge for my inſtance the known practice of the *Chriſtian Church* of the *Apoſtles* and *pureſt* time, who as they *celebrated* the *weekly Lords day* on the *firſt* of the *week*, in *commemoration* of *Chriſts reſurrection*, ſo they continued the *obſervation* of the *Saturday Sabbath* on the *laſt day* of the *week*, in *remembrance* of the *Creation* of the *World*. The cuſtom appears in *Tertullian de Monogam.* and was continued to the time of the *Laodicean Council*, which orders that not only the *Law*, as *Act.* 15. 21. but the *Goſpel* alſo ſhould be read that day. And the *words* of *Balſamon* are clear, παρὰ τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἐξισώθησαν δὲ ὅλως χαρὶν τοῖς κυριακοῖς τὰ σάββατα, *the Sabbaths were by the holy Fathers almoſt quite equalled to the Lords dayes:* and a great deal more to the ſame purpoſe, as is elſewhere ſhewed in the *Expoſition* of the fourth *Commandment*. 8.

Fourthly, When Section 32. he ſo reports my words as to conclude me to affirm, that *if ceremonies be but harmleſs, or negatively wholeſome, there cannot be too much of them*, This is a plain changing of my ſenſe into that which is moſt *contrary* to it; For my words are plain, without his *gloſs*, that *if they be poſitively wholeſom or tending to edification* (not *contenting* my ſelf with *negatively wholeſom* or *harmleſs*, or with any thing leſs than *poſitive wholeſomneſs*) then there will be *little reaſon to accuſe them of exceſs*, then they will *rather help devotion than incumber it*, the fear of which was the main *objection* againſt the *multitude* of them. 9.

Fifthly, When Section 35. he pretends to *prove all folly and vanity in the worſhip of God, to be ſuperſtition*, by demanding what *Superſtition* is, but *folly and vanity?*] this is a meer *paralogiſm* never reducible into a *Logical mood* and *figure*) by ſuppoſing things to be *convertible*, which are *not*, as, if I ſhould prove a *particular ſubſtance* (for example, the *ſoul* of man) to be a *body*, becauſe every *body*, is a *ſubſtance*, The anſwer would be eaſie, by ſaying every *body* is a *ſubſtance*, but every *ſubſtance* is 10.

not

not a *body*; ſo in like manner, *every ſuperſtition* is *folly*, and *vanity*, but every *folly* and *vanity*, even in the *worſhip* of *God*, is not *ſuperſtition*, This was a little too *groſs* a *Sophiſm* to impoſe it ſelf upon the *Diatribiſt*, and he now ſees a ſmall meaſure of *ſubtilty* was ſufficient to *enable* me for the *diſcovering* of it.

11. Sixthly, When Section 34. on occaſion of my ſpeaking of that one *kind* of *exceſs*, of *placing more virtue in ſome things than belongs to them*, he demands what I mean by [*or in the eſtimation of the purer ages of the Church*] and *whether the purer ages of the Church, after the Apoſtles, had power to put virtue into things which they had not either naturally or by the rule of Gods word?* I anſwer, that I never thought of any ſuch thing, that my meaning is *plain* enough, if he would pleaſe to ſee it in the end of Section 45. *viz.* that the *thing*, there mentioned, the *ſign* of the *Croſs* and the *parva Evangelia*, and the like, had *not either naturally or by the rule of Gods word, or in the eſtimation of the purer ages of the Church, that force or virtue in them*, which in the latter *impurer ages* they were thought to have: and I wonder what difficulty there was in *underſtanding*, or fault in *affirming* this, which hath no more *dangerous* intimation, than that the *opinion* or *eſtimation* of the *pureſt* ages of the *Church*, *i. e.* the *firſt* and neareſt to the *Apoſtles* times, were, in any ſuch controverſie as this, very fit to be conſidered in their due place, *i. e.* next after the *Apoſtles* themſelves.

12. Seventhly, When Section 30. concerning *holineſs*, or *ſeparation* to *holy* from *common uſes*, he promiſes to ſpeak *ſomewhat conſiderable*, and under that head tells us that there is this *difference between times and places ſeparated by God, and thoſe which are ſeparated by men, that the former require holy duties to till them up, i. e.* that the *duties* are *appointed* for the *time* or *places* ſake, *but the latter are to wait upon holy duties, the time or place are appointed for the duties ſake*] I muſt ſtill challenge his *promiſe*, whereby he is yet our *debtor* of *ſomewhat conſiderable*. For certainly *prayer* and *faſting* and *ſacrifices* among the *Jews*, all *duties appointed* by *God* (as in ſtead of the laſt, the *offertory* or *alms* among *Chriſtians*) were not appointed for *time* or *places* ſake; *holy dayes* and *holy places*, the *weekly Sabbath*, and the *annual* day of *Expiation*, and the *tabernacle* and *Temple* at *Jeruſalem*, were never the *end* for which *prayer*, *&c.* were *inſtituted*, nor is it imaginable how they ſhould, when each of thoſe *duties*, viſibly *prayer* and *ſacrifice*, were *appointed* and *practiſed* before there was any ſuch thing, as *Tabernacle* or *Temple* inſtituted by *God*.

13. Again, the *time* or *place*, when *inſtituted* by *God* himſelf, is as truly a *circumſtance* of *worſhip* as when *inſtituted* by *man*, and *duty* is equally the *ſubſtance*: and it can with no *probability* be affirmed, that the *ſubſtance* is appointed for the *circumſtances* ſake, or (as he is pleaſed to ſpeak) *to till up the circumſtances*, any otherwiſe than he would ſay, *ſubſtances* were created to *till up accidents*, the *body* for the *colours* ſake.

14. As for his *charge* at the end of Sect. 39. that I make *difference* betwixt *Apoſtolical* and *divine inſtitutions*, and therein vary from my *reſolution* of the *firſt Quære*, Section 22. It is ſoon diſpatcht by acknowledging I do not think that the *Apoſtles* were *God*, and thereupon for *perſpicuity* ſake, I made theſe ſeveral heads of *inſtitutions*, ſome by *Chriſt*, ſome by the *Apoſtles*, *inſpired*, and *commiſſionated* by *Chriſt*; the former I called *Divine*, the ſecond *Apoſtolical*, as that is not *perſonally* and *immediately divine*, yet not at all *doubting*, or giving any cauſe of *doubt*, whether the *latter* were not of *divine original* and *obligation* alſo, wherein ſure I ſpake after the *example* and *manner* of *men*, and that in order to *diſtinctneſs* and *perſpicuity*, not foreſeeing ſuch *cavils* as this, when I thus ſpake.

15. Eighthly, What follows of *Will-worſhip* in the end of this *Exercitation*, muſt be reſerved to the next *Exercitation*, which is the place deſigned for it; and for the *Diatribiſt* to take it here for *granted*, as he doth, that my *voluntary oblation* is an eminent *Species* of *Superſtition*, *againſt which, puniſhment is denounced in the ſecond Commandment*; when he knows that whole *Tract* of *Will-worſhip* undertakes to demonſtrate the contrary; what is this but a meer *begging* of the *Queſtion*, and that a prime ſort of *fallacious arguing*, the ſolemn *refuge* of thoſe which are *deſtitute* of all other?

SECT. XI.

A Vindication of the Tract of Superſtition from uncharitableneſs.

Numb. 1. THeſe few things being thus ſhortly replyed to, by way of *Stricture*, there remains now no more on this *firſt head* of *diſcourſe*, but to *vindicate* and approve my *charity* to the *Diatribiſt*, as I have hitherto done my *doctrine* againſt him. And as this is by his *concluſion* impoſed on me as my task, ſo I doubt not but to find it an *eaſy* one, if he will weigh my *actions* in the ſame *balance* which he uſeth for his own, nay I wiſh he could as eaſily *clear* himſelf, who hath thus judged me.

2. His words are theſe, Section 43. by way of *concluſion* of that firſt *Exercitation*, "And now the "Doctor may be pleaſed to review, and if he will, recal his bitter falſe uncharitable concluſion, Sect. "57, 58. unbeſeeming both his piety and gravity. For now it will appear that the charge of Super-"ſtition on ſome men is no Mormo, nor yet unjuſt, but what is avowed by himſelf and party to be "their opinion and practice, and what is proved to be really Superſtitious according to the true no-"tion of the word Superſtition among Reformed Orthodox Divines.

3. In *obedience* to his *admonition*, and in a *ſolemn dread* of having ſaid any thing *bitterly*, *falſely*, *and uncharitably*, and without any manner of *incitation* againſt the *Diatribiſt*, who uſeth this *language* (which if it be not found to have perfect *truth* in it, muſt be acknowledged to be very *uncharitable*, I need not add, *bitter* toward me) I have *warily* and *ſuſpiciouſly* reviewed thoſe *Sections*, and I ſhall deſire the *indifferent* Reader to do ſo too, and to tell me what *ſyllable* or *minuteſt* part of them there is, which can any way deſerve from any *diſpaſſionate* perſon, the title either of *falſe* in any degree, or of *uncharitable* or *bitter* in relation to any man then or now living.

4. For this I muſt *premiſe*, that the ſevereſt *Satyre* againſt a *vice*, and not a *perſon*, which carries perfect *truth* and *juſtice* in it, that repreſents a *damnable ſin* in the *ugliеſt colours*, and no otherwiſe reflects

flects upon the *perſon* of any man, than as his own *conſcience* ſhall be thus *awakened* with a ſight of his own *guilt*, is ſo far from either *uncharitable* or *bitter*, (unleſs in the notion wherein the *wholeſomeſt Phyſick* or moſt *neceſſary Chirurgery* muſt undergo the ſame *cenſure*) that it is the greateſt and moſt *obliging Chriſtian* act of *mercy*, and *kindneſs*, and *ſovereign charity*, that *piety* and *gravity* can ſuggeſt to any. And unleſs it aſperſe (by affixing ſuch *vices* to) *particular* perſons, eſpecially thoſe who are not *guilty* of them (as here the *Diatribiſt* hath in plain words affixt that *foul ſin* of *Superſtition* on the *Doctor perſonally*, and inlarged it to *his party*, which he knows muſt involve all the *obedient* ſons of the *Church* of *England*, for the *Doctor* cannot with any tolerable *charity* be ſaid or thought to be of any *other party*) there is no ground of *charge* of the leaſt *aſperity* in this.

And then it is moſt certain that thoſe two *Sections* can no wiſe fall under this *cenſure*, the ſumm of 5.
them being no more but this, that if the *crime* of *Superſtition* were faſtned on none but thoſe on whom the *Scripture* directs to faſten it, all that have oppoſed our *Church* in point of *rites* and *ceremonies*, and branded the *innocent* as guilty of no leſs *crime* than *Superſtition*, muſt be obliged to return to *peace* and *charity*, and *perſwaſions* of *kindneſs* toward us; whereas the *contrary* humor of thoſe who oppoſe and malign our *Church*, daily *inflames* and *advances* into that *diabolical* ſin of *calumniating*, and *accuſing* the moſt *innocent* obſervances of thoſe, whom they have undertaken to *oppoſe*, and never conſiders or looks on thoſe many *groſſer crimes*, *ſpiritual pride*, *uncharitableneſs*, *faction*, nay *ſacriledge* and *profaneneſs* it ſelf, with ſo much expreſſion of *averſion* or diſlike, as on the uſage of a *few* and *wholeſome ceremonies*.

This is, as near as I can briefly *paraphraſe* it, the ſenſe of thoſe two *Sections*, and all the *aſperity* 6.
that is there diſcoverable, is but this, that *enemies* and *calumniators* have learnt two of the *Devils attributes*, Σαλανᾶς or ἐχθρὸς ἀνὴρ, and διάβολος or καλήγορος, τῶν ἀδελφῶν, and as long as this hath palpable truth in it, and when I applied it not (ſo much as in my *thoughts*) either to this *Diatribiſt*, whoſe name I think I had never heard of, nor to any other *particular* perſon, and as long as it was *viſible* that there was ſuch *enmity* abroad in this *nation*, which thus *fortified* it ſelf by *calumniating* others, and it being certain that it was perfect duty of *charity*, to indeavour the *deterring* and *preſerving brethren* and *fellow Chriſtians* from ſuch *guilts* and *dangers*, and that the pointing at other ſins that much more juſtly deſerved *cenſure*, might be uſeful to that end, by way of but *neceſſary diverſion*, I can with perfect *peace* of *mind* review thoſe *Sections*, not diſcerning any *man*, or *virtue*, *moral* or *Chriſtian*, any branch of either part of my *duty*, againſt which I have offended; And I now deſire the *Diatribiſt*, if he be not fully of my *perſwaſion*, that he deſcend to the *particularity*, and tell me the man in the *world* to whom I was in thoſe *Sections uncharitable* or *bitter*, and firſt to whom *uncharitable*; and then for the *falſeneſs*, that hath by all this *reply* to this *Diatribe*, been, I hope, ſufficiently *conteſted*.

And having ſaid thus much in *vindication* of my ſelf, I can very well abſtain from making uſe of 7.
the *advantage*, which is here *viſibly* given me, of more than *recriminating*; I am ſo well ſatisfied with my own *innocence*, that I cannot be farther gratified with the *contemplation* of others *guilts*.

And ſo much for his *firſt exercitation*, having I hope competently ſecured the *obſervance* of the 8.
rites and *ceremonies* of our *Church* from being the *introducing* of any *new worſhip*, or *criminous exceſs* againſt any of the *Commandments* of the *firſt table*, and conſequently from the charge of *Superſtition* in any juſtifiable notion, or *Etymologie*, or *acception* of the word, not taking that of *Super Statutum* to be ſuch.

CHAP. V.

Of Will-worſhip.

SECT. I.

The ſtate of the Queſtion. Will-worſhip diſtinguiſht from the circumſtances of it. The matter of mans will of three ſorts The ſix ſeveral poſſible notions of Will-worſhip. The application of them to the matter in hand. The vanity of the Diatribiſts diſtinction. The ſcope of the ſecond Commandment.

IN the *Diatribe* of *Will-worſhip*, the firſt complaint is, that the *Doctor had not* (*as it became him*) *diſtinguiſhed the words* ἐθελοθρησκεία *in Greek*, *or Will-worſhip in Engliſh*, *before he began his defence of them*] and to repair this *unbecoming defect* on the *Doctors* part, the *Diatribiſt* is pleaſed to do it for him, by aſſigning it a *double* notion, Firſt, For *voluntary*, *ſpontaneous* or *willing worſhip*, i. e. *willingneſs* or *freeneſs in worſhip commanded by God*,) *and then they were to blame*, ſaith he, *that put an ill notion upon them*, or *Secondly*, *For worſhip deviſed by the wit and appointed by the will of man*, *as contradiſtinguiſhed to the will and wiſdom of God*, *and then it was not ſo much the ill fortune as the juſt puniſhment of them to paſs under an ill notion*, &c. *For the ſcope of the ſecond Commandment in the affirmative part being this*, *God muſt be worſhipped with his own preſcribed worſhip*, *and in the negative*, *to forbid all deviſed worſhip of God by the wit or will of man*, *the very name of will* (*of man*) *put to worſhip of God*, *as oppoſed to the will of God*, *the only rule of worſhip*, *is as a brand in the forehead of it*, *to characterize it as condemnable in all*. *Numb.* 1.

This his firſt Section I have thus fully ſet down, as the *foundation* of his *diſcourſe* on this *ſubject*, 2.
and very fit for my *direction* how to proceed in the *reply* to it; For if I ſhall now punctually obey his *admonition*, and having, in his opinion, formerly *failed* of my *duty*, ſpeedily indeavour to *repair* it, Firſt, By *diſtinguiſhing* the *Greek* and *Engliſh* word (though by giving it the exact *limits* in that one place, where it is uſed in *Scripture*, I had hoped well that I had formerly performed all that was *neceſſary* in

this kind) and telling him clearly in what *ſenſe* I take it, defending it to be no way *reprovable*; and ſecondly, By ſhewing the *unfitneſs* of his *diſtinction* here premiſed, and the *fallaciouſneſs* of the *reaſon*, or *proof* annexed to it; methinks this ſhould ſet me on a good way toward the end of this ſecond *Stage*, and ſo do that which is moſt deſireable to the *Reader* and my ſelf, confer much to our *expedition* in this journey.

3. For the firſt then, I ſhall diſtinguiſh, as formerly, betwixt θρησκεία *worſhip*, whether the *theological virtue*, or ſome act thereof, together with the *gradual intenſion* and *extenſion*, the *degrees* and alſo the *frequency* or *number* of thoſe acts, on one ſide, and the *external ceremonies* or *circumſtances* of it, on the other ſide, which are not *parts* but *accidents* of *worſhip*; As in any other habit, that of *juſtice* particularly, may be exemplified, It may beſide the *virtue* of *juſtice*, ſignify *Firſt*, ſome *act* of that *virtue*, or *Secondly*, the *degree* thereof, and *frequent* repetition (more or leſs) of the *acts* of it, but for the *circumſtance* of *time* or *place* attending on any *act* of it, they will never be called *juſtice* with any *propriety*.

4. *Secondly*, For [*will*,] the other ingredient in the *compoſition* of the word, meaning thereby the *will* or *choice* of man it may be of *four* ſorts, diſtinguiſhable by the *matter* which is *will'd* or *choſen*, *Firſt*, When the thing thus *will'd* by *man* is *forbidden* by *God*, or *Secondly*, when 'tis *commanded* and under *obligation*, as far as the force of *affirmative precepts* extends (of which the *rule* is true, that *obligant ſemper*, *ſed non ad ſemper*, *they oblige* us *always*, but yet do not *oblige* us to be *always exerciſing* ſome act of the *virtues* ſo *commanded*) and ſo when it is done, it is done in perfect *concord* with, and agreeableneſs to the *precept*, but yet for that *time*, or in that *degree*, it lay not under *particular precept*, but might without *diſobedience* or *ſin*, have been *omitted*. *Thirdly*, When the thing *will'd*, is left *free* and *indifferent*, neither *commanded* nor *forbidden* by *God*. *Fourthly*, When although it be not *indifferent*, much leſs *forbidden*, but *good* in an *high* degree, yet it is not under particular *precept*, and ſo may be *omitted* without *ſin*, and when it is done, it is highly *rewardable* by *God*. I ſhall give an example of each of theſe branches alſo; Of the firſt, when a man himſelf *commits*, or teacheth others to *commit adultery*, *adultery* being *forbidden* by *God*, and ſo his *action* or *teaching*, an act of his *will* oppoſed to the *will* of *God*. Of the ſecond, when I give to the *poor*, *yearly*, or *weekly*, ſuch a *proportion* out of my *eſtate*, which I am able to give (and ſo offend againſt no office of *juſtice* in *giving*) and yet am not *obliged* to give by any *precept* of *Gods* which laies it as a *duty* upon me. An inſtance of which, is ſet down at large in the *Tract* of *Will-worſhip Sect.* 32. which together with other *exemplifications* of the point in hand, very neceſſary to *clear* my ſenſe, and yet in no reaſon here to be repeated, I muſt deſire the *Reader* to fetch from that place *Sect.* 30. and ſo forward. Of the third, when I *walk* or *ſit* ſtill, *laugh* or *weep*, the *law* of *God* leaving it perfectly free for me to *do*, *or omit*, either of theſe as I ſhall chooſe. Of the laſt, all writers, *Jewiſh*, *Heathen*, and *Chriſtian*, give us frequent examples. *Maimonides* among the *Jews* * *More Nevoch.* par. 3. c. 17. mentions it as the common ſaying of the *Jewiſh*, *Doctors*, that *Reward is by God given to him that doth any thing uncommanded.* Among the *Heathens* one for all, *Plutarch* who inſtances in *Acts* * of *fortitude*, *freeing the city from Tyrants doing any great thing*, *which* (ſaith he) *are not* νόμιμα, or ὑπὸ νόμου ὀφειλόμενα, *required or commanded by Law. For* (ſaith he) εἴπερ ὁ νόμος προστάττει, πῶς οὐκ ἂν ἀπειθοῖεν καὶ παρανομοῖεν ὅτε μὴ ἀνδρίζοιντο, &c. *if the Law command ſuch things, then all muſt be counted* παράνομοι *diſobedient and breakers of Laws, which deſerve not reward in war, which let the Tyrants live an hour, or which do not ſome of thoſe other things which are accounted excellent, and by conſequence all ſuch muſt be puniſhed as offenders.* So *Nazianzen* of the *Chriſtian Law*, τὰ μὲν ἀναγκαῖα τοῖς ἐπιτελοῦσιν, ἃ καὶ μὴ φυλάττουσι κίνδυνον, τὰ δὲ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖα, ἀνάγκην δέ, ἃ φυλάττουσι μὲν τιμὴν καὶ ἀντίδοσιν, μὴ φυλάττουσι δὲ οὐδὲν ἔγκλημα κίνδυνον. *Of our Law ſome things lay neceſſity on them to whom they are given* (i. e. ſaith the *Scholiaſt*, Ἡμῖν Χριστιανοῖς, *on us Chriſtians*) *and danger to them who obſerve them not. Others impoſe no neceſſity, but are left to choice, bring honor and reward to the obſervers, but no kind of danger to them that perform them not*, adding that *as he that doth not deſerve puniſhment, doth not preſently deſerve praiſe, ſo neither doth he that doth not deſerve praiſe, preſently incur puniſhment*: So among the *Latins*, *Tertullian* ſpeaking both of *continuance* and of *abſtinence*, in his book *de cultu Fœmin.* (long before he was under any ſuſpicion of *Montaniſm*) c. 9. *Multi propter regnum Dei ſortem & utiq; permiſſam voluptatem ſponte ponentes. Many there were which for the Kingdom of God voluntarily and of their own accord parted with that great and lawful pleaſure of women.* And again, *Quidam ipſam Dei creaturam ſibi interdicunt, abſtinentes vino, animalibus exultantes, quorum fructus nulli periculo aut ſolicitudini adjacent, ſed humilitatem animæ ſuæ in victus quoq; caſtigatione Deo immolant. Some interdict themſelves the creature of God, abſtain from wine, and living creatures, the uſing of which is perfectly free and ſafe, and ſo by chaſtiſing of the body, ſacrifices to God the humility of the ſoul.* So S. *Hierom ad Demetriad.* ſpeaking of *Chriſts* words of *ſelling* and *giving to the poor*, *Non cogo* (ſaith he in *Chriſts* name) *non impero, ſed propono palmam, præmia oſtendo, Tuum eſt eligere, ſi volueris in agone & certamine coronari. Chriſt doth not command it or compel to do it, but propoſeth rewards, and thou if thou wilt be crowned, muſt make the choice.* And *ad Pammachium*, *Non tibi imponitur neceſſitas, ut voluntas præmium conſequatur, No neceſſity is impoſed on thee, that thy will may obtain reward.* And *adverſ. Helvidium*, Of *Virginity*, *Virgo majoris eſt meriti, dum id contemnit, quod ſi fecerit, non delinquit. A Virgin is of greater worth, while ſhe contemns that, which if ſhe do, ſhe offends not.* And *adverſ. Jovinian. Ideo plus amat Virgines Chriſtus, quia ſponte faciant quod ſibi non fuerat imperatum, Therefore Chriſt loves them more, becauſe they of their own accord do that which was not commanded them.* So *Chryſoſtom* formerly produced on *Rom.* 8. Οἱ πνευματικοὶ πάντα ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἐπιθυμίᾳ καὶ πόθῳ, καὶ τοῦτο δηλοῦσι τῷ καὶ ὑπερβαίνειν τὰ προστάγματα. *The Spiritual do what they do, with appetite and deſire, and demonſtrate it in that they alſo exceed commands.* So *Caſſian Chryſoſtoms* ſcholar, *Coll.* 22. c. 30. *Perfecti ſub gratiâ evangelii conſtituti, voluntariâ legem devotione tranſcendunt*, &c. *They which are perfect now under the grace of the Goſpel, do tranſcend the law by voluntary devotion.* And c. 29. he ſpeaks of *worldly* men, *qui nihil Deo voluntariè offerunt, who have no free-will-offering for God.* And ſo *Gregory Moral. in Job. Quidam præcepta legis perfectione virtutum tranſcendunt, Some men tranſcend the precepts of the law by perfection of virtues.*

* p. 381.

*τὸ δειστοῦσαι, τυραννοκτονῆσαι, ἢ ἄλλο κατορθῶσαι. Plut. *lib.* περὶ εἱμαρμ.

This he calls θησαυρίζειν δικαιοσύνην, l. 6. p. 965. l. 34.

To

To apply all this *apparatus* to the preſent matter, the *ſtating* of the *queſtion* in hand, the word ἐθελοθρησκεία *Will-worſhip*, as terminated in the *one God*, the *object* of *worſhip*, cannot be imagined to denote any more than ſome one of theſe ſix things, 1. The performing any ſort of *worſhip* to *God*, which is *forbidden* by him, which yet is not truly but *equivocally* called *worſhip*, as when the *Phariſees* perſecuting the *Apoſtles*, was by them ſtyled *the doing God ſervice*, and the like. 2. The uſing any *ceremony* in the *worſhip* of *God*, which either is particularly *forbidden* by *God*, or bears *analogy* with thoſe which are certainly *forbidden*, as among *Chriſtians ſacrificing* of *beaſts*, &c. 3. Burthening the *worſhip* of *God* with many whether *ridiculous* or *unprofitable ceremonies*, which though they are no where *forbidden* ſeverally by *God*, yet by their *multitude* become an hindrance to *devotion*, or a yoke too heavy for *Chriſtians*. 4. Uſing or inſtituting one or more *ceremonies*, no way *forbidden*, and yet no where *commanded* by *God*, but yet ſuch as the *inſtitution* or *uſing* any of them, is founded in ſome *pious* or *prudential* conſideration, whether of *decency*, as when any *geſture* of *bodily reverence* or *humility* is uſed or *appointed*, or for *edification*, as when *feaſts* not *preſcribed* by *God*, are ſet apart by the *Church*, and ſo by *men*, for the *commemoration* of any eminent *mercy* of *God*, for the propoſing ſome *exemplary virtues* to others, *&c.* and withal, that care is taken, that they are no way *offenſive* by the *number* of them. 5. *Offering* to the ſervice of *God* any thing of which *God* hath any way revealed that he will accept of, and reward, if it be duly *performed*, though he do not by any *law* exact it from every man, as dedicating himſelf to the *miniſtery*, doing it without any *hire* or *payment* here, *vowing vows* of building *Hoſpitals*, *Churches*, &c. and moſt eminently *martyrdom*, when it may poſſibly, and without *ſin* be avoided by *flight*, &c. but yet the man thinks it may much *tend to Gods honour* in the good of *ſouls*, if he thus ſeal and publickly *teſtifie* his *obedience* to *Chriſts* commands by his *bloud*, and accordingly *chooſeth* to do ſo. Laſtly, When either for the degree or frequency of repetition of any known *act* of *worſhip*, a man doth more than he is by *Gods law* ſtrictly required to do, *prays* oftner every day, *faſts* oftner (ſuppoſing he no way hurt himſelf, or omit the performance of any other *duty*, by ſuch *frequency* in either of theſe) gives a more *liberal* proportion out of his eſtate to *pious* and *charitable* uſes, than any *precept* of *Chriſt* obligeth him to do, and the like. 6.

As for that of a *chearful* and ſo *voluntary* performance of any *act* of *commanded worſhip*, I take not this in at all, ſuppoſing that in the *commands* of *God*, not only the *action*, but the *chearfulneſs* of the performance is in like *manner commanded* by *God*, and ſo *neceſſary*, not *voluntary*, as that refers to the *will* of *man*, diſtinguiſht from the *command* of *God*. 7.

Now for the *two* firſt of theſe, it is by me moſt readily acknowledged, that they are *criminous*, and of theſe I *plead* not the cauſe in the leaſt, either here, or in the *tract* of *Will-worſhip*, nor do I apprehend that either of theſe are truly and properly capable of that title of *will-worſhip*, or called by it in that one place of *Scripture*, Col. 2. 8.

Of the *third* ſort alſo I acknowledge my diſlike, but yet again think it not applicable to the notion of the word in the *Apoſtle*, but rather to that by *Epiphanius* uſed of the *Phariſee*, ἐθελοπερειασοθρησκία, *exuberance*, or *ſuperfluity* of *Will-worſhip*, where ſtill the fault is the *multitude* and *unprofitableneſs* of theſe *ceremonies*, not ſimply the uſe of any *one*, and ſo of *each* of *them*, the *ſuperfluity*, and not the *uncommandedneſs* of *them*. 9.

Of the *fourth* ſort, though I muſt affirm that it hath nothing *culpable* in it, but rather *commendable*, as *referrable* to the *Apoſtle*'s *command* of *decency*, &c. yet becauſe it is not *worſhip* it ſelf, but an *extrinſecal* attendant of it, I need not allow that the *title* of *Will-worſhip* neither, nor apply to it the *Apoſtles* uſage of the word, *Col.* 2. but refer it to thoſe *circumſtances* of *worſhip*, for which or againſt which, no *command* or *prohibition* of the word hath interpoſed, of which I oft ſpake in the head of *Superſtition*, and vindicated it from that title. 10.

Of the *fifth* it is, that I formerly ſpake, and compared it with the *voluntary oblations* under the *Law*, and of that there is all reaſon to interpret the word in the *Apoſtle*, and that in a *notion* of *good* and *commendable* (no way of *vitious*) if it be truly ſuch as it pretends to be; and if it be not *really* ſuch, it may yet have an appearance of that, and ſo far an appearance of *Piety* or *Wiſdom*. 11.

And ſo again for the *ſixth*, or *laſt*, I have affirmed of it, and I hope made it clear, that it is firſt *lawful*, then *commendable*, and rewardable by *God*, above a lower degree, or leſs frequent exerciſe of the ſame ſort of *worſhip*, and yet is not under particular *precept*, as appears by this, that at that time, and in the ſame *circumſtances*, when it is thus laudable to give ſo much more, the giving ſomewhat leſs is not a *ſin*, as is manifeſted in the *tract* of *Will-worſhip*. 12.

And ſo now I hope I have exactly obeyed the *Diatribiſt*'s directions, *diſtinguiſht* the words, and ſet the whole queſtion before him as *diſcernibly* as he could wiſh, and therein laid grounds for that juſt *defence* of a blameleſs word, which was at large pleaded in the *tract* of *Will-worſhip*. And then I need add no more to ſhew the *impropriety* and *vanity* of his own *diſtinction* or *double ſenſe of Will-worſhip*, *firſt*, *For ſpontaneous freeneſs in worſhip commanded by God*, or *ſecondly*, *For worſhip deviſed by the wit and appointed by the will of man*, *as contradiſtinguiſht to the will and wiſdom of God*. For as to the *former* branch of the *diſtinction*, as it is reſtrained to *worſhip commanded by God*, ſo it can be no *Species* of that *Will-worſhip*, which reſpects the *will* and *choice* of *man*, without any *neceſſity* particularly impoſed by *God*; and accordingly I have excluded it out of my *Scheme*, not out of any *unkindneſs* to it, but becauſe it neceſſarily belongs to *another* head, the *chearfulneſs* and the *worſhip* being both ſuppoſed to be *commanded* by *God*, and ſo uncapable of this diſtant title of *Will-worſhip*. So that at the beſt imaginable, he hath branched *Will-worſhip* into but *one* part, and that was not the *way* of *diſtinguiſhing* that tearm. 13.

Then for the other *member*, it is ſo ſet, that it hath many improprieties in it, and in brief, is that great *fallacy* to which *Ariſtotle* refers moſt others, *fallacia plurium interrogationum* (and I remember the * *Jews* have a rule of their *Urim* and *Thummim* אין שואלין על שני דברים כאחד *they ask not of two things at once*) *confounding* and putting together things that are moſt *diſparate*, as hath already appeared by the ſeveral *Species* here ſet down, which were to be *diſtributed* into their ſeveral *claſſes*, ſome *contradiſtinguiſht* indeed to *the will and wiſdom of God*, but none of thoſe *defended* by me, others only not particularly *commanded* by him, or impoſed *ſub periculo animæ*, but very *conſonant* and agree- 14.

* *Maim. Hal. Kele-hammikdaſch c. ult.*

able both to *Gods will* and *wiſdom*; and ſo ſtill μηδὲν ὑγιὲς, I have very little to *thank* him for, in his *diſtinction*.

15. As for his *ſum and ſcope of the ſecond Commandment*, with the name of S. *Auguſtine* and the *Doctor* in the *margent*, it already appears how little force it hath againſt my *pretenſions*, it being evident that the words there cited both for the *affirmative* and *negative* part of the *Commandment*, belong to *eſſential* parts of *Gods worſhip*, thoſe only being *preſcribed* and particularly *appointed* by *God*, not to each circumſtance thereof, whether of *time*, or *place*, or *geſture*, which among us 'tis certain are not particularly *preſcribed* by *God*, and yet we can ſo far judge of his *will*, by many indications of it, that he no way *reproves* or diſlikes our *voluntary obſerving*, or the *churches appointing* of ſuch, and to theſe only he knows this controverſie here belongs, as applied to the *Ceremonies* or *Feſtivals* of our *Church*.

SECT. II.

The method of explicating difficulties in the new Teſtament. Θρησκεία *in a good ſenſe: and when ſuch a bad, no prejudice to* ἐθελοθρησκεία.

Numb. 1. IN his ſecond Section where he profeſſeth not to *care how oft or how ſeldom the Greek word is uſed in other Authors, or the tranſlators of the old Teſtament, when the thing ſignified, deviſed or impoſed worſhip by the will of man, is ſo decryed in Scripture*; I ſhall to his *faſtidious* deſpiſing my *method* propoſed, return my *reaſon* of retaining it, and to his reaſon, a brief *demonſtration* of the vanity of it.

2. For the *firſt*, the *reaſon* of my *method* in that, as in other diſcourſes, was, the great *affinity* and *conſent* betwixt the *Greek* of the *Old* and *New Teſtament*, the writers being of the ſame *nation*, *Jews* by birth, which had acquired ſome skill in the *Greek Language*, and yet not ſo much *exactneſs* therein, as wholly to aſſume the *dialect* or *character* of ſpeech obſerved by native or *Learned Greeks*, or to deveſt themſelves of the *idioms* of their *own* language.

3. Upon this *ground* I ſuppoſe it moſt conſequent, that for the explaining all *verbal difficulties* in the *New Teſtament*, reſort ſhould firſt be had to the *Greek Tranſlators* of the *Canonical Books*, or the writers of the *Apocryphal*, of the *old*, and then in the *ſecond* place to other *good* Authors, from whom any light can be fetcht, and when theſe fail in their expected *aids*, then to make uſe of other ſupplies, *analogie* of *phraſes* or *matter*, with what we find in the *Old Teſtament*, *circumſtances* of the *context*, and the like.

4. And if the *Diatribiſt* deſpiſe this *method* of ſearch, it were but neceſſary *charity* in him, to diſcover the *faults* of it, and direct us to a *better*, which having not here done, he leaves us to ſurmiſe, that it was not his *judgment*, but his care to *ſerve* his own *hypotheſis*, which infuſed theſe diſlikes into him; for otherwiſe, the reſult of my way of ſearch being only this, that the word ἐθελοθρησκεία being but *once* uſed in the *whole Bible*, Col. 2. 23. the notion of it in that one place, muſt in all reaſon be reſolved to be that which properly belongs to that place, eſpecially if it proves to be ſuch as agrees exactly with the נדבה or *freewill offerings* in the *Old Teſtament*, I ſee not what *infirmity* it was which could render it up to his *deſpiſing*.

5. However, this wholly *removes* and evacuates all *force* of his *reaſon* of *diſlike*, it being evident by that one example of *freewill offerings*, but much more ſo, by other *evidences*, both there and here added, that there may be many *acts* of *worſhip*, many *circumſtances* of *worſhip*, yea and many heights of *Chriſtian heroical virtue*, which may bear *proportion* with *worſhip*, that are not under *obligation*, from any particular *command* of *Gods*, and ſo remain to be *acts* of the *will* or *choice* of *man*, which are perfectly *lawful*, *acceptable*, yea ſome *highly rewardable* by *God*, and ſo, far from the guilt which *Mr. C.* affixes, of *high indignity or affront to the divine Majeſty*.

6. What he adds of the ſimple word θρησκεία and θρησκεύω, that *they are but twice apiece uſed in the Book of Wiſdom, and alway in an ill notion, which* ſaith he, *is but little to the credit of the compound* ἐθελοθρησκεία] might ſure have been ſpared, it being as certain and *viſible* to him, that the ſame word is uſed by St. *James*, c. 1. 27. in as good a ſenſe as could be wiſht, with the *epithets* of καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος *pure and undefiled before God*, added to it, and *v.* 26. for the *profeſſion* of *Chriſtianity*, though for want of actions, *bridling* the *tongue*, and the like, that becomes μάταια *vain*; And as plain, that the word is in it ſelf *equally* applicable to the *true* as to the *falſe*, indifferently to any *religion*, to St. *Pauls religion* among the *Jews*, Act. 26. 5. *the ſtricteſt ſect of our religion*, to the *worſhip* of *Angels*, Col. 2. 18. and ſo to the *worſhip* of *Idols* in the *Book* of *Wiſdom*, which yet can no more tend to the *diſadvantage* of the *compound* ἐθελοθρησκεία, when that is not terminated on any *prohibited object*, than the uſe of the *Latine cultus* ſometimes for the *worſhip* of *falſe Gods*, can prejudge *voluntarius cultus, voluntary worſhip*, when *either the object* is not *ſpecified*, or the mention of the *one true God* is added to it. It being *confeſt* and ſuppoſed by *both* parties in this *conteſt*, that the ſimple θρησκεία or *worſhip* it ſelf is not *culpable*, ſave only when the other part of the *compoſition*, the ἐθελο, *i. e.* the interpoſition of the *will* (or as he will ſtyle it, the *device* or *appointment*) of *man*, hath an *influence* upon it.

SECT.

SECT. III.

His entrance on the view of Col. 2. *anſwered. The difference betwixt Commands of Magiſtrates, and impoſition of dogmatizers. What 'tis, which is ſaid to have λόγον σοφίας.*

HIS third Section is his entrance on the view of *Col.* 2. where only the word *Will-worſhip* is to be found; and in ſetting down his grounds of interpreting it, *Firſt*, He citeth *Beza* and Biſhop *Davenant*, whoſe words are preſently anſwered, by adverting to the *diſtinction* formerly given between the *eſſentials* and *circumſtantials*, the *parts* and the *ceremonies* of *worſhip*. *Numb.* 1.

Secondly, He pretends to diſcover a *miſtake* in me, in that I obſerve from v. 22. that S. *Paul ſpeaks not of commands, but doctrines, not of the prohibition of the Magiſtrate, but of falſe teachers impoſing them as the commands of God*; *Whereas*, ſaith he, *the Apoſtle ſpeaks expreſly of theſe impoſitions, that they were after the Commandments and doctrines of men*, v. 8. *after the traditions of men to worſhip God by the obſervation of them.*] Of which words of his, if there be any *ſhadow* of *force* in them by way of *exception* againſt me, the meaning muſt be, that the *Apoſtle* there ſpeaks of the *commands* or *prohibitions*, of *Magiſtrates* in things of themſelves perfectly *indifferent*, and cenſures thoſe *commands* under the ſtile of *Will-worſhip*. 2.

But then, this hath no degree of *truth* in it; for *Firſt*, The matter of the *commands* is no *lawful* matter, but either the *worſhip* of *Angels* (and that is *criminous*, as the *worſhipping* of a *creature*) or the reducing of *antiquated* rites of *Judaiſm*, which ought not to be reduced, being once *cancelled* and *nailed* to the *Croſs* of *Chriſt*. *Secondly*, The *commands* were not *commands* of *Magiſtrates*, but of men which had no *authority* to preſcribe any thing, eſpecially ſo contrary to the doctrine which the *Apoſtles* had planted among them, the *Chriſtian* liberty from the *Judaical* yoke. *Thridly*, The *manner* of impoſing them, was quite diſtant from that of the *Magiſtrates* giving *laws Eccleſiaſtical* or *Civil*; thoſe are by way of *Canon*, as of things *indifferent*, in order to *decency*, and the like, without ever pretending them to be in themſelves *neceſſary*, as commanded by God; theſe are *impoſed* as from *God*, when they are not ſo, and that is the known ſin of *dogmatizing*, to which I formerly applied the place; And the word ἐντάλματα *commands*, ſignifies no more than ſo, being joyned with, and explicated by διδασκαλίαι *doctrines*, i. e. ſuch things as *falſe teachers* require all men to do in *obedience* to *God*, or as if they were now *commanded* by him, when ſome of them, as *abſtinencies*, &c. having once been required by *God*, are now *aboliſh't* by *Chriſt*, and the other, the *worſhip* of *Angels*, though it pretend not ever to have been *commanded*, but only to be *acceptable* to *God*, is clearly *forbidden* by him. 3.

So that here is a palpable *miſtake* in the *Diatribiſt*, who obſerves them to be *commands* (meaning, as he muſt, if he cenſureth or oppoſeth me, *commands* of *Magiſtrates*) and not only *doctrines* of *falſe teachers*, when indeed *commands* and *doctrines* are all one, both joined together to ſignify theſe *dogmatizers*, pretending the things which they taught to be in force by *Divine command*, by virtue of the *Law* given to *Moſes*, and not only ſuch as would be *accepted* by *God*, as of the *worſhip* of *Angels* I ſuppoſe was pretended by thoſe *falſe teachers*. 4.

For this is to be remembred here once for all, that the *ſeducers* ſpoken of in that *Chapter*, were the *Gnoſtick hereticks*, who made up their *Theology* of *Judaical* and *heatheniſh additions* to the *Chriſtian truth*; from the *Jews* they had many abſtinences, ſuch as were now *aboliſht* by *Chriſt*, and thoſe they impoſed as *commands* of *God*, when they were not; and from the *heathens* the doctrine of the *Æones* or *Angels*, as *creators* of this *inferior world*, and ſo ſuch as might, with *Gods* good liking, be *worſhipt* by us. 5.

Laſtly, Thoſe *commands* of theirs are not cenſured by the *Apoſtle*, as *acts* of *Will-worſhip*, or *blamed*, or put under any ill *character* for being *ſuch*, any more than for being acts of *humility*, which is ὃ σωφρίζει joyned with *Will-worſhip* in that place v. 22. but as *intrenchments* on that *liberty* purchaſed for them by the *death* of *Chriſt*. v. 20. which had cancelled theſe *Judaical ordinances* to all that were *dead with him*, i. e. to *Chriſtians*, and had turned all *Damon worſhip* out of their *hearts*, but had no way bound up the hands of his *Apoſtles* or their *ſucceſſors* the *Governors* of the *Church*, from inſtituting *ceremonies* or *feſtivals* among *Chriſtians*. 6.

When the *Diatribiſt* adds of *Will-worſhip*, that it *had a ſhew of wiſdom but no more*, tis but a *begging* the *queſtion*, or if it pretend to be concluded from that *text*, it is without all ground ſo *pretended*; for if I ſhall grant λόγον σοφίας to ſignify only a *ſhew*, no *reality* of *wiſdom*, yet it is not of *Will-worſhip* that that is affirmed, any more than of *humility* (and I hope, *humility*, which is an acknowledged *Chriſtian* virtue, hath more than a *ſhew* of *wiſdom* in it) but of the *retrenchments* of their *Chriſtian liberty*, their δογματίζεσθαι v. 20. *ſubjection* to the *doctrines* and *impoſitions* of *falſe teachers*, which had λόγον σοφίας, ſome either *ſhew* or *reality* of *wiſdom* ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ *in Will-worſhip and humility*, which they could not have, if either or both thoſe, when *really* belonging to any, had no more than a *ſhew* of *wiſdom* in them. But of this I have ſaid enough in the *Tract* of *Will-worſhip*, §. 12. 7.

SECT.

SECT. IV.

The Magiſtrates power acknowledged. Inventing new ways of worſhip. Davids *appointing the Levites to wait from twenty years old, an act of a King, not of a Prophet.* Davids *laſt words.*

Numb. 1. IN the fourth *Section* the main of this which I have now *vindicated*, is *acknowledged* by Mr. *C.* for ſaith he, *the Apoſtle hath here no reflexion on the Magiſtrates making Laws in indifferent things* (and if ſo, why was it judged a *miſtake* in the *Doctor*, when he ſaid, the *Apoſtle doth not ſpeak of commands, but doctrines*, i. e. *not of the prohibition of the Magiſtrate, &c.* Certainly if the *Doctor* were *then miſtaken*, the *Diatribiſt* is *now*, who confeſſeth the ſame thing, which ſo lately he had *reproved*) All his quarrel is to the *Magiſtrates inventing a new way of worſhipping God*, and then I am ſure he hath no *real* quarrel to me, after all this *pompous* ſhew of *writing exercitations* againſt me, for I never was *advocate* for thoſe who *invented new ways of worſhipping God*, and if, as he ſaith, the *Papiſts* lie under that guilt, I have taken no fee from them, am under no obligation to *plead* for them, *they are of age, let them anſwer for themſelves.*

2. No more am I entertained of *counſel* for thoſe *falſe teachers*, who any way impoſe *antiquated worſhip* on *God's* people, ſuch are *ſacrificing*, *ſabbatizing*, *circumciſion*, and the like; and ſo all this while the *Diatribiſt* fights with the *air*, and confeſſes as much as his *adverſary* deſires of him, and then all that I have to complain of, is the *ad quid perditio hæc?* To *what purpoſe was all this waſte* of words and paper? I wiſh there were no more yet behind.

3. But in this fourth Section he is pleaſed to take notice of one *inſtance* of mine, that of *David* who appointed *Levites* to ſerve from the age of twenty years, whereas *God* by *Moſes* had appointed it but from 25. *years* old, *&c.* And I wonder what can be replyed to this my inſtance, to hinder it from concluding the *lawfulneſs* of *making human Laws*, in ſuch *circumſtances* of *Gods worſhip*, and thoſe *different* from the *Laws* of *God*, Why, firſt ſaith he, *'tis impertinent, for he brings it as an inſtance of the Magiſtrates power in a thing indifferent, whereas this was in a matter of religion, and more than ſo, in a matter formerly commanded by God.*

4. Having given this *firſt anſwer* under form of a *firſt*, I was in reaſon to expect a *ſecond* to *ſupply* the *defects*, but the Reader will eaſily diſcern with me that there is no ſuch, and therefore this *firſt* muſt bear all the *weight*. And to it I reply, Firſt, From his own confeſſion, that if it was in a *matter of Religion* and *more* than of *Religion*, then by the *argument à majori*, he muſt needs have *power* in the *leſs*, *i. e.* in a *thing indifferent*, and then ſure my inſtance from *David* was *more* than home to my purpoſe (*i. e. pertinent*) it proved *more* than I pretended from it; and if the *Diatribiſts arguments* would do ſo too, I aſſure him, I ſhould be *convinced* by them, I will never object to them that they have *abundantly* proved his *poſition*; but ſuch acts of *Supererogation* he may well condemn (and will not probably be *guilty* of) who writes *Diatribæ* againſt all actions that *exceed*, as well as thoſe that come *ſhort* of the *Commandment*.

5. But then, ſecondly, His anſwer to the *inſtance* of *David* being this, that this *action of* David *was againſt a former command of Gods, an altering of Gods appointment, and no way to be ſalved but by* Davids *being a Prophet, inſpired by God or directed by ſome other Prophet, and not imitable by any Magiſtrate now*] What is it again but a remarkable *inſtance* what δυλεύειν ὑποθήκαι can do?

6. 'Tis true indeed *David* was a *Prophet*, *inſpired by God* in things belonging to that office, and yet as true, that he was a wiſe and *prudent King*, and that he made this *alteration* upon *prudential conſiderations ſet down in that place*, 1 Chron. 23. 25. and 28, *&c. viz.* becauſe the *burthens* being not now ſo *heavy*, as formerly when they were to carry the *Tabernacle*, and all the *inſtruments* thereof, conſequently the full *ſtrength* of *years* was not ſo *neceſſary* to the *undergoing* them, and beſides, by this means there might be more *Levites* to ſerve in the *Tabernacle*, than formerly there had been.

7. And it is not imaginable why in a matter of this *nature*, in ſuch a meer *circumſtance* of the *worſhip* or *ſervice* of *God*, and that ſo far from a *contrariety* to *God's command* (for he that layes it upon the *Levites* from twenty *years old*, no way *oppoſeth* him that had *impoſed* it only from twenty five, and he that *commanded* it from twenty five no way excluded thoſe of twenty from being added to the *ſervice*) *David* might not have *power*, as a *King*, or why any other *Magiſtrate* might not do the like, *command* what *God* had not before *commanded*, in a thing ſo perfectly *indifferent* as was the *age* of the *Levites*, wherein to *begin* and end *officiating*.

8. As for his proofs, that *David* made this *change* by the *Spirit* or *inſpiration* of *God*, as a *Prophet*, *firſt* from 1 *Chron.* 28. 19. *All this the Lord made me to underſtand in writing by his good hand upon me, even all the works of this pattern, aſcribing it to the Spirit of God*, v. 12, 13. *Secondly*, By comparing, 1 *Chron.* 23. 27. with 2 *Sam.* 23. 2, 3. where, as by the *laſt words* of *David* the *Levites were numbred from twenty years old*, in the former place, ſo in the latter place it was ſaid of the *laſt words* of *David*, *the Spirit of the Lord ſpake by me*, &c. Theſe are but a heap of *miſtakes*. For as the former place belongs only to the *pattern* of the *Temple* which *Solomon* was to *build*, deſcribed there *particularly* in the *ſeverals* of it, from *v.* 11. and that *pattern* affirmed, *v.* 12. to be had from the *Spirit* of the *Lord*, and ſo the [*all this*] confined to that *pattern*, and with no *equity*, or ground in the *text*, to be farther *inlarged*, or applyed to *Davids numbring* the *Levites* from twenty *years old*; ſo the *laſt words* of *David*, 1 *Chron.* 23. 27. are clearly *Davids laſt Will* and *Teſtament*, but the *laſt words*, 2 *Sam.* 23. 1. are the *laſt words* of *prophecy* that he delivered, it being evident that he ſpake many other *words* after that, as appears in the *Chapter*, and the *Book* following, 1 *Kin.* and of his *prophecies* it is, and not of his other *words*, that it there follows, *the Spirit of the Lord ſpake by me.*

SECT.

SECT. V.

Col. 2. 22. εἰς φθορὰν. Ἀποχρήσει. δογματίζεσθε. στοιχεῖα κόσμου. *Placing worſhip. Chriſtian liberty. Marriage. The Gloſſes put on the commands of men.*

HIS fifth Section is an *examination* of what I have ſaid for the *interpreting* of [ἃ ἐστι πάντα εἰς φθορὰν τῇ ἀποχρήσει] Col. 2. 22. This *phraſe* I have thus *rendred* and *paraphraſed*, *Theſe commands of abſtinencies* (*Touch not, taſte not, handle not*, v. 21.) *are all to deſtruction, or deſtructive, by the abuſe of them*, i. e. by *impoſing* them on *Chriſtians*, as *commands* of *God*, now when they are *aboliſht* by *Chriſt*; and for this I thought I had produced ſufficient *authority*, to vindicate the *interpretation* from the *cenſure* of *ſingularity*, the plain words of S. *Auguſtine*, and S. *Ambroſe*, or whoſoever it is that wrote the *Comments* which bear his *name*, *Sunt in interitum*, &c. *they are to deſtruction and eternal perdition to them that believe them neceſſary to ſalvation*, and *ſunt omnia in interitum & corruptionem per abuſionem*, &c. *they are all to deſtruction and corruption by abuſe*, &c. *Numb.* 1.

But without adverting to the *commodiouſneſs* of the *interpretation*, or the *authority* of thoſe *ancient Fathers*, or giving any *anſwer* to what is ſaid to recommend this *interpretation*, he is pleaſed to take a much *eaſier* way, to ask ſome *queſtions*, and offer ſome *exceptions*, *Firſt* he asks, *why I refuſe our tranſlation of thoſe words?* 2.

To this *queſtion* I anſwer, by rendring my *reaſons*, Firſt, Becauſe I think this other *preferrable*, and I doubt not but when the *Diatribiſt* finds it uſeful, he will do the like in this or any other controverſie; Secondly, Becauſe [ἐστὶν εἰς φθορὰν] cannot by any *propriety* of *ſpeech*, or *analogy* of the like *phraſe*, ſignifie [*are to periſh*] but either in an *active* ſenſe [*are to corruption*] as that in *falſe teachers* may denote *corrupting* or *ſeducing* of others to their *hereſie*, and particularly to thoſe abominable ſins, which by deteſting of *marriage* the *Gnoſticks* brought in, expreſt often in theſe *Epiſtles* by the word φθορὰ *corruption*, or elſe in a *neutral* ſenſe, *ad interitum, to deſtruction*. Thirdly, Becauſe though ἀποχρῆσις may poſſibly ſignifie *uſe*, as well as *abuſe*, yet it is as eaſily replyed, that it ſignifies *abuſe* as well, nay more properly and frequently than *uſe*; In the *Bible* it is an ἅπαξ λεγόμενον, never uſed either in the *verb*, or in the *ſubſtantive*, but in this place; but in other *authors* 'tis vulgarly uſed in *oppoſition* to χρῆσις *uſe*, Ἀποχρωμένων μᾶλλον ἢ χρωμένων ὑπὸ Λακεδαιμονίων, in *Plutarch* of *Alcibiades*, the *Lacedemonians rather abuſed than uſed him*, and in *Apophtheg.* that *great men have good and ill friends*, εἶτα οἷς μὲν χρῆσθαι, οἷς δ' ἀποχρῆσθαι, *they uſe ſome, and abuſe others*, and many the like. Fourthly, Becauſe the Notion which the *Diatribiſt* from the *civil Lawyers*, out of *Eſtius*, gives of the *Latin abuſus*, is that of *conſuming uſe*, whereas it is both improbable that S. *Paul* ſhould take it from the *civil Law*, (much more *probable* that he ſhould take it in the ſenſe, in which we find *abuſio* ſometimes among *Divines* for ἀποχὴ *abſtinence* or not *uſing* at all: So *Proſper de vit. contempl.* l. 2. c. 22. *veraciter abſtinentes eſcarum non naturas ſed concupiſcentias damnent, ac voluptates ſuas deſiderati cibi vel potus abuſione mortificent*, which ſenſe alſo the words here would bear well enough, and be a more punctual *character* of the *Gnoſticks abſtinence* from *marriage*, by which they brought in all abominable villanies) and if he did, it would as fitly comply with *mine* as with *his* notion of it, for thus it ſignifies *abolition* or *wearing out*, ἀποχρῶμαι, *uſu attero & obſolefacio*, and to that agrees *Phavorinus*, rendring ἀποχρήσατο by διέφθειρεν, and *Suidas* by ἀπέκλινε, *deſtroying*, and then this would be the rendring, Theſe *impoſitions* of [*Touch not*, &c.] which were once in force under the *Jewiſh* ſtate, but now *aboliſht* under *Chriſt*, are thereby to *deſtruction*, or *to ruin* of *ſouls*; as when the *Apoſtle* tells them in one place, of theſe *ceremonies*, that they are ἐγγὺς ἀφανισμοῦ, *Heb.* 8. 13. *nigh to vaniſhing away, to abolition*, and upon that account in another place, that if they look upon them as things ſtill in force among *Chriſtians*, *Chriſt ſhall profit them nothing*: But this I do not really think to be the notion of Ἀπόχρησις, becauſe thoſe that render it [*uſing*] generally apply it to the *meats*, which are *conſumed* by *eating* (and by the way, *Oecumenius*, that underſtood it in this ſenſe, read it not ἀποχρήσει but ἀποκρίσει, a word which denotes *caſting out* of *excrements*) which yet moſt evidently belongs to the δόγματα *doctrines* of *abſtinence*, not to *meats*, and indeed the *antecedent* (to which ἃ πάντα, *all which*, refers) is, *Touch not, taſte not, handle not*, which denotes other *abſtinencies*, beſide that of *meats*, particularly that of *marriage*, which theſe *Gnoſticks* prohibited, and taught to be abominable, and that is not capable of this notion of ἀποχρήσει, *by uſing*, for ſure *marriage* doth not *periſh by uſing*. And the like may be ſaid of *unclean things*, the *leper*, the *dead*, that *Judaizers* would not *touch*, which yet did not *periſh*, were not *conſumed by uſing*. 3.

And though in the next place the *Diatribiſt* leave it *indifferently* betwixt *meats* and *ordinances* of *abſtaining* (which are *contrary* enough) yet the notion of *uſing* is no way applicable to the latter; for what the *Diatribiſt* ſets for the *interpretation* of it [*now being out-dated they periſh with the uſing, without any ſpiritual advantage*] is ſure very ſhort, it being evident by other places of *Scripture*, that the *impoſing* theſe *out-dated obſervances*, is not only *not advantageous*, but moreover *hurtful*, thoſe being as the *Fathers* generally reſolve, not only *mortua*, *dead*, and ſo *profitleſs*, but alſo *mortifera*, *deadly*, *deſtructive*; and ſure that is the meaning of [εἰς φθορὰν *to periſhing*, or *deſtruction*] whether it denote *damnation* it ſelf, or thoſe *horrible* or *unnatural* ſins, and the *ſeduction* of the *Gnoſticks*, which certainly induce it. 4.

In the third place he quarrels with my interpretation, for ſuppoſing that theſe *abſtinencies* were *impoſed* and *taught* by the *falſe teachers* as *divine obliging precepts*, *whereas*, ſaith he, *there is little or nothing in the text to import that*. What will with him, when produced againſt his ſenſe and intereſts, be accounted *great*, I know not; but that there is *ſomething* in the *text*, to incline it this way, will ſoon be evident, Firſt, By the word δογματίζεσθε, v. 20. That δόγματα and διδασκαλίαι, *doctrines*, ſignifie thoſe things which are *taught* as from *God*, *Mat.* 15. 9. hath been formerly ſhewed, and is *evident* from the form of *ſpeech*, *in vain do they worſhip me*, διδάσκοντες διδασκαλίας ἐντάλματα ἀνθρώπων *teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*, where the *commands* of *men* are *taught*, not as ſuch, but 5.

as

as *doctrines* of *God*; From hence the *active* δογματίζειν to *dogmatize*, ordinarily denotes *teaching* those things to be *divine precepts*, and so obliging *conscience*, which are not; and accordingly the *passive* δογματίζεσθαι must needs denote the having such *weights* thus *imposed* upon them, being *subject to ordinances*, (or *doctrines*) as we rightly *render* it. *Secondly*, These are in the beginning of that 20. v. called στοιχεῖα τῦ κόσμυ, *the elements of the world*, whether of the *Jewish* or *Gentile service*, both *nailed* to his *cross* by *Christ*, *cancelled* in his *death*, but such as were incumbent on the ζῶντες ἐν κόσμῳ, *those that lived in the world*, being under those *elements*, or *initial ordinances*, though *Christians* were not. *Thirdly*, These are specified what they were, *Touch not*, *taste not*, *handle not*, *abstinences* from *meats*, and from *marriage*; that of *meats* evidently a *precept* of *Gods* to the *Jews*, and the *Gnosticks divinity* being in part compounded of *Judaism*, there is no reason to doubt but they *taught* these *abstinences*, as the *Jews taught* them, *i. e.* as *divine obliging precepts*, and joined *abstinence* from *marriage* to that of *meats*, in the same form, *i. e.* as under *precept* also.

6. As for that which the *Diatribist* adds to *confirm* his *objection*, viz. that in the *next verse they are called the commandments and doctrines of men*] it hath no force in it, for so really they were, and not of *God*, but yet were by the *false teachers* imposed under a more *honourable gloss*, as *commands* not of *men*, but of *God*, and therein their *false teaching* consisted, And it is strange the *Diatribist* could say of such *false doctrines*, that *they could not be pretended*, *much less imposed as a divine command*] 'Tis as if he should say, *False teachers* could not *teach false*, *hypocrites* and *deceivers* could not pretend the *authority* of *Scripture* for their *errors*, the *Devil* could not put on the appearance of an *Angel* of *light*.

7. So again 'tis with equal truth, that he saith, the *traditions were not pleaded to be the commandments of God*, *but expresly called the commandments of men*, Mat. 15. 9. when 'tis evident that those *commandments* of *men*, were by the *Pharisees* taught as διδασκαλίαι *doctrines* and so *commandments* of *God*, though by *Christ* affirmed in truth to be opposite to *Gods real commands*, v. 3. 6. it being very ordinary with *hereticks*, and *hypocrites*, to *pretend* that to be the *will* and *command* of *God*, which is most extremely *contrary* to it. And in that, the *Pharisees* sin and *hypocrisy* consisted.

8. *Fourthly*, he *would ask* me *another question*, *whether the placing the worship of God in the observation of those ordinances*, *though not taught or imposed as God's commands*, *were not an abuse of them*, *and* εἰς φθορὰν; And I answer, *First*, By *asking* what he means by the *worship* of *God*; if such as *man* may justly *prescribe* or *practise*, either *ceremonies* perfectly *lawful*, but not *prescribed* by *God*, or *more* than so, that which is sure to be *accepted* by him, though yet it be not under *divine precept*, then 'tis certain 'twere no *abuse*; but if he mean the *commanded worship* of *God*, then his *question* implies a *contradiction*, for whatsoever this *worship* of *God* is placed in, that is *taught*, as *command* of *God*, for else it were not *Gods prescribed worship*, which yet it is supposed to be. *Secondly*, That these *abstinences* being of such a *nature*, that *Christ* removed all *ordinances* requiring them, and purposely designed that they should be left *free* to men, no *humane authority* could lawfully impose them, no man can *forbid marriage* to *Christians*, and so any such *command* were an *abuse* of *authority* if given by *lawful superiors*; (or if given by others, an act of *intrusion* and *usurpation*, for *who made them judges* or *dividers* of *tasks* to their *brethren?*)

9. But then this may not be extended to all *ceremonies* and *circumstances* of the *worship* of *God*, *times*, *gestures*, *&c.* for *Christ* never expresst any absolute *dislike* to all such, nor can the *imposing* of such, with *prudence* in respect of *choice*, and *moderation* in *respect* of *number*, be by any *analogy* reducible to those *abstinences* of which the *Apostle* there speaks. Nay even for those, particularly *abstinence* from *marriage*, tis certain that it may be lawfully *practised* by him that *can bear* it, and that all the *error* is in *imposing* it on others, contrary to that *liberty* which *Christ* hath for *weighty* reasons allowed, and required to continue *allowable* and *honorable* among *Christians*.

10. Lastly, He argues from the following words, v. 23. where the *Apostle* says, they *have a shew of wisdom*, *in Will-worship*, not as the *commands* of *God*, and thence he concludes their *abuse* to be, not that they *imposed them as divine commands*, *but as parts of divine worship*; But I answer, that that *verse* is not the setting down the *abuse*, or the *defining* wherein it consists, but at the utmost, a *description* of the *fair glosses*, those *abstinences* and *false-worships* were capable of, viz. a *double shew* or *appearance* of *piety*; one in *Will-worship*, *offering* to *God* a *free-will offering*, for such is every *uncommanded*, if *lawful abstinence*, but such was not this, and therefore 'twas but a *shew* of *piety*; and another in *humility*, *worshipping Angels* as the *ministers* of *God*, *humility* indeed a most *Christian virtue*, but this no *justifiable humility*, (To which also a *third* is subjoyned, that of *self-denial* or *austerity*, of the *same* kind with the former) and so still 'twas but a *shew*, no *reality* of *wisdom* or *piety*, which consisted in this.

SECT. VI.

The Diatribist's way to make the Doctors words witness against him. Τί δογματίζεσθε κ τ λ. &c. *Placing worship, an equivocal phrase.*

Numb. 1. BUT the *Diatribist* is so fixtly resolved on his way, that the *criminousness* and *danger* of these *abstinences*, shall consist in their being *devised* or *willed* by *men*, and not in the *Gnostick dogmatizing* or *teaching* them to be *commanded* by *God*, that in his sixth *Section* the *Doctor himself* shall (again, according to his *method* taken up in his *preface*) be brought in to *testify* for him; to which purpose these words are cited from him, that *the danger consists in imposing on men humane Ordinances or Doctrines*, and then saith he, *stay there a while*, viz. that he may from those words, taken alone, conclude that *then they did not impose them as commands of God.*

2. But I know not what *obligation* lies either on the *Reader* or me, to make a *pause*, upon his command, in the very *midde* of a *period*, when the words which are behind, make these that are cited, utterly uncapable of the *sense* which he puts upon them; For thus the words lay in the *period*, before he had the dismembring of them, [*which words point out that wherein the danger doth consist*, viz. *imposing on men humane*

mane ordinances or doctrines, i. e. *thoſe things, which though they are commanded by God, are yet by men affirmed and pretended and taught (though, as we ſay, magiſterially and without proof) to be ſo commanded.*]

It is not poſſible any words ſhould be more expreſly *contrary* to the *Diatribiſts* concluſion, than 3.
theſe, which he thought fit to ſollicite to bear *witneſs* on his ſide, and to that end cut them in the *midſt*, and then, after the manner of the *ſerpent*, that *fed* upon it ſelf, *ſuborned* and inſtructed one end to *devour* and eat up the other.

This he ſaw, and therefore in the end of that ſixth *Section* he mentions theſe latter words, as the 4.
Doctors gloſs of his own former words, and ſaith, *they will now prove his own*, i. e. *ſingular*. And truly if they ſhould *prove ſingular*, i. e. if no man in the world ſhould be found to have ever ſaid the like, but the *Doctor*, they would yet be ſufficient for the turn to which they were deſigned, to *explicate* the *Doctors own* meaning, and to ſecure the *beginning* of his *period*, from being brought in *judgment* againſt him, and ſo might have ſaved the *Diatribiſt* the pains of this Section. For ſure no man was ſo fit to explain his *own* words, or to give his full ſenſe in them, as he whoſe words they were, foreſeeing that poſſible, which now hath happened, that otherwiſe they might be *miſtaken*.

But then ſecondly, I ſhall not acknowledge my *gloſs* a *ſingular* one, but that which the *Apoſtles* 5.
word will own as a *natural* and perſpicuous *paraphraſe*, Τὶ δογματίζεσθε--- κατὰ τὰ ἐντάλματα καὶ διδασκαλίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων (reading the *middle* as in a *parentheſis*, ſpecifying what δόγματα he means, and the ſpecious *gloſſes* which they put upon them) why do you permit ſuch *abſtinences preſcribed* and taught you *really* by *men*, and not by *God*, to be *impoſed* on you as *doctrines commanded* by *God*, juſt as when the *Phariſees* taught their own *traditions*, as the *doctrines* of *God*. That this is the very *literal* importance of δογματίζεσθαι, to be *ſubjected*, or to pay *obedience* as to a δόγμα or *command* of *Gods*, hath already been ſhewed, And if that be granted, there can be no farther doubt of the whole *expreſſion*, nor conſequently of the *propriety* of my *gloſs* or *paraphraſe* on it.

As for the *placing worſhip* in thoſe *abſtinences*, that *equivocal* phraſe was very lately examined, and 6.
muſt not again return to *exerciſe* us. If they *placed worſhip* in them, in this ſenſe, that they *did* or *taught* them as *parts* of *God's commanded worſhip*, 'tis the very thing wherein I placed the *danger*; If they delivered them as their *own doctrines*, and not as the *doctrines of God*, they did not then *place* any part of *God's commanded worſhip* in them; If they *taught* them as ſuch things, which, though not *commanded* by *God*, would yet be *acceptable* to him, ſtill, after they were *aboliſht* by *Chriſt*, then they taught that which had no *truth* in it, for ſuch kinds of *abſtinences* are not now *valued* by *God*, but more real *acts* of *ſelf-denyal* ſet up in their *ſtead*, *mortifying* of *luſts*, and the like, which thoſe *falſe teachers* were far from being *guilty* of. As for *ceremonies* of *decency* and *order*, and *Feſtivals*, really deſigned to ends of *piety* and *edification*; they are neither of them *parallel*, nor bear any *analogy* with theſe which are here *cenſured*.

SECT. VII.

Of Petitio Principii. *Of* Λόγῳ σοφίας *being capable of two rendrings. The danger from miſtake on the Diatribiſts ſide. My interpretation not ſingular. His no way probable.* Μὲν *a particle of extenuation, no* διτιολογικόν. *No ſhew of wiſdom in reſpect of the folly that is in it. The Will-worſhip parallel to the humility. The prime argument for my interpretation.* Σοφίας *for piety, vindicated from the contrary proofs.* φιλοσοφία. *Worſhip of Angels. No agreement betwixt* Col. 2. 18. *and* 23. *or betwixt* 23. *and* 1 Cor. 2. 4. Ἅτινα μὲν δέ.

HIS ſeventh Section is the arraigning of what my ſeventh had ſaid concerning *v.* 23. Ἅτινά ἐστι λόγον μὲν ἔχοντα σοφίας ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, &c. And all that he there ſaith, will loſe all force, if theſe two things may be obſerved or remembred, Firſt, That the *oppoſers* of the *ceremonies* of our *Church*, againſt whom that *tract* was *prepared*, founded their *concluſion* on theſe two *premiſes*, Firſt, That *Will-worſhip* was a *ſin*. Secondly, That the uſing of *ceremonies* not *commanded* by *God*, was *Will-worſhip*. And therefore to our *vindication* it was ſufficient, if upon ſurvey of that *one* place of *Scripture* where that word was uſed, it ſhould be found capable of ſuch an *interpretation*, which ſhould affix no *ill*, but contrariwiſe a *good character* on it; For herein the task lies on the *opponent* to prove his *affirmative*, that *Will-worſhip* is *criminous*, (and not on me to demonſtrate the *negative*) and that he can never do from this *text*, if in this *text* by a *commodious interpretation*, it be capable of a *good* ſenſe. *Num.* 1.

This I here premiſe, becauſe he ſo oft reminds me in this place of *begging* the *queſtion*, when I deny 2.
the word to be taken in an *ill* ſenſe, Of which *Elench* I cannot be *guilty*, unleſs it were incumbent on me to *prove* and *demonſtrate* the *negative*, his *affirmative* being ſufficiently avoided, by my ſhewing that the *contrary* is *poſſible*, and not *improbable*, which therefore was all that was here required of me, and I hope is competently performed.

Secondly, That if the words be capable of ſeveral *rendrings*, and either of theſe will free *Will-wor-* 3.
ſhip from the *neceſſity* of an *ill* ſenſe, then again this is ſufficient for my turn, for then ſtill he hath not *unanſwerably aſſerted* his *concluſion*: This I ſay, to give an account, why I ſet down two poſſible *rendrings* of λόγον σοφίας, either *rationem ſapientiæ vel pietatis*, *reality of wiſdom or piety*, or elſe only *Speciem ſapientiæ*, a *ſhew*, or *bare appearance of wiſdom*; For of this it is certain, that λόγῳ *ſignifies ratio* as well as *Species*, and much more ordinarily the *former*, and in caſe it ſhould here ſignifie the *former*, then 'tis unavoidably evident, that *Will-worſhip* muſt be taken in a *good*, not ill ſenſe; Mean while as I pretend not that *both* thoſe rendrings are *true*, for if it be only a *ſhew* of *wiſdom*, then it is no *reality*, ſo I profeſs to yield ſo much to the *authority* of the *ancient interpreters*, as to pitch upon the latter only, that of χῆμα ἐν ἀληθείαν, a *ſhew* of *wiſdom*, *not the truth*, and even then, as hath been ſhew'd, the *Will-worſhip* there, is capable of a *good* notion, for how can thoſe *abſtinences* or *doctrines*

have ſo much as a *ſhew of wiſdom in Will-worſhip and humility*, if *Will-worſhip* hath nothing of *wiſe* or *good*, but only of *wickedneſs* (and that we know is *folly*) in it?

4. Having premiſed theſe two things, it is now very eaſie to diſcover the *fallaciouſneſs* of all that is brought againſt me in this or the enſuing Sections; For as to the interpretation of the *verſe*, which he propoſeth and prefers before mine, but without any *convincing proof* of the truth of it, this is on his part a *begging* the *queſtion*, which even now was charged on me, with much leſs *reaſon*; and when he ſaith, *mine may prove a miſtake*, 'tis ſufficient to reply, and ſo *may his*, and the *danger* far greater from the *miſtake* on *his* ſide, than on *mine*; For if *mine* ſhould be ſuch, yet will it not follow, that the *Ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* of our *Church* are ſuch *criminous Will-worſhip*, the uſing of theſe bearing no *analogy* with the *dogmatizing* of the *Gnoſticks*, or their reviving the aboliſht *Judaical abſtinences* among *Chriſtians*; whereas if *his* interpretation ſhould prove *falſe*, and mine *true*, his whole *fabrick* muſt utterly be *demoliſht*, and his *major* and *minor* having *both* failed, the one affirming *Will-worſhip* to be criminous, the other, our uſing *ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* to be *Will-worſhip*, his concluſion is not likely, I hope, to hold out long after, unleſs it ſhall pretend to that *miracle* which is fanſied of *Callimachus* (and denominated him an ἀθάνατος πολεμιστὴς *an immortal warrier*, and ἀτείρης Ἄρεος εἰκών *the ſtatue of Mars*) who is ſuppoſed to ſtand and *fight* after he was *dead*; And then 'tis time to retreat from this *combatant*, with the *Epigrammatiſt*,

Λύε κυβερνήτα, νεκύος περφυγῶμεν ἀπειλάς.

5. But then ſecondly when he vilifies *mine*, reſolving it *ſingular without any precedent*, *ancient*, *or modern*, *Proteſtant*, *or Papiſt*; *Firſt*, This hath no *truth* in it, as will *anon* ſufficiently appear; At the *preſent*, I ſhall only remind him, that within two years after the *Treatiſe* of *Will-worſhip* was printed, came out *Grotius*'s *poſthumous* notes on the *Epiſtles*, and thoſe are clear for this *interpretation*, and ſo though they could not be my *precedent then*, will *now* ſecure me from *ſingularity*.

6. *Secondly*, The *Diatribiſt*'s interpretation is ſo far from being *demonſtratively* true, that it hath arrived to no degree of *probability*: It is this, that *v.* 23. *contains a reaſon of the danger and deſtructiveneſs of thoſe abſtinences*, viz. *becauſe they were no other*, *nor better than Will-worſhip with a fair pretence of wiſdom*, *becauſe the worſhip of God was lately placed in them*, *and they carry a great pretenſion of humility and ſelf-denial in abſtaining from things pleaſing to the body*.

7. But I demand firſt, How doth it appear that this *verſe contains a reaſon of the deſtructiveneſs of thoſe abſtinences?* 'Tis not ſo much as introduced with a γὰρ, *for*, or any other form of *proof*, but ἅ τινα μὲν, which *things indeed have a ſhew*, &c. which is a form of *extenuation* (as the *Diatribiſt* acknowledgeth in this Section, ſpeaking of ᾧ) and then cannot reaſonably be a *proof* of the *deſtructiveneſs* of them, but the *conceding* ſomewhat, *ſpeciouſly* at leaſt, in *favour* of them, that they *have indeed a ſhew of wiſdom* in them.

8. Secondly, What words are there in that *verſe*, which can bear, or give any *pretence* to that *paraphraſe*, that *theſe abſtinences are deſtructive*, *becauſe no better than Will-worſhip?* The words in the *Diatribiſts* own rendring are no more but this, *which things indeed have a ſhew of wiſdom in Will-worſhip and humility*; But can this bear or *induce* this *concluſion* in any *mood* or *figure*, Therefore they are *deſtructive*, *becauſe no better than Will-worſhip?*

9. Is it not much *fairer* and more reaſonable, which I *concluded*, they *have ſome ſhew of wiſdom in Will-worſhip*, *therefore Will-worſhip*, *if it be truly ſuch*, *hath ſome reality of wiſdom in it?* for elſe that which hath but a *ſhew* of *wiſdom* in it, cannot have that *ſhew* in *reſpect* of *Will-worſhip*; *Adultery* being it ſelf *folly*, 'tis abſurd to ſay of any man, or doctrine, that it hath *a ſhew of wiſdom in adultery*, or in *reſpect* of the *adultery* that is in it, for that were to affirm it to have a *ſhew* of *wiſdom* in no other reſpect but that it is *fooliſh*.

10. I acknowledge indeed, that as it was but a *ſhew* of *wiſdom* which they had, ſo it was but a *ſhew* of *Will-worſhip*, or *voluntary offering* to *God*, and ſo a *ſhew* of, not a *true humility*; but ſtill that doth but the more *confirm* (not *confute*) my *concluſion*, that *Will-worſhip truly* ſo *called*, and *humility*, that *real* virtue, are branches of *Chriſtian wiſdom*, or elſe, the having but a *ſhew* of them, would not give them ſo much as the *ſhew* of *wiſdom*.

11. Thirdly, When the former part of his *paraphraſe* is [*they are no other nor better than Will-worſhip*] how can that be coherent which follows in the ſecond place, that *they carry a great pretenſion of humility and ſelf-denial?* when thoſe two are regularly joined with *Will-worſhip* [ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ, *in Will-worſhip*, *and humility*, *and not ſparing the body*] Certainly as the *humility* is, ſuch muſt the *Will-worſhip* be; if the *humility* be only in *pretenſion*, then ſo muſt the *Will-worſhip* be alſo, in *pretenſion*, not in *truth*; and then ſtill the *fault* or *defect* will be in the bare *pretending*, not in the *Will-worſhip*, as it is not in the *humility* or *ſelf-denial*, by the *Diatribiſts* own confeſſion, but in the *falſe pretending* them. How much then is it more reaſonable to do what I did, *viz.* to allot to *Will-worſhip* and *humility*, and *ſelf-denial*, to all three, the *ſame* ſtate, whatſoever it be, whether of *virtue*, if they be *really* what they *pretend*, or of *hypocriſie*, if they be *bare images* or *appearances* of them? And on this I inſiſt, as on the main ground of *inforcing* mine, and *invalidating* his interpretation, that *Will-worſhip*, *humility*, *and ſelf-denial* being here placed together in the ſame *claſſis* or *ſeries*, they cannot be ſo ſeparated, as that one ſhall be a *vice*, when the other two are acknowledged *virtues* in a *Chriſtian*, one *really* what it pretends, and the other only *feignedly*, or in *pretence*, without any *reality* in them. When the *Diatribiſt* ſhall anſwer this argument, he may then tell others of *miſtaking*, but till then, the *miſtake* may much more *probably* be on his ſide.

12. *Thirdly*, What the *Diatribiſt* adds of σοφίας *wiſdom*, which I took in the ordinary notion of *piety*, is ſure more *ſtrange* in him, than what he *cenſures* in me; *in the Proverbs and elſewhere* he acknowledges it muſt *ſignifie piety*, but here it muſt not, but literally *wiſdom*, to which purpoſe he cites Biſhop *Davenant*, who expreſſes it to denote *ſome excellent doctrine rather brought from heaven*, *than found out by men*; But if that be the meaning of it, then ſure, as ſuch, thoſe *falſe teachers* taught it, *i. e.* as *coming* from *heaven*, and that is, as a *doctrine* of *God*, and that was even now *denied*, when I affirmed it: Secondly, How can thoſe *abſtinences* have a *ſhew of coming down from heaven in Will-worſhip*, and

yet

yet *Will-worship* signify *worship devised by the wit and will of man?* 'Tis as if he should say, they *pretend* to come from *God*, in that they come *only from men*; whereas in the notion of *wisdom* for *piety*, the words run very currently and intelligibly, they *pretend* to have *piety* in them, *viz.* such as is discernible in *Will-worship* or *free-will-offerings*, in *humility*, in *self-denial*, &c. Well, that σοφία signifies *piety* in this place, I appeal to S. *Chrysostom*, δοκεῖ γὰρ εὐλαβής τις εἶναι, saith he, by way of *Paraphrase* of ἔχει λόγον σοφίας, *he appears to be* (though *really* he be *not*) *pious, religious*; And *Theophylact* in the same words.

As for his proofs of the *contrary*, they are of no *validity*. 13.

The *first* is from the *context* v. 8. where the *Apostle* calls it *philosophy*; But first, v. 8. hath no *contexture* with v. 23. *Secondly*, φιλοσοφία is not λόγῳ σοφίας, the *philosophy* there spoken of, the joyning of the Αἰῶνες or *Angels* with *God*, the *Gnostick Theology* of the συζυγίαι, out of the *Platonick* and *Poetick Theology* of the *heathens*, had not so much as a *shew* of any *excellent doctrine brought from heaven*, as the *Diatribist* even now from *Bishop Davenant* expresst σοφία to signify, at least not such as of which S. *Paul* could affirm, that it had any *image* or *shew* of such. 14.

Thirdly, 'Tis confest on both sides that the things here spoken of, and said to *have a shew of wisdom in Will-worship and self-denial*, are the δόγματα of *abstinences* from *meats* and *marriages*; and those, abstracted from the *error* of *dogmatizing*, have indeed a *shew* of *piety* in those two respects, that he which *abstains voluntarily*, shall seem to *practise* a *special* piece of *self-denial*, and to *offer* to *God* a *free-will offering* of *abstinence* from *meats* and *marriage*. 15.

As for that of *worshipping* of *Angels*, which I suppose a *corollary* of the *philosophy*, v. 8. that also hath a *shew* of *piety* in *humility*, in *worshipping* the *officers* and *ministers* of *God*, as not daring to *approach* immediately to *God* himself; But then this, as it rather *confirms* the notion of *wisdom* for *piety*, than *confutes* it, so it cannot have any such *influence* on the other branch of *abstinences*, as to qualify them to have any *shew* of *divine doctrine* in *Will-worship* and *humility*, especially if *Will-worship* continue to signify, as the *Diatribist* will have it, *worship devised by the wit and will of man*, for then, as was said, they must have a *shew* of *coming from heaven*, in this very respect, that they *come not from heaven*, but from the *wit and will of men*. 16.

His *second* proof is, because v. 18. the *worshipper of Angels is said to be puft up in his fleshly mind*, i. e. *in a carnal conceit of his own wisdom, in finding out that way of worship*, and to that purpose *Irenæus* is cited, not as an *approver* of this interpretation of σοφία (for in the place cited he speaks not a word to *that* matter, not so much as *reflects* upon that *text*) but to * *testify*, that the *fictions of men are by them counted wisdom*. 17.

* *Sapientiam unusquisque eorum dicit, quam à semetipso adinvenit. Ir. l. 3. c. 2.*

But to this I answer, *First*, That this proof extends not to the *doctrines* of *abstinences*, which we know are the *immediate* antecedent, and the *principal* thing here spoken of. *Secondly*, That what is said of the *worshippers* of *Angels*, that they are *vainly puft up in their fleshly minds*, is there set as an *aggravation* of their *crime*, and as the *cause* of their *assuming* to *know* what they *understand not*; whereas this of having a *shew* of *wisdom*, being introduced with the μὲν, which was by the *Diatribist* confest to be an *extenuating* particle, cannot be designed to *aggravate* their sin, nor consequently to be parallel to that of v. 8. And so indeed to have a *shew* of *wisdom* in some respects, differs very much from being *vainly puft up in their fleshly mind*, the one placing that *shew* in somewhat that is *really good*, though *falsely pretended* to, the other placing it in their *own carnal minds* which have nothing *good* in them. As for the place in *Irenæus* directed to in the margent, it speaks quite of another matter, mentioning neither of these *verses*, 18. or 23. and so cannot be vouched for an *authority* to prove that they are *parallel* one to the other. 18.

What he adds, that it may very well be *parallel* to that place, 1 *Cor.* 2. 4, 5, 6. will be soon dispatched by any *reader* that shall *compare* the places, for he will certainly find, that there is no kind of *agreeableness* betwixt them, the one speaking of the *arguments*, *miracles*, &c. by which the *truth* of the *Gospel* was *confirmed* to *men*, and not by *Topicks* of *humane perswasion*, the other of the *shew* of *wisdom* which the *Gnosticks doctrines* of *abstinence* had in them, which sure are things competently removed from any possibility of *corresponding* one with the other. 19.

But saith he, to *assert those abstinences as a worship of God, to have somewhat of real wisdom or piety in them, is a plain begging the question now betwixt us.*] To this I have premised the *answer* in the beginning of this *Section* shewing how far I am from a *possibility* of *begging* the *question*, whilest I do but *answer* to the *argument* drawn from this *text*, and shew that it *may* well (I need not prove, that it needs *must*) have some other *importance* than that in which alone their *argument* against *Will-worship* is founded. But then *Secondly*, I shall freely gratify the *Diatribist*, and having mentioned that of τινὰ λόγον σοφίας for *some reality of wisdom* or *piety*, only as *possible*, I shall gladly yield, that it doth not so signify here, but rather *some shew of wisdom* or *piety*; and then I hope I do not *beg*, but *grant*, *give* him the utmost in this, which he desires, not *crave* any favour from one, who will no more willingly afford it. 20.

What follows of my *denying Will-worship to be here condemned, but not proving it*, is a little *strange*, when he knows I solemnly propose the *reasons* of my contrary *assertion Section* 11, &c. which being certainly as yet not *answered*, or so much as taken *notice* of in this place, I wonder I should be again so soon accused of *petitio principii, begging the question without proof*. 21.

As for my *presumption* in mentioning, (for I did no more) the ἄ τινα for ἅτινα, I desire his *pardon*, for truly I did not expect it should be so *fastidiously* cast off (the use of it being as *fit* for *his* rendring, τινὰ λόγον *some shew*, as for *mine*, τινὰ λόγον *quandam rationem*) or that the bare taking notice of it as *possible*, not *presuming* it as *certain*, or offering it so much as my *conjecture*, should so seriously have *provoked* him; As it is, the *advantages* are so slender which I aimed at by it, that I shall very contentedly lay it aside, and no farther sollicite his *patience* for it, though 'tis sure enough that many more considerable changes have by *sober* men been proposed in *explicating* that Book. 22.

As for the μὲν, *quidem*, *indeed*, for which I am *charged* that I *leave it out* (though if I did, what greater fault have I committed, than S. *Hierom* had done, who, saith the *Diatribist*, *thinks the particle* 23.

ticle μὲν is redundant? yet) I guess not upon what grounds it should be affirmed, when it is visible in the beginning of Section 7. that I keep it in, and by what hath now been said, that it is *mine*, not *his* interest to *keep* it in; All the appearance he can have for thus *affirming* is, that in proposing that reading of ἅ τινα in *two* words, I set it down thus, ἅ τινα δὴν ἔχοντα λόγον --- but as there I leave out μὲν, so I leave out σοφίας and all the rest of the *verse*, and only set down so many words as are sufficient to *express* what I mean by *dividing* ἅ τινα into *two* words, without any thought (if I may be believed) of *leaving* out μὲν or seeking any *advantage* by so doing, or of ought else than what I now declare to have been *designed* by me.

22. But for the particle δὲ *adversative*, which he next considers, I profess not to *divine* his meaning, there being no such particle in the verse, as far as any of my *copies* or my *eyes* can direct me.

SECT. VIII.

The abstinences how taught by the Gnosticks. Their pretences for them, no realities. Abstinences may be free-will offerings, and self-denials. Such may Fasting duly qualified. Such may virginal Chastity. Pauls *judgment of it.* Chrysostom *of things* ὑπὲρ ὠτολήν. *Abstinences positive acts. And yet, if negative, may be acceptable. These abstinences not commanded.*

Numb. 1. TO his eighth and ninth Sections there is little for me to *reply*, which hath not been cleared sufficiently already; Only in the end of the ninth he saith there is *a great mistake in comprehending these abstinences under free-will offerings*; *for*, saith he, *both the free-will offerings were something positive, and these abstinences were negative, rather not offering than offering, touch not, taste not*, &c. *and all these abstinences were commanded by special Laws, but free-will offerings, the Doctor saith, were not required of them by obligation of particular Law.*

2. Of this my supposed *mistake*, I must give some account, thus; The *abstinences* here spoken of, I suppose to be of *two* sorts, from *meats*, and from *marriage*, both which were now perfectly *lawful* to be freely used *sine discrimine*, by *Christians*; Those therefore that taught them to lie now under *interdict*, were *dogmatizers* and *false teachers*; This therefore was a great fault in them, contrary to the clear *Christian* doctrine of *liberty* from *Judaical observances*, (of which sort were those *abstinences* from *meats*) and of the *honourableness* of *marriage* among all, when the *Gnostick* detesters of *marriage*, making it *damnable*, and the *abstinence* necessary to *salvation* (and so in the words of the *Apostolick Canon*, abstained and taught that *abstinence* ἐ δι ἄσκησιν ἀλλὰ δια βδελυείαν, *not as an exercise, but out of detestation of marriage*) brought in all the ἄτιμα πάθη *dishonourable, vile affections*, and practices instead of it.

3. This *double* error being noted and censured by the *Apostle*, he yet shews the *pretences*, whereby it was recommended by the *false teachers*, to those *seducible* persons corrupted by them, *viz.* that these *abstinences* were acts of *voluntary worship* and *self-denial*, and so could not fail to be *acceptable* to *God*. That they were *truly* such, I never imagined; but that they *pretended* to be such, had some shew at least of *piety* in these two *respects*, pretending on one side to *voluntary worship*, on the other to *self-denial*, but then had *really* no more of these, than of the *piety* which they *pretended* to have; If they had the least degree of *piety* in them (reading τινὰ λόγον σοφίας, and rendring it *quandam rationem somewhat of wisdom* or *piety*) then that was in this respect, that there was somewhat of *voluntary oblation* and *self-denial* in them; If they had *not* the least *reality*, but only a *shew*, (and τινὰ λόγον *some shew* agrees as commodiously to that) then still that *shew* was in these *two* respects, that they had also a *shew* of *Will-worship* or *voluntary oblation*, and of *self-denial*. And so still I am free enough from any *necessity* of acknowledging his *charge* of comprehending *abstinences* under *free-will-offerings*, when I only affirm that they were *recommended* by *false teachers* under those *specious colours*.

4. Yet now *ex abundanti*, and to gratifie the *Diatribist*, by throwing a μύλον λειὸν before him, I shall not doubt to *affirm*, that such the *abstinences* may be, and so they may be recommended by the *Orthodox Church* (which is far enough from these foul *Gnosticks*) that they may very safely and fitly be comprehended under the head either of *free-will-offerings* or *Self-denials*. Of the latter there can be no doubt; for *fasting* and *virginal chastity* are certainly acts of *Self-denial*, *denying* our selves the *enjoyment* of those *satisfactions*, which might most *lawfully* be enjoyed: And if to this of *Self-denial*, be farther added the designing of this to the *honour* or *service* of *God*, *fasting* in order to *Christian* ends, either as an outward effect and *expression* of *Godly sorrow*, or as an instrument of *bringing the body into subjection*, fitting my self for more *leisure* and *ardor* in *prayer*, acting *revenge* upon my self for the *intemperances* of the former life, and, as to the very *Self-denial*, looking on it as that which will be *acceptable* to *God*, though not (to every possible act) *commanded*, *sub periculo animæ*, and as such, *dedicating* it to *God*, this sure will be a נדבה or *voluntary free-will-offering*, and so properly comprehended under that head.

5. And the same is as visible of *virginal chastity*, which is no where *commanded* by *Christ* or his *Apostles* to any, but yet *recommended* to them which are able to *bear* it, *he that can receive it, let him receive it*, and the advantages of it, under the title of τὸ συμφέρον *profitable*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 35. set out by S. *Paul*, in order to the *advancing* of some *Christian* ends, *purity* of *body* and *Spirit*, *caring* for, or *minding* more *intently* the *things of the Lord*, being *without solicitude*, in times of *distress*, when the *cares* of the *world* may very much *incumber* all, and probably *insnare* many; Upon which grounds the *Apostle*, that out of his fatherly care would have them aspire to the *greatest perfection*, and so wishes them this ἀμεριμνία, doth also profess it his judgment, that he that thus *abstains* from *marriage* doth *better*, even when he that *marrieth doth well*, and consequently proposes this whole matter not as ἐπιταγὴν Κυρίου any *command* of *Christs*, for he professeth to have *no* such, but as his *opinion* or *judgment*, v. 25. and 40. which what is it, but the very notion of *free-will-offering*, such as of which S. *Chrysostom* saith, Τὸ δὲ ἑκὼν ἡμῶν προαιρέσεως κατόρθωμα, *it is an act of my own will*, in opposition to the τὸ μὲν δὴν ἐπιτάγμα,

Tom. 3. p. 382.

ταγμα, *a precept*, or *command*, *precedent*, or ἃ μὲν ὑπὲρ τὴν ἐντολὴν γίνεται, πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν μισθὸν καὶ τοῦτο, ἃ δὲ ἐν ἐντολῆς τάξει ὑποστῶσι, *Thoſe things which are done above the precept, have in this reſpect great reward, but thoſe which are in the rank of precept, not ſo much.*

As for the reaſons produced by the *Diatribiſt*, certainly they will be of no force againſt this *evi-* 6.
dence; for why may not *virginity*, or *faſting* deſerve to be accounted *poſitive* things? is it not as truly a *poſitive* action to *conquer* as to *ſatisfie*, to *ſubdue* as to *glut* my *appetite*? and if *ſelf-denials* be *negative* things, and yet *acceptable* to *Chriſt*, what prejudice will it be to theſe *abſtinences*, though they ſhould be deemed *negative* alſo? Are not all the *obediences* that are performed to *negative precepts*, compliances with thoſe *negations*, and ſo *negative* alſo, as *not killing*, *not committing adultery*, &c. And ſhall not the ſame be ſaid of all abſtinences? If *Adam* had *not taſted the forbidden fruit*, this had been but *negative*, yet an *act* of *obedience* to *God*, and that preferred by *God* before *all burnt-offerings* and *ſacrifices*, *preſcribed*, or *voluntary*; And then what *diminution* could it be to an *abſtinence*, or *prejudice* to its being a *free-will offering*, that it is a *negative act*? So wide is this kind of *arguing* from proving any thing.

And as wide is his ſecond proof, that theſe *abſtinences* were *commanded by ſpecial laws*, when he 7.
knows that *abſtinence* from *marriage* was never *commanded* by any *law* of *Moſes*, or *Chriſt*, and that that other from *meats*, was now left *free* by *Chriſt*, thoſe *ſpecial laws* under *Moſes* given to the *Jews*, being now *caſſate* and *cancelled* by *Chriſt*. This ſure is enough to his *preſent velitations*, what he hath of *reſerve* for a *weightier impreſſion*, ſhall then be *warded* when I ſee it *approach*, and therefore ſo much for theſe two *Sections*.

SECT. IX.

Compliance with Papiſts. The Diatribiſts inconſtancy.

HIS tenth Section being an introduction to his ſurvey of my ſix reaſons for the taking *Will-wor-* *Numb.* 1.
ſhip, *Col.* 2. in a *good creditable ſenſe*, begins with a *general*, but that poſing, confounding note, that *taking the word in a good ſenſe, the Doctor complies too much with the Papiſts (moſt of them taking it in an ill) who uſe to take off the force of the Proteſtants objection from this place againſt their Will-worſhip. by anſwering, that it is taken here in a good ſenſe, for voluntary religion or worſhip.*] To which I confeſs my ſelf unable to give any *anſwer*, as not gueſſing wherein the *objection* lies, whether in my *complying*, or *not complying* with the *Papiſts*.

The words expreſly tell me, that *taking it in a good ſenſe I comply with the Papiſts*, and yet there 2.
are other words as expreſly pronouncing, that *moſt of the Papiſts take it in an ill ſenſe*: The only expedient to me imaginable to *reconcile* theſe *contradictions* (which yet I have no pretence of imputing to the *Printer*, or to any but the *Author*) is this, that though *moſt of the Papiſts take it in an ill ſenſe*, yet *ſome*, though *ſmaller* number of them, take it in a *good*, and ſo *defend their many traditions of worſhip* (as he calls them) *and anſwer the Proteſtants objections* (the *Diatribiſts* and his partners) *from that text*, *Col.* 2. and then, that I differ from thoſe *Proteſtants*, and *comply* with thoſe *Papiſts*.

And if this be the meaning, then as firſt, I can truly ſay, that I borrowed not this *interpretation* of 3.
that *word* or *text* from any *Popiſh* writer, but from the weighing the *text* it ſelf, and the *characters* I found in it (the ſame that *Hugo Grotius* hath diſcerned alſo, as was ſaid) and accordingly ſet thoſe down for the *reaſons* of my *interpretation*; ſo if I ſhall truly be found to have *complied* with any *Papiſt* herein, yet firſt, I ſhall never ſtartle at the *interpretation*, upon that account, many *Papiſts* having given the *true* ſenſes of many places of *Scripture*; and ſecondly, I ſhall with much more *juſtice* be able to *retort* this argument on the *Diatribiſt*, if I may *believe* himſelf, the ſenſe which he hath given, *viz.* the *ill* ſenſe, being *owned* by moſt of the *Papiſts*, as he here himſelf confeſſes. And then ſure, he that is *acknowledged* to *comply* with moſt of the *Papiſts*, and not he which is but *accuſed* to *comply* with *ſome few* of them muſt needs be moſt guilty of that *crime*, whatſoever 'tis fanſied to be, which conſiſts in ſuch *compliance*.

Nay 'tis not long ſince he affirmed of my *interpretation* of this *verſe*, that he *believes it is ſingular* 4.
without any precedent, either ancient or modern, Proteſtant or Papiſt; and then I have little reaſon to be- *Diatr.* p. 44.
lieve his bare *general* ſuggeſtion againſt his own *belief*, that the *Doctor* herein *complies with the Papiſts*; eſpecially when out of *Chamier*, he here adds, that that *learned and acute man*, *Panſtrat.* l. 3. c. 6. *Sect.* 5. *profeſſes he never ſaw the good ſenſe in any interpreter of the place.*

So then this *general* note is not likely to tend much to our prejudice, I proceed then to his more 5.
particular anſwer to my reaſons.

SECT.

SECT. X.

A reply to his anſwer of my two firſt reaſons for the good ſenſe. Humility and Will-worſhip aſſociated, either both real or both pretended. Popiſh laniations why culpable. Σωματικὴ γυμνασία, 1 Tim. 4. πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος, ὐ ὀλίγῳ, ἐπ' ὀλίγον. *Faſting a* Λατεία *far from hurtful or abominable; wherein the profit of it conſiſts. The true ſenſe of* 1 Tim. 4. 8. *wherein the illneſs of it conſiſts.* Ἄσκησις *and* βδελυγία. *Abſtinence becauſe of abuſes. For Religion. Marcionites. Durand. A ſhew of Piety in Will-worſhip. All ſhew of good in reſpect of ſomewhat that is good. The Diatribiſts fallacious inſtances and queſtions.*

Numb. 1. AND my *firſt reaſon* being taken from the *joining* of *Will-worſhip with humility*, one *undoubted Chriſtian* virtue, *and not ſparing*, or, as *Calvin*, *mortifying of the body*, To the former his *anſwer* is, that *by my favour, humility here is not the true and laudable Chriſtian virtue, but a meer counterfeit, a pretended humility fit for a pretended Will-worſhip.*

2. And I reply, that if it be ſo, it fits my turn very *well*; for ſtill *Will-worſhip* and *humility* are *aſſociated*, the *pretended Will-worſhip*, he ſaith, with the pretended *humility*, and conſequently, that as the fault is not in the *humility*, but in the *pretending* of it, when it is not *true*, the *falſeneſs* and *counterfeitneſs* of it, and that an *evidence* that the *humility*, if it were *truly* ſuch, were a *Chriſtian virtue*, becauſe the *fault* is in the *feignedneſs* of it; ſo by the *analogy* of reaſon, it muſt hold of *Will-worſhip*, that when that is *truly ſuch*, it is a *Chriſtian* virtue, and that the only *fault* is, that it is not what it *pretends* to be; and ſo that is ſtill a *valid* argument for the good ſenſe of the *word, Will-worſhip*, though not of the *diſguiſe* and *falſe appearance* of it; the bare *ſhew*, even of *divine worſhip* it ſelf, being acknowledged to have nothing of *good* in it, which yet certainly the *reality* of it hath.

3. As for that of the *Self-denial, it is*, ſaith he, *not only a counterfeit, but an impious miſtaken mortification*, viz. *when 'tis made a worſhip of God*; and he inſtances in the *Romiſh ridiculous Penances, Pilgrimages*, &c. and asks *what 'tis that makes them impious miſtaken mortification, not their being held forth as commands of God, for that they deny, it muſt be then*, ſaith he, *becauſe they make them worſhips of God, voluntary worſhip.*] Here again the *former* reply is in force; if it be the *counterfeitneſs* and *impiety* of the *mortification* that *defames* it, then ſtill the *ſelf-denial* and *mortification, truly* ſo called, is a *Chriſtian virtue*, and then that will conclude the *Will-worſhip* to be ſo too, if it be *truly* what it *pretends* to be.

4. As for his inſtance, and *queſtion* founded on it, it *anſwers* it ſelf; for as it is not their *holding it forth as the command of God*, ſo neither is it their *making it the worſhip of God*, that renders it *culpable*, but the *ridiculouſneſs* of it which he mentions, the *unfitneſs* or *inordinableneſs* to that end, to which it is deſigned; ſuch *laniations* of our *own* bodies being on that account, and by their *affinity* to the *bloody ſacrifices* under the *Law*, deprived of all *appearance* of being *acceptable* to *God*, and ſo for all other ſorts, which are not either *regular effects* of *Godly ſorrow* or deſigned as *expedients* to make it ἀμέλαμέλητος μετάνοια a *laſting* and *durable repentance* (as ἐκδίκησις *revenge*, 2 *Cor.* 7. 11. is defined to be) For whatſoever is truly ſo, I muſt not be ſo injurious to it, as to doubt of the *acceptation* with *God*, or to cenſure it either as *impious* or *ridiculous*.

5. My ſecond *reaſon* for the taking *Will-worſhip* in a *good* ſenſe, was this, becauſe theſe *abſtinences are ſaid to have* λόγον σοφίας, *whether that be ſome ſmall reality, or elſe a bare ſhew of wiſdom in reſpect of the Will-worſhip diſcernible in them, neither of which they could be ſaid to have, if Will-worſhip had paſt with St.* Paul *for fooliſh or impious; for how can a thing be ſaid to have ſo much as a ſhew of piety in reſpect to any ſin, as luſt, or rage, diſcernible in it?* To this his *anſwer* is *long* and *perplext*. Firſt, By rejecting that notion of λόγον σοφίας for any *degree* of *real wiſdom*; And to this I that did not really adhere to that, will not be ſo far concerned in it, as to make any reply, or at all to indeavour to *defend* it, or to add of it farther than this, that the bare *poſſibility* that it might ſo ſignifie, *ſuperſedes* all *demonſtrativeneſs* of proof from this *text*, for the *criminouſneſs* of *Will-worſhip*.

6. But upon this occaſion he takes liberty to conſider the *Apoſtles* words of *bodily exerciſe*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 8. and of that affirms, when it is ſaid to be πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος, *profitable for a little, the meaning is, 'tis profitable for nothing, nay hurtful and abominable.*

7. To this πάραεργον I muſt interpoſe, that this is a very ſtrange and *groundleſs* interpretation of πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος *profitable for a little*, i. e. for *nothing*, and even leſs than ſo, *hurtful* and *abominable*. It is, as if when *Agrippa* tells *Paul* ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι, *a little way thou perſwadeſt me to be a Chriſtian*, he ſhould interpret it, that *Agrippa* was *not at all* perſwaded by him toward *Chriſtianity*, but on the *other* ſide was more *confirmed* in his *Gentiliſm*.

8. To this purpoſe it is obſervable, that although the *bodily exerciſe* in that *text*, be by ſome of the *antients* underſtood of *bodily labour*, yet they which do ſo, render πρὸς ὀλίγον ſo, as to ſignifie *ſomewhat*, ὀλίγον ὠφέλησε τὸ σῶμα ἢ πρὸς καιρὸν, *it profits the body a little and for a while*, ſaith St. *Chryſoſtom* and *Theophylact*, (and ſo we know it doth) and St. *Hierom* in like manner, *ad breve tempus in carnali proficiunt ſanitate, they are for a ſhort time profitable in reſpect of bodily health*, and ſo likewiſe thoſe others of the *Antients*, *Ambroſe*, &c. who underſtand it of *faſting*, (ſo doth *Leo* alſo *Serm. de jejun.* 7. *menſis*, ſometimes in that phraſe of *corporum labor, the labour of bodies*, *Serm.* 2. ſometimes of *exercitatio continentiæ, quam ſibi quiſque proprio arbitrio indicit, the exerciſe of abſtinence which every one by his own choice lays on himſelf*, *Serm.* 3.) conceive πρὸς ὀλίγον to denote *ſome degree* of *profit, utilitatem cujuſdam portionis*, ſaith *Leo*, though not ſo great as belongs to that which is underſtood by *piety* in the next words.

9. Thus the phraſe מעט יכבן ſignifies among the *Rabbins*, that which is in *ſome* degree *profitable*, but within certain *bounds*; and ſo alſo among the *Greeks*, as when *Plato* ſaith of *Socrates*, Σωκράτης ἐπ' ὀλίγον θεωτικέον, ἀληθείας δὲ πολύ, *Socrates is a little to be conſidered, but truth a great deal*; and proportionably here the *compariſon* lyes, *bodily exerciſe is profitable for a little, but godlineſs is profitable for all things.*

As

As for his *cenſure*, that by *conſequence* to this interpretation, he faſtens on *bodily exerciſe*, in this notion, taking it for *abſtinences* from *meats* and *marriage*, without relation to that of the *Dogmatizers teaching* and requiring that *abſtinence* as from things *forbidden* by *God*, i. e. (in effect) on bare *voluntary faſting* and *celibacy* (when they are only uſed πρὸς ἄσκησιν, *for exerciſe*, ἢ πρὸς βδελυρίαν *not with deteſtation* of *marriage* or *meats*, as the *antient Canons* have it) viz. that they are *hurtful* and *abominable* [I need ſay no more, but that it is an *ungrounded* and *unwary affirmation*, no way to be juſtified or *excuſed*, unleſs ſtill he relieve himſelf at the dead lift with the *ſuppoſition*, that they are made the *worſhip* of *God*.] 10.

And then again as that cannot be applied to *abſtinence* from *marriage*, in his notion of *worſhip* (for even they that make that a thing *acceptable* to *God*, and a ſtate of *perfection*, do not count it a *worſhip*, unleſs in a *general* ſenſe, as every *virtuous act* performed to *God*, may be ſtyled *worſhip*, and ſo this, being not under *precept*, but *commended*, a *Will-worſhip*) ſo being applied to *abſtinence* from *meats*, it can be of no very good *conſequence*. 11.

For *Faſting* hath long been numbred among the ſorts of *Chriſtian ſacrifice*, and is ſo ſet down by * *Aquinas* from that of S. *Paul* of *offering up our bodies a ſacrifice to God*, *Rom.* 12. which, ſaith he, is done by *faſting*, *continence*, *martyrdome*; *Leo* calls it *continentiæ libamen*, the *ſacrifice of abſtinence*. And † S. *Hierom* ſpeaking of it, uſeth this ſtyle, *quicquid ſupra juſtitiam offertur Deo*, making it an *offering* to *God*, though not under *precept*; and before him * *Tertullian*, ſpeaking of *abſtinence*, *Humilitatem animæ Deo immolant*, *they ſacrifice to God the humility of the ſoul*. And li. *de Reſur. Carn. c.* 8. *Sacrificia Deo grata*, *conflictationes dico animæ*, *jejunia*, *& feras & aridas eſcas*, *Faſting a ſacrifice acceptable to God*. And yet higher, is the expreſs ſaying of S. *Luke* concerning *Anne*, that ſhe did λατρεύειν *ſerve God in faſtings and prayers*, *Luke* 2. 37. And agreeable to this it is, that our *Saviour* mentions it together with *prayer* and *almſgiving*, *Mat.* 6. and promiſeth it a *reward*, v. 18. 12.

* *Secunda ſecundæ qu.* 85. *art.* 3.

† *Ad Celantiam Ep.* 14. *Tom.* 1. p. 31.

* *De cultu fœmi. c.* 9.

That the other two are *ſpecies* of *worſhip*, and the *ſolemn Chriſtian ſacrifices*, ſo ſtiled by the holy *writers*, there is no queſtion; and then why, or how ſhould *Faſting* which is the *third*, if it be *qualified* as it ought, be degraded from the *honour*, and for no other *crime*, but only for being taught to be what really it is, i. e. an *acceptable worſhip* of *God*, become *hurtful* and *abominable*? 13.

By the way, would this be affirmed by the *Diatribiſt* of *hearing Sermons*, in caſe it ſhould be *taught*, or *aſſume* to be a *part* of *God's worſhip*? would it preſently be caſt out as *hurtful* and *abominable*? And yet ſure, bare *hearing* of *Sermons* is not any acknowledged branch of *worſhip*. 14.

Something, I acknowledge, of *difference* there is, betwixt this of *Faſting*, and thoſe other two of *Prayer* and *Almſgiving*, to which *Chriſt* annexeth it; *Faſting* receives the chief of its *virtue* and *eſtimation*, not from the act it ſelf, which is but a *ſelf-denial*, but either as an *effect* of *piety*, as flowing from *godly ſorrow*, and ſo joined with [a] *prayer* for *pardon*, or as an [b] *help* or *expedient* toward *piety*, whether by *ſubduing* of *carnal deſires*, by [c] *humbling* the *ſoul*, &c. or by *fitting* and *gaining* us *leiſure* and *ability* for [d] *prayer*, and *for* [e] *almſgiving*; and if it be the bare *abſtinence* from *meat*, abſtracted from all of theſe, it is [f] no ſuch *eminent* or *acceptable worſhip* of *God*, *Hæc enim virtus adjumentum eſt*, *non perfectio ſanctitatis*, *this virtue is an help*, *not the perfection of ſanctity*, ſaith [g] S. *Hierom*, *ad Celantiam*; But then ſtill, ſuch a *help* it is, and that to more ends than one; For ſpeaking of *Chaſtity*, he adds, *non huic tantummodo*, *ſed omnibus omnino virtutibus abſtinentia opitulatur*, *faſting is helpful not to that only*, *but generally to all virtues*; And ſo *S. Chryſoſtome*, φάρμακόν ἐστιν ἡ νηστεία, *faſting is a medicine*, but that *uſeleſs*, if it be not uſed as it ſhould be. 15.

[a] *Afflictio corporis peccatorum indulgentiam deprecatur*: Hierom. *in* Iſa. 58. *Tom.* 4. p. 191. F.

[b] πάντων ὑποδέσεως ἡμῖν ἡ νηστεία καὶ διδάσκαλος ἔσται. *Chryſoſt. Andriant. γ. Tom.* 6. p. 476. l. 17.

[c] *Eo affligunt carnem ſuam*, *quo animæ frangant ſuperbiam*. Hieron. *ad Celantiam Ep.* 14. *Tom.* 1. p. 398.

[d] *Eodem tempore vacemus orationi*, *ne interior homo noſter Draconis veſcatur carnibus*. Hieron. *in* Iſa. 58.

[e] ἵνα ὅσον ἐπὶ τῇ νηστείᾳ ἡμῖν ἀν παρελθῶμεν ἀυτὴν ἀπαθῶς ἐκεῖ, μᾶλλον, Chryſoſt. *Andriant. 15. Tom.* 6. p. 573. l. 16.

[f] *Frange panem eſurienti*, *partem panis quam ſi non jejunares comeſturus eras*. Jejunium *tuum non ſit lucrum manſupii*, *ſed ſaturitas animæ*. Hieron. *lb. Tom.* 4. p. 191. G. *Quod veſtris uſibus religioſâ parcitate ſubtrahitis*, *in alimoniam pauperum*, *& in cibos debilium transferatis*, *Leo de* Jejun. 7. *menſ. Serm.* 4.

[g] νηστείας ὄφελος ἐστὶν ἀν μὴ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἔπηται πάντα, Chryſoſt. *Andriant. γ. Tom.* 6. p 476. l. 25.

[g] Hier. *Tom.* 1. *Ep.* 14. p. 39. A.

So that ſtill looking on it but as ſuch, it is I hope more capable of the titles of *uſeful* and *profitable* for *ſomewhat*, than of *hurtful* and *abominable*. As it is an *inſtrument* of *good*, a *help*, or *medicine*, ſo ſure 'tis *profitable* εἰς ὀλίγον, in ſome *lower* degree, in order to thoſe *uſes*; And what if by our *faults*, διὰ τὴν ἀπειρίαν τῶν χρωμένων, ſaith *Chryſoſtom*, *becauſe of the unskilfulneſs of thoſe that uſe it*, it become ἄχρηστον *uſeleſs*, yet ſure this is no *defamation* or *prejudice* to it; The moſt *generous medicaments* may thus be rendred *uſeleſs* and *inoperative*, yet are in themſelves very apt to work *cures*; and ſo *prayer* it ſelf may become utterly *unprofitable*, by the like *miſcarriage* of ours; And more eſpecially, *hearing* the *word*, which is very proper for *excellent uſes*, for *inſtruction*, *admonition*, &c. doth yet in the *event* very frequently prove *unprofitable*, and yet this is no *prejudice* to the *inſtitution*. 16.

By this, I ſuppoſe, the *exact* importance of the *phraſe* may be collected, as *bodily exerciſe* is not *oppoſed* to, but *compared* with *godlineſs*, and [*profitable* πρὸς ὀλίγον, *for a little*] to [πρὸς πάντα *for all things*, *having the promiſe of this life*, &c.] viz. that ſuch *exerciſes* as theſe, *faſting* particularly, is a very good *inſtrument* in a *pious* mans handling, *profitable* and *advantageous* in its degree, in order to *mortification*, &c. to teſtify our *ſorrow* and *repentance*, to *aſſiſt* in the *deprecating* of *Gods* wrath, to qualify us for *relieving* of others, for *ardent intenſe prayer*, &c. but yet muſt not be magnified above its *proportion*, being compared with *univerſal piety*, which is *profitable to all things*, and *hath the promiſe of this life and of another*. This falls very low in that high compariſon, it is but πρὸς ὀλίγον ὠφέλιμος, *profitable for a little*, whether in *extent* of *matter*, *profitable* for *fewer* things than *piety*, which is *profitable* for *all* things; or in *extent* of *time*, as πρὸς ὀλίγον ſometimes is rendred πρὸς καιρὸν, *profitable for this time* of *life*, wherein all thoſe *benefits* are to be reapt, to which *faſting* is *profitable*, *humiliation*, *mortification*, &c. but eſpecially in the former *notion* of this *extent*, *profitable* for *ſome few* things, in compariſon. And ſo much *ex abundanti* for the vindicating that *text* of the *profitableneſs* of *bodily exerciſe*. 17.

Before he leaves this, he adds that the *Doctor ſeems to place the illneſs of theſe bodily exerciſes in* this, 18.

this, when they are taught as neceſſary, to the defaming of meat and marriage; But—— I *anſwer*,

19. That I did ſo place their *illneſs*, I thought I had done it on very *good authority*, that of the *ancient Canons*, particularly of the 51. *Apoſtolical*, εἴτις ἐπίσκοπος γάμου καὶ κρεῶν καὶ οἴνου, οὐ δι' ἀσκησιν, ἀλλὰ διὰ βδελυείαν, ἀπέχεσθαι, ἐπιλαθόμενος ὅτι πάντα καλὰ λίαν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς, ἀλλὰ βλασφημῶν διαβάλλει τὴν δημιουργίαν, ἢ διορθούσθω, ἢ καθαιρείσθω, &c. *If any Biſhop or Clerk abſtain from marriage, fleſh, wine, not for exerciſe, (abſtinence* or *continence) but for deteſtation, he forgets that God created all things very good, male and female,* &c. *and blaſphemouſly calumniates the creation, and therefore muſt either reform or be depoſed.* 'Tis viſible here, wherein that *fault* conſiſts, not in the *abſtinence*, but looking on *meats* and *marriage* as *unlawful* things, which they could not be, but as they are ſuppoſed to be *forbidden* by *God*; And *Zonoras*'s comment on it is very *natural*, τὸ μὲν δι' ἐγκράτειαν ἀπέχεσθαι, ἀποδεκτέον, *Abſtinence* for the virtues ſake is to be *allowed* and *commended*: τὸ δὲ ταῦτα βδελυττεσθαι καὶ ὡς βλαβερὰ πρὸς ψυχὴν ἀποστρέφεσθαι, οὐκ ἀνέγκλητον, *but abominating thoſe and rejecting them as hurtful to the ſoul*, this is it which is *criminous* and *cenſurable*. And *Balſamon* adds, that as they ſhall be *cenſured* which *abſtain* from them διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι παραίτια κακῶν τοῖς κακῶς παραχρωμένοις αὐτοῖς, *becauſe they are cauſes of ill to thoſe that abuſe them*, inſtancing in *Bogomilus* which did ſo; ſo he that abſtains διὰ εὐλάβειαν *for religion* or *piety*, οὐ κατακεισθήσεται *ſhall not be cenſured*. As cautious a *prevention* of this *Diatribiſts doctrine*, and as ſeaſonable an advertiſement to him, as could have been imagined.

20. To theſe *teſtimonies* I might farther add that of *Tertullian*, who affirms that among the followers of *Marcion* and *Tatianus* (though not, ſaith he, of *Montanus*) were found men *qui perpetuam abſtinentiam præcipiunt ad deſtruenda & dejicienda opera creatoris, who commanded perpetual abſtinence to the deſtroying and caſting down the works of the Creator, de jejun.* c. 15. And the like intimations of the *opinion* of *hereticks* we meet frequently in the *Fathers*, who give their *cautions* againſt this, *Non rejiciendis generibus ciborum quaſi pollutis. Auguſt. de mor. Eccl. Cath.* l. 1. c. 33. *& eſcarum non naturas ſed concupiſcentias damnent. Proſper de vit. contempl.* l. 2. 22. And many the like. And among the *Papiſts*, no meaner perſon than *Durand* ſpeaks much to this ſenſe, that thoſe old *hereticks* did, (though the generality of the *Papiſts* ſeem not to *approve* or *follow* him) *God*, ſaith he, *curſed the earth, and from thence it is, that in faſting 'tis unlawful to eat any fleſh that is upon the earth, beaſts and birds*, &c. *Rat. divin. Off.* l. 6. c. 7. But this by the way.

21. Next then, taking the words λόγος σοφίας to ſignify only a *ſhew* of *piety*, he cannot but *wonder* at my *queſtion* [*How abſtinences can have ſo much as a ſhew of piety in Will-worſhip, if Will-worſhip paſs confeſtly for fooliſh and impious?*] bidding me *ask all interpreters, who render the words, a ſhew of wiſdom in ſuperſtition or affected religion, how this can be.*

22. But before I ſhall *ask* them, I muſt have ſome aſſurance from this *Diatribiſt*, that all *interpreters* do ſo render it; for otherwiſe my *queſtion* will be loſt in the *air*, and never bring me home any *anſwer*; But of this I am well enough adviſed, that all *interpreters* do not thus render it; I ſhall inſtance, as even now I did, in the learned *Grotius*, as valuable, I believe, as any that will be brought for the *Diatribiſt*'s interpretation, and beſides, any *one* aſſerter of *mine* interpretation (and certainly *Grotius* is *one*) confutes his *aſſertion* of *all interpreters*.

23. However, unleſs I can be farther aſſured, that he or they whom the *Diatribiſt* takes for *all*, doth alſo take *notice* of, and render ſome *anſwer* to my *queſtion*, what ſhall I gain by *asking* them? And if they do *anſwer it*, why would not the *Diatribiſt* be ſo kind as to recite it from them? But this I am ſure he hath not done, by asking me again, *Cannot a thing have a ſhew of wiſdom or piety, which is confeſſedly fooliſh or impious, and if ſo, may it not be ſo in reſpect of the Will-worſhip in it?*

24. I *anſwer*, that if I take the *queſtion* in the *terms* wherein it is propoſed, it is no way of *anſwering* my *queſtion*, but the diverting to a very *diſtant* matter, For when he asks, *may it not be ſo in reſpect of the Will-worſhip in it?* the plain importance of his words is, *may it not be fooliſh or impious in reſpect of the Will-worſhip that is in it?* not, *may it not have a ſhew of wiſdom or piety in reſpect of the Will-worſhip?* for it is viſible that [*be ſo*] refers to [*is fooliſh*] and not to [*have a ſhew.*] And then there is a fair *fallacy* put upon the Reader, the *terms* of my *queſtion*, and of the *text*, quite changed, and others ſubſtituted in ſtead of them; and then I confeſs, that ſuppoſing *Will-worſhip* as *ill*, as the *Diatribiſt* would have it, a thing may be *fooliſh* or *impious* in reſpect of *Will-worſhip*.

25. But let the *queſtion* be fairly ſet, *cannot a thing that is fooliſh and impious have a ſhew of wiſdom in reſpect of Will-worſhip?* And then as I ſhall anſwer, it may: ſo I muſt add, that then that *Will-worſhip* muſt be taken in a *good* ſenſe, for elſe that *fooliſh* thing could not have a *ſhew of wiſdom* or *piety in Will-worſhip*. If a *fool* have any *ſhew* of *wiſdom* in him, it muſt be ſure not in *reſpect* of his *folly*, but of ſome *particular* or other, which is by him that ſpeaks accounted *wiſdom*, and that he muſt have in him either in *reality* or in *appearance*, or elſe how can he have any *ſhew* of *wiſdom*; If *Satan* have the *ſhew* or *appearance* of an *Angel* of *light*, it muſt be in *reſpect* to ſomething which he doth, or pretends to do, which is *Angelical*.

26. As for the *inſtances* with which he proſecutes this, it muſt be a ſtrange *ſhortneſs* of *diſcourſe*, if he can think they *evince* his *concluſion*; He *exemplifies* in the *Baalitical lancing*, and the *Popiſh penances*, and ſuppoſing the former *impious*, and the latter not only *ridiculous* but *heatheniſh*, yet *theſe*, ſaith he, *had a ſhew of piety*. But what if they had, was it ever denyed or *queſtioned* by me, but that *impious perſons* or *actions* might have a *ſhew* of *piety*? for ſure I always knew there were *hypocrites* in the world; but my *queſtion* he knows was, how any thing can have a *ſhew* of *piety* in reſpect of that very thing which is *impious*? This was the only queſtion that belonged to the affair betwixt us, and certainly the *Diatribiſt*'s inſtances are very remote from that; for the *Baalites ſhew* of *piety* conſiſted not in their *bloody lancing* of themſelves, nor the *Papiſts* in their as *bloody penances*, but either in the *reality* or *appearance* of that *deteſtation* of *ſin*, and that *zeal*, which makes them ſubmit themſelves to ſo much *ſmart*.

27. It was very neceſſary then for him in the purſuit of this, when he again recites my queſtion, [*But (ſaith the Doctor) can any thing be repreſented to me as having ſo much as a ſhew of piety, in reſpect of luſt or rage diſcernible in it?*] to tell the *Reader* that this *compariſon* is ill *laid*. For if this be well laid, then ſure his ſetting of the *queſtion* is foully out of the way. But why is it *ill laid?* is it not directly

a way

a way of *tryal*, whether *will-worſhip* be ſet by the *Apoſtle* in an *ill* notion? For if it be, then ſomewhat elſe which is acknowledgedly *ill* (and θύμος and ἐπιθυμία *rage* and *luſt*, the two *principles* of *ſenſuality*, were the fitteſt I could think on of this ſort, to inſtance in) being put in the ſtead of it, the *Apoſtles* words would ſtill continue to have *truth* and congruity in them, *viz.* that ſuch a thing *hath a ſhew of piety in it, in reſpect of luſt or rage.* This it ſeems was too *groſs* for him to ſwallow, and therefore (and upon no other reaſon, but becauſe it made the truth moſt *palpable*) the *compariſon*, ſaith he, was *ill laid*.

But 'tis yet more *ſtrange*, if we conſider his *reaſon* of *excepting* againſt this *compariſon*, *For rage*, 28.
ſaith he, *and luſt are for kind confeſſedly wicked things.* (And truly that was the reaſon why I inſtanced in them, to ſhew that a thing cannot have a *ſhew* of *good*, in reſpect of that which is *confeſſly bad*, which I could not have ſhewed in thoſe *inſtances*, if they might have been *good* as well as *bad*) *but worſhip*, ſaith he, *may be true or falſe.* I ſhall then only ask, whether *Will-worſhip* may ſo too? for that, he knows, is the word we contend about.

If it may *not*, but is always *falſe*, then ſtill it is directly parallel to *luſt* and *rage*, in this, wherein 29.
the *compariſon* was made, *thoſe* always *ill*, and *this* alſo: But if *Will-worſhip* may be *true*, as well as *falſe*, then as I acknowledge a thing may have a *ſhew* of *piety* in reſpect of *Will-worſhip*, meaning the *good* or *true Will-worſhip*, and ſuppoſing S. *Paul* ſo to have meant, and not any *falſe* or *impious will-worſhip*; ſo by this one conceſſion of the *Diatribiſt* after all this *contention* and *ſcrupuloſity* and *niceneſs*, the whole *queſtion* is yielded me, for it ſeems *Will-worſhip may* be *true as* well as *falſe*, and ſo, *good* as well as *bad*, and here not confeſtly *falſe* or *bad*, *quod erat demonſtrandum.*

What now follows, ſhewing that *impious and falſe worſhip may have a ſhew of wiſdom and piety to na-* 30.
tural men, is evidently *impertinent* to our debate or *queſtion*, which conſiſts only in this, whether that which hath a *bare ſhew* of *piety* or *wiſdom*, can have it in reſpect of that which is *confeſtly impious* and *fooliſh*; and therefore when he hath full ſcope, to *put it a little more home* to me, as he ſaith, and yet can do no more but ask, *Whether zeal may not have a ſhew of true zeal, and yet be nothing but rage and madneſs?* it is ſtill to as little purpoſe, equally *beſide* the *queſtion*; And ſo when he asks, *Whether the Devil transforming himſelf into an Angel of light, muſt have ſomething really of light or piety in him, or elſe cannot have ſo much as a ſhew of piety?* 'Tis evident he *may*, without having any *reality* of *piety* in him, and yet it is as evident, that if he have that *ſhew* of *piety*, in reſpect of *humility* or *charity*, or any thing elſe, that *humility* or *charity*, or whatſoever elſe, muſt be of the number of thoſe things that are *accounted good* and *pious*, for otherwiſe his having the *appearance* or *bare ſhew* of them, would not conclude him to have the *appearance* of *piety*. The matter is *evident* enough, if he will pleaſe to *open* his eyes, I cannot have a *ſhew* of *piety* in *Will-worſhip* unleſs *Will-worſhip* be a *branch* of *piety*, and ſo by proportion a *ſhew* of *Will-worſhip* a *ſhew* of *piety*.

His concluſion of this copious *anſwer* is yet more obſervable (and according to his directions, I 31.
ſhall *note it once* for all) that *the words are not, which things have a ſhew of wiſdom and Will-worſhip*, &c. *for then*, ſaith he, *as wiſdom was good and taken in a good ſenſe, ſo might the reſt be taken, and the fault be, that they had only an appearance, not the truth or power*; *but the words are, they have a ſhew of wiſdom in Will-worſhip*, &c. *and if they were faulty becauſe they had only a ſhew of wiſdom, they will be more faulty that they had but a ſhew of piety, or worſhip, or humility.* All which I ſhall very eaſily *grant*, and as in the *latter* part I ſhall fully *comply* with him, that thoſe *doctrines* of *abſtinences*, *Col.* 2. were *faulty*, becauſe though they had a *ſhew* of *Will-worſhip* and *humility*, yet they had not the *reality* of thoſe *virtues* in them; ſo from the *former* part of his words I have all reaſon of *analogie* to *conclude*, that *Will-worſhip* is taken in a *good* ſenſe, by its being evidently joined with *humility and ſelf-denyal*, for thoſe ſure are *good* things alſo, as well as *wiſdom*, and that all the *fault* was, that the *doctrines* of *abſtinences* had only the *appearance* of thoſe *virtues*, not the *truth* or *power* of them. How inevitably this *concluſion* is founded on theſe very *premiſes* given me by the *Diatribiſt*, is ſo evident, that I hope I ſhall not need farther to enlarge to ſhew it. By the ſame reaſon that *Will-worſhip* muſt have been concluded *good*, if it had been joined with *wiſdom*, in this form [*a ſhew of wiſdom and of Will-worſhip*] it muſt certainly follow that *Will-worſhip* is *good*, becauſe it is *joined* with *humility* in this form, [in *Will-worſhip and humility*] *humility* being as confeſtly *good*, as wiſdom is ſuppoſed to be, and the fault of the *abſtinential* doctrines ſtill equal, that they had only the *appearance*, not *reality* of all theſe.

Once more, the utmoſt force of all is yet *reſerved* for the *cloſe* of the *concluſion*, *The words* ἐν ἐθε- 32.
λοθρησείᾳ, &c. ſaith he, *do no more inforce us to take it in a good ſenſe, than when we ſay*, Judas *made a ſhew of love to Chriſt in his traiterous kiſs, and the Papiſts devotion in bowing to ſtocks and images.* But I deſire that he ſet the words of his example ſo, as may be exactly *parallel* to the words, *Col.* 2. 23. (the leaſt *change* may have an *influence* on the matter) and then it muſt be thus, Firſt, Judas *had* (not *made*) *a ſhew of love to Chriſt in his traiterous kiſs*, and *the Papiſts have a ſhew of devotion in bowing to ſtocks and images.* And ſecondly, inſtead of *traiterous* muſt be placed ſome word, which ſhall no more *vary* the *kiſs*, than the addition of *Will* varies the *worſhip*, (for that the *uncommandedneſs* of *worſhip* makes it *traiterous*, or ſo much as *ill*, muſt not be *ſuppoſed* here, where it is the only *queſtion.*)

Having *premiſed* this, I now anſwer to the *example* as it is by him ſet, that as the words in the 33.
Apoſtle were certainly true, ſo theſe words, as they are now *ill* ſet, are as undoubtedly *falſe*; for conſider the *kiſs*, with that ſo *diſtinctive* contrary *adjunct*, as a *traiterous kiſs*, (which addition as it is *neceſſary* to make it *ill*, ſo it deprives it of all *appearance* of *love*) and then *Judas had no ſhew of love to Chriſt in this*, viz. in his *traiterous kiſs.* If indeed he had ſaid, *Judas had a ſhew of love to Chriſt in kiſſing him*, or *ſaluting* him friendly, then it had been *true*, and then the *concluſion* had been evident, that a *kiſs* or *friendly ſalute* is an *act* or *indication* of *love*, an *hearty kiſs* of an *hearty love*, and a *feigned kiſs* of a *feigned love*; or if the addition of *traiterous kiſs*, had made no greater a *change*, than the addition of *will* or *uncommandedneſs* to *worſhip*, then again it had been true; But ſuppoſing the *kiſs* to be a *traiterous kiſs*, viz. a *kiſs* given as a σύσημον or *watchword*, whom (and when) the *Souldiers* ſhould apprehend, then ſure he had no *ſhew of love to Chriſt in that kiſs.* And ſo in like manner, if the *propoſition* had been, *The Papiſts have a ſhew of devotion in bowing*, it had been true, becauſe *adoration* or

bowing is a *ſpecies* or *indication* of *devotion*; but becauſe *Idolatry* is neither of theſe, and *bowing to ſtocks and images*, is *Idolatry*, there can therefore be no truth in that *propoſition*, ſet, as by the *Diatribiſt* it is ſet, and ſuppoſed to be delivered by any *Orthodox* pen (for ſuch ſure was the *Apoſtle's* to his *Coloſſians*) but the direct contradictory will be true and clear to all that count *bowing to ſtocks and images* a *ſin*. For to them, the *Papiſts* have no *ſhew* of *devotion* in *bowing to ſtocks or images*, no *ſhew* of *piety*, but only of *impiety*, in *Idolatry*.

34. And thus, I hope, I have at length vindicated this *Second argument* for the *good* ſenſe of the word, from all the evaſions and χρησφύγελα (and truly there have been good ſtore of them, and I believe this *Section* his *maſterpiece* of *dexterity*, and therefore I have ſo punctually and χρ πόδα inſiſted on it) from all the *ſubtile* refuges of this *Diatribiſt*.

SECT. XI.

The Greek Fathers acception of ἐθελοθρησκία. *An argument of goodneſs, that 'tis pretended by hypocrites. Religion in a good ſenſe. Will-worſhip not worſe than falſe worſhip, not abominable. All deviſed worſhip is not Idolatry, doth not pretend to more wiſdom than Gods. The Latin Fathers cited by Mr.* C. *The vulgar Tranſlator, and the followers thereof.* Δογματίζεσθε *by the vulgar rendred* decernitis. *The authority of* Bellarmine *and* Daillè *for the good ſenſe. The teſtimonies out of* Ambroſe, Theodoret, Salmeron, Eſtius, Auguſtine, Thomas, *examined.*

Numb. 1. MY *third reaſon* being taken from the *Greek Fathers* underſtanding of the place, who *though they interpret* λόγον *only of appearance, yet paraphraſe Will-worſhip by words of good ſavour,* εὐλαβῆς, *pious, religious*, &c. The *Diatribiſt* begins with a *triumph* and *ovation*, *Firſt*, ſaith he, *this is well, that the Greek Fathers agree with us in expoſition of the firſt words, a ſhew (not, as he, ſomewhat real) of wiſdom, &c. they expreſly oppoſe againſt it power and truth, and can that which hath neither power nor truth in the worſhip of God, be taken in a good ſenſe? And do not the Fathers imply as much, Chryſoſt.* δοκεῖ γὰρ εὐλαβὴς τις εἶναι, &c. ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι γε, *he ſeems to be religious, but is not ſo, Oecumenius* ὑποκεινομένων εὐλάβειαν, *pretending religion in worſhip. And is there any goodneſs in hypocriſy?*

2. Here truly it is not to be *reprehended* but *cheriſhed* in the *Diatribiſt*, that he is ſo very much *rejoyced* to hear the news, that the *Greek Fathers* and he are of a mind, in any the leaſt particular; I hope it will *incourage* and ingage him to a more *familiar* converſation with them, and then I am perſwaded no body will have reaſon to repent of it.

3. All that I am to *complain* of at the preſent, is, firſt that their *interpreting* λόγον a *ſhew*, ſhould be deemed an *agreement* with *him*, more than with *me*, who he knows have produced them, and never expreſt any *diſlike* to that *interpretation*. All the *difference* between us being but this, that the *Greek* λόγον being capable of *two* rendrings, *rationem* and *ſpeciem*, I that deſired to proceed on ſure grounds, propoſed them both, and, which ſoever ſhould be adhered to, ſhewed the neceſſity of ἐθελοθρησκία being taken in a *good* ſenſe. 'Tis true indeed, if λόγῳ ſhould be there taken for *ratio*, the *argument* for the *good* ſenſe would proceed moſt irreſiſtably; But ſuppoſing it with the *Fathers* to ſignify *ſpecies*, a *bare ſhew* or *appearance*, yet the *argument* holds very firmly, thus alſo the *Gnoſtick* doctrines cannot have *ſo much* as a *ſhew* of *piety* in *Will-worſhip*, unleſs *Will-worſhip real* be *piety real*, and the *appearance* of *Will-worſhip*, a foundation of an *appearance* of *piety*. And this being the ſenſe of the *Fathers*, which rendered λόγον a *bare ſhew*, this ſure was fit to be confronted to the *Diatribiſt's* pretenſions, as a *third argument*.

4. And is not now a *ſtrange* way of *anſwer* to this *argument*, to *ask*, as he here doth, *Can that which hath neither power nor truth in the worſhip of God, be taken in a good ſenſe?* I reply, by demanding what it is, of which the *Fathers* ſay, that it hath *neither power nor truth?* Sure the *doctrines* of *abſtinence*, and not the *Will-worſhip*; And yet his *anſwer* proceeds as if they ſuppoſed it of the *Will-worſhip*, and without that, hath no *appearance* of force in it. And is not this a ſtrange perverting of plain words? *Chryſoſtom* ſaith, *the falſe teacher ſeems to be pious, but is not*, and *Oecumenius*, that he *ſimulates piety*, and from hence Mr. *C.* concludes that *Will-worſhip is not taken in a good ſenſe*. But I pray, is not *piety* taken in a good ſenſe even when the *hypocrite ſimulates piety?* Nay, would he pretend to it, if it were not *good?* Doth a *hypocrite* pretend to that which is acknowledgedly *ill?* This were ſure to *appear* what he is, and that is contrary to his being an *hypocrite*. The product is plain, *Will-worſhip* is rendred by *piety*, not by *appearance* of *piety*, and unleſs *piety* it ſelf can be taken there in an *ill* ſenſe, *Will-worſhip* muſt be taken in a *good* ſenſe; Certainly I need add no more ('tis pity I ſhould be required to ſay ſo much) of this matter.

5. But on occaſion of the *interpreter* of *Clemens*, who renders ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ, *in religione*, from whence I thought I might conclude it that mans ſenſe, that *Will-worſhip* ſignifies *religion*, and ſo that it was not taken in an *ill* ſenſe, he is pleaſed to ask, [*Why, Is not religion it ſelf of various ſenſes? The ſimple word ſignifies falſe religion, as well as true; but the compoſition makes it worſe, and alters the ſenſe, becauſe it adds the work of mans will to worſhip, which is abominable to God.*]

6. What depth there is in this *queſtion* will ſoon appear; For *Firſt*, What if both *religio* and θρησκεία be of *various ſenſes*, and *ſignify falſe religion as well as true*, *heathen*, or *Judaical*, as well as *Chriſtian?* Is there any appearance of *reaſon* to determine it to the former, in this place, or in that *interpreters* acception of it? If there be, then there is an account of the words being taken in an *ill* ſenſe, without any influence of the ἐθελο, *mans will* upon it; if there be not (as he is obliged to affirm there is not, ſaying p. 69. that the *Apoſtle brands them as deſtructive, becauſe they are but Will-worſhip, not becauſe they are outdated or Judaical*; much leſs then, becauſe they are any more *dangerous* ſort of *falſe worſhip*, ſuch as was uſed among the *heathens*) then what matters it, what in *other* places it ſignify, whenſoever the *adjuncts* or *context* ſo determine it, unleſs it do (or can be pretended to do) ſo *here?*

This

This being premiſed, that which follows is yet more ſtrange, that (θρησκεία *ſignifying falſe religion* 7.
as well as true) *the compoſition makes it worſe*; *worſe* than what? than *falſe religion?* This is fairly to reſolve, that the uſe of any thing *uncommanded* in the *ſervice* of the *true God*, is *worſe* than *falſe religion indefinitely*, i. e. than *Idolatry* or *Superſtition*; and the *reaſon* annext is of the ſame *temper*, [*adding the work of mans will is abominable to God.*]

Here indeed is a *foundation* of charge of *Idolatry*, or whatever is moſt *abominable* on this poor *Church* 8.
of ours, for the bare uſing of any moſt *innocent ceremony*; But this all the while incumbent on the *Diatribiſt* to *prove*; and as it will not be granted for *asking*, ſo it is not ſo nearly approaching toward truth, as to want any farther *anſwer*, than the reciting of it; I cannot yet be ſo uncharitable to Mr. *C.* as to imagine it his *ſerious* opinion, that *kneeling* in *prayer* or *thanksgiving* to *God*, on purpoſe to expreſs our *lowly reverence* to him, or *bowing* at the name of *Jeſus*, in token that we *believe* him to be the *eternal God*, in oppoſition to the *ancient* or *modern Arians* and *Socinians*, is *abominable* to *God*, and *worſe* than *falſe religion*.

And though his *following queſtion* confirms this to be his opinion [*Do not all Idolaters pretend wiſ-* 9.
dom in their inventions, citing in the *margent*, Pſal. 106. 39. *went a whoring with their own inventions*], yet 'tis not to be *believed*, that he can in earneſt thence *conclude*, Therefore all inventions of *men* are *Idolatry*, and worſe than *Idolatry*; If he can, 'tis ſufficient to reply, that though all *Idolatry* be *invented* and *deviſed worſhip*, yet all *inventions* of *men* are not *Idolatry*; though every *beaſt* be a *living creature*, yet every *living creature* is not a *beaſt*; And ſo, that though *Idolatrous Will-worſhip* be abominable to *God*, yet all *Will-worſhip* is not *Idolatrous*.

Once more he preſſeth this argument, *Doth not*, ſaith he, *this pretence* (*of wiſdom*) *make it more* 10.
odious to God, as taking upon them to be wiſer than he, and more devout than he requires?] But it may ſuffice once for all, that he that uſeth an *uncommanded ceremony* in the *ſervice* of *God*, doth not *take upon him to be wiſer than God*, but walking *regularly* in *obedience* to the *divine rule*, whereſoever there is any *particularly* given, acts according to *reaſon* and the more *univerſal* rules of *Decency*, &c. where *God* hath *not particularly* preſcribed any thing. And ſo again in *acts* of *uncommanded devotion*; doing that *voluntarily* out of *love* to *God*, which *God requires* not *ſub periculo animæ*, and ſo, which is not *extorted* by *fear*, either of *offending* or *ſuffering*, this is again no *elevating* our own *wiſdom* above *Gods*, but our making uſe of thoſe *advantages* and thoſe *liberties* which *God* in his *wiſdom* choſe to afford us, that there might be ſomewhat for us *freely* to exerciſe his graces upon, and ſo for him as *freely* to reward in us. And of this there is no *fear*, that it ſhall ever be counted any *irregular* acting, and having *God's* promiſe to be *rewarded*, it is ſafe from being *odious* or *abominable* before him.

Thus I hope I have vindicated the *good* ſenſe of the word as far as in my third Reaſon I *pretended* 11.
from the *Greek Fathers* concurrence with me.

As for the *Latines* and *later interpreters*, to which the *Diatribiſt* now calls me, and asks me *why I* 12.
did not tell him, how they rendred the word? To this I anſwer, that as I have not *commodity* to examine all thoſe *interpreters* in this matter, ſo I did not think my ſelf *obliged* to do it, having never pretended that the *notion* which I give, is *univerſally* received by *all Expoſitors*; I acknowledge, that *all* men have not rendred the word in a *good* ſenſe, particularly that the *vulgar Latine* reads it *Superſtitio* (though in *what* acception of that word I know not, moſt *probably* in an *ill* ſenſe) but ſure this with no more *truth* or *analogy* for ſo interpreting, than is for their interpreting the *Paſſive* δογματίζεσθε by *decernitis*, v. 20. which is no leſs than to change *ſubjection* into *command*, *undergoing* a *yoke*, into *impoſing* of it, one *contrary* into another.

However from thence 'tis nothing ſtrange that the *ill* ſenſe ſhould be transfuſed into thoſe *Expoſitors* 13.
which follow and never depart from that *Latine tranſlation*, neither examining the *original* word, nor the *context*, to *reform* that *tranſlation* by it. This was the task which I then undertook, and having found the *context* to incline it to a *good* ſenſe, and the *Greek* word to bear it very well, and the *Greek Fathers* to concur with me in their notion of it, I thought I might lawfully queſtion the authority of the *vulgar Latine*, and thoſe who had been lead by it, (and ſo we know are the *Papiſts*, and from them *others* alſo, who do not take *notice who* 'tis that leads them) and attempt that here, which I ſaw ordinarily practiſed by *all* other ſorts of men, the *Learned Papiſts* themſelves (and, I doubt not, by this *Diatribiſt*, when he conceives himſelf to have reaſon for it) *i. e.* depart from their words and *conduct*, as in other ſo in this particular.

In ſo doing I now ſee without any ſearch, that I have ſuch a *concurrence* as will ſecure it from any 14.
cenſure of *ſingularity*. Beſide the *Greek Fathers* forementioned, the * *Diatribiſt* tells me I have *Bel-* * *p.* 69.
larmine's conſent (adding *ſome other Papiſts* alſo) and I hope his *authority alone* were conſiderable enough, if there were not alſo *ſome others*, to *weigh* in the *balance* with *Salmeron* and *Eſtius*, which are all the *modern* Expoſitors here cited by him.

And among the *Proteſtants*, to *Hugo Grotius*, already cited, I now add *Monſieur Daillé* in his *late* 15.
tract *de Jejuniis*, written *ex inſtituto* againſt *Bellarmine*, and yet in this place of St. *Paul* conteſted *l. 1. c. 7.*
between them, he expreſly acknowledges with *Bellarmine*, the very thing that I concluded, *viz.* that thoſe *falſe teachers had a threefold colour of wiſdom*, *Firſt*, In *Will-worſhip*, *Secondly*, In *humility*, *Thirdly*, In *auſterity to the body*, *for which three things they admire theſe their doctrines of men*; defining ἐθελοθρησκεία *cultum ſponte & voluntariè aſſumptum nulla cogente Dei lege*, *a worſhip undertaken voluntarily and of their own accord without any law of God conſtraining them*, and again, that *by the whole diſcourſe of the Apoſtle it appears, that they commended and ſet off their doctrines of abſtinence by this, that voluntarily ex quadam zeli & ſanctificationis abundantiâ ſuſciperentur, they were voluntarily undertaken out of an abundance of zeal and holineſs.* And ſo in his opinion, if *abundance of zeal and holineſs* were taken in a *good* ſenſe, *Will-worſhip* muſt be reſolved to be ſo taken.

And ſo this Expoſition of that *learned* man, who will not be deemed *partial* to me againſt the *Dia-* 16.
tribiſt, may now deſerve to be *conſidered* by him, as ſoon as the *contrary* of any *modern* Expoſitor *produced*, or, I believe, *producible* by him.

For as to thoſe *antient Latine Fathers*, whom he hath *already* produced, they are but three, *Am-* 17.
broſe, *Hierom*, and the *vulgar Latine*, and thoſe three may be reduced alſo, and in fine will amount

to little more than the *one* ſingle *vulgar Tranſlator*. This is generally ſuppoſed to be St. *Hierom* (and if it be not, 'tis certainly ſomebody whom St. *Hierom* followed, St. *Hieroms* ſhort *notes* on the *Epiſtles* being affixt to that *tranſlation*) and ſo St. *Hieroms* name is no addition to that, only ſerved the *Diatribiſts* turn, as in a *falſe* muſter, to bear *two* names, to appear *twice*, and fill two ſpaces in his *catalogue*.

18. And for the only *Father* now remaining, St. *Ambroſe*, if thoſe *Comments* be his, which go under his *name*, they will bring no great *prejudice* to our *pretenſions*, for by paraphraſing [ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ] by *ſimulatione religionis*, all that can be *concluded* is, that thoſe *doctrines* of *abſtinence* had not any *reality*, but only a *falſe guiſe* of *religion* in them, and ſo it follows there, *Hinc ſe ſapientiæ rationem habere putant, quia traditioni humanæ nomen religionis applicant, & religio appellatur cum ſit ſacrilegium, Hence they think themſelves to have ſome appearance of wiſdom, becauſe they apply the name of religion to humane tradition, and it is called religion, when it is ſacrilege*; And this I may eaſily grant, and conſequently that the *Will-worſhip* here, and ſo likewiſe the *humility*, were not either of them truly *ſuch*, and ſo *offended* in this, that they were not what they *pretended* to be, and would not have been *criminous*, if they had been *really* ſuch; which ſtill devolves all the *fault* on the *doctrines* and on the *hypocriſie*, not on the *Will-worſhip*, or *Religion*, whoſe name would never have been pretended to by *hypocrites*, if it had not been *good*. See Section 7. of this *ch. n.* 10.

19. Mean while I gueſs not how *Theodoret*, which is acknowledged to be a *Greek Father*, came to be ranked among the *Latines*, and a *Latin interpretation* of ἐθελοθρησκεία cited out of him; However I never pretended, that all either *Greek* or *Latin*, or particularly that he *concurred* with me in this ſenſe, and therefore am not obliged to give any farther account of his *interpretation*; Only this I am ſure of, that 'tis not the *uncommandedneſs* of the *worſhips*, that he finds fault with, but firſt, Their *teaching* thoſe for *Gods commands*, which are *their own*; (That is the meaning of ἴδιον εἰσφέρουσι δόγμα, *their introducing their own ordinances*, τῶν ἄκαιρον αὐτῶν δικαιοσύνην, *their unſeaſonable Judaical doctrine*) and ſecondly, Their *bare ſhew* of *piety* and *humility*, without the *truth* of either (σχῆμα περιποιούμενοι, οὐκ ἀλήθειαν) whereas by his *concluſion*, it is moſt evident, that the *abſtinences* without the *doctrines*, would not have been deemed by him *reproveable*, and ſo not the bare *uncommandedneſs* of the *worſhip*; for thus we have it in the cloſe, γνώμῃ γὰρ ἀπέχεσθαι δεῖ, οὐχ ὡς βδελυκτῶν ἀλλ' ὡς ἡδίστων, *For abſtinences ought to be by counſel, not as from deteſtable, but as from the moſt delectable things*. Which is the very thing, which all this while we have endeavoured to *conclude* from that place.

20. After theſe his *Latin Fathers*, he haſtens to *later interpreters*, and thoſe are two, *Salmeron* and *Eſtius*, and thoſe *two* are *one* again, the one taking from the *other* as the manner is, without any conſiderable *difference*. But to give his *Teſtimonies* their full weight, we will view them *diſtinctly*.

21. *Salmeron* begins with obſerving, that *whereas the Vulgar Latin reads, in Superſtitione & humilitate, & non ad parcendum corpori, the Greek hath only three, words*, ἐθελοθρησκεία, ταπεινοφροσύνη, ἀφειδία σώματος, *which three*, ſaith he, *ſunt tres colores oſtendentes rationem & ſpecimen ſapientiæ, are three colours ſhewing a ſpecimen* (which by the way is more than *ſpeciem*, or *bare ſhew*, ſome *real evidence*) *of that wiſdom* (to which thoſe *doctrines* of *abſtinences* pretended.) *And the firſt of theſe*, ſaith he, *ſignifies cultum ſpontaneum, ſive voluntariam religionem, à ſpontaneous worſhip, or voluntary religion, pro arbitrio cujuſvis abſtinendi à cibis, of abſtaining from meats as every man ſhall think fit*, and afterwards, *illâ voce alludit ad voluntarias oblationes legis quæ nedaboth dicuntur*, Deut. 16. *and* Amos 5. *By this word he alludes to the voluntary oblations of the Law, which are called* נדבות. And then I ſhall deſire the *Diatribiſt* to conſider, how fitly *Salmeron* was called out to give *teſtimony* againſt me, (he, and one more, in the name of all *later interpreters*) when it is *evident* from theſe words, that he ſaith the very *ſame* thing, which all this while I contend for, if I could have thought fit to have defended my ſelf from *ſingularity*, by his *Teſtimony*.

22. 'Tis true indeed he conceives the words to *allude* to *v.* 18. *volens in humilitate & religione*, and ſo goes along with *Eſtius*, and others in that *miſtake*, which I had taken *notice* of in them, and that might have eaſily led him into farther *miſtake*, if the *evidence* of the *truth*, or ſome other better *guide* had not rectified him; But as it is, I have no reaſon to *complain* of him, as to the word ἐθελοθρησκεία which is now before us.

23. Somewhat more he adds of the word ταπεινοφροσύνη which *ſignifying*, ſaith he, *the virtue of humility, is here uſed for a feigned humility, which is contrary to the Goſpel, becauſe by it the Judaizers Evangelio legem admiſcebant, mixt the law with the Goſpel*; And as this is alſo perfectly *concordant* to my *notions*, ſo to this it is, that he brings the *teſtimonies* of *Auguſtine* and *Thomas*, and not for the notion of ἐθελοθρησκεία, as the *Diatribiſt* cites them out of *Eſtius*.

24. However to manifeſt my care of profiting by all his *animadverſions*, I ſhall view thoſe *teſtimonies* alſo. The one thing which *Salmeron* cites from both of them, is this, that *omnis ritus colendi Deum qui à Deo non eſt, nec à Spiritu ſancto per Eccleſiam traditus, ſed voluntate hominum inventus, ſuperſtitioſus eſt, every rite of worſhipping God, that is not delivered from God, nor from the holy Ghoſt by the Church, but is invented by the will of man, is ſuperſtitious*. Where it ſeems, that which is delivered by the *Church*, being by him ſuppoſed to be from the *holy Ghoſt*, doth in no degree fall under this *cenſure*; And then the *Diatribiſt* hath free leave to make his beſt *advantage* of this *citation*.

25. As for *Eſtius*, his main endeavour in the *interpretation* of the *verſe*, is to evince that λόγος ſignifies *ſpeciem in genere, ſive veram ſive falſam, a ſpecies in general, whether true or falſe*, which is very little for the *Diatribiſts* advantage; for granting it to ſignifie *ſpecies*, if that ſhould prove a *true* one, then that is perfectly *deſtructive* to his *intereſts*, for ſuch a *ſpecies* of *wiſdom* nothing could have in *Will-worſhip*, if *Will-worſhip* were ſuppoſed to be *impious* and *fooliſh*; And if it ſhould prove a *falſe ſpecies*, and ſo a *bare ſhew of wiſdom*, yet is that very *reconcileable* with the *good* notion of *Will-worſhip*, as hath oft been ſhew'd.

26. What *follows* in him, is, ſaith he, *ſecundum Auguſtinum & Thomam*, *according to* Auguſtine *and Thomas*, that theſe *abſtinences have rationem ſapientiæ non veræ, ſed ejus quæ fita eſt in ſuperſtitione & humilitate, quæ falſa eſt ſapientia, not true wiſdom, but that which is placed in ſuperſtition and humility, which is falſe wiſdom*. But where *Auguſtine* or *Thomas* give him authority to pretend their *accord* with him,

him, he cites not. In all reaſon this defect muſt be ſupplied by *Salmeron*, who cited in the margent, *Auguſt. lib. de verâ rel. & lib. 2. de doctr. Chriſt.* c. 25. *and Thomas, ſecunda ſecundæ qu.* 93. *art.* 1.

What place in *Auguſtines* book *de vera relig.* it is, to which he *refers*, we have no direction, and 27.
ſo are left to gueſs, that it is cap. 55. *Non ſit nobis religio in phantaſmatibus noſtris, Melius eſt enim qualecumq, verum, quàm omne quicquid pro arbitrio fingi poteſt, Let not our religion be placed in our fantaſmes, for any thing which is true, is better than whatſoever can be feigned at our own pleaſure.* And as to the truth of this poſition, I give full *conſent*, that all *fictitious falſe worſhip* is to be *avoided*, not only (as he contents himſelf to ſay) unfit to *compare* with true; ſo I no where undertake to be *advocate* for any *falſe* or *fictitious*, or *fantaſtick religion*. The commemorating the *birth* of *Chriſt* on the 25th of *December*, I hope, is not ſuch, nor any *Ceremony* admitted into *uſe* in our *Church*.

The other place out of the *Second de doctr. Chriſt.* c. 55. ſtands thus; Having at the 20. *Chapter* 28.
defined *Superſtitioſum ſuperſtitious*, to be *whatſoever was inſtituted by men, for the making or worſhipping of Idols*, and that either *belonging to the worſhipping any Creature*, or *part of a Creature as God*, or *to conſulting or making any pacts with Devils*, &c. and having fallen on the *ſeveral* ſorts of *divinations* c. 20, 21, 22, 23, 24. he begins his 25. ch. *quibus amputatis atq; eradicatis ab animo Chriſtiano, deinceps videndæ ſunt inſtitutiones hominum non ſuperſtitioſæ*, i. e. *non cum dæmonibus, ſed cum ipſis hominibus inſtitutæ, The former being lopt off, and eradicated from a Chriſtians mind, let us farther view ſuch inſtitutions of men as are not ſuperſtitious*, i. e. *are not made with Devils, but with men themſelves*. And having added ſomewhat of ſuch *vain inſtitutions* (which ſure no way concern the matter now in hand) he comes to thoſe which are uſeful *to humane ſociety*, and reſolves that ſuch are not to be *avoided* by a *Chriſtian, imò etiam, quantum ſatis eſt, intuenda, memoriæque retinenda, but in a competent manner to be obſerved and retained*, and this, how little it belongs to the preſent purpoſe to the proving ἐθελοθρησκεία to be here uſed in an *ill* ſenſe, is already ſo apparent, that I need add no word more to the clearing of it.

As for the place of *Aquinas, ſecunda ſecundæ. qu.* 93. *art.* 1. It is the very ſame, which long ago, 29.
we conſidered in the former part of this *Tract*, ch. 3. §. 3. n. 5. and to the view of it, there preſented, I refer the *reader*, finding nothing more in that whole place *art.* 1. which was not there punctually conſidered, unleſs it be a citation out of the *Gloſs Col.* 2. *quòd ſuperſtitio eſt, quando traditioni humanæ religionis nomen applicatur*, that it *is ſuperſtition, when the name of religion is applied to the tradition of men*, which words have nothing in them, which I am not ready to acknowledge, being ſufficiently aſſured, that *dogmatizing* is a *ſin*, and conſequently that ſo *good* a *name* as *religion* ought not to be *pretended* for, or *applied* to it.

What he adds by way of *anſwer* to my *fourth* reaſon, hath, I think, nothing of *moment* in it, but 30.
what hath oft been ſpoken to already, unleſs it be that he ſaith, he *hath not obſerved any ſuch difficulty or obſcurity in that text Col.* 2. 20, &c. but *dares ſay, the Doctors expoſition makes the greateſt obſcurity that ever he met with*: But of this there is no *diſputing*; I muſt not expect that he ſhall acknowledge my *interpretation* to be clear, when he diſlikes it, or diſcern the *involutions* or difficulties of that *other* which he hath *eſpouſed*, when, if he did, he were obliged to forſake it.

SECT. XII.

The fifth reaſon vindicated. Ἐθελοθρησκεία. *Heſychius corrected twice.* Ἐθελουσίως *adverbially.* Ἐθέλημος. Ἐθελοκωφῶν. Ἐθελοπεξίνος. *Heſychius's Gloſſary concordant to the Scripture uſe.* Εὐλογελία, Eph. 5. 4.

TO my *fifth reaſon* taken from *Heſychius*'s rendring it by ἐθελοσέβεια *voluntary piety* or *worſhip*, *Numb.* 1.
and the notion which he had of ἐθελο in compoſition, to *ſignify* that which a man did ἐθελούσιος *voluntarily*, and ἑκὼν of his *own accord*, agreeably to which the נְדָבוֹת *free-will-offerings* are rendred by the *Septuagint* ἑκούσια *voluntary performances*, his *anſwer* is brief that *this is no advantage to my cauſe, for the words may both ſignify will-deviſed worſhip in an ill ſenſe. And though in humane authors the derivatives and compounds of this word expreſs the Free-willingneſs of the perſon, yet that will not help the Doctor who doth not underſtand* ἐθελοθρησκεία *in reſpect to the willingneſs of the perſon in a commanded worſhip of God, but voluntary worſhip*, i. e. *worſhip not commanded by God, but offered to him by the free will of man.*

To this I reply, *Firſt*, That I willingly confeſs ἐθελοσέβεια as capable of an ill ſenſe, as ἐθελο- 2.
θρησκεία, i. e. that when the *worſhip is forbidden* or *falſe*, then being *ill*, the *voluntarineſs* of it, can infuſe no *goodneſs* into it, as when it is of it ſelf *good*, the *uncommandedneſs* cannot make it *ill*.

And therefore *Secondly*, this was not it, on which I laid the *weight*, (only I thought ἐθελοσέβεια had 3.
not been ſo likely to hear *ill* with *gainſayers*, as this other which I ſaw was fallen under *great prejudice* with ſome) but rather that which followed of the other compounds of ἐθελο which *ſignify* no more but doing ſomewhat *voluntarily*, or of their own accord, without any *neceſſity* to do it.

Thirdly, Then I ſay that acknowledging it my notion of the word, to ſignify *worſhip not command-* 4.
ed by God, the *authority* of *Heſychius* and the other *Greek Gloſſaries* which concur with, or follow him, is clear and home to confirm *that* to be the meaning of it.

If that which is ſaid already be not ſufficient to lay the *parallel* directly betwixt *Will-worſhip* and 5.
voluntary oblations, or *performances* of things not *commanded*, then add *Firſt*, from *Heſychius* again, that ἐθελουσὶς ſignifies ἑκούσιος, αὐτοβούλητος, *voluntary*, proceeding from his *own will*, and that ſure is diſtant enough from the *will* or *command* of *another*. The words in *Heſychius* are certainly falſe *printed* (as much of that book is) ἐθελουσὶς ἑκουσίως, αὐτοβουλήτως. It muſt queſtionleſs thus be mended, either ἐθελουσὶς, ἑκούσιος, αὐτοβούλητος, or elſe in ſtead of ἐθελουσὶς we muſt read ἐθελουσίως *adverbially*, for ſo *Suidas* fetcheth that word out of approved authors; and which way ſoever it is, the *ſenſe* is the ſame, that ἐθελουσὶς ſignifies one that doth any thing *from his own*, not anothers *will* or *command*;

command; whereas the word to ſignifie πρόθυμος *voluntary* in performing *commands*, is by him ſet ἐθέλημος, not ἐφελοντὴς, for ſo thoſe two words muſt be read together (and not ſevered, as they now are in the vulgar copy) ἐθελήμοι, πρόθυμοι, as immediately after, ἐθελήμως προθύμως.

6. So again of the two words formerly cited by me ἐθελοκωφῶν, and ἐθελοπρόξενος, the *former* certainly ſignifies the *freeneſs* of the *matter*, not of the *perſon*, one that is *willingly deaf* or *diſobedient*, θελήσει παρακόων, which ſure cannot be phanſied a doing that *freely* or *willingly* which is *commanded*, for no man is *commanded* to be *diſobedient*, and in like manner the latter is rendred by *Suidas*, ὁ ἀφ' ἑαυτῦ γενόμενος καὶ μὴ κελευσθεὶς ὑπὸ πόλεως, *he that is made ſuch by himſelf, and not commanded by the city*, adding οἱ γὰρ πρόξενοι κελευόμενοι ὑπ' ἐαυτῶν πόλεως ἐγίνοντο, ſetting ἐθελοπρόξενος directly in oppoſition to κελευόμενος πρόξενος, *voluntary*, to *commanded* by another, and *Phavorinus* repeats the very ſame words, only with the change of the *Gender* ὁ ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς γενομένη, καὶ μὴ κελευσθῆσα ὑπὸ πόλεως, adding alſo (as ſeldom he omits to do) what *Heſychius* had ſaid, ἑκὼν πρόξενος. The ſame may appear again by ἐθελοκακήσας, ἑκουσίως τὸ κακὸν ἐκλεξάμενος, *he that chooſeth ill voluntarily, i. e.* he which of his *own* accord *chooſeth* the *evil*, both in *Phavorinus* and *Suidas*; where ſure that which he *chooſeth voluntarily*, is not firſt *commanded* by *God*, being ſuppoſed to be *evil*. And ſo ſtill theſe *compoſitions* from ἐθελο ſignifie all of them in *perfect* accord with my notion of *Will-worſhip*, i. e. a performance *voluntarily* taken up, without any *command* of *God*.

7. And indeed 'tis a little ſtrange that this *Diatribiſt*, who takes it here in an *ill* ſenſe, and places the *ill* in this, that it is an *uncommanded worſhip*, ſhould yet here diſpute againſt this ſignification of ἐθελοθρησκεία, for *voluntary worſhip, uncommanded* by *God*, and phanſie that I pretend no more but the *free-willingneſs* of the *perſon* in a *commanded worſhip* of *God*.

8. What he adds in the end of that fifteenth Section, that *though the word in other authors be taken for voluntary worſhip, and be but once uſed in Scripture, yet the Spirit of God uſeth words in a ſenſe clearly different from other authors*, inſtancing in ἐυτραπελία, Eph. 5. 4. *taken for a vice, which in* Ariſtotle *is taken for a virtue*,] will ſoon receive anſwer; For firſt *Heſychius* being the *author* now peculiarly under conſideration, and his *Gloſſes* having a ſpecial *propriety* to the explicating of words in *Scripture*, what is ſaid by him, is not ſo much the ſenſe of *other authors*, as of the *Scripture* it ſelf, and ſo cannot *reaſonably* be thought diſtant from it.

9. Secondly, Though ſome *words* are taken in the *Scripture* in a *ſenſe different from other authors*, this is not applicable to *all* words of *Scripture*, ſome are uſed in *ordinary* vulgar ſenſes, and by much the greater part of words there, and from thence to conclude of ἐθελοθρησκεία, that it is taken in a *different* ſenſe, is to conclude and *ſyllogize* from *particulars*, which is againſt all *Laws* of *Logick*.

10. Thirdly, Whenſoever a word in any place of *Scripture* is affirmed to be uſed in ſuch a *different* ſenſe, that muſt be concluded either by the *circumſtances* of the *text*, which ſo inforce it, or elſe by comparing it with *other* places of *Scripture*, where that ſenſe is *neceſſary*; as when ἐυτραπελία is concluded to be a *vice*, *Eph.* 5. 4. 'tis manifeſt by the *context* it muſt do ſo, for to it is immediately annext, τὰ μὴ ἀνήκοντα, *which are* (not only *not convenient*, but, as that phraſe denotes) very *inconvenient*, nay as the companions of it there, πορνεία, ἀκαθαρσία, ἀισχρότης, μωρολογία in force, *filthy, noiſome, unſavory*, ſo as *folly* oft ſignifies *uncleanneſs*, and ſo this is a viſible *reaſon* alſo, why the word is taken in an *ill* ſenſe, when *Ariſtotle*, meaning only *cleanly*, not *beaſtly jeſting*, takes it in a *good* ſenſe: But of ἐθελοθρησκεία this no way appears in this one place where 'tis uſed, but on the *contrary*, the *ſociety* in which 'tis found, *humility* and *ſelf-denial* or *auſterity*, determine it to the *good* ſenſe, as certainly, as the *company* of ἐυτραπελία determine that to an *ill*. And ſo much for my fifth Reaſon.

SECT. XIII.

M^r C. *his diſtinction of voluntary. Spontaneous. A work of love. The Teſtimony of* Socrates. *Worſhip true or falſe. Nothing unlawful which is not forbidden. Voluntarineſs no way forbidden. The ſecond Commandment.*

Numb. 1. TO my *laſt reaſon* [*becauſe things done in the ſervice of God are not therefore ill becauſe ſpontaneous, but on the contrary, that when out of a pious affection a man ſhall do any thing elſe beſide what God hath commanded by any particular precept, this action of his is ſo much more commendable and acceptable to God*,] he thinks it ſufficient to *diſtinguiſh* of *voluntary*, either as it denotes the *manner*, or the *efficient cauſe* of *worſhip*; in the *firſt* reſpect *that is voluntary*, ſaith he, *which yet is neceſſary*, viz. *commanded by God*, in the *ſecond*, *that only which is done by the will of man contradiſtinguiſht to the will of God*.

2. But this *diſtinction* is very far from *anſwering* my *reaſon*. For of the *ſecond*, it is, he knows, that I underſtand the word, and that I might prevent all *want* of this or the like *diſtinction*, I ſpeak moſt plainly, uſing the word *Spontaneous*, not *voluntary*, on purpoſe to denote that which was done by *mans will* on his *own* accord, without any *command* of *Gods*; for ſo ſure *Spontaneous* ſignifies (however the *Diatribiſt* here confounds it with *voluntary*, and ſo *involves*, in ſtead of *extricating*, *mixes*, when he went to *diſtinguiſh*) that which is *ſuâ ſponte* from a mans *own incitation*, not from any *external impellent*, whether *command* or *puniſhment* attending it, for this indeed being done thus *freely*, is perfectly a work of *love*, and that renders it ſo extreamly *grateful*, and *rewardable* by *God*. I ſhall give you the deſcription of it in the words of * *Socrates* ſpeaking of *Eccleſiaſtical rites*; Ἐπειδὴ οὐδεὶς φέρει τότε ἔγγραφον ἔχει δεῖξαι παράγγελμα, δῆλον ὡς φέρει τότε τῇ ἐκάστου γνώμῃ καὶ προαιρέσει ἐπέτρεψαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι, ἵνα ἕκαστος μὴ φόβῳ μηδὲ ἐξ ἀνάγκης τὸ ἀγαθὸν κατεργάζοιτο, *Seeing no man can ſhew any written command for this, it is manifeſt that the Apoſtles left this to every mans judgment and will, that every man might do good, neither by fear nor of neceſſity*.

* *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 5. *c.* 22.

3. When he adds, that *in worſhip deviſed by man the will bears all the blame, and then the more voluntary, the*

the more abominable] I anſwer, that *worſhip* is either *falſe* or *true*, *bad* or *good*, *Heathen* or *Chriſtian*; His rule is perfectly true in *unlawful*, *wicked worſhip*, all the blame thereof lyes on the *will* of *man*; but it can have no place, where the *worſhip* is *lawful*, for then no blame is due at all, but the more free it is, 'tis ſo much the more *commendable*. Now it is of *lawful* and *Chriſtian* worſhip that we here ſpeak, as he knows well enough, or elſe it were not imaginable we could take it in a *good* ſenſe, and of this he muſt needs *underſtand* us alſo; or elſe he could not place all the *blame* of it in *mans will* or *deviſing*, as he doth.

And that a *worſhip*, in it *ſelf*, and *materially lawful*, i. e. whilſt it is abſtracted from the *conſideration* of *Gods commanding* it, or not, ſhould by *not* being *commanded* by *God*, become *unlawful*, this is to *confound* things moſt *diſtant*, *forbidding* and *not forbidding*; For the *Law* and *Will* of *God* being the *rule*, in agreement with, or *oppoſition* to which, *lawful* and *unlawful* conſiſts, it is as impoſſible that any thing ſhould be *unlawful* in reſpect of *Gods Law*, which is not *forbidden* by it, as that any thing ſhould be *lawful* which is *forbidden*. 4.

When therefore he proceeds, *affirming* (but offering no *proof*) that the *voluntarineſs of an action is the ἀνομία or irregularity of it*; firſt, this is a *begging* the *queſtion*; Secondly, 'Tis ſet in ſuch terms, that it hath not the leaſt *appearance* of *truth* in it, for how can the *voluntarineſs* be the ἀνομία or *irregularity*, unleſs the *Law* forbid *voluntarineſs*, which certainly it no way doth, as was formerly evidenced from hence, *becauſe there is no univerſal negative command in Scripture, prohibiting all acts and degrees of acts, beſide what are in particular commanded*. 5.

That there is no ſuch, ſufficiently appear, by the *one* inſtance, which here he thinks fit to mention, that of the *ſecond Commandment*, *which*, ſaith he, *forbids all things*, i. e. *all worſhip and all degrees of that worſhip, beſides what are particularly commanded*. Which though it be as far from all *appearance* of *truth* as any thing affirmable by any (for what word is there in that *Commandment*, which can ſound that way? Certainly none, unleſs every *ceremony* deviſed by *man*, and every degree whether of *charity* or *devotion*, which is not particularly under *precept*, be preſently *metamorphoſed* into a *graven image*) hath not yet any the leaſt *proof* to back it, and ſo ſtill is the meaneſt *begging* of the main *queſtion* imaginable. And ſo having more largely ſpoken of this before, this is ſufficient alſo to be ſaid here in the *vindication* of my *laſt reaſon*. 6.

SECT. XIV.

The firſt occaſion of miſtaking ἐθελοθρησκεία *for ill. The vulgar tranſlator and* Mr. Calvin. *The Diatribiſts three exceptions to this, ſhewed to be of no force. Will-worſhip diſtant from Superſtition.* Θρησκεία *only in a good ſenſe among Chriſtians. Three miſtakes of the Diatribiſt. All uncommanded is not forbidden.*

THIS next poſt or Stage is made up of an examination of thoſe things to which I conceived the *miſtake* and *abuſe* of ἐθελοθρησκεία imputable. The firſt of which I aſſigned to be the *vulgar tranſlations* rendring it *Superſtitio*, that being moſt probably S^t *Hieroms*, and his words being found agreeable to it in ſome places, and from thence Mr. *Calvin* hath affirmed it, *Superſtitio Græcis dicitur* ἐθελοθρησκεία. *Numb.* 1.

That this was fit to be inſiſted on, as a *firſt occaſion* of the *miſtake*, will be evident enough to any, who conſiders how ordinary it is for the *Romaniſts* on one ſide without farther *inquiry* or conſideration to follow the *vulgar tranſlation*, and for the *reformed* on the other to follow the ſteps of Mr. *Calvin*, and not always to examine his grounds of affirming, which certainly were very far from *ſolid* in this matter, it being evident to all that know any thing of words, that δεισιδαιμονία is the *Greek* for *Superſtition*, and not ἐθελοθρησκεία, nay that ἐθελοθρησκεία being but once uſed in *Scripture*, and not found in any *author*, but ſuch as may be reſolved to have uſed it from thence, Mr. *Calvins* words, that *Superſtitio* is called by the *Greeks* ἐθελοθρησκεία, cannot probably ſignifie any more than that the *Greek* word in that *one* place is by the *vulgar tranſlator* rendred *Superſtitio*. And then this is an *evidence* of that which there I affirmed, that the *occaſion* of taking ἐθελοθρησκεία in an *ill* ſenſe (which I muſt be allowed to deem a *miſtake*) is the *vulgar tranſlators* rendring it *Superſtitio*. 2.

Now to this, three things are here objected, though not to the main of the obſervation (for no word is replied to that) yet to the mention of the *Greek words* δεισιδαιμονία, *&c.* Firſt that a *man may ſay as much for* δεισιδαιμονία *it ſelf as the Doctor ſaith for* ἐθελοθρησκεία, *and bring the Doctor for his voucher who ſaith that* δεισιδαιμονία *ſometimes is taken in a good ſenſe*. 3.

But I reply firſt, that the *Doctor never* ſaith that δεισιδαιμονία is taken in a *good* ſenſe among *Chriſtians*, who ſure never allowed the *worſhip* of *Dæmons*, but only among *heathens*, who do allow it. Secondly, That if it were ſometimes taken in *good* ſenſe, yet that were not ſufficient to conclude, that it were all one with ἐθελοθρησκεία; all *good* things are not the *ſame*, no nor all *ill*; and therefore in whatſoever ſenſe the words are taken, whether both in *good* or both in *ill*, the one in *good*, the other in *ill* ſenſe, yet ſtill the nature and importance of the words is *diſtant*, and ſo ought not to have been confounded either by the *vulgar tranſlator* or by Mr. *Calvin*; and being ſo unduly confounded, the *Diatribiſt* cannot from thence raiſe any more *ſolid argument* for the *ill* ſenſe of the one, than I can (which I pretend not to do) for the *good* ſenſe of the other. 4.

Secondly, He objects, that θρησκεία, *as the Doctor knows, is taken alſo ſometimes in an ill ſenſe, as well as a good, why then*, ſaith he, *may they not both equally ſignifie ſuperſtition? eſpecially when applied to falſe or men-deviſed worſhip*. I anſwer, that θρησκεία when ſpoken of *Chriſtians*, is never taken in an *ill* ſenſe, unleſs by virtue of ſome *Epithet* joined with it, which it ſelf is *ill*, as ματαία θρησκεία in S^t *James*, *vain religion*, and then alſo 'tis the vanity which hath the *ill* ſenſe, not the *religion*. And again, that *vain* or *ill religion*, is not *ſuperſtition* neither, but an unagreeableneſs of the *Profeſſors* practice to his *religion*. Now he knows it is of *Chriſtians* that now we ſpeak, and ſo there could be no 5.

place

place for this *exception*, nor for any thing to be founded in it, nor plea from hence that either the *ſimple* or the *compound* ſhould be rendred *ſuperſtition*; As for the *men-deviſed worſhip*, that that ſhould be *ſynonymous* with *falſe*, that is the old artifice of *begging* the *queſtion*, inſtead of ſaying ought for the *gaining* of it.

6. His *laſt* exception is, that *Superſtition* or *Will-worſhip is more general than* δεισιδαιμονία, *that's but one ſpecies of ſuperſtition, if taken (as the word imports) for Dæmonum cultus. But all falſe worſhip is ſuperſtition, and the rather becauſe it is ſpontaneous, voluntary*, i. e. *Will-deviſed worſhip.*] Here is a fair *proportion* of miſtakes, without any tender of *proof* for any, no leſs than three in theſe ſo few words.

7. *Firſt*, he begins with a preſumption that *Superſtition* and *Will-worſhip* are all *one*; and that, he knows, is now the one thing denied by him, with whom he is *diſputing*; and he cannot be ignorant, how *illogical* an *argument* that is; we have oft minded him of that *fallacy*.

8. *Secondly*, he affirms that either of theſe is *more general than* δεισιδαιμονία, whereas 1. *Superſtitio* being *ſuperſtitum cultus*, is directly all *one* with δεισιδαιμονία which is *dæmonum cultus*, the *Superſtites* and δαίμονες being the ſame in ſeveral *languages*; and the other notion of *Superſtition* (that in *Aquinas* for *prohibited* or *illegitime worſhip*) that is but a *branch* of the former, ariſing by *analogy* with it, and is not any *oppoſite Species* to it; and for *Will-worſhip*, if that be more *general* than δεισιδαιμονία, that very thing will prove it 1. not to be all *one* with δεισιδαιμονία, a *ſubſtance*, which is the more *general*, is not all one with a *body*, which is a *Species* of *ſubſtance*; The truth is, that the *generical Will-worſhip*, as that comprehends all *worſhip uncommanded* by *God*, hath ſeveral *Species* under it, *Jewiſh out-dated*, and ſo now *uncommanded worſhip*, *heatheniſh forbidden*, and ſo *uncommanded worſhip*, and finally *Chriſtian acceptable*, yet not *commanded acts*, or *circumſtances* or degrees of *worſhip*; And as the *genus* is not all *one* with any one *Species*, ſo *Will-worſhip* in *general* is not any *one* of theſe, but *all* of them together. And 2. It implies the word to be capable of a *good* as well as of an *ill* ſenſe, and ſo indeed it is, being taken in a *latitude*, *Will-worſhip*, or as he will ſtile it, *men-deviſed* or *Will-deviſed worſhip*, may be of *two* ſorts, (as the *generical* word *Worſhip*, may) either *true*, or *falſe*, *heathen* or *Chriſtian*, and as the one is *ill*, ſo the other is certainly *good*.

9. But then what is that to the *Will-worſhip* in this *text*, which is not the *generical*, as that is common to *good* and *bad*, but that which is in the *Diatribiſts* underſtanding, a *wicked* and *falſe*, and in mine a *good* and a *Chriſtian Will-worſhip*, and which ſoever of the two it is, it is certainly not *both*, and ſo ſtill but a *Species* of the *generical Will-worſhip*, and ſo not the *genus* it ſelf.

10. Laſtly, when he ſaith, *all falſe worſhip is ſuperſtitious, and the rather becauſe it is ſpontaneous*, this is a ſtrange involution again: For the whole truth of that *propoſition* [*All falſe worſhip is Superſtition*] conſiſting in this, that all *worſhip* of *falſe gods*, or *forbidden worſhip* of the *true God*, is wont to be compriſed under that name, the former according to the *literal* ſenſe of the word *Superſtitum cultus*, the latter as reducible, or by *analogy* agreeable to that; it is very unreaſonable to *ſuperſtruct* upon this, that that *falſe worſhip* is the *rather ſuperſtitious, becauſe it is ſpontaneous*, It being certain, that if it offend not ſome other way than by being *ſpontaneous*, i. e. if it be not in reſpect of the *matter* of it, *falſe worſhip* and ſo *forbidden*, it is not *ſuperſtition* at all; and if it be *falſe worſhip*, in it ſelf *forbidden*, then ſure it is more than *ſpontaneous*, for ſo muſt all be that is actually *forbidden*. So that there is not the leaſt degree of *appearance* of truth in that laſt *affirmation*.

11. That which is indeed *falſe worſhip*, is more than *ſpontaneous* (the *uncommandedneſs* of it, is *precedent* and *inferior* in order of *nature*, to its being *forbidden*, and its being *forbidden* is an *addition* to its not being *commanded*) the *falſeneſs* conſiſts in its being *deviſed* by *mans will*, not ſimply, but in *oppoſition* to *Gods*, i. e. when 'tis *forbidden*, and it would not otherwiſe be *falſe worſhip*, if it were not fordidden, either *directly*, or by *analogy* with ſomewhat which is directly *forbidden*, and what is *forbidden* is more than *not commanded*, and ſo more than *ſpontaneous*, and ſo the ill of it cannot be increaſed by being *ſpontaneous*, and ſo it is not the rather *ſuperſtition* (or any other kind of evil) for being *ſpontaneous*.

12. On the other ſide, that *worſhip* which is ſuppoſed *not* to be *forbidden*, is conſequently thereto, to be reſolved not to be *falſe*, and if it be not *falſe*, it cannot be *Superſtition* (for ſuch only is *falſe worſhip*) and if ſo, then again the *voluntarineſs* or *Spontaneity* of it, cannot make it *more falſe* or *more Superſtition*, than before it was, becauſe it was neither *falſe* nor *Superſtition* before, and the bare *uncommandedneſs* cannot render it either, *Gods not commanding* implying his *permiſſion*, and ſo a *liberty* allowed by *God*, and that is ſo far from being all one with *prohibited*, that it is in effect the very *contradictory* to it, this being *permitted* by *God*, whereas all that is *prohibited* is *not permitted*. And ſo here is a *competent* number of *infirmities* in very *few* words.

13. And yet there is ſtill *one* behind, the great *impertinency* of this, and of the *two* former anſwers to the point in *hand*, the *occaſions*, to which it is imputable that *Will-worſhip* came to be taken among many in an *ill* ſenſe, which without *queſtion* (at leaſt without any word of *exception* from this *Diatribiſts three* branches of this 18. *Section*) is the *vulgars* rendering ἐθελοθρησκεία *Superſtitio*, and Mr. *Calvin's* following the *vulgar*.

SECT.

SECT. XV.

The ſecond occaſion of taking ἐθελοθρησκία *in an ill ſenſe, vindicated. The deſign of the Treatiſe of Will-worſhip only for ceremonies, not for new kinds of worſhip. Whether all ceremonies be forbidden, which are not commanded. The various reading of Philoſtorgius. Sitting at the Goſpel forbidden.* Chryſoſtomes *Teſtimonie.* Τελεώδηεον *not* τελεώδυεον. Θεῖος θεσμὸς *for Eccleſiaſtical Canon.* Diſpeoplunga *Will-worſhip.*

THE *ſecond cauſe* of *miſtaking* this word I had ſet down at large, Section 19. to be the reflexion on the *Judaical* θεοκρατία, where, in the *building* of, and *officiating* in the *Temple*, all was to be done according to the *pattern* in the *mount*, from which ſome may have made a ſhift to conclude, that ſo it muſt be in the *Chriſtian Church*, *no rite, no circumſtance, no degree of worſhip to be uſed there, but what hath Chriſt's example or precept to authorize it.* To this he *replyes*, Firſt, That I *much miſtake the queſtion, for it is not about a rite or circumſtance or degree of worſhip commanded, but of the worſhip it ſelf, and herein Chriſtians are equal with the Jews, we muſt not vary from the preſcription on the mount in the ſecond Commandment to conſtitute any part of worſhip, but what we have the authority of Chriſt for in the New Teſtament*, adding the *ground*, for this, both the ſecond *Commandment*, and this *text*, *Col.* 2. to *juſtifie* that *aſſertion*. *Numb.* 1.

To this I haſten this *brief* reply, Firſt, That this is not, in any word, to the point now in *hand*, the *occaſion* of taking *Will-worſhip* in an *ill* ſenſe; and 'tis evident that though all were true which here is ſaid, that I *miſtook the queſtion*, and that no *part* of *worſhip* may *lawfully* be ſet up among *Chriſtians* without the *example* or *precept* of *Chriſt*, yet this of the *Jewiſh obligation* to do all according to the *pattern* in the *mount*, may be occaſion to give men *prejudices* to all that is not under *particular command*, or according to *pattern* of *Chriſts*, and his *Apoſtles*, which was all I aſſumed in that *Section*. 2.

But then ſecondly, 'Tis moſt certain, that I do *not miſtake* the *queſtion*, nor *can* I *miſtake* it (who had the *ſetting* it my ſelf) unleſs I firſt *ſet* it one way, and then *handle* it another. And this certainly I do not. For the very *deſign* of that *Treatiſe* was to *inquire*, whether the *obſervation* of *ceremonies* uſed and preſcribed in our *Church* of *England* were *criminous*, only upon this account, becauſe they were *not commanded* by *God*; And in this I was then ſure that I had *adverſaries* enow, who concluded it ſo, upon this one way of *probation*, becauſe all *Will-worſhip* was *criminous*, and the *uſe* and *impoſition* of all *uncommanded ceremonies* were *Will-worſhip*. 3.

And if this *Diatribiſt* be not in the number of thoſe *adverſaries*, then hath he done himſelf and me and the *reader* very great *injury*, in *diſputing* againſt that *concluſion* which he doth not *oppoſe*, then hath he moſt prodigally *miſpent* and laviſht out all his *pains*, in confuting (or *exerciſing* himſelf upon) this *tract*, of which this was the only *deſign*, not to plead for any *new kind* or *parts* of *worſhip*, but to *juſtifie* the uſe of *uncommanded ceremonies* and *circumſtances*, and ſuch are *days* of *worſhip*, and to ſhew that being *unforbidden* as well as *uncommanded*, they were therefore *lawful* and free to be uſed by *Chriſtian* people or *preſcribed* by *Chriſtian Magiſtrates*. And if he hath nothing to *reſiſt* in this, then why ſhould he delight in this *impertinent ſeverity*, *arraign* and *triumph* over a poor *innocent* Tract, that never thought to provoke any, which allowed the *uſe* and *obſervance* of *uncommanded rites*, and *days* of *worſhip*, never attempted in the leaſt to bring any new *part* or *kind* of *worſhip* into the *Church?* Upon this, and other viſible *reaſons*, it will ſure be needleſs here to *examine* again his two *grounds*, which we have formerly been ſo oft acquainted with, the ſecond *Commandment* and *Col.* 2. 23. It was no ſmall *infirmity* of diſcourſe in this place to *mention* them. 4.

The ſecond part of his reply, is, that *in worſhip that is condemned which is not commanded.*] But firſt, What is that again to the point in *hand*, that *particular occaſion* of taking *Will-worſhip* in an *ill* ſenſe? Secondly, I ſhall demand, is that propoſition *univerſally* true, ſo as to extend to every *ceremony* in *worſhip?* If it be, then it ſeems, I *miſtook* not the *queſtion* (as very lately I was told) nor my *adverſary* neither, this *Diatribiſt* being directly *contrary* to me herein, if he thus affirm, that *in the worſhip of God every ceremony is forbidden which is not commanded.* 5.

To the place in *Photius*'s ἐκλογαὶ out of *Philoſtorgius*, which I propoſed and explained, he acknowledges he *hath little to ſay*, yet ſomewhat he is willing to *note* for his own *advantage*, viz. that *I ſeem to make it a fault to ſit at the reading of the Goſpel, which the Eccleſiaſtical Canons did not command, and yet make it no fault to add a Will-worſhip of a mans own which* θεῖος θεσμὸς *the divine law doth forbid.* 6.

To this I *anſwer*, that the *Diatribiſt* ought in all reaſon to have *markt*, what there I ſet viſible before his eyes, and then he could not poſſibly have *mentioned* this. For 'tis evident in that place, Firſt, That I had taken notice of the reading of the *Manuſcript* in the *Oxford Publick Library*, which hath ἐπεκράτει, inſtead of ἐπλάτυνε in *Gotofred*'s *Printed Copy*, and ſecondly, That as this *latter* reading imported it a *fault* to do that which the *Canons commanded not* (for which very cauſe I *examined*, and then ſaw reaſon to *reject* that reading) ſo the former and right reading, to which only I adhered, implied no more than this, that it was a *fault* to act *contrary* to *Canon*, to do many things ὧν μὴ θεῖος θεσμὸς ἐπεκράτει *which the Eccleſiaſtical Canon did not admit* or *permit*, or which was *not in uſe* with the *Church* of *God*, but the *contrary*, viz. that of *ſtanding* up at the *Goſpel*. 7.

If there need proof of this, the plain words of * *Chryſoſtome* (or whoſoever was the *Author* of the *Oration* εἰς τὸ ἱπποδρόμιον) will be ſufficient, τῆς διακόνου ἀνοίγειν μέλλουσης τὸ τῆς εὐαγγελίου τετράθυρον (ſo it muſt be read, as appears, *p.* 974. *l.* 20. where we find τὸ εὐαγγελίου τετράθυρον ἅρμα, not τετράθυρον, as it is now Printed) πάντες ἀνὰ πόδα ἀτενίζομεν, ἡσυχίαν παρέχοντες, καὶ ὡσπερεὶ τῷ ἅρματι τῷ ἀναγνώσεως ἀρξηται, εὐθέως διανιστάμεθα ἡμεῖς, ὑπομένοντες, ἀλλὰ δόξα σοὶ Κύριε, *When the Deacon is about to open the Goſpel (that Chariot drawn with four horſes) we all look very earneſtly upon him and are ſtill, and when he begins to* 8. * *Edit. Savil. Tom.* 6. *p.* 975.

read (and so to run his race in that *Chariot*) *presently we stand up and use this acclamation, Glory be to thee, O Lord.*

9. Certainly the *Diatribist* never expected that his *Exercitations* should be *examined* by any, or but *compared* with the plain words of the *Treatise* to which they *related*, when he thought fit to observe this.

10. He is pleased also to retain that rendring of θεῖος θεσμὸς *divine Law*, which he must needs discern to have been there cleared by me to signifie not the *Law* or *word* of *God*, but the *Canons* or *unwritten customs* of the *Church*, as there appeared by *Nicephorus* reciting that place of *Philostorgius*, and reading ἐκκλησιαστικὸς, in stead of θεῖος, and by many other *evidences* from *Epiphanius* and *Athanasius* and *Pseudo-Clement*, and *Nicephori Constantinop.* στιχομετρία, superadded to the former store, in the *Annotation* on *Col.* 2. published since that *Treatise*. To all which I now add *Leo*, who having mentioned * *Divinarum Reverentia Sanctionum*, the *reverence of divine sanctions*, soon explains his meaning first by *quod publicâ lege celebratur*, then by *quod universa Ecclesia suscipit, that which was observed by publick Law, that which the universal Church received.*

* *Ser.* 3. *de jejun.* 7. *mens.*

11. Another parallel mistake also I there mentioned in our *Anglican Councils*, *Can.* 60. *Sub Edgaro*, where πιλεοπραγία is translated *fictæ ad libitum adorationes*, but should be rendred *fontis adoratio*, not *Will-worship* but *Well-worship*, for which I refer the *Reader* to the former place in the *Annotations*.

SECT. XVI.

The third occasion of the mistake cleared. Worship of Angels forbidden, not only not commanded. The reviving Judaical worship not called Will-worship, Col. 2. 23. Maimonides's *words wrested to a distant sense by the Diatribist. Original of Angel-worship. Vain worships.* Clemens *confounding of* Col. 2. 18. *with* 23. *Worship of Angels,* &c. *a forbidden Will-worship. The imposing of virginity and abstinences, as from God, the only crime, found fault with by S.* Paul *and the ancient Catholicks.* Alcibiades *his using, and remission of austerity. The like of* Spiridion *and* Marcianus. Cyrill *of meats,* 1 Tim. 5. 23. *explicated.*

Numb. 1. A Third *occasion* of the mistaken *ill* notion of ἐθελοθρησκεία I had taken notice of to be the *confounding* of *two* verses very distant, the eighteenth and twenty third of that second *Chapter* to the *Colos.* the *voluntary humility* and *worshipping* of the *Angels* in the one, and the *shew of wisdom in Will-worship and humility* in the other. To which end I at large cleared the difference between those *two phrases*. To this he replies, that the *distance pretended between them is so little, that they may easily be reconciled, that respecting a new devised worship only, and this the reviving an old out-dated worship.*

2. To this I *answer*, first, that the *worship*, v. 18. being expresly the *worship* of *Angels*, that sure is much more than *Will-worship* in the *Diatribists* notion hitherto expressed of it, and therefore 'tis strange he should now labour to *perswade* us they are *all one*, or easily *reconciled*. *Will-worship*, as he hath hitherto *defined* it, is bare *uncommanded, will-devised*, or *men-devised worship*, and that he hath still pronounced *unlawful* upon that one account, because not *commanded*. But can he think the *worship* of *Angels* to be such? Is not that distinctly *forbidden* in the *first Commandment?* Certainly it is; And if it be, hath it no other guilt by being so *forbidden*, above that which is only *not commanded?* Secondly, The *Will-worship*, v. 23. is not truly affirmed to be the *reviving old out-dated worship*; For first, The *abstinences* from *marriage* there spoken of, as well as those from *meats*, had never been *commanded* among the *Jews*. Secondly, 'Tis not there affirmed of one or other *abstinence*, that it was *Will-worship*, Only those *doctrines* of *abstinences* of both sorts are said to *have a shew of wisdom* in respect of the *Will-worship* discernible in them, and so likewise they are said to have in respect of the *self-denial*, and the *worship* of *Angels* in respect of the *humility*, that either *is*, or is *pretended* in them. And yet I hope it will not be said that *humility* or *self-denial* is the *reviving* of *Judaism*.

3. But however some *advantage* he resolves to get by that Section, and having no other means to *acquire* it, he will have it out of some words which I had cited out of *Maimonides*, the words are these, that *the greatest part of Idolatry came into the world, existimando hanc varietatem esse Dei voluntatem, by the opinion that God was honoured by the worship of his Angels or Officers, and that it was his will to have men exercised in this variety of worship.* From hence the *Diatribist* subsumes, that *the error that brought the greatest part of idolatry into the world was, that men conceived and taught that vain worships and superstitions were the will and pleasure of God.*

4. Here I must demand what he means by *vain worships?* doth he mean bare *will-devised, uncommanded worships*, which have in his opinion no other *crime* in them, but their *uncommandedness?* If so, then hath he much *misapplied Maimonides*'s words, as must be visible to him, those clearly belonging to the *worship* of *Angels* (and others beside the one *God*) which all men are strictly *forbidden* to *worship*. And then what a *confusion* of things most *distant*, what an *injustice* is this?

5. But if by *vain* he designed *false forbidden worships*, such as are by him fitly joined with *superstition*, and such as the *worship* of *Angels* was, then indeed he knows, or must in *charity* believe, that 'tis as much *mine* interest and *inclination*, as his, to fasten an *ill character* upon them, and to believe as much of the *danger* and *criminousness* of affirming them *acceptable* to *God*, as *Maimonides* could teach, or the *Diatribist* wish me to *believe*. I shall not fail therefore, I hope, to obey his *admonition*, if it be really such, and be abundantly *cautious* neither to *justifie* nor *imitate*, what I so much *dislike* and *abhor* in them that are *guilty* of it.

6. What he next adds of *Clemens Alexandrinus confounding those two*, the 18. and 23. *verses*, was by me *produced* and willingly confest, and made an *evidence* of the point there in hand, that some have (though without all *reason*) *confounded* them, and it is not imaginable how this which so evidently proved

proved what I brought it to prove (evidencing the *occaſion* of the *miſtake*) ſhould be ſo ſpeedily mentioned to the *diſproving* of it, or be farther *argumentative* againſt me, than I had before acknowledged by producing it: For ſure the *Diatribiſt* cannot pretend that *Clemens* his reading was the true, Μηδεὶς ὑμᾶς καταβραβευέτω ἐν ἐθελοθρησκείᾳ ταπεινοφροσύνης, καὶ ἀφειδίᾳ σώματος, if he can, all our *copies* of the *New Teſtament* will abundantly confute him. And then it is no very good *indication* of the truth of his *cauſe*, which is fain to catch hold on ſuch ſupports as this; which is acknowledged a *miſtake* in him, from whom it is *produced*, and ſo in all reaſon will cauſe *miſtake* to any that *borrows* it from him.

But the *Diatribiſt* inlarges in two long *Sections* more to enervate what I had ſaid to ſhew the difference betwixt thoſe two *verſes*; And I need make no farther reply to them, than to refer the *reader* to the *two parts* of the *obſervation* (*Section* 22. and 23. of the *Tract* of *Will-worſhip*) to which his *anſwers* are applied, the ſecond of them clearly anſwering all that he hath *objected* to the *firſt* (if he would but have had *patience* to have lookt ſo much forward) and as *clearly preventing* what he hath ſaid to the ſecond. 7.

The ſhort of it is, that the *worſhip* of *Angels* being not only *not commanded* but *forbidden* by *God*, the *voluntary worſhipping* of them is acknowledged by me to be a *fault*, but that *reſulting* from the *unlawfulneſs* of the matter, which is under *interdict* in the *firſt Commandment* of the *Decalogue*, not from the *voluntarineſs* or *uncommandedneſs* of it. And the ſame I ſhall not doubt to yield of the *abſtinences* from *meats* and *marriages*; *Chriſt* hath give *perfect liberty* for the uſing of *both*, and they that *dogmatize* and *impoſe* either or both thoſe *abſtinences* on *Chriſtians* as from *God*, are *falſe teachers*, and ſo that is their *fault* in *impoſing*, and the like in thoſe who δογματίζονται *ſubject* themſelves to thoſe *ordinances*; And yet for all this, a *ſpontaneous abſtaining* from *meats*, at ſome time, δι' ἄσκησιν, ἢ διὰ βδελυγίαν, *for exerciſe*, *not for deteſtation* (in a *religious faſt*, not out of opinion of the *unlawfulneſs* of *meats*) being in it ſelf perfectly lawful, and ſo likewiſe *celibacy* or *virginity* in him that *can receive* it, there is no pretence from the *uncommandedneſs* of either, or both of theſe, that they ſhould be deemed *culpable*, or made *parallel* to that *other* ſort of *uncommanded worſhip*, where the matter is under *interdict*, the *worſhip* of *Angels* or impoſing of *Judaical abſtinences*. 8.

The matter is clear to any that ſhall but obſerve S. *Pauls doctrine* in ſeveral places, and the *arguings* of the *Catholicks* againſt the *Montaniſts*. S. *Paul*, who reſolves *marriage* to be *honorable among all*, and ſo brands them for *hereticks* who *forbid to marry*, doth yet not only allow but *recommend virginity*; and ſo for *meats*, he profeſſeth all to be *lawful* to all, and that no *queſtion* is to be made *for conſcience ſake*, and accordingly cenſures the *Gnoſticks* that they *commanded to abſtain from meats*, and yet the ſame *Apoſtle* was himſelf *frequent in faſtings*, and certainly had not the leaſt *diſlike* to thoſe performances. 9.

So in like manner the *Catholicks* or *orthodox Chriſtians* of the *Primitive Church*, which objected it as a *fault* to the *Montaniſts*, that they *impoſed faſting*, and made it *neceſſary* (as may appear by the *character* of *Montanus* given by *Apollonius* in * *Euſebius*, that he was ὁ ὑπείας νομοθετήσας one that *required* and *exacted faſtings* as by the *law* of the *Paraclete*, for ſo he ſtyled himſelf, and the ſame is evident by *Tertullian* in his *Tract*, *De jejuniis*, when being turned *Montaniſt* he pleads their cauſe againſt the *Orthodox* under the name of *Pſychici*) and which *anathematized* the *Marcionites* and *Encratites*, &c. for deeming meats *unlawful*; do yet every where *commend* and *preſs* the uſe of *faſting*, as hath formerly been ſhewed in part, and as it is known to all that have but lookt into their *writings*. 10. * *Eccl. hiſt.* l. 5. c. 18.

The paſſage of the * *Epiſtle* of the *Chriſtians* of *Lyons* and *Vienna* to the *Aſiaticks* concerning *Alcibiades*, is remarkeable; he had lived, ſay they, παν' ἀυχμηρῶς, *very auſterely*, *uſing nothing but bread and water*, and when he was by the *perſecutors* caſt in *priſon*, he *attemped to continue this ſtrict diet*, but *Attalus*, who was in *priſon*, and had once been *carried* out into the *amphitheatre*, adviſed him to *leave* it, ἀπεκαλύφθη, ſay they, *having received a Revelation*, that he ſhould *not do well not to uſe the creatures of God*, adding that he would by that means, ἄλλοις τύπον σκανδάλου ὑπολείπεσθαι, *leave an example of ſcandal*, of *ſnare*, of ſtumbling *to others*, whereupon ſay they, *he eat freely and gave God thanks*. Here it ſeems his former courſe of *auſterity* and ſevereſt *abſtinence* was no way diſliked (and had long been *practiſed* by that *Holy Martyr*) only at this time it was thought not to be ſo fit to be *continued*, whether in reſpect of the *combat* which he was now to *undergo*, (ἀγῶνα ἐν ἀμφιθεάτρῳ, *a combat in the amphitheatre*, and if he *macerated* himſelf too much he might not be ſo fit for ſo *weighty* and *difficult* an *undertaking*, and others alſo if they ſhould follow his *example* might *weaken* themſelves overmuch, and ſo be *enſnared* by that means) or in ſome other reſpect, wherein his *abſtinence* might by the *example* be hurtful to others. And upon theſe conſiderations he *intermitted* it; an *example* both of the *practice* of the *ſevereſt abſtinences*, and of the *free* uſe of *meats* according to the doctrine of *Chriſtian liberty*. 11. * *Euſeb. hiſt. Eccl.* l. 5. c. 3.

The ſame is yet more viſible in the known paſſage of * *Spiridion*, one of the *Biſhops* that ſat in the *Council* of *Nice*, who though with his family he obſerved *Lent* moſt *ſeverely*, yet on occaſion of a *weary* gueſt, made no doubt to break his *cuſtomary* rules, and his *gueſt* being more *ſcrupulous* than he παραιτήσεσθαι καὶ λόγον χρίσταυδν ἑαυτὸν, *ſaying he was a Chriſtian*, *Spiridion* replied, ταύτῃ μᾶλλον ὁ παραιτητέον, he *was the rather not to ſcruple*, becauſe he was a *Chriſtian*, *the Scripture it ſelf affirming that all things are pure to the pure*. And the ſame we have in the paſſage of *Marcianus* to *Avitus*, in * *Theodoret*, giving his reaſon for the breaking his *aſcetick Laws* of *faſting*, that *charity was more honourable than faſting*, τὸ γὰρ τῆς θείας ἔργον νομοθεσίας, τὸ δὲ τῆς ἡμῶν αὐτῶν ἐξουσίας, *the former being a work of Gods preſcribing*, *the latter of our own freedom*. 12. * *Sozomen.* l. 1. c. 11. * *Tom.* 3. p. 791.

The words of *Cyrill* of *Jeruſalem Cat.* 4. may *conclude* this matter. Πολλοὶ οὖν τὰ βρώματα πταίουσιν, &c. *Many offend in this matter concerning meats*, *ſome eat indifferently all kind of meats*, *that which is offered to Idols*, &c. *others abſtain*, *and condemn all that eat*, *and ſo the ſoul is diverſly polluted in this matter of meats*, *by not knowing the profitable cauſes of eating and not eating*; *when we faſt*, *we abſtain from fleſh and wine*, *not hating them as abominations*, *but expecting our reward*, *that contemning ſenſible delights we may injoy the ſpiritual and intellectual Table*, *and that now ſowing in tears*, *we may reap in joy in the world to come*.. *Deſpiſe not therefore thoſe that eat*, *and partake*, *becauſe of the weakneſs of their* 13.

bodies, neither find fault with (ἔλεγχε the *Barocian MS.* reads not ψόγε) *thoſe that uſe a little wine for their ſtomack, and frequent infirmities, neither condemn them as ſinners* (the *Barocian MS.* adding to the *Printed Copies*, καὶ μήτε αὐτὸς οἱ ἁμαρτωλὸς κατακείνης) *nor hate fleſh as ſtrange* (or unfit for *a Chriſtian*) *for of ſuch the Apoſtle took eſpecial notice, ſaying, they forbid to marry, and abſtain from meats, from ſuch keep thy ſelf, and abſtain not from meats as deteſtable things, if thou doſt thou haſt no reward, but ſuppoſing them good, omit to make uſe of them* διὰ τὰ προκείμενα (ἐλπιζόμενα the *Barocian Copy* reads) νοητὰ καλλίονα, *becauſe of the intellectual better things which are ſet before thee*, or *which* thou *hopeſt* to receive.

14. Where it is evident, how *faſting* and *abſtinences* being freely and ſpontaneouſly uſed, and not as *neceſſary*, or the contrary *unlawful*, but perfectly *ſpontaneous* and *uncommanded abſtinences*, are yet ſo far from being *ſinful* (if they be not joined with *condemning* of *others* which *eat*) that they are *highly rewardable* by *God*. Nothing could be ſaid more *dilucidly* and *fully* to this whole matter.

15. This place of *Cyrills* will by the way give us a *fuller* underſtanding of that *exhortation* of S^t *Paul* to *Timothy*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 23. *Drink no longer water, but uſe a little wine*, &c.] than formerly I had taken notice of in the *Annotation* on that place, in relation to the words *precedent* there, *Lay hands ſuddenly on no man, neither partake of other mens ſins, keep thy ſelf pure, drink no longer water*, &c.] Thus; thoſe that by the *Gnoſticks infuſions* and *falſe doctrines*, c. 4. 1, 2, 3. have been ſeduced into *error* and by that means fallen under thy *cenſures*, are not to be over *favourably* uſed, nor too *ſpeedily abſolved*, and then (on that occaſion, as in a *parentheſis*) be ſure thou fall not thy *ſelf* into their *ſnares*, thoſe *errors*, or *faults* conſequent thereto, which thou art to *cenſure* in others; And theſe *errors* being ſpecially *two*, the commanding to *abſtain*, from *marriage* and from *meats*, for the former of them, be ſure, that as thou *abſtaineſt* from *marriage*, ſo thou preſerve thy ſelf perfectly *pure* from all the *Gnoſtick pollutions* conſequent to their *doctrines* of *hating marriage*, (that is the meaning of ἁγνὸν σε τήρει) and for the latter, though thou uſeſt *auſterities* and *faſtings*, which may be uſeful to *virginal Chaſtity*, yet do not this to the *hurting* of thy *body*, but in conſideration of thy *infirm* habit of *body*, thy frequent *indiſpoſitions*, give thy ſelf the uſe of *lawful liberties*, take *wine* ſometimes in a *moderate* proportion, and keep not thy ſelf ſo ſtrictly to *water-drinking*, as perſons of *auſterity* uſe to do.

16. All this (and much more might be added of the ſame nature) makes it moſt evident, that *uncommanded performances* (ſuch ſure were *virginity* or *faſting*) had no ill *character* faſtned on them by thoſe ſame *Orthodox Fathers*, who yet would not indure to have them *impoſed* on *Chriſtians*, as from *God*, but brand all ſuch, as attempt it, for *falſe teachers*.

SECT. XVII.

The laſt occaſion of the ill ſenſe. Ἐθελοθρησκεία *in* Epiphanius. *Of the Phariſees appellation.* Περισσόν. *Dogmatizing and diſcriminating.* Epiphanius's *words cleared. Wherein their hypocriſie conſiſted.* Ἐκστατιζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ, 1 Mac. 2. 42. Aſidei חסד ἐκστασιασμὸς *turned into* ἀνάγκη, *the fault.*

Numb. 1. THE *laſt* occaſion of the *ill* ſenſe of ἐθελοθρησκεία, which I took notice of, was *Epiphanius*'s mention of ἐθελοπερισσοθρησκία, as the *denotation* of the *Phariſees name*, in reſpect of the *voluntary* performances wherein they pretended to *exceed* other *Jews*. And I leave the Reader to view in that place, Section 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. what I thought fit to note on that *word*, which when he hath done, I ſhall have ſome *confidence*, that he will need no farther *reply* of mine to demonſtrate the *invalidity* of all this *Diatribiſt*'s *exceptions* againſt thoſe *Sections*.

2. For there he will find, Firſt, That the περισσὸν, as that may denote the *ſuperfluity* of either *noxious*, or *ridiculous*, or but (for number) many and ſo *burthenous ceremonies*, is not pleaded for by me; and that is *anſwer* to his twenty fourth Section.

3. Secondly, That what was *blameable* in the *Phariſees*, was not their bare uſing of ſome *lawful*, *indifferent*, or elſe *good*, and *commendable* things, not *commanded* by *God*; but their *teaching* ſuch for *doctrines*, and laying them as *burthens* on others, and what was conſequent to this, their *diſcriminating* themſelves *proudly* and *faſtidiouſly* from other men, upon this account; and that *prevents* his twenty fifth Section.

4. Thirdly, That I no way plead for the *Phariſees*, but affirm them *generally* to have been *ill* men and *hypocrites*; Only I ſay, that when they impoſed that name of *Phariſee* upon themſelves, ſure they meant not to *reproach* themſelves by ſo doing, and that *Epiphanius* ſaith they thus *impoſed* it, on purpoſe to denote their ἐθελοπερισσοθρησκεία, by that, meaning ſome *performances* of theirs, wherein they conceived themſelves to *exceed* all others; which again was the *preventing* of all that he adds Section 26. And leſt there ſhould remain any doubt of this (the *Diatribiſt* ſetting it quite *another* way, and affirming that *Epiphanius calls the hereſie of the Phariſees by that name; as offending both in Will-worſhips of their own deviſing, and alſo in the abundance and ſuperfluity of them*) I ſhall ſet down here the words *punctually* as they are found in *Epiphanius*, and leave the Reader to judge on whoſe ſide the truth lies in this particular. Ἐλέγοντο Φαρισαῖοι, * ſaith he, διὰ τὸ ἀφωρισμένους εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων διὰ τὴν ἐθελοπερισσοθρησκείαν παρ' αὐτοῖς νενομισμένην, φαρὲς γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραΐδα ἑρμηνεύεται ἀφωρισμός, *They were called Phariſees for being ſeparated from others, becauſe of the abundant Will-worſhip* whether *preſcribed* or *cuſtomary* (ſo νενομισμένην frequently ſignifies) *among them, for Phares in Hebrew is interpreted Separation.*

* *l.* 1. *Hær.* 16.

5. In which words what is there I pray, which can give the leaſt *ground* for the *Diatribiſts gloſs*, either that *Epiphanius calls the hereſie of the Phariſees by that name*, when he only ſets it down as the *interpretation*

tion of that name of *Phariſees*, long before *Epiphanius*, impoſed on them; or that this *name* was given them as a *character* of their *offending both in Will-worſhips* and *in the ſuperfluity of them?* Certainly neither of theſe hath the leaſt *appearance* of *foundation* in *Epiphanius*; I wonder the *Diatribiſt* could think fit to *cite* them from him.

Fourthly, That though *hypocriſie* were the *Phariſees* chief *crime*, and withal the *fewel* to their *pride* and *deſpiſing* of others, yet their doing ſome things which were *not commanded*, was no part of this their *hypocriſie*, but on the contrary, either their *ſaying* but not *doing*, or their *doing* the *lighteſt* and *neglecting* the *weightieſt* duties, or their *preferring* their *own traditions* before the *commanded duties*, and making the obſervance of the one (as in *Corban*) their *commutation* and *excuſe* for *neglecting* the other; and this indeed was far more likely to inflame their *pride* and *deſpiſing* of others, than the real *Chriſtian* neceſſary performances would have been; the *lighteſt* things aſcending *higheſt*, and appearing moſt *viſibly*, whileſt the *weightier* ſink down and lie *hid*. 6.

But ſtill this is no *prejudice* to thoſe *real* performances of more *ſtrictneſs* than the *law* exacts, *faſting twice in the week*, and the like, ſuppoſing, as we here ſuppoſe, that they are not uſed to the *ſupplanting* of *neceſſary* duties (but go along very *friendly* with the *practice* of them) and offend in no other reſpect, but that they are *uncommanded* performances. And this avoids all his *artifices* in Section 27. 7.

Fifthly, That ἐκουσιαζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ, 1 *Mac.* 2. 42. ſignifies more than a *well mindedneſs to the law*, meaning by that, the *precepts* of *God*; moſt evidently, a *ſpontaneous* performing of ſome things which the *law required not*. Let the place be there viewed, and theſe two things will be evident, Firſt, That that phraſe ἐκουσιαζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ is ſet to denote the *Aſidæi* by way of *periphraſis*; Now of them 'tis certain that they were ſo called from חָסִיד which we ordinarily render *mercy*, but ſignifies ſaith * *Kimchi* יתרון הטובה *excellence of goodneſs*, † others פלנת הטובה *abundance of goodneſs*, and in *Maimonides*, * *exceſſum & ſupremum gradum* in one place, the *exceſs and higheſt degree of any performance eſpecially of charity or beneficence*, and in † another, *benignitatem erga aliquem cui nihil planè debes, vel erga eum qui beneficio dignus eſt, at non tanto, benignity to him to whom you either ow nothing, or not ſo much as you afford him*; by which it is manifeſt, that the name *Aſidæi* denotes not only *willing* but *ſpontaneous* agents, which keep not themſelves within the *line* of the *law*, as to do nothing which is not *commanded*, but have their ἑκούσια *voluntary performances* to *offer* to *God*, above that which the משרת הדין the *line of law*, as the * *Rabbines* ſtyle it, exacts of them, and ſo are properly ſtyled ἐκουσιαζόμενοι τῷ νόμῳ *volunteers in* or *to the law*, as that is oppoſed to *preſt* or *hired ſouldiers* of it. 8.

* *In Pſal.* 36.
† *Rabbini in Prov.* 22. 28.
* *In Pirke Avo.*
† *More Nevoch. Part.* 3.

* *Rabbi Iſmael in Beracoth. c.* 1.

The *ſecond* thing is, that the men that are there particularly mentioned in that place of the *Maccabees*, are thoſe that *liſted* themſelves *voluntarily* under *Mattathias* to defend the *law* by *arms*, which was no where *required* of all men that were *Jews*, but was the *act* of the *Zelots*, at that time, and ſo again an ἐκουσιασμὸς a *ſpontaneous* and *uncommanded* performance, *above* or beſide the *law*; and ſuch as theſe were far from being blamed, being every where *commended* in thoſe men. And the *Diatribiſt* will never be able in the leaſt degree to make *good* againſt *Scaliger* (what he undertakes Section 28.) that our *Saviour condemned* them. 9.

Laſtly, That all the *Fault* was, when the ἐκουσιασμὸς was turned into ἀνάγκη, when what they undertook and acted *laudably*, whileſt *ſpontaneouſly*, they at length *impoſed* on others, as *neceſſary*; and for that it is, that (beſide their *hypocriſie* of ſeveral kinds) the *Phariſees* are juſtly *cenſured* in this matter, and not for the *uncommandedneſs* of their *actions*; and this with the former, are a full anſwer to Section 28. 10.

CHAP. VI.

Of Free-will Offerings.

SECT. I.

The uſe of them in this queſtion. The Diatribiſts diſcourſe of them. His Κρησφύγετον. *The Leviticalneſs of ſpontaneous offerings aſſerted by him, in order to denying them among Chriſtians. Arguments againſt this conceit. Allowance of days as well as of worſhip among the Jews. Allowance acknowledged by the Diatribiſt to be as good as commands.*

TO make it evident that all things which are *not commanded*, are not yet *unlawful* or *prohibited* in the *ſervice* of *God*, and conſequently that all *uncommanded ceremonies* and *circumſtances* (and under that head, *Feſtivals*, i. e. *Times*) of *worſhip* are not *prohibited* to a *Chriſtian*, I thought it neceſſary in that *Tract* of *Will-worſhip* to reflect on the נדבות or *free-will offerings* of the *Jews*, which being *ſpontaneouſly*, and without any *obligation* of *divine law* preſented to *God*, were ſo far from being *deteſted* or *diſliked*, that they were *accepted* and *rewarded* by him. *Numb.* 1.

And on this head I inlarged in that *Treatiſe*, conceiving the ἐθελοθρησκεία once mentioned in the *New Teſtament*, *Col.* 2. and taken in the notion of *ſpontaneous* performances, to be directly *parallel* to thoſe ἑκούσια, *voluntary* or *uncommanded oblations* among the *Jews*; and from thence concluding, as I thought, *irrefragably*, that the *uncommandedneſs* of a *few decent rites*, or uſeful *ſeaſons* ſet apart for the *worſhip* of *God*, could not upon that one account, their being *uncommanded*, become preſently *unlawful* and *criminous*, when even under the θεοκρατία they were *allowed* and *accepted*. And if in any other *reſpect* there were *difference* betwixt the things thus *compared*, yet I was ſure there was none in that, 2.

wherein

wherein I compared them, both agreeing evidently in this, that they were equally *not commanded* or *preſcribed* by *God*, and ſo though the *obſervation* of *rites* or *ceremonies* or *feſtivals* arrived not to that *excellency* of being *parts*, but only *circumſtances* of *worſhip*, yet they would by thoſe *precedents* be ſecured from being *abominable* or *criminous* in the ſight of *God* upon that *one* account of *uncommandedneſs*, for if ſuch they were, then the נדבות would be ſo too, and being ſuppoſed to be *uncommanded*, either *ſtand* together, or both *fall* under the ſame *condemnation*.

3. And to this part of my diſcourſe he at length proceeds Section 29. and finding *fault* with me for not ſetting down or ſhewing *wherein the formality of a free-will offering conſiſted*, he is pleaſed to ſpend ſome leaves on this *task*.

4. But as I had not offended in that kind, nor needed this *ſupply* of his, there being evidently no more required to the *formality* of a *free-will offering*, but that firſt it were not particularly *commanded* by any *law* of *Gods*, and ſo were *ſpontaneous* (not *neceſſary*) to *offer*, or not to *offer*; ſecondly, that it were *offered* to (and *graciouſly accepted* by) *God*, as being of thoſe kinds which are known to be *allowed* by him; and both theſe being evidently ſet down by me in that *Treatiſe* Section 29. I have little to thank him for, in his *diſcourſe* on this ſubject, finding the greateſt part of it to concern the *preſcribed*, *commanded ſacrifices*, and the *willingneſs* firſt, and ſecondly ſome lower *degree* of *freeneſs* obſervable in them, both which are certainly nothing to our purpoſe, who ſpeak only of thoſe *oblations* which were *not commanded*, and might freely *not* have been *offered* (to which none but the laſt *member* of his diſtinction appertains, *libertas exercitii*) and yet were *graciouſly accepted* by *God* when they were *offered*, which one ſort of *oblations* (medling not with any other that were any way *commanded*) make it viſible, that even under the θεοκρατία, that *government* of the *Jews* where *God* preſided immediately, and gave *lawes* preciſely for the very *manner* of his *worſhip*, ſome things were yet left to mens *free-power* and *choice*; if they *offered*, they ſhould be *accepted*, if they did *not offer*, they *ſinned not*; which is the perfect *image* and clear *interpretation* of that ἐθελοθρησκεία or *Will-worſhip*, for which that *Treatiſe* undertook to plead, that it was not *criminous* in a *Chriſtian*.

5. Now of theſe *freewill offerings*, defined by him, *p.* 91. juſt as I now, and then defined them, there is but one thing only which he obſerves by way of *præcognoſcendum* to his *anſwer* to that *Treatiſe*, and I muſt here take a particular *view* of it, becauſe I ſuppoſe it that, on which *all* his contrary *hypotheſis* muſt be founded; It is this, that *the formality of a freewill offering, as contradiſtinguiſhed to the offerings commanded by the Law, conſiſting in this, that it was left free for a man to offer or not to offer, beyond what was poſitively required by the Law, here*, ſaith he, *the Leviticalneſs or Ceremoniality ſeems to ly, whereby* (he pronounceth that) *they are now aboliſhed*. And afterwards oft to the ſame purpoſe, *that they were parts of the worſhip of God in thoſe times is true*, p. 92. intimating that *thoſe times* differed from *theſe times* in this reſpect; and *this inference*, ſaith he, *hath too much of the* λόγῳ σοφίας *ſhew of wiſdom, but neither ſubſtance, power, nor truth in it. It was ſo in the Old Teſtament, therefore it may be ſo in the New*, p. 93. and *Divines reſolve that the worſhip of God then, was far different from the worſhip of the Goſpel, and conclude the contrary. It rather follows, that they are not parts of worſhip now, becauſe that Levitical worſhip was aboliſhed*, p. 94. And this is his principal *engine* of *battery* to *demoliſh* all that I had ſaid from that *parallel* between thoſe *freewill offerings* and the ἐθελοθρησκεία in the *New Teſtament*.

6. I ſhall therefore, I ſay, make ſome ſtay here to *examine* and conſider this *reſerve* of his, for if it ſhall *fail* him, it is evident he hath no other *refuge* to retire to.

7. And firſt I ſuppoſe it ſufficiently *reſolved* between us, that the kind of the *worſhip* (that by *bloody ſacrifices*, &c. among the *Jews*) was indeed *Levitical*, no longer to continue than the *Jewiſh Prieſthood* of the *Tribe* of *Levi* continued, and ſo is long ſince *aboliſhed* by *Chriſt*; and accordingly I never *meant* (and I hope he cannot think I *meant*) to *conclude* that the *ſame kinds* of *freewill offerings* which were *acceptable* then, that of *ſlaying* a *Bullock* or a *Ram*, *&c.* do now continue *acceptable* among *Chriſtians*.

8. Secondly then, the only *queſtion* muſt be of the *ſpontaneouſneſs* of the *oblations*, whether that being confeſtly *lawful* and *acceptable* under the *Law*, it be now *unlawful* under *Chriſt*; or in plain terms, whether *Gods acceptance* of *uncommanded oblations*, when the *matter* of them is confeſt to be ſuch as is *acceptable* to him, be to be deemed *Levitical*, and ſuch as being *peculiar* to the *Moſaical œconomy*, is not now to be lookt for, being *aboliſhed* under *Chriſt*?

9. The *queſtion* thus plainly ſet, his affirmation is too far from the leaſt ſhew of *probability*, and ſo utterly deſtitute of all *proofs*, either from *reaſon* or *Scripture*, as far as he hath here *diſcovered* himſelf (and ſo but a *begging* of the *queſtion* in him that thus *affirms*) that there is no need of my pains in *diſproving* it; Yet ſhall I offer a few conſiderations to this purpoſe, and the *firſt* ſuch as may be of force *ad hominem*, to this *Diatribiſt*.

10. And it ſhall be the reminding him of his *three* ſpecial *proofs*, which he hath brought in his *Preface* and in his *Diatribe*, to infer the *ſinfulneſs* of *Will-worſhip*, viz. the ſecond *Commandment*, the *ſum* of which is, as he oft ſaith, *Gods preſcribed worſhip*, and all *deviſed worſhip*, an *exceſs* and ſo *ſin* againſt it; The words of *Deut.* 4. 2. where all *additions* to the word are *prohibited*; And (to the particular of *Feſtivals*) the fourth *Commandment*, againſt which, ſaith he, it is an *offence* in the *exceſs*, to obſerve any other *holy day*, but that *one* of the *Weekly Sabbath*. Now of theſe three it is plain, that they are all taken out of the words of the *Judaical Law*, and conſequently, if they were fitly urged to *Chriſtians*, then muſt it needs follow, Firſt, That they were thus of force againſt all *uncommanded ſervices* in the *Old Teſtament*; and ſecondly, That by way of *analogy* they *ſtill* hold under the *New Teſtament*, which if they do, then is this the direct *contradictory* to both the *Diatribiſt*'s preſent *pretenſions*; to his *allowing unpreſcribed uncommanded worſhip* under the *Old Teſtament*, for how can that be, when his proofs againſt *uncommanded worſhip* are all fetcht from the *Old Teſtament*? to the *aboliſhing* in the *New Teſtament* what was *allowed* in the *Old*, for if ſo, how can the *analogy* hold betwixt the *Old* and the *New*, in which his three proofs were founded, as to the *application* of them to *Chriſtians*?

11. Which being ſo, the great evidences on which he had founded his *hypotheſis*, proving ſo *irreconcile-*

able

able with his preſent *pretenſion*, I ſhall ſtill give him his *choice* which part of his *method* he will *adhere* to, the *former* or the *latter*; The former he cannot (the force of thoſe places in the *Moſaical Law*) for it is manifeſt by the *free-will offerings*, and now confeſt by the *Diatribiſt*, that *uncommanded worſhips* were *allowed*, and ſo *lawful*, among the *Jews*; And the *latter* he cannot, having formerly *ſuppoſed* in his arguing, that the *analogy* holds in this matter between the two *Teſtaments*.

So that I may now form a *Syllogiſm*, the *premiſes* whereof ſhall be both fetcht out of the *Diatribiſt*, 12.
the *Minor* from his very words, the *Major* from that on which his *arguments* are founded, thus, Whatſoever was *lawful* under the *Old Teſtament*, is *lawful* under the *New*; But *free-will* or *uncommanded offerings* were *lawful* under the *Old Teſtament*; (and then having given me my *premiſes*, 'twill be great *unkindneſs* to deny my *concluſion*) therefore, *uncommanded offerings* are *lawful* under the *New Teſtament*; *Quod erat demonſtrandum.*

A *Second argument* againſt his *affirmation* ſhall be, the conſideration of the *liberty*, and *advan-* 13.
tages which reſult to *Chriſtians* from the *abolition* of the *Moſaical Law*. That *liberty* muſt conſiſt, in the *taking off*, not in the *impoſing* of *weights* and *interdicts*, whereas, by this *Diatribiſts* affirmation, there ſhall by this *abolition* of what was *Levitical*, i. e. by this *liberty*, come in a multitude of unprofitable *burthens*, which never lay upon the *Jews*; Whenſoever I ſhall do any thing in the *ſervice* of *God*, which I am not particularly *commanded* to do, I am preſently *enſnared*, guilty of an *abominable* ſin whereas a *Jew* might, by his *confeſſion*, bring a thouſand *free-will offerings*, and in each of them be *accepted*. This ſure muſt be directly againſt one main part of the deſign of *Chriſt's* coming, and therefore is not to be admitted in the *ſecond* place.

Thirdly, It is ſufficiently known, and by the *Apoſtle* affirmed, that they were δόγματα, *poſitive or-* 14.
dinances, and νόμον τῶν ἐντολῶν ἐν δόγμασι, *Eph.* 2. 15. *A Law of Commandments in ordinances*, which *Chriſt* did by his death καθαιρεῖν, *cancel*, and *nail* to the *Croſs*; and indeed nothing elſe is capable of *abolition* or *cancelling*; But this of the *free-will offerings*, among the *Jews*, is not any *Law* of *Commandments* or *Ordinances*, but rather a *negation* of all thoſe, (for ſuch is a *bare allowance* to be deemed) and therefore ſure this, as to the *voluntarineſs* of them, was none of the things which were *aboliſhed* by *Chriſt*.

Fourthly, If it were true, which is here ſaid by the *Diatribiſt*, that *the Leviticalneſs* or *Ceremonia-* 15.
lity of the offerings ſeems to ly here, viz. in the *uncommandedneſs* or *freedom* to *offer* or *not* to *offer* (wherein he truly ſaith, that *the formality of a free-will offering conſiſts, as that is contradiſtinguiſhed to the commanded offerings*) then ſure the *Leviticalneſs*, &c. would not extend to the *commandedneſs* of the other *offerings*, and conſequently the *commanded offerings* under the *Law* would not be *Levitical*; Which as it is palpably *falſe*, and contrary to *plain Scripture*, *Heb.* 9. 1. 20. and elſewhere frequently; ſo it will farther conclude alſo, that the *commanded offerings* are ſtill in force, for by the *Leviticalneſs* and *Ceremoniality*, ſaith he, *it was*, *that thoſe other are ſuppoſed to be now aboliſhed.*

Fifthly, Againſt his *concluſion* I thus *argue*, Whatſoever was *lawful* before the *Moſaical Law* to 16.
mankind, and remained *lawful* under the *Moſaical Law*, and is *not* now *prohibited* by *Chriſt* or his *Apoſtles* under the *Goſpel*, that certainly is now perfectly *lawful* and *free* to *Chriſtians*; But ſuch are *free-will offerings*, *Ergo*. Of the *Major* I ſuppoſe there will be no doubt; And the *Minor* conſiſting of *three* branches, is manifeſt in the *firſt* of them, among many others by *Abel's oblation*, which the *Fathers* generally obſerve not to have been by way of *precept* from *God*, and 'tis affirmed by the *antient Author* of the Διαλέξεις, the *Pſeudo-Clement*, c. 22. (I ſay not how truly) that before the *Jews idolatries* and high *provocations*, *ſacrifices themſelves were not impoſed on*, *or commanded the Jews*, *but only left to their free power*, ἐὰν ποιῇς, *If thou wilt do it*; *but upon their provocations impoſed*, ὅπως πιεζόμενοι ὑπὸ ζυγοῦ ἀγχόμενοι ὑπὸ πολυθέου πλάνης ἐκσῶσι, *that being conſtrained and compreſt by this yoke, they might be kept from idolatry.* In the *Second* branch, it is granted by the *Diatribiſt*; And for the *Third*, it muſt ly upon him to ſhew any *prohibition* of *Chriſts* or his *Apoſtles*, which *forbids* to do any the leaſt thing in the *ſervice* of *God*, which is not particularly *commanded*: Now this he hath not yet attempted to do (no not here, where it was moſt *ſeaſonable* and *neceſſary* to do it, the whole *weight* of his cauſe being divolved upon it) and though it be not incumbent on me to prove a *negative*, yet having all *Chriſts prohibitions* before my eyes in the *New Teſtament*, where this would be diſcernible, if there were any ſuch, and being ſure that I cannot *diſcern* the leaſt *glimpſe* of any ſuch, and withal remembring upon what grounds the *Diatribiſt* affirms it, *viz.* upon the *Leviticalneſs* and *ceremoniality* of theſe *free-will offerings*, which hath already been competently *diſproved*, and how *ſuſpicious* and *cautious* he was in *affirming* that the *Leviticalneſs ſeems to ly there*, not daring to affirm any more, than that ſo it *ſeemed*, (and that I muſt ſuppoſe only to *himſelf*, no *concurrence* of any other mans judgment appearing with him) I doubt not but that I may with ſobriety aſſume, that there will never be produced by him any ſuch *prohibition*; and then there can be no way of *ſuperſeding* the *concluſion*, that *uncommanded* performances in the *ſervice* of *God* are ſtill *lawful.*

But leſt this ſhould ſtill ſeem but a leſs *perfect*, being only a *negative* probation, I muſt (to add 17.
yet more force to it) refer the *Reader* to the many *poſitive* inſtances, in the *New Teſtament*, of ſuch *free-will* performances, as *contra-diſtinguiſht* to thoſe which are under *precept*, ſet down in that *Treatiſe* of *Will-worſhip*, §. 30, 31, 32, &c. and much more largely in the *Annotation* on *Col.* 2. And then this will abſolutely *ſuperſede* all that he hath thought fit to obſerve here procemial to the inſtance of the *Judaical free-will offerings*, or to reply to my *three* obſervations of them.

For as to that which he ſpecially inſiſteth on, and which only hath the leaſt ſhew of force in it, 18.
viz. *Gods* promulgate *allowance* of thoſe *free-will offerings* among the *Jews*, without which he conceives it had been unlawful to the *Jews* to offer them, *Firſt*, That *allowance* being no *command*, is an *irrefragable* proof that acts of *uncommanded worſhip* may be *allowed* and *accepted* by *God*: and *Secondly*, it muſt be ſome *poſitive* prohibition which is required to make any thing *unlawful*, the want of a *declared allowance* will not do it: and *Thirdly*, there are many *evidences* under the *New Teſtament* of the like *allowances* for thoſe things, which are not under *precept*, yea, and ſometimes of more than *allowance*, of *Gods accepting* and *rewarding* of them.

And

19. And if, as he *deſires* to have it *obſerved*, thoſe *voluntary oblations* were a *part* of *Gods worſhip*, then, though I am not obliged to make good the *parallel* ſo far, as that every *rite* and *feſtival* ſhall be a *part* of *Gods worſhip* alſo, yet certainly I may conclude firſt, that ἐθελοθρησκία, *Will-worſhip* is ſuch, and that is the whole matter of our *preſent debate*; ſecondly, that the *voluntary* (I mean *uncommanded*, *ſpontaneous*) uſe of theſe *rites*, &c. is now as *lawful*, as it would have been, if they had been *parts* of *worſhip*, both by force of the *argument*, *à majori ad minus*, (*parts* of *worſhip*, are much more *conſiderable*, and more *ſpecially* taken care for by *God*, than *rites* and other ſuch *circumſtances*, the reaſons of which may be *temporary* and *uncertain*, upon ſome *new* or *accidental* emergents, whileſt the reaſons of performing, or *inſtituting parts* of *Worſhip*, are moſt *conſtant* and *certain*) and alſo becauſe among the ſame *Jews*, as we have *uncommanded offerings*, ſo we have *uncommanded days* of *worſhip*, both *feſtival*, the *feaſt* of *Purim*, and of the *Dedication* of the *altar*, and *faſting*, that of the *fourth* and *fifth*, and *ſeventh* and *tenth month*, in *Zachary*, and all theſe *allowed* by *God* among them, at leaſt *approved*, when uſed without any *precedaneous ſpecial allowance*.

20. And then, if it have any truth in it (which the *Diatribiſt*, when he thinks it for his turn, ſaith *expreſly*) that a *ſpecial allowance of God was as good, and equivalent to a command*; then, Firſt, *So Gods approbation* will be alſo; and ſecondly, I ſee not how he can avoid the *inference*, that then, it ſeems, theſe other *feſtivals* and *faſts* ſtood by *as good* an *authority* as did the *weekly Sabbath* of the fourth *Commandment*, or the great yearly *Sabbath*, the *day* of *Expiation*. But this by the way; what influence it will have on his whole *ſcheme* of *Phænomena*, I leave him to conſider.

SECT. II.

A firſt inſtance of uncommanded Pieties, Davids *intention to build the Temple. Vindicated from the three anſwers of the Diatribiſt.*

Numb. 1. HIS thirtieth Section proceeds, after theſe *preluſory ſkirmiſhes*, to adapt anſwers to the ſeveral *inſtances*, which I had given of *performances uncommanded*, and yet accepted by *God*; and the firſt is that of *David*, whoſe intention to build *God* a *Temple*, *exceeding Gods command*, 2 *Sam.* 7. 5. 7. was yet very *acceptable* to *God*, 1 *King.* 1. 18. and ſo appears to be, by *Nathans* meſſage to him, in that place of *Samuel*. To this he hath returned three *branches* of *anſwer*, I ſhall take a brief view of them.

2. The firſt [that *this is one of* Bellarmines *arguments for their religious vowes, and is fully anſwered by* Chamier, firſt, *that it was in time of the law, when free-will offerings were allowed, but the times of the Goſpel give no ſuch allowance*] is already *anſwered* in the laſt *Section*, where the *Leviticalneſs*, and ſo, abolition of that *allowance* of *free-will offerings*, was competently examined and *confuted*. Yet *ex abundanti* I here add, that the *allowance* that was expreſt in the *law*, belonging to *ſacrifices*, did not expreſly pertain to the *building* of *Temples*; and if ſtill, by the *analogy* or *parity* of *reaſon* it may be *extended* to ſuch other things, which were not expreſt in the *allowance*, and yet which were not meerly *ceremonial*, viz. to *Davids intention* of *building God* an *houſe*, when *God* had never expreſt any ſuch *command* or *deſire*, I deſire to hear ſome *ſatisfactory* reaſon, why the *parity* of reaſon may not in like manner extend the ſame allowance to *uncommanded* acts of *piety* under *Chriſt*, in caſe no ſuch *allowance* ſhould appear to be expreſt in the *Goſpel*.

3. This *firſt anſwer* therefore having ſo little of *ſolidity* in it, it was meet that it ſhould be introduced with a *proœme*, which might caſt a *prejudice* upon the *Argument*, *viz.* that it was one of *Bellarmines for religious vowes, and fully anſwered by* Chamier. But firſt every *Argument* is not *invalid*, which *Bellarmine* hath once uſed; I do not believe him ſo ill a *manager*, that a *ſharp* weapon taken into his hands would preſently be *blunted*. Secondly, *Bellarmines* uſing it to another purpoſe, that of *religious vowes*, ſuppoſing it *fully anſwered*, as to that, can have no *influence* on my uſing it to prove the *lawfulneſs* of *ſpontaneous* performances of *piety*; It might not come home to ſuch *vowes*, and yet might and doth come home to *reſolutions* or *intentions*.

4. And therefore if this be the truth of the matter, as it lies betwixt *Chamier* and *Bellarmine*, if it concern only the buſineſs of ſuch *religious vowes*, of *building a Temple*, before *Gods pleaſure* be known concerning it, and the like, then this *Diatribiſt* hath not done well to inlarge *Chamiers* words to this other ſo *diſtant* matter, and to vouch his authority both here and *formerly*, for the *abolition* of *free-will offerings* under the *Goſpel*. It cannot be a good cauſe, which needs ſuch *aids* as this.

5. His ſecond *anſwer* is, that *God doth not abſolutely deny that he had commanded, but ſaith he had not commanded it to* David, *or any before him, not becauſe he would not have it done, but becauſe not yet, and therefore foretels that* Solomon *ſhould do it*. To this I anſwer firſt, that here is very *nice diſtinguiſhing betwixt abſolutely denying that he had commanded*, and *ſaying, he had not commanded*. Can *conſcience* ever be ſatisfied of the *ſinfulneſs* of *voluntary oblations*, or the *charitableneſs* of *judging* a *Church ſuperſtitious* for uſing *uncommanded rites*, upon ſuch anſwers as theſe?

6. But ſecondly to diſinvolve this *intricacy*, and take aſunder this *ſubtile* fabrick, I demand, did *God* ever *command David*, or any *governor before him* to build him a *Temple*, or did he not? If he ſhall ſay, he did; Then is that expreſly *repugnant* to the plain words of *Nathan*, 2 Sam. 7. 5. *Thus ſaith the Lord, ſhalt thou build me an houſe to dwell in?* the *queſtion* implies, that he *ſhall not*, and v. 7. *Spake I a word with any of the tribes of Iſrael, ſaying, Why build ye not me an houſe of Cedar?* and ſo forward to the ſame purpoſe; But if he ſhall acknowledge that *God* never did thus *command David* or any *before* him to *build* him a *Temple*, then it is clear, his *intention* to *build*, was a *free-will offering*, under no *command* of *Gods*, and yet that *intention accepted* and *commended* by *God*; which was all I undertook to conclude in this *inſtance*.

7. Thirdly, What he adds, that *God ſaith this, not becauſe he would not have it done, but becauſe not yet*, &c. is evidently nothing to his *advantage*; for ſtill it is confeſt *God* would not have it done by *David*,

vid, which was all I *contended*; and then, *Davids deſigning* to do it, was without *command*, and ſo a *freewill offering*; As for the *prediction*, that *Solomon* ſhould do it, Firſt, That is no *intimation* in the leaſt of any *command* to *David*; and ſecondly, It followed *David's reſolution* of doing it, and was *God's anſwer* to *David*, *v.* 13. on occaſion of his *reſolving* to build *God* a *Temple*, v. 1, 2. and ſo that is only a farther *evidence*, that what *David reſolved* to do, was, without any the leaſt *command*, only that which the *dignity* of the *matter* ſuggeſted to a *pious* ſoul, *v.* 1, 2. and accordingly was *approved* by *Nathan*, v. 3. *Go do all that is in thy heart*, and alſo by *God*, 1 *Kin.* 8. 18. though he were not *permitted* to *actuate* this *pious reſolution*.

His third *anſwer* is, that *the houſe that* David *would build was not to be a part of worſhip, but by accident, as the houſe of* Obed Edom, *or the place where* David *ſetled the Ark, and our Churches now, only a circumſtance of worſhip*. I anſwer, Firſt, So is a *Feſtival* now, a *time*, as that a *place*, and ſo equally a *circumſtance* of *worſhip*. And ſecondly, It being already evident that *voluntary oblations* were then *lawful*, and that thoſe are *parts* of *worſhip*, 'tis viſible that this had equally been *lawful*, if it had been a *part*, as it is now, being but a *circumſtance* of *worſhip*. 8.

But then thirdly, The *intention* of *building* this *place*, was ſure a *pious intention*, an act of *reverence* and *love* to *God*, whoſe *houſe* it was deſigned to be, and ſo that being *uncommanded*, muſt needs be an ἐθελοσέβεια, and ſo directly *parallel* to the ἐθελοθρησκεία, to which I thought fit to *compare* it. 9.

And ſo ſtill there is no other *virtue* in theſe *anſwers*, ſave only to *evidence* his *diſtruſt* in his σοφὸν φάρμακον, and to aſſure us, that he could not heartily believe, that *voluntary oblations* were now *aboliſhed* under the *New Teſtament*; for if really they were, having rendred that for his *firſt anſwer*, he could not have *wanted* or *ſatisfied* himſelf with ſuch *evaſions* as theſe. 10.

SECT. III.

A ſecond inſtance, and that under the New Teſtament. Paul's *taking no hire from the Corinthians*; *This, no action of common life, nor yet a due debt.* Καταχρήσασθαι *for uſing*, 1 Cor. 7. 31. 1 Cor. 9. 17. *explained. The authority of* Auguſtine, Chryſoſtom *and* Theophylact.

MY *ſecond inſtance* was that of S^t *Paul, who might have received hire for his labour among the Corinthians, but would not, and counts and calls this matter of boaſting. This*, ſaith he, *is as little to the purpoſe, if not leſs, for it is not in an action of worſhip, but an action of common life as himſelf ſpeaks, and it is alſo a miſtake to call it a free-will offering, when it was a due debt.* Numb. 1.

But firſt, 'Tis certain that I no where *ſaid* that this was *in an action of common life*, the *Reader*, if he will view the place at the top of *p.* 17. will find that it is *miſreported*, and truly I ſhould have been to blame to think the *Apoſtle's preaching* and *officiating* among the *Corinthians*, in which this was, to have been an *action of common life*; And I ſhall appeal to this *Diatribiſt* himſelf, whether he can really doubt, whether an *Apoſtle's* exerciſing his *office*, be not an *act* of *worſhip*, and conſequently any (but) *circumſtance* thereof, a *circumſtance* of *worſhip*, and this over and above, an act of *ſacred alms*, and ſo, of *piety*. And if it be ſo, then this *inſtance* of S^t *Pauls* not receiving *hire*, was either an *action*, or *in an action* of *worſhip*, or both, and ſo ſurely a נדבה or *free-will offering*. 2.

Secondly then, for his aſſertion, that it was a *due debt* (for which he cites *Chamier*) I ſhall make my appeal no farther than to the *text* it ſelf, and the notion, which the *Fathers* had of it. 3.

The matter is ſet down at large, 1 *Cor.* 9. The *preaching* of the *Goſpel*, ſaith the *Apoſtle*, was *committed* to him, and was under *precept*, and ſo no *free-will offering* of his; That is his meaning, when he ſaith, *For if I do this willingly*, v. 17. ἑκών, as a *volunteer* (ſo ſaith * *Theophylact*, εἰ μὴ ἑκὼν ἐνεχειρίσθην τὸ κήρυγμα, ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς δὲ τοῦτο ἐποίουν, *If I had not been commiſſionated to preach, but had done it of my ſelf*, If I did *preach* the *Goſpel* without any *command*, and ſo, *neceſſity* to do ſo, if *of my ſelf, ſpontaneouſly*, μισθὸν ἔχω, *I have the reward*, this would be *rewardable* in me, *i. e.* the very *preaching* would, without any other *honourable* circumſtance to *inhanſe* it; εἰ δὲ ἄκων, *but if involuntarily*, i. e. εἰ ἐνεχειρίσθην, ſaith *Theophylact*, *if I am commiſſionated to preach*, and ſo my *preaching* be an act of *obedience* to a plain *command*, and ſo, *neceſſary*, v. 16. (and *woe to me if I do it not*) then all that can be ſaid of me is, that οἰκονομίαν πεπίστευμαι, *being intruſted* with a *Stewardſhip*, I *diſcharge* it, σφόδρα λοιπὸν ὅτι οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς τοῦτο ποιῶ, ἀλλὰ δεσποτικὴν ἐντολὴν πληρῶ, τοῦτο γὰρ ὅτι τὸ ἄκων, *it is manifeſt that I do it not ſpontaneouſly, but I perform my Lords command, for this is the meaning of involuntary*; And ſo there is nothing of *excellence* in this, ὁ φιλοτιμία τὸ πρᾶγμα, this will bring me in *no reward*; Upon which it follows, Τί οὖν μοί ἐστιν ὁ μισθός; *What reward then ſhall be to me? i. e.* What in this whole matter ſhall bring me in any *reward?* To which the *Apoſtle* anſwers, ἵνα ἀδάπανον θήσω, that *preaching* the *Goſpel*, I do it *freely*, without making it *chargeable* to the auditors, εἰς τὸ μὴ καταχρήσασθαι τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, *ſo that I make not uſe of* (not as we render it, *abuſe not*) *my power* or *liberty* that I have in the *Goſpel*, i. e. the *power* of receiving *maintenance* from others, whether by *hire* from them to whom he *preacht*, (the *labourer* being *worthy* of that) or by way of *aid* from other *pious* perſons (ſuch as *Phœbe* and the like, intimated by the ἀδελφὰς γυναῖκα, ſome *Chriſtian women* that *attended* and *miniſtred* to them, *v.* 8.) without putting my ſelf to *bodily labour* to earn *neceſſaries*, v. 6. 4.

The doing of this thus, was that which would yield him the *reward*, And although this was not obſerved by *Cephas* and other *Apoſtles*, v. 5. yet ſure *Cephas* is not conceived to have *ſinned* thereby, but 'tis poſitively ſaid that 'twas *lawful* for all, *v.* 7. 11. 14. for as for *Cephas* and others, though only *Paul* would not uſe it, *v.* 12. and accordingly both there, *v.* 15. and after, 2 *Cor.* 11. 9, 10. he diſtinctly *counts* and calls this, matter of *rejoycing* or *boaſting*, in reſpect to the *reward* which he was allowed to *expect* from *God* for it. 5.

And ſo, nothing can be more plain than that this was a נדבה a *voluntary* act of *piety* in that *Apoſtle* toward 6.

* *In* 1 *Cor.* 9.

toward his *Corinthians*; and ſo ſure it was conceived by S^t *Auguſtine*, *Potuit Beatus Paulus ex Evangelio ſibi victum quærere; quòd maluit operari, amplius erogabat; Bleſſed* Paul *might have had his food for his preaching; that he choſe rather to labour* for it with his hands, was a *greater liberality* than he was *bound* to. And * S. *Chryſoſtom*, οὐκ εἶπεν ὅτι κακὸν τὸ λαβεῖν, ἀλλὰ βέλτιον τὸ μὴ λαβεῖν *he ſaid not* thoſe words, *Act.* 20. 35. *becauſe it was ill to receive, but becauſe it was better not to receive.* And † again, that it is τέταρτος βαθμὸς, *the fourth* and *higheſt degree* of *munificence*, κηρύττοντα καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα λαμβάνειν, μὴ λαμβάνειν, *for one that preacheth, and hath power to receive, yet not to receive.* And on the place to the *Corinthians*, τὸ μὲν ὄν ἐπίταγμα, τὸ δὲ ἐκ προαιρέσεως καλόρθωμα, *One was a precept, the other a virtuous action of his own choice,* ὑπὲρ τὸν ἐντολὸν, *above the Commandment*; and κατὰ τοῦτο, *in this* very reſpect, πολὺν ἔχει μισθὸν, *it hath a plentiful reward*; And again, of the word ἀνάγκη *neceſſity*, he ſaith, that it *pertains to the command* by which it became *neceſſary*, πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῆς ἐλευθερίας τῆς ἐν τῷ λαμβάνειν *in oppoſition to the freedom in receiving* (*i. e.* the *power* to *receive* from the *Corinthians*, v. 12.) forementioned. So again *Theophylact*, Τὸ γὰρ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι, ἐπίταγμά ἐστι, καὶ ἐὰν πληρῶ τοῦτο, οὐδὲν κατόρθωμα, &c. *preaching the Goſpel is a precept to me*, and ſo a *debt* from me, *and if I do it, there is no* great matter of *excellence* in it; τὸ δὲ ἀδαπάνως κηρύσσειν, προαιρέσεως φιλοτιμία, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καύχημά ἐστι, *but to preach without charging them, is the honour of my will, and in that reſpect there is place of boaſting*, in this I may fitly *rejoice*.

* *In Act.* 21. *Tom.* 4. *p.* 860. *l.* 12.
† *Ibid. lin.* 20.
See alſo *To.* 1. *p.* 559.

7. This I have ſet down thus largely, to clear all *difficulties* or *doubts* in this matter, and to ſhew how punctually home it comes to the matter for which it was brought, to ſhew not only the *lawfulneſs*, but *acceptation* of ſuch *uncommanded* performances now under the *Goſpel*, as well as the נדבות under the *Law*.

8. The only *exception* he offers againſt this, is that from *v.* 18. where what he doth, he ſaith was done that he *abuſe not his power in the Goſpel*; But ſaith he, *to abuſe power is to ſin*, &c. But that is already anſwered, that καταχρήσασθαι ſignifies to *uſe* to his own *advantage*, and not only to *abuſe*; Thus in *Lyſias*, ταύτας λαβὼν κατεχρήσατο, *he took and uſed them*; and in *Iſocrates* in *Panegyr.* ἐν καιρῷ καταχρήσασθαι, *to make a ſeaſonable uſe* of other mens *actions*, by way of *example*: in *Plato*, οὐκ ὀρθῶς κατεχρήσατο δωρεᾷ, *Ep.* 8. he hath not rightly *uſed the gift*. And ſo 1 *Cor.* 7. 31. χρώμενοι τὸν κόσμῳ ὡς μὴ καταχρώμενοι, *uſing the world as if they uſed it not*, ſo it muſt be rendred in *proportion* to what goes before, *weep as though they wept not, rejoice as though they rejoiced not, buy as though they poſſeſſed not*, and ſo the *vulgar* reads, *tanquam non utantur, as if they uſed not*. And ſo *Chryſoſtom* on *Act.* 21. in the place even now cited, doth thus *paraphraſe* it, ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντα λαμβάνειν, μὴ λαμβάνειν, *not to receive, what he hath power to receive*; and ſo here *Theophylact* expreſly interprets it, ἵνα μὴ καταχρήσωμαι, τουτέστιν ὅλως χρήσωμαι, τῷ γὰρ ἁπλῶς χρῆσιν καταχρησιν ὠνόμασεν, the word ſignifies *ſimply* to *uſe*; δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐδὲ οἱ λαμβάνοντες ἡμάρτανόν τι, *ſhewing that they which received, ſinned not a whit*; which is the *direct contrary* to the *concluſion* of this *Diatribiſt* from the ſame *premiſſe*; And ſo *Chryſoſtom* alſo, δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐδὲ οἱ λαμβάνοντες ἐγκλημάτων ἄξιοι, by this expreſſion he *ſhewed, that they which received, are not worthy of accuſations, guilty* of any *fault*; which they muſt be, if they are *bound* by any ſpecial *call*, as the *Diatribiſt* cites from *Chamier* (but againſt the whole contexture of the place) to do what they did. And ſo this may ſuffice for the ſecond *Inſtance*, ſo particular, and that in the *New Teſtament*.

SECT. IV.

The third, of Paul's *going up to* Jeruſalem: *this under no precept. No refuſing to ſuffer, no retarding of the Goſpel. The example of* Chriſt *and S.* Paul *at other times*; *the teſtimony of* Origen, *and confeſſion of the Diatribiſt.*

Numb. 1. THE third *inſtance* was taken from *Paul*'s going up to *Hieruſalem*, *Act.* 21. when, being told by a *Prophet*, v. 11. that *bonds expected* him there, he might *lawfully* have *avoided* that danger, and gone ſome other *way*, and been *juſtified* by *Mat.* 10. 23. and yet in this *conjuncture*, when he might have *abſtained*, he would yet needs *go up*, v. 13. and ſo that was his נדבה. Now *to this*, ſaith he, *the like may be anſwered*, viz. *that it was no free-will offering, for though by the general allowance he might have fled, yet if he ſhould have refuſed to ſuffer, with the retarding of the Goſpel, he had ſurely ſinned.*

2. To this *anſwer* the *reply* may be brief, that *Pauls* not going to *Jeruſalem* at that time, did in no wiſe imply either his *refuſing to ſuffer*, or *retarding the Goſpel*: Firſt, The *not going*, when he *knows*, that if he goes, he ſhall *ſuffer*, is not *refuſing to ſuffer*; it is only the *diverting* at that time, the not caſting himſelf upon *apparent danger*, which we find ſometimes exemplified by *Chriſt*, *Mat.* 12. 15. upon knowledge of the *Phariſees* deſign to kill him, though ſure he never *refuſed* to *ſuffer*, but eſteemed it a *prime* part of his *miſſion*.

3. Upon this occaſion, it was * *Origens* obſervation, ὃ διὰ φόβον θανάτου, &c. *Chriſt did not this, for fear of death*, i. e. *refuſing*, or being in the leaſt degree *unwilling* to *ſuffer*; giving thereupon this *univerſal axiome*, ὃτι ἀγεννές ἐστι τὸ μετ' οἰκονομίας φευξάμενον τοὺς κινδύνους μὴ ὁμόσε ἀνιόντας χωρεῖν, *'Tis no degenerous thing, to avoid dangers prudently, and not to go among them.*

* *Contra Celſ.*

4. And ſure it would have been the ſame in S. *Paul*, who was not obliged to run into *danger* here, any more than to go unto the multitude, or into the *Theatre*, *Act.* 19. 30, 31. both which when he was willing to have done, he yet *abſtained* from both, upon the *intreaty* of the *diſciples*, and the *Aſiarchæ* that were *kind* to him; And accordingly we know at other times he made uſe of the ſame *liberty*, and induſtriouſly *avoided* the *perſecutors* hands, 2 *Cor.* 11. 33.

5. And *Secondly*, his *not going* up, was no way the *retarding* the *Goſpel*, only the *reſerving* himſelf to do *Chriſt* more *ſervice* upon *earth*, in preaching the *Goſpel* and *confirming* the *Churches*; For of this there is no queſtion, that the *Goſpel* might be advanced by his *life*, as well as by his *death*; and

as

as it appears in his *Epiſtle* to the *Philippians*, it might be better for the *Chriſtians* committed to his charge, that he ſhould continue to *live* and *labour among them*; and accordingly the pious *Chriſtians* here beſought him that he would not go up, and, I hope, were not guilty of *deſigning treachery* to the *Goſpel* in ſo doing, and ſo to the *Diſciples*, v. 4. who had *by the Spirit*, i. e. by the gift of *Prophecy* received *knowledge* of his danger, *adviſed* him alſo. Not that I think the *Spirit*, either by them, or by *Agabus*, *diſſwaded* his going, for then it had been an act of *obedience* to the *Spirit*, and ſo of *duty*, not to go; but that the *Spirit* made known his *hazard*, which there he ſhould run, leaving it *free* to him to *go*, or not to *go*, and that there were *Spiritual reaſons* on *both* ſides, and for *not going*, over and above, *motives* prudential, in regard of his own *ſafety*, and no *command* to deſpiſe theſe, nor conſequently ground of *neceſſity* or *obligation* to go up, only an *intuition* of ſome things that ſeemed to be *more excellent*, *exerciſing* of many admirable *graces*, of *courage*, and *conſtancy*, and *confeſſion* of a *perſecuted Chriſt*, every of which received luſtre from the certain *foreſight* of his *danger*, and theſe, it ſeems, weighed down the *ballance* with him againſt all the *importunities* of his *friends*, ſuperadded to the contrary *motives*, and accordingly he *choſe* that which was moſt *noble*, moſt *excellent*, moſt *contrary* to *fleſh* and *blood*, made not uſe of that *liberty* which *God* had given him, and in that reſpect this is directly *parallel* to the former, that of *refuſing* of *hire*, μὴ καταχρησάμενος τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ, he *made not uſe of the power* which he had, and ſo ſtill, his נדבה his *voluntary*, *ſpontaneous oblation* of himſelf even to *martyrdom*, without any *command* or *obligation* for it at this time.

Origen ſhall conclude this, in his *Books* againſt *Celſus*, Κἂν φεύγῃ ὁ Χριστιανὸς, ὁ διὰ δειλίαν φεύγει· ἀλλὰ τηρῶν ἐσολὴν τῆ διδασκάλε, καὶ ἑαυτὸν φυλάτων καθαρὸν ἑτέρων ὠφεληθησομένων τῇ σωτηρία. *Though a Chriſtian fly* (and yet that is more than *not going up here*) *yet he flies not for cowardiſe, but obſerving the commandment of his Maſter*, (and then ſure he *offends* not, much leſs *betrays* his *Maſter*) *keeps himſelf pure, that others may be profited by his preſervation*; and ſo ſtill this is not the *betraying*, but rather *advancing* of the *Goſpel*. 6.

That there was no ſuch *command* to S. *Paul* or *others*, *binding* to be *bound*, *beaten*, *ſtoned*, is here acknowledged by the *Diatribiſt*, and from thence I *conclude*, therefore it had not been *ſin* in him *not to go* up, when he knew he ſhould be *bound*, for *ſin* is a *breach* or *tranſgreſſion* of a *law*. This *Diatribiſt* therefore denying it to be a *free-will offering*, that he *choſe* the danger, when he might have preferred his *ſafety*, ought in all reaſon to have ſhewed the *ground* which rendred his going *neceſſary*; which having not attempted to do, but only in ſtead of it, *affirming*, that *if he had refuſed with the retarding of the Goſpel, he had ſurely ſinned* (which is *equivalent to acknowledging* that his bare *not going* to *Jeruſalem* had *not* been *ſin*, in caſe it had not been (as certainly it might not have been) to the *retarding* of the *Goſpel*) 'tis certain there remains no appearance of *reaſon* for his *negation*, nor conſequently of *objection* or *pretence*, why this ſhould not be a נדבה as well as the *former*, or any thing which is moſt *ſpontaneous*. 7.

The vulgar *anſwer* of ſome, that this was an *inſtinct* or *motion* of the *Spirit*, is not here *adhered* to by the *Diatribiſt*, and therefore I ſhall not ſpeak to that, being alſo ſure, that no ſuch thing doth here appear in the *Story*, and therefore muſt not be ſuppoſed, without all *proof*. 8.

SECT. V.

The fourth, of the more liberal almes-giving. Sadduces and Aſidæi. Righteouſneſs. Mercy. Paul's *advice without command*, 2 Cor. 8. 2. *The Diatribiſts anſwer ſatisfied. Alms, the Chriſtians ſacrifice in the offertory. Allowance no command. A latitude of degrees in the middle rule. The Apoſtles direction of giving as God hath proſpered. Of the circumſtances of giving.*

THE fourth *inſtance* is in the *almſgiving* or *works* of *mercy*, where the *quotum* (what *proportion of the whole every rich man ſhould ſet apart for this purpoſe out of his yearly revenue*) *being left free, and not particularly defined by God*, there is evidently place for *voluntary oblations*, above that which is *under command* or *neceſſary*, as is ſet down undeniably in that *Tract.* §. 32. *Numb.* 1.

To what is there ſaid, I now add theſe two conſiderations, for the *evidencing* of it; the *firſt* from the very denotation of the names, *Saducæi* and *Aſidæi* or *Eſſeni* among the *Jews*: A *proportion* there was of *charity* and *liberality*, which was by *Law* required of all, and this was called their צדקה *righteouſneſs*, and from hence I ſuppoſe the *Sect* of the *Sadduces*, called *Tſadikim*, firſt derived their title, they that obſerved the whole *righteouſneſs* of the *Law*, did all that by the *Law* they were *required* to do, and ſo *tranſgreſt* not in this *reſpect*; But beſide this, there was חסד that which exceeded this *neceſſary* proportion, יתרון הטובה *abundance of goodneſs* or *mercy*, as hath formerly been ſaid, and from thence the *Eſſeni* had their title חסדים *Chaſidim* or *Aſidæi*, and they were ſuppoſed to have their ἐπίμετρα τῷ νόμῳ, their *over-meaſure*, performances, *more* than the *Law exacted* from them, and ſo that is an *example* of what I now ſpeak of, the *free-will* performances of *mercy*. 2.

The *Second* ſhall be from S. *Pauls* language, 2 *Cor.* 8: 2. where ſpeaking of the *Corinthians* equalling the *Macedonians* in *liberality* to the poor *Jews*, he gives them no *command* to do ſo, (κατ' ἐπιταγὴν λέγω, *I ſpeak not by way of precept*, v. 8.) but only his *advice* or *opinion*, his γνώμην, juſt as in the caſe of *ſingle life*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 25. ἐπιταγὴν οὐκ ἔχω, γνώμην δὲ δίδωμι. *I have no commandment of the Lord, but I give my advice*; And if the *Corinthians* did *obſerve* and *practiſe* according to this *advice*, if they did give in *proportion* to the *Macedonians*, or (in caſe they did not) yet ſtill the *Macedonians* themſelves, which certainly were thus *exemplarily liberal*, and that, αὐθαίρετοι *of their own accord*, v. 3. without any *obligation* of *precept* lying upon them, and yet farther ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, *above* what they were well able to do; are again an *inſtance* of doing more in this kind, than either *all* men at *all* times, or *they* at *this*, were *obliged* to have done; and ſo this was a נדבה in them. 3.

Now to this *inſtance* of *works* of *mercy*, he firſt reſolves, that *it may be anſwered in part, that it belongs not to the queſtion, which is of worſhip, not of actions of civil life.*] But to this I *reply*, Firſt, That 4.

an *anſwer in part*, is no *ſatisfactory* anſwer; and ſo this, profeſſing to be no *more*, needs not be *conſidered*. Secondly, That the *parity* of *reaſon* holds from *one* act of *Chriſtian performance* to *another*, that if in *duties* of *charity* between *fellow Chriſtians*, there may be an ὑπερεχον τῷ νόμῳ, ſomewhat *above* the *commands* of the *law* of *Chriſt*, there may alſo by *analogy* be the ſame in matters of *Chriſtian worſhip*, there being neither *reaſon* nor *revelation* of *Chriſts* will, not yet of his *allowance*, to *one* more than to the *other*. But then thirdly, This of *works* of *mercy* is generally defined to be, in a *Chriſtian* performance of it, an *act* of *worſhip*, ſet in the *front* of ſuch by *Chriſt*, *Mat.* 6. 1. appointed to be exerciſed on the *Lords day* (as a work of the *day*) 1 *Cor.* 16. 2. and accordingly interpreted by *Chriſt* to be done to *himſelf*, *Mat.* 25. 40. and ſo by S^t *Paul* ſtyled θυσία and δεκτὴ θυσία, a *ſacrifice*, an *acceptable ſacrifice*, *Phil.* 4. 18. *Heb.* 13. 16. And yet fourthly to remove all ſcruple, I wiſh that after the cuſtom of the *Primitive Apoſtolick Church*, this *almes* be preſented to *God*, in the *offertory* at the *Sacrament*, and then, as it will certainly be a *branch* of *Chriſtian worſhip*, ſo my inſtance ſhall be ſet *particularly* to that ſort of *almes*, and it will certainly hold in that, as exactly as in any other.

5. But this *imperfect anſwer* being not confided in, he is pleaſed to *add more*, Firſt, That *the queſtion is not of a degree of an act of obedience, commanded, as Almes-giving is, but of the act it ſelf, if not commanded nor allowed in the ſpecial nor in the general.* But this anſwer cannot be of any manner of uſe to the *Diatribiſt*. For firſt, The *queſtion* being certainly this, Whether *Ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* in a *Church* are *criminous*, if they be not *commanded* by *God*; and *Ceremonies* and *Feſtivals*, being *geſtures* and *times*, and ſo *circumſtances* not *acts* of *worſhip*, 'tis viſible that the *queſtion* is not only of the *act* it ſelf. Secondly, The *reaſon* being the ſame of *circumſtances* and of *degrees*, of one *acceſſory* and of *another*, it follows, that if *uncommanded degrees*, may be *lawful*, *uncommanded circumſtances* muſt be *lawful* alſo. Thirdly, Though *almes-giving* in *general* be *commanded*, yet as long as the *degrees* be *uncommanded*, the *argument* from the *lawfulneſs* of thoſe *degrees*, will hold to the *juſtifying* of *Ceremonies* or *Feſtivals*; becauſe as *almes-giving* is *commanded*, ſo *praying* to, and *praiſing* of *God*, is *commanded* alſo, and theſe *ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* are as viſibly *circumſtances* of *prayer* and *praiſing*, as theſe *degrees* are of *almes-giving*. Nay fourthly, To take away all *poſſibility* that this *anſwer* ſhould be uſeful to him, the *inſtance* which I ſet of *almeſgiving*, is of an *uncommanded act*; for ſuppoſing the *utmoſt degree* of the *uncommanded mercy* to be once *defined* and *determined*, and ſuppoſe me to *exceed* that *proportion* in *giving*, 'tis evident that that *exceeding* is an *act* firſt, and then an *uncommanded act*; an *act*, for ſo is every *exerciſe* or *work* of *mercy*, and this *giving* is ſuch an *exerciſe*; and an *uncommanded act*, for ſo is all which is not under *precept*, and ſo this is ſuppoſed to be, and herein it is perfectly *anſwerable* to the *free-will offering* among the *Jews*; *Sacrifice* or *offering* was a *determined* and *commanded duty*, and every *exerciſe* of that, above what was *commanded*, was a *free-will oblation*, and as ſuch *accepted* by *God*; and ſo it is here.

6. As for his *cautious reſtriction* added in the cloſe of that *anſwer*, which pretends that the *queſtion* is of ſuch *acts*, which as they are *not commanded*, ſo *neither* are they *allowed in ſpecial or in general*, he muſt needs know that this is an *impoſing* on the reader; For firſt, The *queſtion* being of the *lawfulneſs* of *uncommanded acts*; and *allowance*, whether *general* or *ſpecial*, being yet no *command*, for no man is *bound* to do all that he is *allowed* to do; 'tis evident that the *acknowledging* the *lawfulneſs* of *allowed* acts, as they muſt needs be *lawful*, if they be *allowed*, is the *acknowledging* the *lawfulneſs* of ſome *uncommanded* acts; for ſuch are they which are no more than *allowed*.

7. Secondly, For the clearing of this, I ſhall offer the *Diatribiſt* this *Dilemma*; Are theſe *high* but *uncommanded degrees* of *mercy allowed* either in *general* or *ſpecial* now under the *Goſpel*, or are they not? If they are *not*, then this *cautionary* clauſe was very *impertinently* added, and my *inſtance*, though it proceeded of *degrees* which are not thus *allowed*, yet proceeding of *degrees* which are *not commanded*, was a *valid* inſtance. But if they are *allowed*, as I ſuppoſe by his *caution* he will affirm, why then, it ſeems, there is either *general* or *ſpecial allowance* ſtill under the *Goſpel* for *uncommanded acts*, and then there is as much for them under *Chriſt*, as there was under *Moſes* for *freewill offerings*; and ſo the *Leviticalneſs* of the *freewill offerings* conſiſted not in this, that they were thus *allowed*, and then this was no part of that *Levitical Law*, nor *conſequently* of that which was *aboliſhed*, as * before he had affirmed; and ſo the *Diatribiſt's* whole *ſcheme* is demoliſhed, or rather *fallen* aſunder of its own *accord*, as all infirm *fabricks* are apt to do.

* p. 91.

8. What follows in the ſecond place, as if it were an *anſwer* to the *inſtance*, is but an *attempt* or two of the *Diatribiſt's*, out of my words to gain ſome *advantage*, and thereby to *conclude*, that there is ſome *middle rule that binds men ſo, as that whatſoever is more or leſs than that, offends either by way of exceſs or defect.*] But both this and all the other *artifices* were exactly *prevented* in the manner of my ſetting of the *inſtance*, of a *proportion* exceeding that, whatever it is, which can be defined our *duty*, and yet not *offending* againſt any other *ingagement* of the *givers*. For if that which is done, be *more* than that which we are any way *bound* to, 'tis *impoſſible* it ſhould *tranſgreſs* in the *defect*; and yet being no way *forbidden* to give ſo *much*, not being guilty of *neglecting* any *other* part of *duty* incumbent on us, 'tis on the other ſide as *impoſſible* that there ſhould be any *exceſs*. Nay there being, in the *New Teſtament*, a viſible *allowance*, of *ſelling* all and *giving* to the *poor*, of laying that all at the *Apoſtles feet*, and S. *Paul* commending the *Macedonians* who had been ἀυθαίρετοι ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, *willingly liberal above their power*, 1 *Cor.* 8. 3. and the like, our greateſt *liberalities* if they be *prudently* ordered and *ſeaſonably* placed (and there is no *neceſſity*, that he that is moſt *liberal* or *merciful*, ſhould be a *fool*) are competently ſecured from *offending* on *that* ſide.

9. And therefore the *Diatribiſt*, that from the *poſſibility* of falling into *extremes*, was willing to collect a *middle rule*, and from thence a *debt*, ſhould in any reaſon have aſſigned that *rule*, and produced his *authority* for it in the *New Teſtament*, and then the *weakneſs* of his *anſwer* would ſoon have been viſible. For I ſhould immediately have aſſigned ſome *proportion exceeding* that *middle*, and made my *inſtance* of that, and ſo have proceeded as *formerly*. But the truth is, ſuch a middle cannot be produced; And if it cannot, then is this an *evident* proof, that there are no ſuch *middle* points *quos ultra citráque nequit conſiſtere rectum*, the *variation* from which is always *criminous*; Nay if it were not ſimply *impoſſible*, and yet *cannot eaſily* be done by *every man* for *himſelf*, or by the *teacher* for *all*, then ſtill it is evident that this *obligation* is not *univerſally revealed*, and ſo no *duty univerſally obligatory*; and then my *inſtance* ſhall be ſet to ſuch a *perſon*, to whom it is not *obligatory*.

But,

But, as I ſaid, there is no ground in the *Goſpel* for *defining* or determining the *middle rule*, which conſtitutes a *debt*. The truth is, that this *middle rule* conſiſts not in any *indiviſible* point, but in a *latitude*, wherein there are many *degrees*, but *all* within the *rule* of *allowance*, though not *all* within the *rule* of *precept*, he that *obſerves* the *duty* in any *degree* of the *latitude*, *doth well* (for if not, then that was too great *parſimony*, and ſo no *obſervation* but a *breach* of the *rule*) and he that goes yet *farther*, but not *beyond* the *latitude*, *doth better*; for ſo he *muſt*, unleſs he go *too far*, which if he do, then he is *prodigal*, and that is a *breach* of the *rule* again on the other ſide. 10.

By this it appears, that as there is *allowance* not only for ſome one point, but for every *degree* within the *latitude*, ſo every *degree* of that *latitude* doth not *bind* every man, ſo as to make that *degree* a *debt* or *duty* in that man; No nor the *general rule* of *giving according to God's proſpering them* (the only thing which the *Diatribiſt* hath ſtill behind.) For beſides that *rule*, 1 *Cor.* 16. 1. ſeems to have a *propriety* to that *particular* time, in conſideration of the *great diſtreſs* and *famine* in *Judæa*, and conſequently is not a *rule* for *all* other *times*; Beſides this, I ſay, it is manifeſt, that they which do *obſerve* that *rule*, i. e. offend not in the *defect* againſt it, may yet be able to *exceed* the *proportion*, which that *rule* ſtrictly *required*, and then not only do *well* (as they muſt, if they offend not againſt any *other rule*) but alſo do *better*, for ſuch muſt all that be, which is *more* than *well*, and yet *degenerates* not into *ill*. 11.

For ſuppoſe a man, in deſire to *obſerve* that *rule* of *giving as God hath* proſpered him, to give the *tenth* of his *profits weekly* or *yearly*, and ſuppoſe him to do *well* in ſo doing, *i. e.* not to *offend* againſt the *rule*, as it is ſet and meant by St. *Paul*; or if the *tenth* be not a fit *proportion*, let any other be *aſſigned* which is *fit*; and then ſuppoſe that man yet to give *more*, ſo that ſtill he *offend* not againſt any *other precept* by *exceſſive* giving, and then you have the *inſtance* of the נדבה the *uncommanded* yet *acceptable* work of *mercy*, ſtill the ſame, as formerly, though ſomewhat more *explicitely* ſet, and ſo a more *manifeſt* evidence, that nothing *is* by this *Diatribiſt* (I may ſay, *can be*) produced as a *valid exception* or *objection* againſt it. 12.

For as to that of the *circumſtances of time and place and perſons in regard of the neceſſities of the poor*, the caſe which I ſet, is not capable of thoſe *conſiderations*, my *inſtance* being not laid in any *particular almes*, terminated in a *particular perſon* (though that alſo would admit of a *latitude*; I might give *as much* as were my *duty* to that *particular perſon*, and then I might *exceed* that, give *more* to him, and that would be my נדבה) but in a *weekly* or *yearly conſecration* or ſetting apart of ſome more *liberal* proportion for *pious* and *charitable uſes*, not *foreſeeing* particularly what they are, and withal not *reſtraining* my ſelf from giving *more*, if *objects* offer themſelves to my *charity*, above what my *aſſignation* will extend to. This ſetting the caſe, evidently prevents all thoſe *difficulties* ariſing from *circumſtance of time and place and perſons*, by remaining abſolutely looſe and *abſtracted* from *all* theſe, and thus the caſe was (and is to be) ſet, and will not doubt to ſecure it ſelf from all *objections* by this means. 13.

SECT. VI.

The fifth inſtance vindicated. Circumſtances of Prayer acknowledged free. Difference between placing worſhip in geſtures, &c. and pleaſing God by them. So in Feſtivals.

MY *fifth inſtance* was in *ſecret prayer*, firſt of the *adjoining bodily worſhip* to it, any ſuch as is moſt *humble*, and yet not *under command*, as *proſtration*, &c. Secondly, Of the *frequence* of it, *ſeven times a day*, with *David*, or ſome other *proportion above* that which is by the *evangelical law* ſuppoſeable to be required of us. To this he anſwers briefly, that *Prayer indeed is a worſhip of God, but for the manner, geſtures, times, frequency, they are not properly worſhip, but circumſtances, rites*, &c. *left to the liberty of every perſon, and ſo though free, not parts of worſhip.* *Numb.* 1.

This *anſwer* is very *brief* indeed, but needed not to have been *larger*, being in theſe few words a *yielding* of the whole *cauſe*; For is it not *evident*, that if *geſtures* and *times* be *free*, then *ceremonies* and *Feſtivals* are ſo too? and if they are, then are they *lawful* at once and *uncommanded*, for *freedom* comprehends both thoſe, being *free* to be *done* and ſo *lawful*, free to be left *undone*, and ſo *uncommanded*. I need add no more, ſure, of that. 2.

What follows in that Section is on purpoſe deſigned to involve this *plain* matter, and reduce it into an *intricacy*: And the way to do it, is to *confound* or *ſhuffle* together, theſe *two* things, *placing the worſhip of God in them, and pleaſing God by them.* But to this I anſwer, that theſe are *two diſtant* things, and ſo in all reaſon to be *ſevered*. He that *juſtifies* or *defends* the *uſe* of the *humbleſt geſtures* in the *ſervice* of *God*, and affirms them to be more *acceptable* to *God*, than either the *leſs humble geſtures*, or thoſe which have no *humility* at all in them, doth not yet place *worſhip* in them, but willingly acknowledges that *God* may be *worſhipt* without them. 3.

So he again that undertakes the *defending* of other *Feſtivals annually* commemorative of the *birth* and *aſcenſion* of *Chriſt*, &c. beſide the *weekly commemoration* of the *reſurrection*, and affirms it to be *acceptable* to *God* that we obſerve theſe alſo, and that the *thankful pious* obſervation thereof is more *acceptable* to *God* than the *contrary* whether *negligence* or *contumacy*, doth not yet *place* the *worſhip* of *God* in theſe *Feſtivals*, but in the *prayer* and *thanksgiving* which are offered to *God* in thoſe *Feſtivals*. And the ſame will certainly hold in all other *particulars*, to which either the *Treatiſes* arraigned by this *Diatribiſt*, or this *defence* have attempted to *extend* it. Such are the *frequent*, *daily*, and *conſtant hours* of *prayer*, either *publick*, or *private*, ſuppoſing as ſtill I do, that they do not *interfere* with, or *ſupplant* any other *duty*, or run out all into *formality*, &c. 4.

Of this laſt, *frequency* of *Prayer*, he would fain perſwade us that it is not a נדבה (but a *debt*) and to that end tells us firſt of *pray continually*, that *the ſcope of it is to command frequent prayer every day*, and ſecondly, that *it hath reſpect to the frequent occaſions and neceſſities of men every day, and ſo binds to* 5.

pray

pray as oft as need ſhall be, with ejaculatory prayers at leaſt. And yet in the *midſt* of this, ſpeaking of the *particular* number of ſeven times a *day*, he is content to acknowledge it true what I ſay, *i. e.* that it is *no debt.* And if ſo, then is that all that I contend for, ſuppoſing a man to *pray* as oft as that *precept* [*Pray continually*] obligeth, and withal to uſe *ejaculatory prayers* as need ſhall be, and yet farther to have more *frequent daily returns* to the *ſolemn* performance of that *duty*, than that *precept* is pretended to *require*, then ſtill this is under no *precept*, and yet no doubt *acceptable*, and ſo ſtill as exact a נרבה as could be pitcht on.

SECT. VII.

Of the difference betwixt a precept and a grace. The proportionable return to grace is in a latitude. The higheſt no exceſs. A poſſibility for grace to be given in vain.

Numb. 1. HIS next branch of diſcourſe is deſigned to diſcover my *miſtake* in making the difference ſo great betwixt a *precept* and a *grace*; And my ſetting down of that *difference* conſiſting of many *degrees*, of which each *ſuperadds* to the former, and not any *one* ſingle, but *all* taken together are a perfect *ſtating* of it, the *Reader* is deſired to review the whole matter Section 39. and by ſo doing he will ſoon find that every of the *Diatribiſts objections* to the former degrees, was perfectly *prevented* and *anſwered* in the *following*, ſave only the *laſt* of them, and therefore that only remains to be now *examined.*

2. The *objection* is p. 103. that *ſure as grace it ſelf, ſo any meaſure or degree of grace being a talent alſo, requires a proportionable return to that degree, as to whom more is given, of him is more required.* But to this alſo my *anſwer* hath formerly been *intimated*, viz. that as in the *middle rule* of *almes-giving* there is a *latitude*, ſo here in the *proportionable* return to any *degree* of *grace*, this *proportionable* return is not ſo placed in any *indiviſible* point, that as he that comes ſhort of that point, *offends* in the *defect*, ſo the *exceeding* that point in the leaſt degree, ſhall be an *offence* alſo, but, as I ſaid, in a *latitude*, wherein there may ſtill be a *variation*, and yet all the *degrees* of that within the *latitude.*

3. And therefore as it may be true of two men that have the ſame *grace* in *ſpecie*, that both may uſe it *well*, and yet one make *better* uſe of it than another, ſo it is ſuppoſeable of the ſame *degree* of the ſame *grace*, for though to that *degree* of *grace*, there be ſome *degree* alſo of *return* proportioned, that who ſo fails in that, *offends* by *defect*, yet it doth not follow from thence, that whoſo *exceeds* that *minimum quod ſic*, that *leaſt degree* that was proportionable, ſhall preſently *offend* by way of *exceſs*, but indeed the *contrary* will be moſt viſible, that he that thus *exceeds*, is more *acceptable* and more highly *rewardable.*

4. He that had *ten talents* intruſted to him to *occupy* withal, and having *gained* other *ten*, was *accepted* and *rewarded*, had he been yet *more* induſtrious, and brought in his *Maſter* more *profit*, gained *eleven* or *twelve talents* by thoſe *ten*, 'tis not imaginable but this would have been *acceptable* alſo to his *Lord*, and yet more highly *rewardable.*

5. Paul *laboured more abundantly than all the Apoſtles*, and this *by the grace of God that was in him*, and by ſome *eminent meaſure* of that *grace*, and ſuppoſing that *meaſure* to have been no *greater* in him than it was either in *John* or *Peter*, yet would this certainly have been *accepted* by *God*, and more richly rewarded, and not uſed like the *Giants* on *Procruſtis* his bed, all the *exuberance* cut off and caſt away, I mean, required to come down to that *lower* degree of *return*, which either of thoſe other *diſciples* did make, or to *loſe* his *reward* of that *higher* degree. And ſo this is full *anſwer* to all his *exceptions* againſt the *difference* by me aſſigned between *Precept* and *Grace.*

6. As for his *incidental* wonder at my *expreſſion* when I ſaid [*it is the deſign of grace only to ſtrengthen and incline, which he that makes uſe of as he ſhould, is promiſed a reward*] upon which he cries out, *This is ſtrange divinity; doth God give grace only to ſtrengthen and incline, and leave men free to uſe it or not to uſe it? ſo grace might be given in vain.*] To this I briefly *anſwer*, firſt from the words of *Scripture*, *Heb.* 12. 28. that men are exhorted to have *grace*, i. e. I ſuppoſe to make uſe of it, as when *to him that hath, Chriſt* promiſeth it *ſhall be given, and he ſhall have abundance*, 'tis evident it ſignifies, to him that makes *uſe* of the *grace* which he hath, and certainly that *exhortation* were in vain, if the contrary were not *poſſible*; and ſo likewiſe when he which *hath not* (makes not *due uſe* of it) is threatned with the *auferetur, & ejicietur, taking away from him his talent, and caſting him into utter darkneſs*, ſure 'tis ſuppoſed *poſſible*, that ſome man may not make *uſe* of his *talent*, or elſe theſe *threatnings* muſt be in vain, or men both *deprived* and *caſt* out without any *demerit.*

7. Again, doth not the *Apoſtle* exhort, that we *receive not the grace of God in vain*, that we *grieve not, quench not* (as elſewhere there is mention of *reſiſting*) *the Spirit?*) Doth he not tell us of ſome that did *abuſe the grace of God unto wantonneſs?* and *can* none of theſe be done? Is it not *poſſible*, through our own *corruption* and *ſinful* negligence and default, to *reſiſt*, to *grieve*, to *quench* the *ſpirit*, be it of *prayer*, of *faith*, of *charity*, &c. to *abuſe it to wantonneſs*, or not to *uſe* it through *idleneſs?* What then is the meaning of *laying up the talent in the napkin*, that was ſo puniſht? Did not he *receive* the *talent*, the *grace in vain?*

8. But as generally it falls out, that thoſe that reprehend this kind of *Divinity* moſt demurely, if they be a while *obſerved*, need no other *evidence* to confute them, but what their own words will yield us, they that leave nothing to mans *will*, do yet often *exhort* and *reprehend* men, which muſt certainly be *vain* and *ridiculous*, unleſs they that are exhorted, be in ſome poſſibility by *Gods grace* to do what they are *exhorted* to do, and they that are *reprehended*, in the ſame poſſibility to have done otherwiſe; ſo hath it happened to this *Diatribiſt*; He that juſt now thought the *Divinity* ſo *ſtrange*, that *grace* might be *given in vain*, adds in the very next words, that S. *Matthew* ſaith, *take him and caſt him into utter darkneſs for not uſing his talent*, which certainly is that identical *ſtrange* thing, with *grace*

being

being given him in vain, as to all *fruit*, or *uſe* he made of that *grace*. And in the very next words again he adds, *Is he not threatned with loſs of his talent for not uſing it?*

But 'tis poſſible, the *ſtrange divinity* here cenſured, may have been ſomewhat elſe, not my ſuppoſing 9.
that it was left *phyſically free* or *poſſible* for man to *uſe* or *not* to *uſe grace*, but that it was *morally free*, i. e. *lawful*, or that which included no *ſin*, and then *Gods not giving of grace in vain*, muſt be his not *giving* it ſo as that it ſhall be no *ſin not* to *uſe* it; And if that be his meaning, then, as his *expreſſions* were very *ſtrange*, much more than my *divinity*, ſo *ſtrange* that I, whoſe *divinity* it was, could not underſtand it, as it was thus *diſguiſed* by him, (for who would ſay that to *give grace* without any *deſign* of laying *obligation ſub periculo animæ* to make *uſe* of it, were to *give grace in vain?* Is there no other *poſſible uſe* of *grace* but to *condemn* them, and render them *unexcuſable?* this indeed is another branch of no very old *Divinity*, though theſe days have not made it *ſtrange* with ſome men) ſo I ſuppoſe I have already given *anſwer* to this in the former part of this Section, and muſt not now ſo ſoon *repeat* it.

The ſhort is, though *grace* bring *obligation* with it, and that to ſome *return proportionable* to that 10.
grace, yet ſtill this *proportionable return* conſiſts in a *latitude*, which hath ſeveral *degrees* in it, and as the loweſt of theſe are under *obligation*, ſo the *ſuperiour* are not, but yet ſuch as will be *accepted* and *rewarded* by *God*, to him that *arrives* to them. And ſo much for that of the *difference* between the *grace* and *precept*, which he thought would have yielded him ſo great *advantage*.

SECT. VIII.

My anſwer to a firſt head of objections vindicated. Prudence loſt by mans own ſin, recoverable by grace. The puniſhments of Adams *ſin, are not our faults. Perfection of innocence capable of degrees. So perfection of the Judaical law, and of the Chriſtian. So mercifulneſs to ability.* Κατὰ δύναμιν ἀνθαίρετοι, 2 Cor. 8. 3. *Merciful as God is merciful, belongs not to the degree. Gods righteouſneſs puniſhes not where there is no law. Intuition of reward in Chriſtian performances, no Popery. Proofs of this from Scripture, from the nature of Hope, Faith, Gratitude. Not always prudent to undertake the higheſt. Martyrdom no conceited Popiſh perfection, yet under no precept to all.* S. Hieroms *words examined. Two notions of the word Perfection. Some perfection poſſible in this life, and yet capable of growth. The law, as it ſignifies the condition of the firſt Covenant, is not now in force with believers. Of Chriſts perfecting the law. Every man is not bound to do what is beſt,* 1 Cor. 7. 3. 8. καλῶς ποιεῖ *of moral good. The ſaying of* Gregory *explicated.*

WHat remains now in that *Tract* of *Will-worſhip*, was by me added for the *preventing* of *miſtakes*; To which end, *three* heads of *objections* I propoſed, the *firſt* ariſing from the *obligation* that *prudence* ſeems to lay upon us, to do always that which is *fitteſt* and *beſt*; the *ſecond*, from the *general precept* of *loving the Lord with all the heart*, &c. the *third*, from the ſeeming *favourableneſs* of our *doctrine* to the *Romaniſts works of ſupererogation*; and to each of theſe I gave particular anſwers, which muſt be viewed in that *Tract* from Section 40. to the end. And to theſe *anſwers*, what he now oppoſes, I ſhall now examine κατὰ πόδας. *Numb.* 1.

And firſt, ſaith he, *Every man is bound to be prudent to that degree of prudence which he loſt by ſin.* 2.
To this I anſwer, that if he ſpeak of the mans *own actual ſins*, whereby he hath any way *infatuated* himſelf, there is then truth in his affirmation; but 'tis not appliable to the matter in hand, *viz.* to ſuch an high *degree* of *prudence* as now I ſpeak of, for of that he may come ſhort, without any *degree* of *actual ſin* as ſhall thus infatuate and deprive him of *prudence*; and beſides, ſpeaking, as I do, of a *pious, merciful*, and ſo of a *regenerate man*, I may ſuppoſe him by the *inlightning* wiſe *Spirit* of *God*, returned to that ſtate of *prudence* from which his *own actual* ſins may have *degraded* him, and in caſe he be ſo, then, as he is as *prudent* as by this rule of the *Diatribiſts* thus underſtood, he is bound to be, ſo certainly he is yet capable of *growing* in that, as in other *graces*, and ſo of being yet *more prudent*, and if he do ſo, and thereby obey that *exhortation* of St. *Peters*, *Grow in grace and in the knowledge* — he is ſtill free from ſin in this reſpect, though he have not yet arrived to the higheſt *degree* of *prudence* that *humane*, but *lapſt nature* is capable of.

But if by *ſin*, he means not *actual* but *original ſin*, and ſo thinks that every man is bound to be *prudent* 3.
to that *degree* of *prudence* that *Adam* loſt by his *fall*, this ſure will be found to be a *miſtake*; For this loſs of *Adams* was a *puniſhment* of *Adams ſin*, and when it is inflicted by *God* on his poſterity, muſt be lookt on as a *puniſhment*, and he that is *puniſht*, cannot be obliged *not* to be *puniſht*; No man is now obliged to be as *prudent* as *Adam* was in his *integrity*, any more than to be as *healthy*, i. e. in effect to be *immortal*; Nay ſuppoſing *Adam* to have *ſinned*, and ſo to have *tranſgreſt* the *Law* in that, it cannot be imagined, that it is over and above that, a *new* or *farther* act of *ſin* in him to be leſs *knowing*, *prudent*, or *healthy*, than he was; all theſe, without any new act of his *will*, nay contrary thereto, falling upon him by *Gods decree* or punitive *juſtice*; and if it were not *ſin* in *Adam* himſelf, then ſure it cannot be ſuch in his *poſterity*, and ſo a man now, one of his *poſterity*, cannot be bound to that *degree* of *prudence* which *Adam* once had, any more than to be *born* in the ſtate of *innocence* and *perfection*, when yet he is neceſſarily ſuppoſed to be *born* after the *image* of the *lapſt imperfect Adam*, which he could not be, if he were born in this *perfection*.

And when in the ſame place he adds, that *every man is bound to be pious in the higheſt degree*, proving 4.
it by this, that *the law requires perfection of holineſs, and the Goſpel (ſaith the Doctor) yet greater perfection, and every man is bound to be merciful to his ability, as our heavenly Father is merciful (which ſure is the higheſt degree)* this is but an heap of *paralogiſms*, no one of the proofs belonging to the *higheſt degree* of *piety* or *mercy*, which was the one thing which was to be inferred from them.

For *Firſt*, the *perfection* of *holineſs* which the *law* required, was but either *ſincere* and *upright*, or 5.
at

at the moſt, but *unſinning obedience*, and neither of thoſe includes the *higheſt degree* of *piety*, which is poſſible

6. If by the *law*, be meant the *Covenant* made with *Adam* in *innocence*, then indeed 'tis true that the *perfection* which that required was *unſinning obedience*, and if *Adam* had performed that, 'tis yet evident that he had been capable of *higher degrees* of *piety* than that *law* required, there being in *unſinning obedience*, a *latitude*, and ſo, many *degrees*, of which the *loweſt* denominates it *unſinning*, and ſo, *perfect* in that ſenſe, and all the ſuperior degrees are *additions*, and to each of thoſe *higheſt*, the *Law* cannot be thought to *bind*, when it is *ſatisfied* with the *loweſt*.

7. This will be plain by the *inſtances* formerly given, of *frequency* in *prayer*, &c. wherein it is viſible that *Adam* in *innocence* might have exceeded any proportion which *Gods law* will be ſuppoſed to have required of him: And in a word, if *Adam* had never ſinned, yet might his ſtate have been a *ſtate* of *proficiency*, by which it is evident that the *perfection required* of him, was not the *higheſt degree* of *piety*, for then he had ſinned by any *lower*, and ſo *innocence* and *growth* in him had been *incompetible*; Beſide, there is no reaſon to doubt but that *Adam* and his *poſterity* ſhould have been *rewarded according to their works*, and ſo have been capable of *different degrees* of *rewards*; in caſe they had continued in *innocence*, which yet had been impoſſible, if every man had been bound to be *pious* in the *higheſt degree*, and had *ſinned* as oft as he did not *arrive* to it.

8. But this is but *ſpeculation*; and by the *law*, I rather ſuppoſe he meant the *law* of the *Jews*, and then the *perfection* of *holineſs* which that *required*, muſt, I ſuppoſe, ſignify *truth* and *ſincerity* of *holineſs*, ſuch as was in *Zac. Lu.* 1. 6. and in reſpect of which, he was ſaid to be *juſt* and *blameleſs in all the Commandments of the Lord*— Now 'tis as certain that this *perfection* is as capable of *degrees* alſo, and that all that are thus *perfect*, are not yet ſo in the *higheſt*, or in the *ſame degree*; Tis certain *Zachary* and *Elizabeth* were both thus *perfect*, but no way *probable* that they were arrived *juſt* to the *ſame degree* of it, one might very reaſonably be deemed to *excel* the other.

9. This may appear of the *Judaical Law*, by that which we have oft cited out of the *Law*, that there was one *degree* of *mercy* which was called צדקה their *righteouſneſs*, that to which they were *obliged* by the *Law*; another ſtyled חסד *abundance* or *excellence* of *goodneſs*, χρηστότης, ἀγαθότης, which the *Law* did not *command*, *ſub periculo animæ*, *require* or *exact* from them: This is ſo plain I need ſay no more of it.

10. *Secondly*, That *greater perfection*, which *Chriſt* required, is yet but a *higher degree* of the ſame *perfection*, but not the *higheſt* that is poſſible; Suppoſe there be *eight degrees* as of *heat* in *nature*, ſo of *zeal* or *piety*, or *perfection*, and ſuppoſe a *Jew* required to have ſo many of them as would denominate him *perfect*, i. e. at leaſt *five* of them, and a *Chriſtian* to have more than a *Jew*, ſuppoſe *ſix*, yet 'tis viſible that he that hath all that is *required* of a *Chriſtian*, is yet *capable* of having *more*, than is ſo *required*, viz. *ſeven*, and yet not to arrive to the *higheſt* that is *poſſible*, i. e. to the eighth *degree*.

11. But beſide this, there is in every ſuch *degree* a *latitude* alſo, and in it, as it were, *fractions* of each *degree* (and all this *ſubdiviſion* little enough to bear *proportion* with the great *difference* of the works of *pious* men here, or with the *difference* of the *degrees* of their *glory* hereafter) and he that hath the *loweſt fraction* of the *ſixth degree*, hath the *ſixth degree*, but not in ſo *high* a *meaſure*, as he that attaineth to an *higher*, viz. to the *ſeventh degree*, or to another *fraction* of the *ſixth*, and ſo 'tis evident in the *hypotheſis* or *application*, that every *Chriſtian* may be obliged to *exceed* a *Jew* in *piety*, *mercy*, &c. and yet nothing hinder but that one *Chriſtian* may *exceed* another in *every* of theſe.

12. *Thirdly*, Though every man be *bound* to be *merciful* to his *ability*, yet firſt, That *mercifulneſs* which is according to *ability*, is not placed in any *indiviſible point*; Two men that have the ſame *abilities*, and the ſame *opportunity* and *occaſion* requiring *mercy* from them, may very lawfully give or be *merciful* one *more* than another; For ſuppoſing any ſum that in all thoſe *circumſtances both* are *bound* to give, yet certainly one may *lawfully exceed* that ſum, give *more* than he was thus *obliged*, and yet not do beyond his ability; and ſecondly, In caſe he do yet give more, even *beyond* his *ability*, i. e. deny himſelf lawful *injoyments* on purpoſe to inable himſelf for this *higher* liberality, yet ſure this will not be *ſinful* in him, but on the contrary, more *acceptable* and *commendable*, as it was in the *Macedonians*, of whom St. *Paul* teſtifies that they were ὑπὲρ δύναμιν αὐθαίρετοι, thus *liberal of their own accord beyond their power*, and as ſuch, are propoſed for an *example* to the *Corinthians*, 2 Cor. 8. 3.

13. *Laſtly*, The *precept* of being *merciful as our heavenly Father is merciful*, is not (the *Diatribiſt* well knows) applicable to the *degree* of *mercy* which is in *God*, for *finite* creatures cannot attain to that; but only to the *kind* of it, mercy to *enemies* as well as *friends*; and ſo, could not with any colour be brought for a proof of his *objection*. And indeed after all this, the *Diatribiſt* hath let fall a few words in the cloſe of this fourth Section which ſhew, he had no *belief* in the *force* of it; For having ſet the caſe ſo as is the moſt for his advantage that he could wiſh, all circumſtances ſo concurring that a *man ſhould be bound to give ſo much as will ſupply anothers wants, and to give leſs were neither prudent nor pious*, yet he dares not pronounce it an *offence* againſt either of thoſe *virtues*, to go beyond this, but breaks off abruptly with theſe words [*whatever it were to give more.*] From which *in-confidence* of his, I ſhall not doubt to infer, that in that very caſe, ſo clothed with all thoſe *circumſtances*, he cannot *deny*, but that as I am bound to ſupply his preſent wants, ſo I may make proviſion alſo againſt his *future neceſſities*, and be far from *ſinning*, do that which is more *acceptable* to *God* in ſo doing.

14. His *next* return to a ſecond *degree* of my anſwer, is taken from his old *Topick*, of *virtues conſiſting in a middle point between two extremes*, *from which if it ſwerve to either extream*, *it is a fault*, *though not obſerved*, *perhaps obſervable by men*, *yet juſtly puniſhable by a righteous God*. But to this though much might be ſaid afreſh, from the *conſideration* of that *righteouſneſs* of *God*, which doth not uſe to *puniſh* thoſe *facts* which have no *Law obſervable* by *man* to *forbid* them, but firſt *ſhews* men his *will*, and what is *good*, and then *requires obedience* to it; yet becauſe ſo much hath already been ſaid, both to that of all *virtues* being placed in the *middle*, and to the *latitude* and not *indiviſible point* of that *middle*, I ſhall not now give farther *reply* to that; Any more than to the next branch of it, of *prudence* in our *created nature*, requiring to do what was *fitteſt*, for to that I have ſpoken already in this Section.

Under

Under this head of *prudence*, one farther degree of *objection*, I foreſaw, *viz.* that *Prudence knowing* 15.
the greateſt perfection to be moſt gloriouſly rewarded, would bind a man to aſpire to perfection, and not to content himſelf with any thing but the beſt. Upon the firſt ſight of theſe words the *Diatribiſt* is ſtartled, and *diſclaims* making any ſuch *objection*. But to this I anſwer, that he well knows I had no *intelligence* with him, and conſequently could not *divine* his pleaſure, but as well as I could, propoſed all *objections* I foreſaw *poſſible* from him, or any man elſe, of the moſt *different* perſwaſions.

But then till he ſhall pleaſe to propoſe *other* which have more *force* in them (as all this while he 16.
hath not *propoſed* any, but ſuch as thoſe from the *Second Commandment*) I might expect that this my *ſervice* ſhould not be ſo very *ill* interpreted and *faſtidouſly* caſt off, with a [*we ſhould not have framed ſuch an objection.*

The crime which was thus to be *averted*, was it ſeems, a *leaven* of *Popery*, in thoſe words wherein 17.
I had propoſed the *objection*; And *Firſt*, If it were ſo indeed, I wonder, what *error* I had *committed*, or why *Papiſts* may not be permitted to make *objections*, or how the *Diatribiſt* came to have the *monopoly* of making them. But then, *Secondly*, What was the *ſuſpicious phraſe* which I had uſed? Why forſooth, that I mentioned *glorious rewarding*, *This*, ſaith he, *ſeems at firſt ſight to touch upon the mercenary and meritorious way of Romaniſts.*

This is not to the buſineſs in hand, yet I cannot but make ſome *ſtay*, and behold this *rarity*. For *Firſt*, 18.
Is the *mercenary way* all one with the *Romaniſts doctrine* of *merits*? If it be, it is to be feared, that *David* was a *Romaniſt*, for certainly he affirms it of *God*, that he *rewardeth every man according to his works*, even when he *depredicates* the *mercy* and *free grace* of *God*, and makes this the prime *evidence* of it, that he thus *rewards* men. Nay what is *Chriſt*, when he minds them of their *great reward in heaven* that *ſuffer* for him, *Mat.* 5. 12. That *give*, and *pray*, in *ſecret*, *Mat.* 6. 2. 5. of a *prophets reward* and a *righteous mans reward*, *Mat.* 10. 41. and S. *Paul*, of ſuch works peculiarly as were not *under precept*, 1 *Cor.* 9. 18. and a multitude of the like nature every where in the *Scripture*? Is not this *reward*, *merces*, and is not all that *obedience* which is performed in *intuition* of the *glory which ſhall be revealed*, this very *mercenary* way? and being ſo, is it preſently the *meritorious* way of the *Romaniſts*? Is there not *merces ex pacto*, *reward by the tenure* of *Chriſts promiſe*, as well as *merit* either of *congruity* or *condignity*? and is it as *unlawful* to look at and expect the performance of *Gods promiſe*, as to challenge *heaven* as the *merit* of our *works*?

Again, hath not *Chriſt* propoſed his *rewards* on purpoſe to allure us to *come* unto him? and is it 19.
not *lawful* for us to *come* that very *way* which *God* hath *called* us? Is not *hope* a *Goſpel grace*, and ſuch as ſets us a *purifying*, 1 *Joh.* 3. 3. and is not the *future reward*, the object of that *hope*, and ſo, that which regularly ſets a *Chriſtian* about his *work*? Nay is not that *Faith* which *juſtifies*, in this *Diatribiſt's* opinion, the *belief* of the *promiſes*? and may not a *Chriſtian* then *look* at thoſe *promiſes*, which yet he muſt *believe*?

But, ſaith he, *he muſt firſt look on the commands of God, and beauty of holineſs, and ſeek that firſt for* 20.
it ſelf, and by and by *it is but carnal prudence, adviſing only or firſt to look at the perfection of glory.* But to this I anſwer, *Firſt*, That the form of my *objection* was not ſuch as ſuppoſed *prudence* to look either *only* or *firſt* on *glory*, but on the *greateſt perfection* (of *virtue* here) as the *way* to the moſt *glorious reward* (hereafter;) And therefore to inſert the word [*only*] was that to which he had no kind of *temptation*.

Nay for the *priority* of order, looking *firſt* on the *reward*, it is viſible that I had not given the leaſt 21.
intimation of it, but contrariwiſe I had ſaid diſtinctly, that *prudence would adviſe to aſpire to perfection*, and to the *beſt*, meaning evidently the *perfection* of *virtue* (not of *glory*) to which the moſt *glorious reward* was proportioned. And yet after all this, ſuppoſe I had ſpoken of ſome man (in my objection) who *looks firſt* at the *perfection* of *glory*, and in order to that *laſt* end, purſues *virtue* as the one *way* to it, could he juſtly ſay this were *carnal prudence* in him and *ſinful*?

The *beauty* of *holineſs* is a thing ſeldom diſcerned but by the *experience* and *practice* of it, and in 22.
that caſe ſure there is need of *promiſes* to *excite* and *attract* to that *practice* (yea and of *terrors* to *drive*) and the *Goſpel* makes uſe of both theſe, and ſo doth *Faith*, which is the *Spiritual*, not *carnal prudence*. And indeed, if the *beauty* of *holineſs* may firſt be lookt on, and that is one *promiſe*, but that a leſs *perfect* one, and to be enjoyed in this *life*; then why may not the τελείωσις or *eternal reward*, which is alſo the *beauty* of *holineſs*, and that a *perfect beauty*, a *purity* from *ſin*, as well as *immunity* from *burthens* and *miſeries*, a wiping away *ſpots*, as well as *tears*, be *firſt lookt* on alſo?

Briefly I ſhall demand of the *Diatribiſt*, whether *gratitude* in a *regenerate* man who hath received 23.
from *Chriſt* the great *benefits* of *election* and *redemption* and *juſtification*, may not be allowed to incite and ſtir up *duty*? If it may, I demand again, whether the reward decreed to him in his *election*, be not *lookt* on by him, and whether that do not *excite* this *gratitude*? If it do, whether this be a *carnal gratitude*, and the *mercenary* way of the *Romaniſts*?

But I muſt not allow my ſelf farther to *expatiate* on ſuch *digreſſions*: The *Diatribiſts* divinity in 24.
this point is but ſuitable to what formerly he gave us a taſte of, in the paſſage of *ſlaviſh fear*, and both together are exemplified to us by the *woman* that went about the *City* with a *firebrand* in *one hand*, and *a baſon of water* in the *other*, ſaying, that one was to *burn* up *heaven*, and the other to *quench* the *fire* of *hell*, that neither *hope* nor *fear*, *promiſes*, nor *terrors*, might have the leaſt *influence* on her, but pure *æthereal love* do the whole work. And all that I ſhall need add, is only this, that ſtill there is an *Heaven* and *Hell* in *Scripture* (and all *duty* is not quite *rarified* and *converted* into this *love*) and many good *Chriſtians* there are, which make uſe of *both* theſe, and offend againſt no *precept* of *Chriſt* in doing ſo.

But I have at large handled this point of *looking* at the *promiſes* in our *obedience*, not only in a *Ser-* 25.
mon on 1 *Cor.* 7. 1. but more punctually in an *addition* to the *Pract. Catech.* now in the *Preſs*, p. 416, [1655.]
&c. and ſo ſhall not here any farther *inlarge* upon it.

My anſwers there to the forementioned *objection* are fitter for the *Diatribiſt* to combat with. I 26.
proceed therefore to conſider what *replies* he makes to them.

26. To my *firſt anſwer*, which was this, *That though prudence doth adviſe to this of aſpiring to perfection; yet doth it not lay any command, ſo as not to obey it will be preſently ſinful*] (a thing which had oft been *proved* formerly, by the example of S. *Pauls advices* when he had no *commands*, for ſure *Prudence* may well imitate S. *Paul* herein, and do ſo too) To this I ſay, he *replies* by bare *affirming*, but not *proving* or offering the leaſt *proof* for the *contrary*, only when he mentions the *perfection* of *virtue*, he adds [*required by the commands of God*] as if the *higheſt degree* of *virtue* were *under command*, which he knows is the thing which through this whole debate is *denied* by me, and the *proofs* and *reaſons* of my denying it, given at large, and then what a *begging* of the *queſtion* is it, to affirm it here, without any tender or *overture* of *probation?*

27. To my *ſecond anſwer* then, which was by conſidering the *want* of *ſtrength* in ſome men, which makes it not *prudent* in them to *undertake the ſteep way of the greateſt perfection*, founded in the words of *Chriſt*, *He that can receive it, let him receive it*,] He *replies* by asking *what perfection I mean which will be dangerous to undertake as a ſteep way? that which is required in the commandments of the Law and Goſpel?* I anſwer, 'twere a *contradiction* and *madneſs* in me, when I ſpeak of *perfection*, which is *not* under *command*, to mean that which is *required* in the *commandments*; It is certain I mean *uncommanded degrees* of *virtue*, the undertaking thoſe *courſes*, be it of *virginity*, *auſterity*, *abundant labourings*, *Martyrdom* it ſelf, when either I am not competently furniſhed with *ſtrength* from *God* for the going through with them, or have not any *reaſon* to perſwade my ſelf that I ſhall be ſo *furniſhed*. For then, if indeed I have not *ſtrength*, the very undertaking ſuch heights, may prove *treacherous* and *precipitious* to me. And that this is my meaning, he at laſt takes notice, and fills his *margent* with *proofs* of it, both from this, and from another *Tract*, and when he hath taken all that *pains* to *find* out my *meaning* (which I profeſs to be it, and thought it had been *obvious* to any man before) he fairly takes his *leave* of it again, hath nothing to ſay to it, but returns to that perfection of *holineſs* which, ſaith he, *is the duty of all*; and all that I need return to him, is this, that if it be ſo, it is not that perfection I ſpeak of, *viz. virginity*, &c. for that, I hope, is not every mans duty, but at the utmoſt, his, who *can receive it*.

28. This he is reſolved not to take notice of, and accordingly proceeds, and when I ſay, that *even the precept of God may ſometimes interpoſe and make it unlawful for us to aſpire to the moſt perfect ſtate* (meaning evidently *virginity*, *martyrdom*, &c.) he ſaith *this is as ſtrange* (and again in the rear, by way of *exclamation*, *What ſtrange divinity is this*) demanding *whether Gods precepts croſs one another*—— when he cannot but ſee that my whole *diſcourſe* and *proceſs* is founded in the ſuppoſition of that *evident* truth, that theſe ſtates of *perfection* are not under any *precept* of *Gods*, and ſo that the *precept* which ſhall *croſs* the *undertaking* of them, is far from *croſſing* any *precept* of *God*.

29. After this repeated *exclamation* and *wonderment*, he is content at length, as he ſaith, to *hear me ſpeak and explain my ſelf*. And my *explanation* being by ſuppoſition of a *duty* of our *calling awaiting us on the one ſide*, *and an opportunity of martyrdom* on the other, and that *exemplified* by S. *Cyprian*'s caſe, that then *obedience* is better than the *richeſt ſacrifice*] here he finds place for *triumph* and *ovation*. *By this* 'tis *evident*, ſaith he, *he means not perfection of holineſs according to the commandments of God, but a conceited perfection of martyrdom, as Papiſts do*.

30. That I who ſpeak through that whole *Tract* of *uncommanded acts*, ſhould not mean that *perfection* which is *according to* (as that ſignifies *required by*) *the Commandments of God*, is too evident to be any *ſpecial* εὕρημα or *diſcovery* at this time, now toward the *concluſion* of his *view* of that *Diſcourſe*. Of that therefore he hath my *free confeſſion*; But if by *perfection according to the Commandments*, he will allow me to mean (as the words literally import) that *ſort* and *degree* of *perfection* which the *Commandments* of the *Goſpel allow* of very well, though they *require* it not of every man, or lay it under *precept*, then I ſhall not doubt to approve the *perfection* which I inſtance in, *viz.* that of *martyrdom*, to be ſuch, (unleſs when ſome diſcharge of known *duty*, or yet *greater good*, calls us another way) and if this be the doctrine of *Papiſts*, I hope yet that all *Proteſtants* are not therefore bound to *diſclaim* it, I never heard that our *old Engliſh Reformation*, which I thought had been ſealed by the blood of many *martyrs*, had lookt on *martyrdom* as a *conceited Popiſh perfection*; And if this be the *privilege* of the preſent *deformation*, to exclude *martyrdom* out of the *catalogue* of *virtues*, as the *Martyrs* and *Saints* out of our *Kalendars*, if this *Diatribiſt* be now one of that *Triumphant Church*, which hath thrown all *croſs* from their *ſhoulders*, and diſclaimed all *pretenſions* to this *conceited perfection*, and reſolved all to be *Papiſts* which ſhall thus *communicate* with the *ſufferings* of *Chriſt*, and obſerve this *conformity* with the *image* of *Gods ſon*, *Rom.* 8. I ſhall only tell him, that I ſhall be very well pleaſed to be *guilty* of this piece of *Popery*, and to ſuffer from this ſword of the *Tongue*, till *God* pleaſe to call me to any higher trials: Mean while, when the *Apoſtle* and the *Church* which hath tranſcribed his ſtyle, have uſed the phraſe τελειοῦσθαι διὰ παθημάτων, *being perfected by ſufferings*, and called *martyrdom* τελείωσις *perfection*, I cannot retract that ſtile, what *envy* ſoever fall on me for the uſing it.

31. What now follows in purſuit of this matter, *Does God call all men at all times to martyrdom? Is there any command for all men to be martyred*, &c.] is directly the evincing my *aſſertion* againſt himſelf; for upon that very *foundation* it is, that I *ſuperſtruct*, therefore *Martyrdom* which is the higheſt *degree* of *perfection*, is not under any command, *Quod erat demonſtrandum*.

32. In my *third anſwer*, which was, that *perfection here had degrees in it* and conſequently *ſuppoſing men bound to be perfect*, *Mat.* 5. 48. yet it follows not that they are *bound to the higheſt degree of perfection*) his anſwer is, *he will grant this, and yet deny my voluntary oblations ſtill*,] But how can that be, when that *higher degree* of *perfection* is ſuppoſed to be under *no precept*, and ſo to be *free*, and ſo when arrived to, a *voluntary oblation?* But his *grant*, it ſeems was only *conditional*, for it follows in his words [*For we ſay there are degrees of, or rather to perfection here, upon condition that he will grant that every degree, even the higheſt, is required by the law of God, and what is ſhort of that higheſt is ſo far culpable*] This *condition* I confeſs I cannot perform, and ſo muſt loſe the *advantage* of his *grant*; And truly to *require* it of me, is to *grant* my *premiſes*, and *require* me to *renounce* my *concluſion*; For from that *conceſſion*, that there are *degrees* in *perfection*, and there may be *perfection*, where yet there is not the *higheſt*

degree

degree of *perfection*, it infallibly follows, that the *higheſt degree* of *perfection* is not under *obligation* of that *precept*, which requires no more than that we be *perfect*; as when the *precept* binds to no more, than to be *merciful* in ſome *degree*, it is evident, that it binds not to be *merciful* in the *higheſt degree*, and conſequently, that the *higheſt degree* of *mercy* ſhall be ſtill *free*, under no *obligation* of *precept*.

In this matter he deſires to ſpeak his *own ſenſe in S.* Hieroms *words, Charitas quæ non poteſt augeri,* 33.
&c. citing *Ep.* 62. for it. But this *citation* is ſure *miſtaken*, there is no ſuch thing in that *Epiſtle*. The
place ſure is in S. *Hieroms Epiſtle* to S. *Auguſtine*, where he deſires his ſenſe of thoſe words, *Jam.* 2. *Tom.* 9. p. 159.
10. *He that keeps the whole Law, and offends in one point, is guilty of all.* On which occaſion he diſ-
courſeth a great while, how *one virtue* may be found in them which yet are guilty of *other ſins*, and
ſo from one thing to another, not by way of *defining*, but by *raiſing* of *difficulties* to provoke S. *Au-*
guſtines ſolution of them.

And on theſe terms he propoſes his notion of *virtue*, that it is the *loving of that which is to be loved*, 34.]
and is in ſome *greater*, in ſome *leſs*, in ſome *none* at all, and then adds *Pleniſſima verò, quæ jam non poſſit*
augeri, quamdiu homo hic vivit, eſt in nemine; quamdiu autem augeri poteſt, profectò illud quod minus eſt
quàm debet, ex vitio eſt. Ex quo vitio, non eſt juſtus in terrâ qui faciat bonum, & non peccet, &c. But
the moſt full virtue, ſuch as cannot be increaſed, is in no man as long as he lives here; But as long as it may
be increaſed, that which is leſs than it ought to be, is faulty, whereby it is that the Scripture ſaith, that
there is not a juſt man on earth, which doth good and ſinneth not; and, in thy ſight ſhall no man living be
juſtified; and, if we ſay we have no ſin, we deceive our ſelves, &c.

By this *view* of the place it is evident, that the *virtue*, which, on occaſion of the place in S. *James*, 35.
he ſpeaks of being an *univerſal*, *impartial* obſervation of the *whole Law*, and conſequently every
failing in that, a *vice* (for to that, all the *proofs* belong, that there is *no man but ſinneth ſometimes*)
there is no reaſon to *extend* his *ſpeech* any farther than to this, and then it will in no wiſe be *appliable*
to *our* buſineſs, which is only of the *degrees* of this or that particular *virtue*, which it is certain that
man may have, who yet is guilty of ſome *ſin* in other *particulars*.

This therefore I willingly acknowledge, that he that *fails* of any part of his *duty*, is therein *faulty*, 36.
or this is *ex vitio* in him, and if of that only S. *Hieroms* words [*quamdiu augeri poteſt*] be underſtood
(as it is moſt reaſonable they ſhould, whether we judge by the *occaſion*, or the *proofs* of his ſpeech, or
by the *expreſs* words, *quod minus eſt quàm debet, ex vitio eſt, that which is leſs than it ought*, i. e. *leſs*
than he is *bound* to do, *is faulty*) then as I fully conſent to the truth of them, ſo when that is granted,
no man can hence infer, therefore every *regular* act of *obedience* which comes ſhort of the *higheſt de-*
gree of *perfection*, is a *ſin*; for beſide many other *inconveniences* formerly noted, this freſh one will
be obſervable from S. *Hieroms* own words, that then every act of *virtue* in this life is a *ſin*, for as
for that *fulleſt perfection* which *cannot be increaſed*, the beginning of this *teſtimony* acknowlegeth, that
it is *not* to be found *in any man in this life*.

In a word, the word *Perfection* is capable of *two notions*, either it may ſignify the *perfect obedience* 37.
of *never ſinning*, and of this only S. *Hierom* ſpeaks, both when he ſaith, it is *not attained* in *this life*,
and when he adds, that *whatſoever is leſs than this is ſinful*. Or elſe it may ſignify any *higher degree* of
exerciſe of any *particular virtue*, *chaſtity*, *mercy*, *fortitude*, &c. And of this only it is, that I ſpeak
(and S. *Hierom* in the words cited from him, appears not ever to have thought of it) and to this on-
ly my *affirmation* belongs, that there are *degrees* in that *perfection*, and that he that hath attained to
any of thoſe *degrees*, *ſins* not againſt *Chriſts precept* of *perfection*, though he was not arrived to the
higheſt degree.

But, ſaith he, *the Doctor goes on, If there be any perfection attainable in this life, 'twill be capable* 38.
of degrees and growth alſo] and then he adds, *whether he be of their mind who hold perfection poſſible in*
this life, I cannot ſay, but this I can ſay, he ſpeaks contradictions, for perfection admits of no degrees or
growth.

Here I ſee the *Reader* may be abuſed, if I do not give him a true *narration* of my words in that 39.
place, *Section* 46. Having mentioned one *interpretation* of the *perfection* which *Chriſt commands* us to
aſpire to, *Mat.* 5. 48. viz. that it ſignifies *mercifulneſs*, *Luke* 6. 36. I add, *if that ſenſe will not be ad-*
mitted, yet if it be any perfection acquirable in this life, 'twill be capable of degrees and growth alſo. Now
by a ſlight change of [*if it be*] into [*if there be*] this ſenſe is quite altered and made lyable to *ſuſpi-*
cion, that I teach *perfection* (I ſuppoſe he muſt mean the *unſinning perfection* ſpoken of by S. *Hierom*)
poſſible in this life, and to the charge of ſpeaking evident *contradictions*, that I can talk of *growth* in
ſuch *perfection*.

Truly there was little of *juſtice* in this; I hope he will be *ſenſible* of it. The *perfection* which 40.
I there ſpeak of, be it *love* and *mercy* to *enemies*, or be it any other *Chriſtian duty* ſet under *precept* by
Chriſt, is certainly in ſome *degree attainable* in *this* life by them which have *ſinned*, and do ſtill *ſin*
through *infirmity*, in other things, and perhaps in ſome *circumſtances* of this, and then I hope there
can be no *hereſy* in this, to ſay that by the *grace* of *Chriſt* one may *obey* ſuch a *precept* of *Chriſts*, *love*
his *enemies*, &c. when S. *Paul* profeſſeth unlimitedly he *can do all things through Chriſt that ſtrengthened*
him.

And then, what *contradiction* can there be in affirming, that in this *virtue* of *loving enemies*, of 41.
mercy, &c. there are *degrees* and conſequently, *poſſibility* of *growth*; Of *mercy* it hath oft been *ex-*
emplified that it is ſo; and whatever particular *virtue* it be, that can be phanſied to be meant by
Chriſt by τελειότης *perfection*, I doubt not but it will be as viſible, when that *virtue* is named. But the
Diatribiſt attempts nothing that way, only miſtakes *perfection* for ſome other thing, either for a *ſin-*
leſs perfection, or for ſuch a *ſtate* as cannot be *increaſed*, knowing well enough that that is not *attain-*
able in *this* life, and certainly is not the matter of *Chriſt's precept*, *Mat.* 5. and as certainly is not the
perfection that there I ſpeak of

Once more, what I ſaid in this matter [that *if the perfection* (ſpoken of in the *objection*) *be not* 42.
acquirable in this life, 'tis certainly not under Evangelical precept now, citing that of *Mat.* 11. of
Chriſts light and *ſupportable burthen*, and his *commands not grievous*, i. e. *poſſible to be performed*

by us] falls under his very ſharp *diſcipline*, *This, ſaith he, is ſtrong and ſtrange confidence.*

43. His language I ſhall not only willingly *bear* with, but *thank* him for it; I ſhall only examine the *reaſons* which he offers for thus *accuſing* me. They are *three*, *Firſt*, *Becauſe the Law requires perfect obedience of Chriſtians, as the rule of eternal righteouſneſs*, adding, that *all Orthodox Divines have maintained this againſt the Church of* Rome, *Only the Doctor is of the Church of* Romes *mind, and charges the Law with imperfection*, citing it from *Pract. Cat.* p. 94.

44. Here are many *miſadventures*; I ſhall but name them. Firſt, That the *Law requires perfect obedience of Chriſtians*, meaning by that, the *Moſaical* Law, for that only, he knows, it is, which the *Doctor* chargeth with *imperfection*. The *Law* indeed ſometimes ſignifies the *Covenant* of *exact unſinning obedience*, and of that *Law* or that *Covenant*, it is moſt true, that it *required perfect*, as that ſignifies *unſinning obedience*. But then firſt, This was the *firſt Covenant*, and is not *now* in force with *faithful penitent Chriſtians*, who are *not under this Law, but under grace*, i. e. under a ſecond *Covenant* which requires not *innocence* but *repentance, ſincere*, not *perfect obedience*: And therefore ſecondly, It cannot truly be ſaid, that this *Law requires* this *perfect obedience* of *Chriſtians*, nor conſequently, that it is the *rule* of *Evangelical righteouſneſs*, i. e. of that *righteouſneſs* by which *believers* are now ſaid to be *juſtified*: I ſhall not inſiſt on the proving of this here, becauſe it is but a digreſſion in this place, and is abundantly explicated elſewhere, in the *Pract. Cat.* concerning the *two Covenants*.

45. Secondly, That he makes this doctrine of the *Law's* requiring *perfect obedience* of *Chriſtians*, to be one of the *Doctrines* maintained by the *orthodox* againſt the *Church* of *Rome*, when it is indeed but a *contention* of *words*, that the *Diatribiſt* (it ſeems) and ſome others have eſpouſed againſt I know not what *adverſary*.

46. Thirdly, That the *Doctors charging the Law with imperfection*, is a thing wherein he *complies with the Church of Rome*; when 'tis evident in that place of the *Catech.* that firſt, The words of *Chriſt* that he *came* πληρῶσαι νόμον, *to fill up* the *vacuities* of the *Moſaical Law*, and ſecondly, The many expreſs *examples* of his doing ſo, in that fifth of *Mat.* his *additions* to the *Law* in ſo many particulars introduced with [*It was ſaid of old*—But I *ſay unto you*] and *laſtly*, the uniform ſuffrage of all *antiquity* joining in this *interpretation* of *Chriſts* words, was the ground whereon I built my *affirmation*; and if in this, the *Church* of *Rome* were of my mind (as I do not find it is, making ſome of thoſe additions, *Mat.* 5. *counſels*, not *all* of them *precepts*) I ſhould never diſclaim the *doctrine* upon that account, any more than the *articles* of the *Creed*, which the *Church* of *Rome* is acknowledged to *believe* with us.

47. His ſecond *proof* is, that *the Goſpel calls for the perfection of the law*, *Be ye perfect as he is perfect*, Mat. 5. *and be ye holy as he is holy*, 1 Pet. 1. 15, 16. I anſwer, Firſt, This proves not his *propoſition*, viz. that it was *ſtrong* and *ſtrange confidence* in me, to ſay, that *if the perfection be not acquirable in this life, 'tis not now under Evangelical precept*; *Acquirable perfection* may be (and ſome *degree* of it is) *under precept*; but *unacquirable perfection* is not. *Chriſts eaſie yoke* is not now made up to us of *impoſſible precepts*. Secondly, That *perfection* in one of the places mentioned by him, appears to be *mercifulneſs*, and the *holineſs* in the other, that of S. *Peter*, being oppoſed ταῖς πρότερον ἐν ἀγνοίᾳ ἐπιθυμίαις, *to the former luſts*, when they were in *ignorance*, reſpects either that ſort of *purity* particularly, or however that more *univerſal purity*, which is now more ſeverely *required* of all *Chriſtians*, in an *higher degree*, than it had been under the *Jewiſh œconomy*; and of either of theſe I never doubted, but they are now under *Evangelical precept*. But then ſtill that is nothing to the *higher degrees* of thoſe, or other *Chriſtian virtues*, which all this while we ſpeak of. No more is that which follows from the Doctor *himſelf*, *ſaying that Chriſt came to perfect the Law*. So he might do, and yet leave ſome degrees of *mercy*, &c. *free* and not under *precept*, as hath oft been ſaid.

48. I ſhall not now take leaſure to examine, with what truth he adds, that that *perfection* which *Chriſt* came to add, is ſtill the *perfection* of *the Law*; It is true, it was the *requiring* of what the *law* had not *required*, and ſo the adding more to it, and *perfecting* it, as a *law*, requiring all that ever ſhall be *required* of men by *law*, or *precept*. But this concludes nothing againſt *higher degrees* of this very *perfection*, being ſtill left *free*, and not *under law*, the only thing which now he contends againſt.

49. His third *proof* is taken from the *account I give in the Pract. Cat.* p. 95. *of the lightneſs and ſupportableneſs of Chriſts burthen, firſt in taking off the burthen of unprofitable ceremonies, ſecondly, in taking away the damning power of every leaſt ſin*, &c. *thirdly, in giving greater ſtrength*. From whence he concludes, *It was not then, that he required not perfect holineſs under the Goſpel*. I anſwer firſt, πρὸς ἔνστασιν, that this *concluſion* can with no *Logick* be thus deduced being *à teſtimonio negativé*. It is very poſſible there might be *other* reaſons, beſide thoſe I there named, My mention of *three* being ſufficient for the matter then in hand, did no way *prejudge* or *exclude* more. But then ſecondly, I grant that this now mentioned, neither was, nor well could have been any part of my *account* of the *eaſineſs* and *ſupportableneſs* of *Chriſt Evangelical burthen*, above that *legal* of *Moſes*, becauſe it was common both to the *law* of *Moſes* and of *Chriſt*, that there were ſome *degrees* of *perfection*, which were by *neither* of them under *precept*, *Moſes's law* had place for *free-will offerings*, as well as *Chriſts*; nay *Chriſts* hath put ſome things under *precept*, as I conceive, which were not under *precept* by *Moſes's law*; in this one reſpect, there lies more *weight* on a *Chriſtian*, then did formerly on a *Jew*, but that is *abundantly* recompenſed by other *reſpects*, which this is not a ſeaſon to *inlarge* upon.

50. Having thus anſwered all his *objections* in this matter, it will I hope be *conſequent*, that he hath not yet *demonſtrated* the truth of that *aſſertion*, which from what he hath ſaid, he aſſumes to be *apparently* and *viſibly true*, viz. that *every man is bound to do that which is beſt, becauſe the law and the Goſpel alſo require perfection of obedience in every commandment*; For to this I have oft replied, that both of them *require perfect obedience* to all, that either of them *requires*, which notwithſtanding, there are ſtill נדבות under both, which no *precept* either of *law* or *Goſpel requires*, or puts under *neceſſity* of *obligation* to any.

51. The *falſeneſs* of that *propoſition*, that *every man is bound to do that which is beſt*, I had formerly evidenced by *two* means, firſt, the words of the *Apoſtle*, 1 Cor. 7. 38. *he that marries doth well, but he that marrieth*

marrieth not doth better; ſecondly, by this, that the *beſt* being a *ſuperlative*, *ſuppoſes the poſitive, which is lower than that, to be yet good*, &c.

To theſe he will now apply *anſwer*; To the *firſt*, that *well and better there, do not refer to moral goodneſs but worldly good, for the preventing of troubles in thoſe afflicted and perſecuting times.* But this *anſwer* will be ſoon ſhaken aſunder, firſt, by conſidering that as the *well* and *better* do certainly belong to the *ſame* kind of *good*, ſo it is viſible that the *well* cannot belong to the *worldly* but *moral good*, and then conſequently, the *better* muſt do ſo too. That the καλῶς ποιεῖ, *doth well*, belongs to *moral goodneſs*, is evident by *v.* 28. where adviſing them that are looſed *from marriage*, *not to marry*, he adds ἐὰν δὲ καὶ γήμῃς, οὐχ ἥμαρτες, *but and if*, or, *though thou do marry, thou ſinneſt not, and if the Virgin marry, ſhe ſinneth not.* What can be more clear, than that the *doing well* is *not ſinning?* and ſure that is a *moral*, not only a *worldly good*. 52.

Nay ſecondly, the *Apoſtle* is as expreſs that the *marrying* is quite contrary to the *worldly good*, for having ſaid, that they that *marry ſin not*, he adds immediately, *v.* 28. θλῖψιν δὲ τῇ σαρκὶ ἕξουσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι, *but ſuch ſhall have trouble to the fleſh*; and what can be more contrary to *worldly good?* But yet farther, thirdly, the *Apoſtle* ſets down the *advantages* of *not marrying*, v. 32. *the unmarried careth for the things of the Lord how he may pleaſe the Lord, and the unmarried woman in like manner that ſhe may be holy both in body and ſpirit*, v. 34. whereas the *married man cares for the things of the world how he may pleaſe his wife*, and the *woman* in like manner *how ſhe may pleaſe her husband*; And then, are not theſe *ſpiritual* (not barely *worldly*) *advantages*, and is not the holineſs of both *body* and *ſpirit*, and the caring for the things of the Lord, a greater *moral* or rather *ſpiritual good*, than the bare *caring* for the things of the *world*, to pleaſe a *yoke-fellow?* I hope I need ſay no more on this; nor ſure on that which he next adds, that *if the perſon have not the gift of continence, it is then not only good but neceſſary for him to marry*; for he knows, that as S. *Paul* ſpake of him that had that *gift*, when he ſaith he doth *better*, ſo I that only cited S. *Pauls* words, muſt be reſolved to ſpeak alſo. But as long as of him that hath that *gift*, i. e. hath *power* of his own *will*, it is true, that if he *marry*, he *doth well*, i. e. *ſinneth not*, but yet *doth better* if he do *not marry*, it is evident that I have all that I pretend to, and certainly this is *given* me by S. *Pauls* words. 53.

To my ſecond *argument* that *the beſt being ſuperlative, ſuppoſes the poſitive to be good*, he *replies* [*I hope the Doctor will not deny but works done by Faith are good, and yet that they are not perfect in this life*, i. e. *come ſhort of what we are bound to by the Goſpel, will he now ſay they are evil?*] I *anſwer*, I will not ſay they are *evil*, but they are *good*, though not *perfect* from all poſſible mixture of *ſin*. And what now he can *gain* from this his *queſtion* thus anſwered by me, as he expects I ſhould anſwer it, it will not be eaſie for any man to *imagine*; For ſure, this is the *confirming*, not the *diſproving* of my *argument*; For by his own ſetting it, it is *manifeſt*, that thoſe things are not *evil*, which yet are capable of a *greater perfection*, and then the *perfection* being the *ſuperlative*, the *poſitive* is ſuppoſed to be *good*, and not *evil*; and yet *evil* it muſt have been, if every thing which is inferiour to the moſt *perfect*, were *ſin*, or if the *higheſt perfection* were under *Precept*. 54.

What he adds out of *Gregory*, that *all humane juſtice is convinced to be injuſtice, if it be ſtrictly judged*] is firſt *contrary* to his former *queſtion* to me [*will he now ſay they are evil?*] whatſoever the *Doctor* think, the *Diatribiſt* it ſeems will ſay they are *convinced to be injuſtice*, and that, I muſt ſuppoſe, is *evil*, (and is not this great *inconſtancy* in him?) Secondly, It is of no force againſt my *pretenſions*; for when I ſaid, ſuch a thing is *good*, and another *beſt*, I never meant that either of them is not *convincible by Gods ſtrict judgment to have ſome mixture of evil*, but that the *evil* which is or may be *adherent* to it in ſome other reſpect (as of all *humane* actions is acknowledged) being pardoned by *God* in *Chriſt*, the *lower degree* being *good*, i. e. an act of *obedience* to *Chriſts command*, that which is *higher* and ſo *better* than that, may yet be ſomewhat which he hath *not commanded*, and ſo ſtill a נדבה in a *Chriſtian*. And thus much on occaſion of the ſeveral *degrees*, and paſſages of my *anſwer* to the *firſt objection*, which I foreſaw, that which was taken from the *conſideration* of what *Prudence* might *adviſe* and ſeem to *require* of us; which hath proved a *buſineſs* of ſome length. 55.

SECT. IX.

My anſwer to a ſecond ſort of objection, vindicated. Loving God with all the heart. Adam's *love in innocency capable of degrees. Perfect love that caſts out fear, to be had in this life. Chriſt more intenſe in prayer at one time than another, an argument that all is not ſin that is leſs than the higheſt.*

TO the ſecond *objection* from thoſe large *comprehenſive* words, *Thou ſhalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart*, &c. I anſwer'd thus; that that phraſe [*with all*, &c.] denoted only two things, Firſt, The *ſincerity* of this *Love* of *God*, as oppoſed to *partial*, *divided love*, (to which I now add for farther explication, that what we do according to the *precepts* of *Gods Law*, we do out of *love* toward *God*, not *hypocritically*, or as by *conſtraint*;) and ſecondly, not admitting *any thing elſe* into *competition* with him; this *ſincere love* of *God*, mean while being capable of *degrees*, ſo *that it is very poſſible for two men to love God with all the heart, and yet one to love him more intenſely than another* (as was *exemplified* among the very *Angels*) nay for the *ſame* perſon, which ſo *loves* him, to *love* him, and expreſs that *love* more *intenſely* at one time than another, as appeared by the *example* of *Chriſt*, *Lu.* 22. 44. *Numb.* 1.

Now to this he replies; that *theſe two are there required, but not only theſe, but perfect love, ſuch as caſts out fear*, 1 Joh. 4. 18. *ſuch as was in Adam in innocency*; To which I need ſay no more than what hath formerly been ſaid, that even that *perfect love* which was in *Adam* in *innocence*, conſiſted not in any *indiviſible* point, but had a *latitude*, and conſequently ſeveral *degrees* of that *perfect love*. But then withal it muſt be remembred, that the *perfect love*, 1 *Joh.* 4. 18. is not all one with that which *Adam* had in *innocence*, for that he confeſſeth is not *acquirable* in this *life*, whereas the *love* in S^t *John* that 2.

caſts

casts out fear, is in every *Confessor*, and *Martyr* for *Christ*, and is elsewhere styled, ἀγάπη ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ, *love of Christ in sincerity*, *Eph.* 6. 24. in the notion wherein *perfection* is all one with *sincerity*; But then this also is capable of *degrees*, one *Martyr* or *Confessor* may be more *zealous*, and express more *intense* and *fervent love*, than another doth.

3. What he adds, and confirms out of *Hierom*, was in one part answered before, and must not now be repeated; As for the other, it may *answer* it self, one part being directly *contrary*, if not *contradictory* to the other; For when he hath *admitted* and *allowed* of the *supposition*, that *sincere love is capable of degrees either in one man at several times, or in two men at the same time, and so both obey the precept*, yet, saith he, *those degrees argue love not to be perfect, and so far faulty in vitio*,] But sure if those of whom the *supposition* is made, do *both obey* the *precept*, then they do not *offend* against it; if they do not *offend* against it, then is not this *faulty*, or in *vitio*, for sure every *fault* or *vice* must be a *transgression* of the *Law*. The evidence of the matter may, it seems, extort some few words of *truth* from a *gainsayer*, though to acknowledge it *intirely* and *constantly*, it must not be expected.

4. In the next place he passeth to the inforcement of my *argument* from what we read concerning *Christ* himself, that he was *more intense in prayer at one time than another*, when yet the *lower degree* was sure no *sin*; and prepares to make *answer* to it, viz. that *Christ was above the Law, and did more than the Law required, but men fall short many degrees of what is required.*

5. But sure this *answer* is nothing to the matter now in *hand*, for the evidencing of which, that *example* of *Christ* was brought by me, viz. that *sincere love* is capable of *degrees*; This was first shewed in *several* men, and in the *same* man at *several* times, in the *several* ranks of *Angels*, and at last in *Christ himself*, more *ardent* in *one* act of *prayer* than in *another*; wherein what is affirmed of *Christ* is common to *Angels* and *men*, and so still may be, though he *differ* from them in other things, to wit, that he is *perfect* and never *sins*, though men be *imperfect* and *faulty*, the *best* of them; For still it must be remembred, that it is not the *sinless perfection* we speak of, when we say it consists in a *latitude*, and hath *degrees*, but *sincerity* of this or that *virtue*, expresst in this or that *performance*, and as this, though it excludes not all *mixture* of *sin* in the *suppositum* (the man in whom it is) yet may by the *grace* of *God* in *Christ* exclude it in this or that *act* (for it is certain that I may in an *act* of *mercy*, give as much as any *Law obligeth* me to give, and so, not *sin* in giving *too little*) so to this, his *answer* belongs not at all, nor shews any *difference* or *reason* why such *sincerity* may not in any *pious Christian*, be capable of *degrees*, as well as in *Christ* himself, and the *lowest* of them be *sinless*, and all the *Superior*, *voluntary oblations*, more than the *strict Law required* of us.

6. Suppose a man should in one *ejaculation*, pray to *God sincerely* and *ardently*, to *avert* an *evil* from him, I shall ask whether he commit any *sin* in respect of *ardency*? If it be answered, yes, he doth, in case it be *possible* for him, or any man else, or *Adam* in *Paradise*, to pray more *ardently*, I shall then hope I shall have refuted his *answer*, by the *example* of *Christ*, who when he *prayed ardently*, did not *sin*, though he *fell short* of that *higher degree*, which after that we find he *used*.

7. As for that which *alone he adds* in this matter, that the *example* of *Christ holds forth, that great pressures call for inlargements of affections, not as voluntary oblations, but as duties.* I shall only ask, whether they did so call for that very *degree* of *inlargement*, which *Christ* at *last* used; If it did not, then it seems this *addition* was little to the *purpose*; If he shall say it did, then how could he even now say, that *Christ* did *supererogate* in this *particular*, and that it was not *appliable* to *men*?

SECT. X.

My answer to the last objection, of Supererogation. A place in S. Cyprian *vindicated from the Romanists reading. Imputare. An act of mercy in God that our works are rewarded. Supererogation wherein it consists. The Diatribist's Etymology of the word disproved. Erogare. Erogatio. The Diatribists ways of Supererogating. Pride, Glorying. More reward for eminent uncommanded excellencies superadded to duty. The Diatribsts charity, and confession of us. His censure of the Bishops unjust.*

Numb. 1. NOW follows my *answer* to the last *objection*, freeing this doctrin of *voluntary oblations*, or of doing somewhat which is *free* and *uncommanded*, from all *lyableness* to the *suspicion* of being *favourable* to the doctrine of *Supererogation* among the *Romanists*, which is founded in their *opinion* that a man may by these *performances* make *satisfaction* for his *own* and *other* mens *sins*, which I that no way believe or acknowledge, cannot be charged as guilty of that *opinion*.

2. And to what is there said, I must suppose with some *evidence*, §. 51, 52, 53. I shall here add, and apply one considerable saying of S. *Cyprian's* in the *Epistle* ad *Lapsos*, telling them that *Qui in Ecclesiâ semper glorioſe & granditer operati sunt, opus ſuum Domino nunquam imputaverunt*, *Those which have through all times wrought gloriously and heroically in the Church, yet never thought their Master beholden to them.* That is the meaning of *imputare*, to *reckon* their *layings* out, and charge him with whom they *reckon*, to be in their *debt*. For want of understanding of which (or from some *worse* principle) the latter *edition* of S. *Cyprian* by *Pamelius* leaves out the word [*nunquam*, *never*] which the *old* Basil *edition* doth retain, and the sense evidently requires in that place.

3. By this (which is my *full* sense in this matter) and by what is already said in that *treatise*, that *objection* is wholly *superseded*; for I do not pretend that *God* becomes a *debtor* to any man for any of his most *bountiful spontaneous oblations* but that 'tis an act of *infinite mercy* in *God*, as the *Psalmist* saith, that any the most *excellent work* of ours is *rewardable* with him. And that *partly* because we being *sinners*, the utmost we can ever do, can never make *satisfaction* for our *sins*; and partly because whatsoever *degree* of *perfection* either by *doing* or *suffering* we can aspire to, *First*, It is still a *work* of *God's* good *grace* and *strength* in us, (for *what hast thou, which thou hast not received?* and then, what place for *glorying?*) and *Secondly*, It is in no *degree* meet or *worthy* to be *compared*, bears no

proportion

proportion to the *glory which ſhall be revealed*; and partly again, becauſe *God* wants neither our *obedience*, nor our richeſt *performances*, we only are like to receive the *benefit* of them, and ſo we only are *debtors* to *our ſelves*, and can claim nothing from him, ſave only on the *account* of *meer mercy*.

Now in his reply, the firſt thing that he *objects*, is, that this *diſtinction* betwixt *doing more than is* 4.
commanded, *and doing ſomething which is not commanded*, *is new*, *and ſometimes co-incident*, *for he* (ſaith he) *that doth ſomewhat not commanded*, *doth alſo ſomewhat more than is commanded.* And becauſe he cannot but know my notion there, of *doing* ſomething *more*, viz. *doing all*, and *more* than all, he therefore preſſeth it farther, that in this ſenſe the *Romaniſts in their ſupererogation do not ſuppoſe that he which ſupererogates hath done all that is commanded him.*

To this I anſwer, by yielding that the *Romaniſt* is not ſo *groſs*, as to affirm him that *ſupererogates*, 5.
not to have *ſinned*, And therefore I never defined that to be the *Romaniſts* doctrine, or that our *doctrine* was by that one *diſtinction*, *differenced* from theirs, but having by way of *foundation* laid that *diſtinction* (as will appear to any that ſhall view the place, Section 51.) I make the notion of *ſupererogation* to be founded in *one* of theſe *two*, either in having *paid all* that is *due* (*i. e.* having *never ſinned*) or ſecondly (having been a *debter*, i. e. *a ſinner*) in *paying* that *debt* by *ſatisfaction*; And the *latter* of theſe two it was, and not the *former*, wherein I placed the *Romaniſts opinion*, and wherein I conceived the *doctrine* of *freewill oblations* under the *Goſpel* to differ from their *doctrine* of *ſupererogating*, as appears Section 52. And this he ſees, and ſets down in his next words; It was but the *multiplying* of my *lines*, and his *own*, that he could not *earlier* take notice of it.

To this ſecond then at length after ſome *proœme* he will proceed; that *ſtill I cannot free my doctrine* 6.
from ſome kind of ſupererogation, *for*, ſaith he, *ſuch works have not their denomination from ſatisfaction made by them*, *but they are therefore called ſatisfactions*, *becauſe they are ſomething more than the law required*, *ſupererogare is as much as ſuper quod erogavit lex.*

By this at length appears what *bottom* all this *Diatribiſts* ſtructure is built on, the extraordinary *ety-* 7.
mology which his *fancy*, or ſomewhat elſe hath *ſuggeſted* to him, of the word *ſupererogation*, which if it ſhould hold, I (after all this debate thus far prolonged) am obliged to *yield* the *cauſe* to the *Diatribiſt*, thus far at leaſt, that I were a friend to one *word* made uſe of by the *Romaniſts*. But I am ſo well aſſured of this *Diatribiſts* failings in this kind, by the experience of his *ſuper ſtatutum*, from whence he would have *ſuperſtition* deduced (and loſt his chief hold, when that *origination* of the word was wreſted from him) that I may be allowed again to *queſtion* his skill in that *faculty*. That *erogare* ſignifies to *lay out* (and not to *require*) is evident enough; *erogare pecuniam in claſſem*, *to lay out money upon the navy*, is *Cicero's* phraſe, *pro* Flacco; *erogare pecunias ex ærario*, in his *Oration in Vatinium*; *erogare in oleum*, in *Plinie*, *Ep.* 240. joined with *conferre in operibus balnei*, *unde in eos ſumptus pecunia erogaretur*, in *Livie* l. 1. and the *ſubſtantive*, *erogatio*, for *expending* or *laying out*, *erogatio pecuniæ* in *Cicero ad Atticum* l. 15. 32. *Tot impendiis*, *tot erogationibus*, ſaith *Pliny* in his *Panegyrick*, and in *Suetonius* 'tis explained by *largitio*, and *profuſio pecuniarum.*

And accordingly, *ſupererogo* is to *lay out all* and *more*, and from the *opinion* of *pious* mens doing ſo, 8.
the *Romaniſts* have clearly raiſed their *treaſure* of the *Church*, as the *bank* into which theſe *payments* are made. I could not have expected that there ſhould be any *queſtion* made of this; As it is, I hope this will ſatisfie it. And then alas, what a *remote*, *unhappy etymologie* hath this *Diatribiſt* fallen on, *ſupererogare* is as much as *ſuper quod erogavit lex!* Had he been pleaſed to have *engliſhed* this *latine*, the miſtake had been too viſible, and therefore that was *more prudently omitted*; For what can *erogavit* ſignifie in that *period* of his? *Required?* (ſo he renders it in the following *period*, *works*, ſaith he, *may be ſaid ſupererogare*, *when men think they have done more than the law required.*) But firſt, that is in no wiſe the meaning of the word, as hath already been manifeſted; Secondly, Whatſoever it ſhall be reſolved to ſignifie, yet in this way of *etymology*, the *erogavit* belongs to the *law*, whereas we know in the uſe of the word among all *Romiſh* writers, it is the man or the works (not the *law*) which *erogates*, i. e. *lays out* his *money*, *pains*, *life*, &c. and proportionably, which *ſupererogates*. Thirdly, (and which is yet more groſs) the *ſuper* muſt in this *etymologie* be aſſigned to the *man*, as the *erogating* to the *law*, and ſo the one word be *divided* betwixt them, the *law* muſt be ſaid to *erogate*, the *man* to *ſuper*, and what is that? either nothing, or elſe to *ſupererogate*, and yet that he cannot do in any ſenſe wherein the *law* could be ſaid to *erogate*. Thus (beyond all either *reaſon* or *grammar*) *incongruous*, and *inconſiſtent* is this *etymology.*

And this being ſaid concerning the *nature* of the word, all that remains of his *exercitation*, being 9.
built upon this *miſtake*, is perfectly *ſuperſeded*; yet I ſhall attend him κατὰ πόδα.

In many reſpects, ſaith he, *ſuch works may be ſaid to ſupererogate*, *Firſt*, *With reſpect to the law it ſelf*, 10.
when men think they have done more than the law required, *which makes not ſupererogatory*, *but derogatory from the perfection of the law of God*, *and lays imperfection upon it* (*as the Doctor hath plainly done above.*) To this I anſwer, Firſt, That by his own *confeſſion* theſe which he now mentions, are not *ſupererogatory* works, but the *contrary*; why then doth he ſet them as a firſt inſtance of the many *reſpects* in which ſuch *works* may be ſaid to *ſupererogate?* Secondly, When he knows, that that *treatiſe* of mine, on which he *exerciſes* his *diſcipline*, doth not defend the thinking a mans ſelf to do *more than the law requires*, but preciſely (in *diſtinction* from that) to *do ſomewhat which the law doth not require*, why ſhould he ſtill *confound* things thus *ſevered*, and lay that to my charge which he knows I am not *guilty* of? Thirdly, There is no truth in his *ſuggeſtion*, that this *doctrine* as it is taught by me, is *derogatory* to, or layes *imperfection to the law of God.*

For if by the *law* of *God*, he mean the *Moſaical law*, then though from *Chriſts* own words I con- 11.
clude that he came to *fill* it *up*, or *perfect* it, and ſo that it had in it before *vacuities* and *imperfections*, yet the *doctrine* of the *treatiſe* of *Will-worſhip*, is no way founded or concerned in that; As for the *law* of *Chriſt*, under which, as well as under the *law* of the *Jews*, ſome things are left *free* and *uncommanded* (and conſequently I affirm it poſſible for a *Chriſtian* to do ſomething which is *not commanded* him) I never accuſed that of *imperfection*, but do without all *doubting* ſuppoſe it to be a *perfect codex* of *commands*, to which *God* will never add more; and when I have done ſo, I found this doctrine of the *Chriſtians voluntary oblations*, in this *perfection* (not *imperfection*) of this *law*, viz. that even

in

in the *greateſt perfection* there is a *latitude*, and the *higher degrees* of that *latitude* are not under *precept*.

12. A ſecond way of *ſupererogating* he mentions in *reſpect to other men, as the Phariſee that ſaid with ſcorn and pride enough, I am not like other men, I faſt twice a week*, &c. To this I *anſwer*, firſt, that this as little belongs to the *true*, as it doth to his *falſe* notion of *ſupererogating*. For in neither of them doth the *ſuper* include or *intimate ſuperiority above other men*; and ſecondly, that he that thus *ſcorns* and *exalts* himſelf above *other* men, is far from doing *more* herein than is *commanded*; 'tis evident he comes ſhort of very *duty* in an *eminent* moſt *rewardable virtue*, that of *humility*, wherein he that ſtrives not to *exceed* as much, and more, as in any *voluntary oblations*, 'tis evident that he is no *good Chriſtian*, and I never undertook to plead for ſuch *Phariſees*, but of all others, think *Chriſtians* obliged to uſe all *diligence* to avert this *ſhipwrack*.

13. And yet thirdly the *Apoſtle* himſelf both by his *doctrine* and *practice*, allows of a καύχησις, that ſignifies literally a *glorying*, but it is certainly an *humble rejoicing*, in having done things which he knows are *eminently acceptable* to *God*, and elſewhere, *rejoicing in his own work*; and as this is no way *increaſable* to a *Chriſtian*, by comparing it with *other* mens *defects* or ἀτήματα, for his *charity* makes him *paſſionately* wiſh, and his *humility* really think all others *better* than *himſelf*, ſo it is very far from that *ſcorn* and *pride* in all *Phariſees*, which makes them *diſcriminate* themſelves from other men.

14. The third way he mentions is, *with reſpect to the over-pleaſing and acceptance of God, when they that think they can do ſomething not commanded, expect to find more acceptance from God than they themſelves or other do for doing only what is commanded.* To this I anſwer, Firſt, That ſtill this is nothing to the notion of the word *ſupererogating*, (which ſure ſignifies not *over-pleaſing.*) Secondly, That if one *caution* be taken in, *viz.* that *uncommanded works* can never *ſatisfie* for *diſobediences*, and conſequently that it is perfect *impiety* and *folly* to neglect any *duty*, on one ſide, and then to think to *compenſate* that, by doing more than is *commanded*, on the other ſide: If, I ſay, this *caution* be premiſed, and proportionably, the *earlyeſt* and *principalleſt* care be taken to ſecure *duty*, to make good *obedience*, it cannot be amiſs in the *next* place to ſuperadd this other care of the moſt *eminent heroical* (*uncommanded*) performances, and he that ſhall have obſerved this *method* uprightly, *eſchewed evil*, in a ſtrict *mortifying* of *luſts*, &c. in *abſtaining* from *ſin*, and doing all that is commanded (as,

> *Virtus eſt vitium fugere, & Sapientia prima*
> *Stultitiâ caruiſſe* ———)

and whenſoever he hath *failed*, ſecured his *retreat* by an early *humiliation*, *confeſſion*, begging of *pardon* in *Chriſt*, and *ſincere reformation*, and then *laboured* induſtriouſly to *ſuperſtruct doing* of *good* works of the more *eminent* (I mean *uncommanded*) *degrees* of *virtue*, I ſhall not doubt to incourage him, to think *confidently*, and *expect* from our great βεβαιωτὴς and ἀγωνοθέτης, *more* and *greater acceptance* (I ſhall add, *reward* alſo) than the *ſame* perſon could in reaſon expect for doing only what is *commanded*.

15. And though it be not beſt for him in this caſe to *compare* himſelf with *other* men, the poſſible *hazard* of that, *exemplified* by the *Phariſee*, perſwading the *contrary*, yet of the truth of the *ſucceſs*, there is no reaſon to make *queſtion*, or *ſuſpect*, but that of *two* men which have been *equal* in *obediences*, one *exceeding* the other in *acts* of *uncommanded perfection*, the more *perfect* ſhall have the *richeſt reward*, as is moſt evident whether by conſidering the *degrees* of *glory* in *heaven*, or the *rule* by which *God diſtributes* them ſtill under the *Goſpel*, by way of *reward* to every man, *ſecundum opera, according to his works*.

16. What he adds of *Papiſts thinking they can merit with God by ſuch works for themſelves and others, though ours*, ſaith he, *are not come ſo far yet*] is an eſſay of his *charitable opinion* of us; and I ſhall take it by the beſt *handle* I can, and *conclude* from it, then, by his own confeſſion, we are not *Papiſts yet*, and then I do not (after all that *tract* of *Will-worſhip*) maintain *works* of *Supererogation yet*; and then I need only add, that 'tis no way uſeful for him to loſe his *pains* and his *charity* by *confuting* thoſe, of whom he only *divineth*, that they *may hereafter* fall into *falſe doctrine*, which yet I hope I ſhall not do, having no *temptation* from all this *Diatribiſt's Exercitation*, and the *arguments* therein contained, to fly to any other *Sect* of *Religion* to furniſh my ſelf with *anſwers* for him.

17. What now remains in the ſhutting up this ſecond *Exercitation*, is wholly ſpent either in proving it to be my *doctrine* (which I willingly and expreſly grant it to be) that the *voluntary oblations are more acceptable and rewardable with God*, or in repeating his own ſenſe, *the more voluntary the more abominable* (wherein it ſeems we are already at diſtance enough, a man need not fly to the *Papiſts doctrine* of *Supererogation*, to make the *breach* the *wider*) or in *charging* on this *doctrine*, that it makes *Superſtitious Will-worſhippers and Formaliſts to overlook others with abundance of contempt and inſolence*, adding *Characters*, by which we may diſcern who they are to whom he is pleaſed to *affix* theſe titles.

18. To which my *anſwer* is, Firſt, With S^t *Paul*, *Rom.* 14. that as thoſe which *freely* do thoſe things which others account *unlawful*, ought not to *deſpiſe* thoſe which *do* them *not*; ſo on the other ſide, thoſe which *do* them *not*, ought in no wiſe to *judge* or *condemn* thoſe which *do* them; and conſequently, that if our *Biſhops*, whom he ſeems to *tranſlate*, thoſe who did *overlook* others, had really been *guilty* of *contempt* and *inſolence* toward them, yet had not this been more *criminous* in them, more contrary to St. *Paul's* direction, than this which is here *viſible* in this *Diatribiſt*, in calling them *Superſtitious Will-worſhippers*, and *Formaliſts*, which firſt preſumes all uſe of *uncommanded ceremonies* to be *Superſtition* firſt, and then *Formality*; and ſo is a *double untruth*; and ſecondly charges thoſe two great *ſins* upon his own *Lawful Superiours*, and ſo is a double *uncharitableneſs*, attended with *diſobedience* to, and *ſeparation* from them: I delight not now to compare theſe *ſins*, and affirm, which is more *culpable*; If his own plain words or *conſcience* do not accuſe this *Diatribiſt* in any of theſe, neither ſhall I *accuſe* him, but rather implore *God's pardon* for him; And only add ſecondly, That I have reaſon to *hope* and *believe* that the *Governours* of our *Church*, and thoſe who lately *preſided* in it, did not make

their

their own *voluntary performances*, the *foundation* or *occaſion* of any degree of *contempt* or *inſolence* towards others which uſed them not; If any did, I neither *intended* nor now *deſign* any *defence* for them: And ſo much for the *Second Exercitation*.

CHAP. VII.

Of Chriſtmaſs and other Feſtivals.

SECT. I.

The obſervance which is due to the Cuſtom of a Church. The Teſtimonies of Ambroſe, *and* Auguſtine, *and* Iſidore.

IN our entrance on the diſcourſe of *Feſtivals*, I had thought that the *cuſtomary practice* of the *univerſal Church* of *Chriſt*, and particularly the *perpetual immemorial uſage* of the *Church* of *England*, continued, as far as we can *diſcern*, from the *firſt plantation*, without any *interruption*, to the time of *writing* that *treatiſe*, might have had ſome weight with any that were not *contentious*, if it were but upon the account of S. *Pauls argument* thus drawn from the *cuſtomary practice* of the *Churches* of *God*. *Numb.* 1.

On occaſion hereof the *Diatribiſt* falls preſently into the *examination* of that place where S. *Paul* uſeth that argument 1 *Cor.* 11. 16. and inquires what inferences naturally ariſe from the words of the *Apoſtle*. But I who deſigned to conclude no more from that *reference*, but only this, that the *cuſtom* of the *Church* ought to be of ſome *force* and *weight* with any *meek ſon* of the *Church*, have no need of following him into that *inquiry*, if the looſeſt conſideration and very firſt *view* of thoſe words do not prove that, neither ſhall I farther *contend* for it. 2.

Paul argued from *cuſtom*, and I propoſed the like *argument*, and ſo made a *reference* to S. *Paul*, whoſe *example* I thus far *tranſcribed*; and if in other *reſpects* the *analogy* held not, it matters not, ſo it held in *this*, that *cuſtom* was conſiderable in *circumſtances* of *religion*, ſuch was *covering* or not *covering* the *head* in the ſervice of *God* there, and ſuch is the *obſervation* of a *Feſtival* here; And this is all that I need reply to his *Firſt Section*. 3.

Yet I ſhall *ex abundanti* add one or two *teſtimonies* for the confirming the *weakeſt* part of that conſideration, viz. the *reaſonableneſs* of complying with, (ſo as not to *oppoſe*) the *cuſtoms* of any *particular Church*, though they be no more than ſo, though they pretend not to be derived from the *Apoſtles*, whether by *inſtitution* or *practice*, ſuppoſing withal that they are no way *contrary* thereto. 4.

And *Firſt*, We have the words of S. *Ambroſe*, ſufficiently known. *Ad quamcunque Eccleſiam veneritis, ejus morem ſervate, ſi pati ſcandalum non vultis aut facere*; *To whatſoever Church ye come, obſerve the cuſtom thereof, if you will neither receive nor give ſcandal.* 5.

Secondly, The (as clear) words of * S. *Auguſtine*, *Ego te illud breviter admonendum puto, traditiones Eccleſiaſticas (præſertim quæ fidei non officiunt) ita obſervandas ut à majoribus traditæ ſunt, nec aliorum conſuetudinem aliorum contrario more ſubverti. I would briefly admoniſh you, that Eccleſiaſtical traditions (eſpecially ſuch as offend not the faith) are ſo to be obſerved as they are delivered by our Anceſtors, nor muſt the cuſtom of ſome be ſubverted by the contrary cuſtom of others.* And yet higher in the ſame *Epiſtle*, *Unaquæque provincia præcepta majorum leges Apoſtolicas arbitretur*, *Let every Province eſteem the precepts of their Anceſtors as Apoſtolical Laws*, i. e. certainly, pay *obſervance* to them, though they be not of *Apoſtolical inſtitution*. So *ad Januar.* Ep. 118. *Una in his obſervationibus ſaluberrima regula tenenda eſt, ut quæ non ſunt contra fidem nec bonos mores, & habent aliquod ad exhortationem vitæ melioris, ubicunq; inſtitui videmus, vel inſtituta cognoſcimus, non ſolam non improbemus, ſed etiam laudando & imitando ſectamur, ſi aliquorum infirmitas non ita impedit ut amplius detrimentum ſit.* 6. * *Ep.* 28. *Tom.* 1. p. 69.

So *Iſidore*, l. 2. *de Eccl. Offic.* c. 43. *Nec diſciplina in his melior eſt gravi prudentique Chriſtiano, niſi ut eo modo agat quo agere viderit Eccleſiam ad quam devenerit. There is no better rule in ſuch things for a grave and prudent Chriſtian, than to do in that manner as he ſees the Church do to which he comes.* 7.

Store of *ſuffrages* might be heaped up on this *occaſion*; theſe few may ſuffice to *juſtify* all that I had ſaid in that *Firſt Section*. 8.

SECT. II.

Heathen adherents a proof of the firſt Antiquity.

THE *Second Section* had propoſed one *argument* for the *antiquity* of this *uſage* among us, founded in the *adverſaries ſuggeſtion* againſt it. The *adverſaries* generally accuſe the *Chriſtmaſs Feſtivity* for ſome *heatheniſh mixtures* retained in it; From which, if it were true, or however from the *conceſſion* of thoſe that affirmed it, I conceived an *argument* might be drawn, that therefore it was to be taken as *granted*, that this *uſage* was continued among us from the time of our *firſt converſion* from *heatheniſm*. *Numb.* 1.

2. And I cannot yet see, how this *inference* can be *avoided*; For how can any *heathen usage* adhere to this *Festivity*, if all *heathen* customs were laid aside long before this *Festival* were observed? Can it be imagined, that after the *ejecting* of *heathenism*, and the solemn *abolition* of all their *feasts*, *Saturnalia* and the like, when *Christianity* had gotten the *possession*, there should still continue among them those *adherent rites* of their *Heathen Feasts*, so many *accidents* without their *subjects*? Or that *Christians* that had long since renounced *heathenism*, and at length received this *Christian feast*, should ransack their *heathen rituals* for *ceremonies* wherewith to *adorn* it?

3. But this, it seems, is of no force, or (as he saith) *no way constringent* with this *Diatribist*; *For* saith he, *they might be added some good while after the first conversion of some part of this Island, the better to win the rest to a liking of Christian religion, by conforming to them in the celebration of festivals. As the like was done to win the Jews in observing the old Sabbath, Pentecost*, &c.

4. But sure there is little force in this *evasion*; For *First*, It is by this *answer* confest that as to *some parts* of this *Island*, my argument is of *force*, and that in those, this *festival* was introduced as *early* as their *Christianity*; and if that may be granted me, I shall contend for no more by this *medium*, but think I have gained a very fair confession for the *antiquity* of this *usage* in this *Church*, that this *festivity* was thus *early* introduced among us, even as soon, if not before *Christianity* had gotten *possession* of this *whole Nation*.

5. Meanwhile, that the *Nation* was not converted the several parts of it together, I mean not every person of every part, but some of all) or that there was any such *interstitium* or *interval* considerable betwixt the *conversion* of *some* part of this *Island* and the rest of it, this is incumbent on the *Diatribist* to prove, or else the *argument* remains in full force to the whole *Nation*, as well as to any *part* of it. And for this, he hath offered no proof, and so hath yielded the force of my *argument*, when he went about to *refute* it.

6. *Secondly*, The example of the *Christians* complying with the *Jews*, will stand him in as little stead; for when was it, that the *Christians* thus complied with the *Jews*, or that they retain'd their old *sabbath*, out of that design of compliance with them? Was it not at the *time* of the *first conversion* of the *Jews* to *Christianity*? Can it be imagined that the *Jews* were a *good while before converted* to the *faith*, and to the *doctrine* of the *abolition* of the *sabbath*, and then, some *good while after* that their *conversion*, the *observation* of their *sabbath* should be reduced, *ex postliminio*?

7. Would not this be a *constringent* argument to any gainsayer, to prove that *baptism* was introduced at the first *beginnings* of *Christianity*, because *baptism* is known to be a *custom* taken from the *Jews*? And so sure of the *sabbath*, and the like; If any space or *interval* had come in after the *planting* of *Christianity* among the *Jews*, it is no way probable that the *sabbath* once laid aside, as a *ceremony nail'd to the cross of Christ*, would ever after have been *recalled*, and observed among *Christians*; only at the *first conversion* or *plantation* of the *faith*, such things might from the *Jewish state adhere* unto the *Christian*, though they were not taught by *Christianity*, and so some others from the *heathen* also, tis possible and imaginable; but tis no way supposeable *after* the space of *many* years, when *heathenism* with all its *rites* and *adherents* had long ago been cast out.

8. And let this serve for his *second Section*, The matter is not so weighty (being but an *argumentum ad homines*) as to deserve any greater *length* of *discourse* to *vindicate* it.

SECT. III.

Of Crescens *coming into* France, *and* Simon Zelotes *into* England. *The difference of keeping* Easter *in the* West *and* East. *Testimonies for our conversion in the Apostles times, Before King* Lucius. *The* Diatribists *suggestion disproved.* Britain *not converted from* Rome.

Numb. 1. CONcerning the *first planting* of *Christianity* in this *Nation* by some *Apostle* or *Apostolical* person, what was said with competent probability out of our *histories*, is considered by the *Diatribist* in the next place, but nothing said or offered to be proved by him, which may exact *answer* from me, the whole matter especially being but a πάρεργον to the business of *Festivals*: only some passages of his, must be *shortly* noted.

2. As *First*, When from my saying that *Crescens his being in* France, *removes all improbability from those histories, that record the plantation of Christianity in these Islands in the Apostles times*] he seems to believe it my opinion that *Crescens came over hither*, (*for so*, saith he, *the Doctor would have it, and proves it out of Scripture*) which very thing he knows I absolutely disclaim, and only conclude it as *credible*, that some other *Apostle* or *Apostolical* person should so early come over hither and plant the *Faith*, as that *Crescens*, should come into *France* in S. *Pauls* days, which yet the *French* generally believe that he did, and have received it by *tradition*, and the words of *Scripture* may very fitly be so interpreted as to affirm it (and I do not believe that *Estius* hath, or that this *Diatribist* can demonstrate the *contrary*, I am sure he hath here produced nothing toward it, but the bare name of *Estius*)

3. That *Joseph* of *Arimathea*, or *Simon Zelotes*, was the person that first *planted* the *faith* here, I receive from our *Stories* by *tradition*, and accordingly satisfy my self therewith, and never attribute it to *Crescens* or any other, but particularly express my reasons why I cannot imagine it to be *Crescens*, and therefore am very much *misreported* in this matter.

4. All that I had to do with *Crescens* in that place was this, that from the *authority* of the relations of *Crescens*'s coming so early into *France*, I thought I might conclude against the *improbability* of *Josephs* or *Simons* coming hither, the latter being perfectly as *credible* as the *former*, and the *passage* from *France* to *England* so *short* and *easy*, that there can be no *difficulty* or *disparity* in the matter, that one should be believed by the *French*, and the other be *incredible* to us. This was set down intelligibly enough in that treatise, if the *Diatribists* haste or somewhat else had not cast the cloud over it.

Secondly,

Secondly, when from the *time* of celebrating *Eaſter anciently* in this *Nation*, I conclude that neither *Peter* nor *Paul* nor *Creſcens* did *firſt* bring the *Faith* into this *Iſland*, and the *Diatribiſt* thinks he hath thereby gained an advantage, and that the ſame reaſon is of force againſt *Joſeph* and *Simon Ztlotes* alſo, this is an evident *miſtake* in him. For it is ſufficiently known, that as the *Weſtern* cuſtom of keeping *Eaſter* was deduced from S. *Peter* and S. *Paul*, ſo the contrary *Eaſtern* obſervation pretended to *tradition* from other *Apoſtles*, particularly from S. *John*. Now, as to the former of theſe it is conſequent, that none of the *aſſociates* or attendants of S. *Paul* or S. *Peter* were the *planters* of the *Faith* here (and ſo not *Creſcens*, who was ſuch, 2 *Tim.* 4. 11.) becauſe of thoſe it is not imaginable that they ſhould *vary* from the cuſtom received from thoſe two *Apoſtles*, as 'tis apparent the *firſt Chriſtians* here did, in the *celebrating* of *Eaſter*; ſo it is no way concluſible of all others, which related not to thoſe *two Apoſtles*, and ſuch I ſuppoſe *Joſeph* and *Simon Zelotes* were, it being very poſſible that either of theſe might comply with the *Jewiſh* account, and accord with S. *John*, and the *Eaſtern* Church in this *celebration*. 5.

And accordingly as by this *indication* it appears, that the words of *Metaphraſtes* concerning *Simon Peters preaching* the *faith*, and *conſtituting Churches*, &c. in *Britain* in the 12. of *Nero*, cannot be deemed to have truth in them, ſo if it may be ſuppoſed that *Metaphraſtes*, receiving his *intelligence* from ſome more *ancient author* or *tradition*, miſtook *Simon Peter* for *Simon Zelotes*, I ſee not what could be objected againſt the *probability* of the relation, either in reſpect of the perſon of that *Simon*, who is by very good Authors deemed to have been the *planter* of the *faith* here, or in reſpect of the *earlineſs* of *the plantation*, in or before the 12. of *Nero*, i.e. within 34 years after *Chriſts aſcenſion*. 6.

To this matter of the *antiquity* of the *faith* in this *Iſland*, and that particularly by this *Simon Zelotes*, I ſhall now add ſome *few* conſiderations: Firſt out of the * words of *Theodoret* in his *Therapeut. Ser.* 9. περὶ Νόμων, where having compared the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, under the title of † ἡμέτεροι ἁλιεῖς καὶ τελῶναι *our Fiſher-men and Publicans*, with the *Lawgivers* of the *Grecians* and *Romans*, he affirms that whereas theſe latter did not *perſwade* or gain upon *their next neighbours to live according to their laws*, *thoſe former wrought upon not only* Grecians *and* Romans, *but* ἅπαντα τὰ βαρβάρων τάγματα, *all the nations of the Barbarians* (among which we know the *Britains* were vulgarly contained) *and brought them to embrace the Evangelical law*; and if this be yet too *general*, he then adds the enumeration of the *ſeverals*, and among them by name ſpecifies the *Britains*, οἱ ὑπὲρ ἡμέτεροι ἁλιεῖς, καὶ οἱ τελῶναι, καὶ ὁ σκηνοβόμος ἅπασιν ἀνθρώποις τὸν εὐαγγελικὸν πρεσβεύσασι τρόπον καὶ ὁ μόνον Ῥωμαίους καὶ ὑπὸ τούτοις τελοῦντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ Σκυθικὰ καὶ τὰ Σαυρομάτικὰ ἔθνη, καὶ Ἴνδους καὶ Αἰθίοπας, καὶ Πέρσας, καὶ Σῆρας, καὶ Τζκάνους καὶ Βακτριανοὺς καὶ Βρεττανοὺς, καὶ Κιμβρους, καὶ Γερμανούς, καὶ ἁπαξαπλῶς πᾶν ἔθνος καὶ γένος ἀνθρώπων διδάξαντα τὸν σταυρωθέντος τοὺς νόμους ἀνέπεισαν. A clear teſtimony that the *Apoſtles* themſelves in *perſon* paid this *obedience* to *Chriſts* command of *going to all nations*, none excepted, and that with ſome kind of *ſucceſs* every where, particularly here in *Brittain*. 7. * *See Sir H. Spelman De Exord. Chriſt. Rel. in Brit. p. 2.* † *p.* 123. *p.* 125.

Secondly, From the expreſs words of * *Nicephorus Calliſtus*, who ſetting down the *ſeveral* plantations of the *Apoſtles*, hath theſe words of *Simon Zelotes*, Μετὰ γὰρ τὸν ἐπιφοίτησιν τοῦ παναγίου πνεύματος ἀποδημίησιν, Αἰγύπτῳ, Κυρήνῃ τε καὶ τῇ Ἀφρικῇ προσβαλὼν Μαυρεταν[illegible], καὶ ὅσον ἡ Λιβύης ὅση, τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ διαδρομὼν, καὶ πρὸς Ἑσπέριον Ὠκεανὸν εἰσβαλὼν καὶ τὰς Βρεττανικὰς νήσους εὐαγγελισάμενος πολλοῖς τε σημείοις καὶ θαυμάτων ἐπιδείξεσι, θεολογίᾳ τε καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ χρησάμενος ὡς χρεὼν ἀνυμνήσας, ἀπείρους ἔτι θλίψεων ἐξελαθεὶς τέλος καὶ τοῦτο ἡ διὰ σταυροῦ θάνατον, ἀλύκτῳ τινὶ χαρᾷ εἰσδεξάμενος, πρὸς ἃ αὐτὸν διδάσκαλον μετεχώρησεν. *After the coming of the holy Ghoſt upon him, he betook himſelf to* Ægypt, *and* Cyrene, *and* Africk, *and paſſing through* Mauritania *and* Libya *in the preaching of the Goſpel, and adventuring on the* Weſtern *Ocean, and preaching the Goſpel to the* Britiſh *Iſlands, and depredicating Chriſt as was needful both by many ſigns and wonders, and by divinity and doctrine, and being tried with many afflictions, at laſt with endleſs joy embracing the death of the croſs he departed to his Maſter.* Which laſt paſſage of his *death*, that it belonged to theſe *Iſlands* alſo, is affirmed by *Dorotheus*, who adds that he was *ſlain* and *buried* here, and thereto accord the *Greek Liturgies* in their *Menology*, though *Baronius* and others diſſent in that particular of his *death*. 8. * *Hiſt. Eccl. l.* 2. *c.* 40.

Thirdly, That *Gildas Brito* or *Badonicus*, who affirms that *Chriſt* was preached to *Britanny* (under the name of *glaciali frigore rigenti Inſulæ*) *ſummo* Tiberii Cæſaris, in the laſt *year of* Tiberius Cæſar, *i. e.* in the *fifth* year after *Chriſts reſurrection*, is by Sir *Hen. Spelman* cited as *author gravis & eximiæ fidei, a grave author and of great fidelity*, anciently ſtiled *Sapiens*, *The wiſe*, and ſo agreeing with theſe former *teſtimonies*, may deſerve to be heeded by us, and not caſt off, as by the *Diatribiſt* he is, magiſterially dictating, that his *affirmation* was *meer tradition and far from probability*, but not adding the leaſt proof of it, but only that *no authors of any credit lay it ſo high*, with what truth, doth now competently appear, and is yet farther confirmed by a former *teſtimony* brought by Mr. *Fox* out of *Gildas Albanicus* in his Book of the *victory* of *Aurelius Ambroſius*, where he affirms *Britanny* received the *Goſpel* in the reign of the *Emperor Tiberius*. To this accordeth alſo the *Vatican MS.* one of which *Baronius* placeth the reception of the *Faith* in this *Iſland* about the year 35. which is *two* years earlier than the *laſt* of *Tiberius*. 9. *p.* 107.

For *other* paſſages to the ſame *purpoſe*, eſpecially for the *relations* of *Joſeph* of *Arimathæa* in *Guil. Malmesbur.* I refer the Reader to that worthy *Antiquary*, Sir *Henry Spelman*, *de exord.* p. 4, &c. And whatever the *Diatribiſt* ſuggeſts, I ſee not indeed in any or all of this, the leaſt degree of either *impoſſibilty* or *improbability*; For of thoſe *Apoſtles* that immediately after *Chriſts aſcenſion* took their *journeys* to ſeveral *corners* of the *world*, to *publiſh* and *propagate* the *Goſpel*, what difficulty is there in believing, that in the ſpace of *four* or *five* years, ſome one either by himſelf, or by his *miſſive*, at leaſt that the *tidings* of that bleſſed *news*, ſhould find the way hither into this *Iſland*? I ſhall now add no more of this. 10.

Laſtly, when in the ſetting and tranſlating the *ſuppoſed* words of *Eleutherius* to *King Lucius*, the *Diatribiſt* chargeth me for leaving out or not tranſlating *nuper* (which the *Latine* in my *margent* retained) adding that I did it wiſely (I ſuppoſe on ſome *deſign* to aſſiſt my cauſe) and *leaving others to judge why it was done*; this is but a *calumny* all this while. 11.

For *Firſt*, having (as he acknowledges) ſet down the word *nuper* in the *margent*, that was a fair *evidence* 12.

evidence to any charitable person that there was no *treachery* designed the *Reader*, for it being certainly *foreseen* by me that my Readers would easily understand so much *Latine* as the rendring of *nuper* would amount to, I had been by any such design engaged to conceal the *Latine* also; the setting down that, was the certain way of *discovering* any such supposeable treachery, and so sure no *artifice* or *master-piece* of *wisdom* (which the *Diatribist* imputes to me) but at once an *act* and *punishment* of *folly*, such as I heartily desire may always attend such *enterprises*.

13. But I need not such *preludorie* answers as these, the matter is plain to any man that hath *eyes* in his *head*; My *English* translation was not *verbum verbo*, yet by way of *paraphrase* perfectly *answerable* to the *Latine*, the *Latine* is, *Suscepistis nuper miseratione divinâ in regno Brittanniæ legem & fidem Christi*, and the *English* is as explicite to every *minute* part of it, that *before that writing of his* (is not that the full *paraphrase* of *nuper*, without defining what is not there defined, how long, or how little while ago this was, but only *before* the *writing* of *Elutherius*'s *Epistle*) *the kingdom of* Brittain *had received by Gods mercy the law and faith of Christ*. I see there is no hope of approving my self to this *Diatribist*; If there were, I should not have fallen thus causelesly under his severest discipline, for such I must esteem this his *suggestion*, and the *insinuations* accompanying it.

14. And yet after all this, if I had done the utmost which he can suppose, *viz.* not rendred *nuper* at all, on purpose that this *conversion* of the *Island* might be thought to be *long* before the time of *Lucius* and *Elutherius*, which was above 140. years after *Tiberius*'s decease, I hope it is by this time plain by what hath here been said of our *conversion* by some *Apostle*, particularly by *Simon Zelotes*, that I should not much have abused the *Reader*. That the *faith* was not *first preacht* in *Lucius*'s days, but *revived* after the *death* of the *first planters* of it, I refer the Reader to learn from Sir *Henry Spelman*, p. 12. out of our *ancient records*: And for the truth of the *passages* between *Elutherius* and *Lucius*, as I never had *ingaged* my self, so if from thence, as the *Diatribist* pretends, any inconveniences be now found consequent toward the support of the *Romanists* plea to our subjection, it will be his (not my) concernment to *fence* himself against them, having here thus far acknowledged the *truth* of the *story*, that *Lucius* sent to *Elutherius* for some to *baptize* him and his people, withal from hence concluding that *Christianity was not here planted from the Apostles times*.

15. And here let me add in reference to his Sixth *Section*, that if I should yield what here he doth, that this *Nation*, first received *Baptism* not from any *Apostle* or *Apostolical Planter*, but in *Lucius*'s days from *Elutherius Bishop* of *Rome*, it could not well be imagined how our *ancient Brittish* should be found so *different* from the *usages* of *Rome* in the *celebration* of *Easter*, &c. as it is known they were before, and at the time of *Augustines* coming hither. For certainly the *Western* manner was conveighed to all who had their *Christianity* or *Baptism* from *Rome*.

16. And indeed, as to the other concernment, what would it avail us to prove that we had not our *Christianity first* from *Rome* in *Augustines* time, if we be yielded to have had it *first* from *Rome* in *Elutherius*'s time? I desire the *Diatribist*, which even now foresaw the *danger*, will now see to it.

17. What to this he saith (*viz.* that *the Eastern Christians which kept their Easter after the Jewish manner, kept it not so in the Apostles times*) is neither proved to have any *truth* in it, nor if it had, would it give any account of the *reason* of the *Brittish* retaining the *Jewish* and *Eastern* custom, in case they had their *baptism* from *Elutherius*, for as to the *latter* of these, though this *difference* were granted to be of a *later* original than the *Apostles* times, yet what possibility were there that the *Brittish* should have the *Eastern Jewish* custom from *Rome*, when the *Romish* was constantly the *contrary*, or that receiving *Baptism* from *Rome*, we should have our most *ancient* rites from *Greece*, quite contrary to the *usages* of *Rome*.

SECT. IV.

The keeping of Easter *in the Apostles times.* Polycrates's *Epistle to* Victor. *The* Asiatick *way from* Philip *and* John. *From* Philip *derived to* Britanny. Ἐορτάζωμεν. Κυριακῇ. *The testimony of* Socrates *against Festivals, examined.*

Numb. 1. AS for the *truth* of his negation §. 6. that the *Eastern Christians which kept their* Easter *after the* Jewish *manner, kept it not so in the Apostles times*] It will deserve considering a while, and the rather because this of *Easter* being certainly a *Christian Festival*, the annual commemoration of the *resurrection* of *Christ*, and that observed by the *Asiaticks* on *any* day of the *week* on which the *quartadecima Lunæ* should fall, and not only on the *Lords day*, if that shall be found to be so kept by any of the *Apostles* themselves, this will be no small prejudice to the *Diatribists* pretensions, who will not, must not allow any other *festival* among *Christians*, but that of the *weekly sabbath* or *Lords day*, as 'tis by him deduced from the *fourth Commandment*. And accordingly in his reasoning here against it, his *arguments* proceed not only against the *Jewish* manner, but against the *feast* it self being observed in the *Apostles* times, as will presently appear.

2. Now then for the clearing *trial* of this *negation* of his, on which his cause so much dependeth, I appeal to the *history* of that *question* or *controversy* betwixt the *Eastern* and *Western Church*, as it is set down with very little *difference* by *Eusebius* l. 5. and *Nicephorus* l. 4.

3. And first, 'tis *Eusebius*'s affirmation of it, that *all the Provinces of* Asia *observed it on the fourteenth*
l. 5. c. 24. *day*, ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως ἀρχαιοτέρας, *as from a more ancient tradition*, and again as τὸ πάλαι παρ' ἑτέροις ἐθος παραδοθὲν ἦν, *a custom long before delivered to them*; which, considering the *time* wherein this *question* was agitated, at the end of the *second Century*, can amount to little less than *Apostolical*.

4. But I need not lay *weight* on this, his 24. *Chapter* gives us the full *debate* of it in the *Epistle* of *Polycrates* to *Victor*.

5. This *Polycrates* was the *eighth Bishop* of *Ephesus*, and was then 65. years old, which reacheth up very

very high, within 30. years of S. *Johns time*, and he * ſet down and manifeſted the *tradition* to be *Apoſtolical*, expreſly deducing it from *two* of the *Apoſtles*, *Philip* one of the *twelve*, which, ſaith he, *died* at *Hierapolis*, and *John* the *beloved diſciple* of *Chriſt*, who *lived* and *died* at *Epheſus*, adding to theſe *Polycarp Biſhop* and *Martyr* of *Smyrna*, and *Thraſeas Biſhop* and *Martyr* of *Eumenia*, *Sagaris* of *Laodicea*, *Papyrius*, and *Melito* of *Sardis*, *All which*, ſaith he, *obſerved*, *the fourteenth day* χτ τὸ ἐναγγέλιον, *according to the Goſpel*, μηδὲν παρεκβαίνοντες, ἀλλὰ χτ ἡ κανόνα τ πίστεως ἀκολουθοῦντες, *keeping exactly the Canon of faith, and no way varying from it.*

* Τλιὰ Ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσιν καὶ αὐθεντίαν ἔχει ὃ καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν ἀληθῶς παρακολουθοῦντες. Niceph. l. 4. c. 37.

Here it is undeniably evident, that the *Aſiatick* cuſtom was by *Polycrates* (and all the *Biſhops* of *Aſia* συνευδοκήσαν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, *conſented to this Epiſtle* of his) fetcht from *two* of the *twelve Apoſtles*, S. *Philip* and S. *John*. And if that which † our ſtories tell us of *Philips* being in *France*, and ſending *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* and others into *Brittain*, be to be underſtood of *Philip* the *Apoſtle*, as ‖ *Gildas Albanicus* expreſly affirms, then have we a clear account of the *derivation* of this *cuſtom* of keeping *Eaſter* in this *Nation* from *Philip* to our firſt *Chriſtians*, juſt as *Polycrates* in *Aſia* deduces it from the ſame *Philip*. 6.

† *See Guil. Malmesb. de Antiq. Glaſton. Eccl. ex Freculpho* l. 2. c. 4. *Et Baron. Tom.* 1. *an.* 35. *num.* 5.

‖ *Addit is miſſum fuiſſe Gallià in Britanniam à Philippo Apoſtolo Joſephum Arimathæum.* *Sir* H. Spelman *Appar.* p. 1.

And that affords us an *irrefragable* inſtance of the *obſervation* of *Chriſtian feſtivals* among us, not only from the *firſt plantation* of *Chriſtianity* among us, but even from the *practice* of the very *Apoſtles* themſelves, which was the utmoſt that I could pretend to in this matter. 7.

And it is farther obſervable, that Pope *Victor* of *Rome*, though he was willing to have proceeded with greater *rigor* againſt the *Aſiaticks*, even * ἀπολύμενον τὰς Ἀσίας πάσας ἅμα ταῖς ἐμβρέγεις ἐκκλησίαις παρεικίαις, *to cut off* or *excommunicate all the Provinces and Churches of* Aſia, ὡς ἑτεροδοξούσας, *as heterodox*, yet never queſtions the *truth* of *Polycrates*'s *affirmations*, concerning his receiving the *cuſtom* from thoſe *Apoſtles*; And indeed the other *Biſhops* aſſembled, were not for ſuch ſeverity, but for *peace*, and *unity*, and *charity* with theſe *fellow Chriſtians*, and reprehended *Victor* ſeverely for his thoughts of *ſeverity*. 8.

* Κεφ κε.

And the * *Epiſtle* of *Irenæus* to *Victor* is very conſiderable to this purpoſe, who though he reſolved on *Victors* concluſion for the keeping it on the *Lords day* only, yet he is abſolutely againſt *excommunicating* the *Aſiaticks*, upon this very ground, that theſe *Churches* of *God* did ἀρχὴν ἔθους παραδοσιν διατηρεῖν, *obſerve the tradition of ancient* or *original cuſtom*, and he farther tells him that the *Biſhops before him had never broken peace with any on occaſion of this difference*, inſtancing in *Polycarp* who came to *Rome* in *Anicetus*'s time, and as *Anicetus* could not perſwade him to leave his *cuſtom*, ἅτε μετὰ Ἰωάννου τοῦ μαθητοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν Ἀποστόλων οἷς συνδιήτριψεν ἀεὶ τηρήσαντα, as *having obſerved it always according to* the practice of *John the diſciple of the Lord, and the reſt of the Apoſtles with whom he had converſed*. So neither could *Polycarp perſwade Anicetus* to leave his way, and yet they *communicated* one with another; Here again by *Irenæus* his own *confeſſion*, who was for the *Weſtern* cuſtom, the *Eaſtern* was practiſed by *John* and the reſt of the *Apoſtles* (ſure more than one) with whom *Polycarp* had *converſed*. 9.

In unâ fide nihil officit ſanctæ Eccleſiæ conſuetudo diverſa. Gregor. l. 1. Ep. 41.

* Κεφ κε.

Laſtly, There is no doubt all this while, of that which the *Weſtern* pretended for their *cuſtom*, that they had it ἐξ ἀποστολικῆς παραδόσεως, *by Apoſtolical tradition*, ſaith *Euſebius*, ἀποστολικαῖς παραδόσεσιν ἄνωθεν ἐπόμενοι, *following the Apoſtolical tradition downward*, or *from the beginning*, ſaith *Nicephorus*, and that expreſly from S. *Peter* the *Apoſtle*, which ſtill leaves the matter moſt evident and irrefragable, that this *feaſt* of *Eaſter*, which ſure is a *Chriſtian feſtival* (and all *others* are to be rated by that *ſtandard*) was *obſerved* and celebrated by the *Apoſtles*, and ſo is the evincing of all that I need to pretend to, for the *vindicating* of that *Reſolution* of the *Quære* concerning the *Feſtivals* of the *Church*. 10.

l. 5. c. xv. l. 4. c. 36.

What now can be invented by way of *reply* to this *argument* thus inforced, I profeſs not to be able to foreſee; what he hath thought fit to offer for the *proof* of the *contrary*, I ſhall now very briefly *conſider*. 11.

And *Firſt*, ſaith he, *there is no mention of the inſtitution or obſervation of it in Scripture, nor any ground to found it on*; But to this. *Firſt*, It is ſufficient to anſwer, that there is ſmall *virtue* in this *argument* from *Scripture negative*. *Secondly*, That the *Apoſtles* word ἑορτάζωμεν, *let us keep the Feaſt*, which by *circumſtances* is applied to the *feaſt* of *Eaſter*, is ſome (be it acknowledged a leſs *weighty*) *ground* in *Scripture* for the *obſervation*. *Thirdly*, That the mention of κυριακὴ *the Lords day*, *Rev.* 1. is ſome farther *ground*, whether that ſignify the *weekly* or *annual Lords day*; If it be the *annual*, there is then a clear evidence for the obſervation of it in the *Apoſtles* days; and if it ſhould be the *weekly*, yet in any reaſon, the *annual day* of the *reſurrection* was the *foundation* of this *weekly day*. which we know is to commemorate the *reſurrection*, as it is evident that the *weekly friday faſts* in the *Church* had their *foundation* in the *annual* great *faſt* on the day of *Chriſts death* in the *Paſchal week*. 12.

Fourthly, If the *Scripture* ſhould give us no kind of mention of this, yet ſeeing it hath otherwiſe *appeared* from the moſt *ancient* and *undoubted records* of the *Church*, that *Eaſter* was obſerved by the *Apoſtles*, by *Peter* and *Paul* in one manner, by *John* and *Philip* in another, what place of doubt or queſtion can there be in this matter? 13.

What he adds in the *cloſe* of his *firſt reaſon* that the *Apoſtles were ſo far from inſtituting theſe as Chriſtian feaſts, that they do expreſly repeal them and cry them down*, hath not the leaſt *degree* of *truth in it*, as hath formerly appeared in the view of *Gal.* 4. 10. 14.

His *Second* proof is from *Socrates* the *Hiſtorian* ſaying that the *Apoſtles were not ſolicitous to appoint any feſtival days at all, therefore not this of* Eaſter. To this I anſwer, that *Socrates*'s words do not at all deny this to have been the *practice* of the *Apoſtles*, only his conceit is, that neither *Chriſt* nor his *Apoſtles* * νόμῳ τοῦτο παραγγέλλειν παρήγγειλαν, *commanded to obſerve this by any law*, and again that they intended not ἑορτασικῶν νομοθεσίαν, *to make laws of feſtival days*, referring the *original* of them to *cuſtom*, which varied in ſeveral *regions*, as appeared to him by that difference betwixt the *Aſiatick* and *Weſtern Chriſtians*, from whence his *concluſion*, or (as in the ſame matter he ſaith, τεκμαίρομαι his conjecture was, that ἡ τοῦ πάσχα ἑορτὴ παρ' ἑκάστοις 15.

* l. 5. c. xxii.

ἑκάστοις ἐκ συνηθείας τινὸς ἐδιάζουσαν ἕσχε τὴν παρατήρησιν, διὰ τὸ μηδένα Ἀποστόλων μηδενὶ νενομοθετηκέναι περὶ αὐτῆς, *the feaſt of* Eaſter *among all ſorts of people had a peculiar different obſervation from ſome cuſtom, becauſe none of the Apoſtles had made any law concerning it.*

16. The ſhort is, *Socrates* ſaw that ſeveral *Nations* had their *ſeveral cuſtoms* of keeping *Eaſter*, ſome, ſaith he, from *John*, others from *Peter* and *Paul*, ſetting down the very *ſtory*, as we have given it, out of *Euſebius*, and from thence he *collects* (how truly it matters not) that no *Apoſtle* had given any *binding law* to all *Chriſtians* concerning it.

17. And ſo I that ſpeak only of the *practice Apoſtolical*, and not at all of their νομοθεσία *commanding* it by *law*, am no way *incommodated* by this *teſtimony*, And for any more than ſo (*practice* and *cuſtom Apoſtolical*) it will be hard for the *Diatribiſt* to produce any evidence for the *weekly Chriſtian ſabbath* or *Lords day*; ſure the *New Teſtament* hath no where any νομοθεσία *giving* of *law* concerning it.

18. His third proof taken from the *difference of the obſervation of it in the* Eaſtern *and* Weſtern *Church, which*, ſaith he, *makes it evident that it was not inſtituted by the Apoſtles*] hath ſure now been competently anſwered, for though that difference conclude againſt the νομοθεσία or appointment of the day by *univerſal law*, yet it no way prejudgeth the *practice Apoſtolical*, or the derivation of the ſeveral *cuſtoms* from this *original*.

19. How *true*, or *pertinent* to his purpoſe that is which follows, that *the obſervation of* Eaſter *hath better antiquity than this of* Chriſtmas, *though not Apoſtolical*, doth already ſufficiently appear, the *Apoſtles practice* for the one being ſo *evident* on all hands, by the *confeſſion* both of the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern Chriſtians*, (the ſeveral *practices* being derived from ſeveral *Apoſtles*) that there can be no *doubt* in that matter; And then the *analogy* holding, and the *argument* proceeding in full force from one *Chriſtian feſtival commemorative* of *Chriſts reſurrection*, to another *commemorative* of his *birth*, or his *aſcenſion*, will certainly juſtifie the *lawfulneſs* of the obſervation, though the *antiquity* ſhould not *equally* be pleadable for it.

20. And ſo I hope I have fully *cleared* and *vindicated* the *concludency* of this *argument*.

SECT. V.

Midwinter-day. The Winter Solſtice. Julius's *Calendar.*

Numb. 1. NExt he proceeds to view the *argument* drawn from the title which our *ancient records* give *Chriſtmaſs day*, calling it Midpintpa-dæg *Midwinter-day* (and as I now find in other *Saxon monuments*, Midpintpæg-mærre *Midwinter-maſs* or *feaſt*) and with this he is pleaſed to *refreſh* himſelf and to be *cheerful* [*How ſweetly all agree*, &c.] and then to make offer of ſome *anſwer*; But the truth is, he hath not made any the leaſt *diſcovery* by thoſe *anſwers*, that he *adverted* at all to that one thing, wherein *alone* all the force of the *argument* was placed; I ſhall therefore repeat it again for him.

2. The *Winter ſolſtice* falling now many days *earlier* than the 25th of *December*, the acknowledged day of *Chriſts* birth, we are in reaſon to believe, that at the time when that title of *Midwinter-maſs* was beſtowed on this *feſtival*, the *Sun* entred into *Capricorn* (*i. e.* the *winter ſolſtice* fell) if not *upon*, yet very *near* to the 25th of *December*. And then this will drive it very high, up to the *Apoſtles* and our *Saviours* time, at the year of whoſe birth though as the *learned* exactly calculate it, the *Sun* entred *Capricorn* on the 24th of *December* at *Rome*, yet 'tis certain that *Julius Cæſar* ordering the *Calendar* 43 years before that, and believing that in his time it was as *Hipparchus* had ſaid (*viz.* that the *ſolſtices* had *anticipated* eight days, for ſo in his time *Hipparchus* had obſerved) he placed the *ſolſtices* on the *eighth* of the *Calends*, i. e. on the 24th of *June*, and 25th of *December*: In conſonance whereto, the *difference* being yet not great, the firſt *Chriſtians* might well call this *feaſt Mid-winter maſs*, being indeed ſo near the *ſolſtice* then, though the farther we deſcend from thoſe *firſt* times, the leſs *exactneſs* of truth we ſhall ſtill find in that *appellation*.

3. Now to this Mr. *C.* is not pleaſed to make the leaſt word of *reply*, and ſo hath not qualified himſelf to expect any ſyllable of *return* from me to his ſeventh Section. Only I ſhall tell him for his utmoſt ſatisfaction, Firſt, That my *argument* no way depends on the falling of *John Baptiſts* day on *Midſummer* day, and only mentioned it to ſhew the *agreement* betwixt them. Secondly, That if *Chriſtmas* day were not *celebrated* till the end of the ſecond *Century*, it could not with any propriety be called *Mid-winter maſs*, for *An.* 200. the *Winter ſolſtice* was certainly at a pretty diſtance from the 25th of *December*. Thirdly, That though now *Mid-winter* day be a *fortnight* ſooner than the 25th of *December*, yet in the *Apoſtles* times it was not ſo, and ſo that is an *argument* for, not againſt the *obſervation* of it, in, or near the times of the *Apoſtles*, for elſe it could not with any truth be called *Mid-winter day*.

4. By this time I hope the *Diatribiſts* eyes may be opened to diſcern ſome force in this *argument*, and how nothing he hath *replied* to it.

SECT. VI.

Feſtivals not Romiſh. *The primitive Churches pure from the Hereſies that ſollicited them*; *The* Romiſh *corruptions not fetcht from them.*

Numb. 1. IN the next place he proceeds to my two *inferences*, the former of which being only this, that the *antiquity or immemorial uſage of any feſtival in our nation, doth no way argue that it hath any of the corruptions of the Roman See adhering to it, but the contrary*, It is freely granted by him: And then I may for once *congratulate* the unexpected ſucceſs of that *Paper*. For it ſeems the uſe of *Feſtivals* is not

Romiſh

Romiſh and *Antichriſtian*, on the ſcore of which he certainly knows ſome who have caſt them out, and I foreſee not how he will ever approve himſelf to them again, after this one confeſſion.

However he will make no delay to make ſome *reparations*, For though *feſtivals* have none of the 2. *corruptions* of the *Roman See* adhering to them, yet, ſaith he, *they may have too much of the corruption of thoſe Churches wherein they were firſt invented, corruptions which crept into thoſe Churches not long after the Apoſtles days, and the* Romiſh *Religion is a bundle of moſt of thoſe corruptions.*

To which I anſwer, that nothing could be more *unjuſt* at once and *improbable*, than what is here 3. without either *proof* or *diffidence* ſuggeſted againſt the *moſt ancient Primitive* (and *next to Apoſtolical*) *Church.*

That there were many *foul* and *dangerous errors* which very early, even in the *Apoſtles* days, ſoli- 4. cited and infeſted the *Church*, there is no doubt; that impure deteſtable ſink of the *Gnoſticks*, and the ſeveral ſorts of *hereticks* which all joined together under that title; But then 'tis moſt evident, that the *Governours* of each *Church*, by the ſtrength of that *depoſitum* committed to them by the *Apoſtles*, uſed all care to ſecure their *flocks* from ſuch *peſts* as theſe, and were by *Gods* bleſſing ſucceſsful in it, *noted, branded, expulſt* theſe *hereticks*, and kept the *Catholick Church* intire from their *corruptions.*

And then as it is moſt incredible that thoſe *Churches* that cenſured theſe *corruptions*, ſhould be *in-* 5. *fected* with them, ſo nothing can be more *unjuſt*, as well as *uncharitable* and *impious*, than to *affix* that *character* on the *Churches*, which belonged only to the *hereticks* that *diſturbed* and were *ejected* out of thoſe *Churches.*

By this account the *Apoſtolical Churches* themſelves, whileſt the *Apoſtles* preſided in them, might 6. be blaſted alſo, for we know there was in their very time a *myſtery of iniquity*, πλάνοι *deceivers* and *Impoſtors*, *Antichriſts*, and *falſe teachers* good ſtore; but, as St. *John* ſaith of theſe, that *they went out from us, ſeparated* from the *Churches*, and ſo diſcovered that *they were not of them*; So it was alſo after the *Apoſtles* death, the *hereticks* and *ſchiſmaticks* infuſed not their *corruptions* into the *Church*, and ſo they cannot with truth be imputed to thoſe that were preſerved *pure* from them, the *corruptions* of the *enemies* of the *Church*, unto the *Churches.*

And however the *Doctor* have been accuſed ſometimes of *complying* with the *Papiſts*, I am confident 7. he never let any thing fall which yielded them ſo true and *ſolid* advantage, as this one *affirmation* of the *Diatribiſt*, *that the corruptions, of which the* Romiſh *Religion is a bundle, are thoſe which crept into the Churches not long after the Apoſtles days*: For what is that, but an *agnition*, that the moſt *accuſed Romiſh practices* now adays, are the ſame which were *delivered* to them from the *Primitive Church.* For my part I proteſt my *diſſent* (and ſo ſure doth the whole *Church* of *England*, and every true *ſon* thereof) to this *concluſion.*

SECT. VII.

The grounds why this Feaſt may not be aboliſht among us. The Diatribiſts miſtake of the queſtion.

MY ſecond *inference* now follows, that *any ſuch ancient uſage of this particular Church, if it had* Numb. 1. *no other ground to ſtand on* (*as its foundation*) *or concurrence of all Chriſtian Churches* (*as Pillars*) *to ſuſtain it, were a very competent authority for the preſent continuance of ſuch a practice in the Church, and that* upon this *ſcore*, becauſe the *Anglicane Church being one of thoſe which by its foundation is* αὐτοκέφαλος *ſubject to no foreign Patriarch, is conſequently inveſted with unqueſtionable power to inſtitute Ceremonies for it ſelf, which conſequently may not without great temerity be changed or aboliſhed by any.*

To this, becauſe I ſee there are ſome pages of *objections* inſerted by the *Diatribiſt*, before I read 2. them over, I deſire it may be *adverted*, wherein the force of my *inference* conſiſts, *viz.* in theſe three things, Firſt, That this particular *Church* of ours being firſt *planted* by ſome either *Apoſtle* or *Apoſtolical* perſon, was thereby conſtituted αὐτοκέφαλος of *abſolute power* within it ſelf, as that excludes *ſubjection* to any other *foreign* power.

Secondly, That in all probability this *feaſt* was ſet up, or *celebrated* here, by thoſe that *firſt plan-* 3. *ted* the *faith* among us, *i. e.* by ſome *Apoſtle* or *Apoſtolical* perſon, by *Simon Zelotes*, or by thoſe twelve which were ſent hither by *Philip* the *Apoſtle*, and *Joſeph* of *Arimathea* one of thoſe.

Thirdly, That what was by ſo good *authority* introduced, having no equal reaſon to *ſuperſede* it 4. (ſuch as was the *contrary tradition* of other *Apoſtles* in the buſineſs of *Eaſter*) may not without *temerity* now be *aboliſhed* by any; not by any other *perſon* or *perſons*, *Pope*, or *Conſiſtory*, becauſe no *other* hath *power* over a *Church* which is αὐτοκέφαλος *founded* by the *Apoſtles*, and not ſubjected by them to any; not by the *Church* it ſelf, which cannot now be ſuppoſed to have any ſuch *perſons* in it, as may be fit to *compare* with the *firſt founders* of it, at leaſt, not without ſome greater reaſon for the *changing* and *aboliſhing*, than they may appear to have had for the *uſing* of it.

Upon theſe *grounds* my *inference* being built, as is there apparent by the *premiſſes*, and the very *ex-* 5. *preſſions* cautiouſly uſed in ſetting it down, let us now ſee what the *Diatribiſt* hath to *object*; And firſt, that it is αὐτοκέφαλος by its *foundation*, he willingly grants, ſubordinate to no *foreign Patriarch*; I ſhall only demand whether it be *ſubordinate* to its own *ſons*, or to any but the *legal Fathers* of it? I hope it will be as reaſonable for me to to preſume it is not, as it was for the *Diatribiſt* to *grant* the former; for elſe M. *C.* a *ſon* of this *Church*, by diveſting the *Pope* of his *authority*, ſhall only have *removed* and *veſted* it in himſelf, and ſuch as he, tranſlated it from the *Papacy* to the *Presbytery*, which I hope he will not profeſs to do, leſt that be the very *crime* which was charged on our *Biſhops*, that they *aſſumed* to themſelves the *Papal power*, or the *power* of *ordaining ceremonies*, which ſure is no greater than that of *aboliſhing* them.

Having made this grant of the αὐτοκεφαλία of this *Church*, it is obſervable what he preſently *inter-* 6. *poſeth*, *Yet*, ſaith he, *we juſtly queſtion whether it be inveſted with ſuch unqueſtionable power to inſtitute*

what

what ceremonies it pleaſe, which may not upon good reaſons be changed and aboliſhed. In which very *form* of propoſing his *queſtion* or *exception*, 'tis viſible what *change* he hath thought fit to make in my *inference*, when I ſpake of the *power* of this *Church* to *inſtitute ceremonies for it ſelf*, I never affirmed of thoſe *ceremonies* once *inſtituted* that they might not *upon good reaſons be changed and aboliſhed*, for I doubt not but the ſame *power* which may on *good reaſons inſtitute*, may on *good reaſons aboliſh* alſo; But *firſt* I deſired to *examine* the preſent *reaſons* of *abolition* of this *Feſtival*, whether they were as *important* as thoſe whereon this *Feſtival* was ſuppoſed to be *inſtituted*, viz. that of the *pious* and *thankful commemorating* the *birth* of *Chriſt*; and withal *Secondly*, whether thoſe *reaſons* pretended for *abolition*, were not *feigned reaſons*, as thoſe taken from the heads of *Will-worſhip*, and *Superſtition*, have, I muſt hope, been evidenced to be: or again *Thirdly*, whether they might not otherwiſe be *ſatisfied*, as that of the *riot* (charged only as a conſequence accidental to the *Feaſt*) by *care* and exerciſe of *diſcipline*.

7. To which conſiderations may *Fourthly*, be farther added this reaſonable *aphoriſm* of *Chriſtian policy*, that what was thus brought in on ſuch grounds by the *governers* of a *Church*, ſuppoſing them but ſuch as are of an ordinary rank of *governours*, and not the *Apoſtolical founders* of the *Church* (to whom certainly *more reſpect* is due) may not be caſt out by *ſons* of the *Church*, or indeed by any *other* than the *authority* of the *ſucceeding Governors*.

8. And theſe few *conſiderations* I ſuppoſe, may competently evidence the *unreaſonableneſs* of this *changing* the terms of the *queſtion*, if not of his *plea* for the *abolition* of the *Feſtival*.

9. And therefore whereas, upon this *occaſion*, he enters into a *large diſcourſe* concerning the *power* of the *Church* to *inſtitute ceremonies*, I ſhall take take leave to paſs it over untoucht, it being certain that the two branches of the one *propoſition*, for which I *contend*, are no way concerned in any *part* of his ſtate of this *queſtion*, nor indeed any thing with the leaſt *probability ſuggeſted* againſt either, *viz. Firſt*, That a *National Church planted* by the *Apoſtles* or their *ſucceſſors*, may *lawfully* uſe a *feſtival* for the *commemorating* the *birth* of *Chriſt*, and on it *pray* to, and *praiſe God* in the *ſolemn aſſembly*, reach out the *word* and *Sacraments*, *exhorting* all good *Chriſtians* to partake thereof, and to lay aſide their ordinary *labours*, that they may be vacant for ſuch *holy exerciſes*; and *Secondly*, That when ſuch a *pious uſage* hath gained a *reception*, either from the time of the firſt *planting* of the *faith* among us, or however by *immemorial cuſtom* (all other *Churches* in the world for very many *hundred years*, and for ought we can diſcern, from the very *Apoſtles* practice, concurring with us) it ought not to be *declaimed* againſt, as *Antichriſtian*, or *laid* aſide, or *covenanted* againſt by this *Diatribiſt* or others, perſons not *in* but *under authority*, upon no weight of *ſolid* reaſons, but upon ſome *cauſleſs ſuggeſtions*, that it is *criminous*, under the head of *Will-worſhip* and *Superſtition*.

10. This was ſo plainly ſet down before, to be the whole matter in *debate* betwixt me and any *gainſayers*, that there was nothing left to the *Diatribiſt*, but briefly to point at the *weak* part, if there appeared to be any ſuch in either branch of this *propoſition*, and having nothing from him to this purpoſe, I ſhall now omit to take notice of the *infirmities* of which this *diſcourſe* of his is as full as from any writing of no greater *length* may well be expected, and haſten to his following *Sections* in hope of *ſpringing* ſomewhat more *pertinent* to our *controverſy*.

SECT. VIII.

The Reformation in this Kingdom. No imperfection in it in point of Feſtivals. The States joyning in it, no diſadvantage to the Church.

Numb. 1. MY *Tenth Section* proceeded to ſome few *conſiderations*, the adverting to which, might render this *change* or *abolition* of the *Chriſtmaſs Feſtival* more *unreaſonable*; As *Firſt*, That this *obſervation* was an *undoubted part of that eſtabliſhment which the Reformation in this kingdom enacted for us, and that by act of Parliament, and not only by Church-Canon.*

2. To this he anſwers two things, *Firſt*, That *the Reformation was not ſo full as the Reformers themſelves could have wiſht*; Never conſidering how far this is from being *applicable* to the point in hand, For I ſhall demand, Did all or any of the *Reformers*, to whoſe *piety* and *temper* we ow our *eſtabliſhment*, ever expreſs their *wiſh* that all *Feſtivals*, particularly this of *Chriſtmaſs* ſhould be *aboliſhed?* or did they not? If it ſhall be ſaid, they did, I then preſs that the *Record* may be produced, by which this hath been *notified* to the *Diatribiſt*; But if he *confeſs* they did not, or offer no *proof*, that they did, then what is it to this matter of *feſtivities*, wherein only our preſent *debate* is concerned, if in other things of a quite *different* nature, as that of bringing all *notorious ſinners* to *penance* every *Lent*, mentioned in the *office* for *Aſhwedneſday*, they *wiſht*, and expreſt their *wiſh*, that the *Reformation* were more *perfect?* The *rule* in *law* is ſeaſonable to be here applied, *Exceptio firmat in non exceptis*, Their expreſſing their *wiſh* that other things might be more *perfect*, gives us aſſurance, that they *wiſht* not any farther *change* in this *particular* of *feſtivals*, than that which they made in the *Romiſh Calendar*.

3. This *anſwer* therefore had little of *advantage* for him, and yet his only *Reſerve* is, that *Secondly*, *this ſeems to grant that the Reformation was made by the State and not by the Church, which now is pleaded for.*

4. And I pray what is that to the *diſadvantage* of the *Church* that the *State* joined with it in the *Reformation, confirming* and *eſtabliſhing* it by *Act* of *Parliament?* or *Secondly*, why is that the *fitter* to be *aboliſhed* which ſtands by *Statute law*, as well as by *Eccleſiaſtical Canon*, and *Cuſtom immemorial?* or *Thirdly*, how doth the *Parliaments confirming* the *Liturgy*, and therein the *feſtivals*, infer that this *feſtival* was not firſt *introduced* by the *Church*, when it is moſt evident that the *Feſtival* was in the *Church* long before that *Act* of *Parliament?*

5. Theſe indeed are all the *anſwers* we can have to an *argument*, which ſeemed to have been of ſome force with a *friend* of *Parliaments* or *eſtabliſhed laws*: and therefore we muſt content our ſelves with them

SECT.

SECT. IX.

The Lutheran *Churches accord in this.* Morney's *wiſh. The* Helvetian *confeſſion.* Rivets *cuſtom of preaching on the day.*

MY ſecond *conſideration* was, that *this and other feaſts of Chriſt are retained in the reformed* Lutheran *Churches; and where they are taken away, wiſht for by ſober members,* as *Ph. Mornye Du Pleſſis,* and *approved by the confeſſions of thoſe Churches* as the *Helvetian,* and in *other places the day of Chriſtmas afforded the ſolemnity of a Sermon.* *Numb.* 1.

To this he *anſwers,* that *the* Lutheran *are not reputed the beſt reformed Churches, nor by the Doctor,* he believes, *thought fit to be compared with* England, *and ſo not fit precedents for our Reformation.* 2.

But ſure he might have marked that the *Lutheran Churches* concurring with the *Engliſh* in this of *Feſtivals,* 'tis no way to the *diſparaging* of my *argument,* that I do not *compare* the *Lutheran Churches* with that of *England*; 'Tis certainly ſufficient if they and the *Church* of *England* together may be able to *compare* with all *other reformed Churches* which have *caſt* out all *feſtivals* as *ſuperſtitious* or *Antichriſtian*; And thus I ſhall, without much inſolence, adventure to make the *compariſon.* 3.

As for the little regard he is pleaſed to give to ſuch *private* perſons *wiſhes,* as that of *Ph. Morney Du Pleſſis,* I may reaſonably reply, that how *faſtidiouſly* ſoever he reject it, it may very well be allowed to keep the *practice* of the *Church* of *France* from being any example or precedent to us, when the *prime* members of their own *Church* have expreſt their *diſlikes* of it. 4.

And I pray, why was not the *Helvetian confeſſion* worth his taking *notice* of? that was no bare *wiſh* of a *private* man, but the *approbation* of a *Church,* which Mr. *Calvin* thought fit to *write* to for their *judgment* and *ſuffrage* to his *new erected model* at *Geneva.* 5.

As for the paſſage of *giving Sermons* to *Chriſtmas* day, I ſee it is miſtaken by him, and applied to, as ſpoken of himſelf and ſuch as he in their *former practices,* and upon that *miſpriſion* it is, that he is ſo much concerned to have *their prayers as good and as large as the Liturgies,* (by the way, if they be not much *better,* and ſure always to be ſo, why muſt the *Liturgy* be *aboliſhed?*) whereas all this while I never thought of him, or ſuch as he, which it ſeems, kept fair with *Chriſtmas* (from whence I am in charity to believe, they thought it not Superſtition) till they had an advantage of *ejecting* it, and then made all ſpeed to cloſe with the *opportunity*; but of ſome other *preachers* in other *Churches,* where this *Feſtival* was not *obſerved,* ſuch as *Andrew Rivet* in the *Low Countries,* who, as I have been informed, conſtantly preacht on that day to his *auditors,* which was a *civility* fit to be mentioned to thoſe that will now perform that *office* on any *day* of the *week,* rather than on *that.* 6.

SECT. X.

Ejecting Feſtivals. Separation from the pureſt times, even thoſe of the Apoſtles. Our Churches departure from Rome, *unjuſtly parallel'd with the departure of ſons from our Church.*

MY third *conſideration* was, that *the raſing this Feſtivity out of the Calendar is an act of ſeparation from the Church of* England, *and the univerſal Church of all ages, eſpecially of the firſt and pureſt times.* *Numb.* 1.

To this he *anſwers* by denyal of *both parts, Not the latter, having proved,* as he ſaith, *that the firſt and pureſt ages of the Church did not obſerve it, Not the former, unleſs I yield that the Reformation of the Church of* England *was a diviſion and ſeparation from the Church of* Rome, *or the reformation in* Luthers *time a ſeparation from the Catholick Church, as Papiſts ſay it was.* 2.

But for the former of theſe, it is ſufficient to reply by way of *demand,* where it is that he hath ſo *proved* this of the *firſt* and *pureſt* ages not obſerving *feſtivals,* that he can affirm it *certain* that this of *diſuſing* or *laying* them down is not *ſeparation* from the *Church* of thoſe ages? Truly my *eyes* or my *memory* very much fail me, or he hath not as yet *proved* it in any *degree,* much leſs ſo demonſtrated it, that a *Corollary* deduced from thence, and depending on that probation, ſhould deſerve to be *pronounced certain.* 3.

Nay ſure there hath yet been no *occaſion* offered him (at leaſt made *uſe* of by him) to attempt ſo *impoſſible* a thing, as is ſuch a *negative probation.* Of this I am ſure, that for this *Feſtival* and that other of *Eaſter* the reaſon muſt be the ſame, and I have already made it as *clear* as the *day,* that that was obſerved by the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt,* by *Philip* and *John* on the *Jewiſh* day, and by *Peter* and *Paul* on the *annual Dominical*; And if through the *dimneſs* or *want* of *ſtories* of thoſe times, this be not ſo evident of this *particular Feaſt* of *Chriſtmaſs,* yet the *analogy* holding directly betwixt the *one* and the *other,* the *argument* remains as *firm,* that the laying aſide either *this* or that *feſtival,* is a *ſeparation* from the *Apoſtolick,* and thoſe ſure are the *firſt* and *pureſt* times. 4.

Beſides, I have as clearly ſhewed, that the *ſolemnities* and *feſtivities commemorative* of the *Martyrdom* of *Ignatius* and *Polycarp,* two *Biſhops* that lived in the *Apoſtles* times, were *obſerved* from the very times of their *deaths,* and that in compliance with other the like *feſtivals* of the *Church* before them, which muſt needs come home to the *obſervation* of *feſtivals* in the *Apoſtles* days. 5.

And then how can this *Diatribiſt* flatter himſelf, that he hath *proved* the *contrary* to this, when he hath not ſo much as offered either the leaſt *anſwer* to theſe, or any the leaſt *reaſon* or *proof* of his *negation?* 6.

For the *latter,* I reply, that there is no *analogie* betwixt the *Church* of *Englands departing* from *Rome,* and the *Diatribiſts departing* from the *Church* of *England*; I might inſtance in many, 'twill be ſufficient 7.

ſufficient that I ſhew it in two particulars, Firſt, The *Church* of *England* in the *Reformation departed* not from their *lawful ſuperiours*, being, as the *Diatribiſt* acknowledges, ἀντοκέφαλον, and owing no *ſubordination* to the *Church* of *Rome*, when ſhe *departed* from her, whereas the perſons then ſpoken of by me, and the *Diatribiſt* for one, were certainly *members* that ought a *Chriſtian obedience* to the *Church* of *England*, as *inferiours* to *ſuperiours*, and ſo departed from their *lawful ſuperiours*, wherein *Schiſm* doth *principally* conſiſt, as hath elſewhere been ſhewn.

8. Thoſe things wherein the *Church* of *England reformed*, and *departed* from the *Romiſh opinions* and *practices*, were none of them ſuch as this of *feſtivals* now appears to be, *i. e. common uſages* of the *Univerſal*, *ancient*, eſpecially of the *Primitive pureſt Church*, but *innovations* unduly brought in by them, and *impoſed* on all *Chriſtians*.

9. And as even now, ſo again this *Diatribiſts confeſſion* here, is more to the *advantage* of the *Romiſh Church*, than any thing that he could likely have ſaid, no way clearing his *fact* from *Schiſm*, nor offering the leaſt *colour* to it, and yet acknowledging that the *Church* of *Englands reformation*, and ſo *Luthers reformation* alſo, was as truly an *act* of *Schiſm* from *Rome*, as is theirs from the *Church* of *England*. But I muſt put in my *proteſtation* of *diſſent* to this *propoſition* alſo, and that is all I need to ſay to that anſwer.

SECT. XI.

The profaneneſs objected to the Feſtival. Caſting out the Creeds.

Numb. 1. HIS *anſwer* to the fourth *conſideration* is ſo ſlight, and therein ſo little on which to faſten any reply, that I may ſafely intruſt the Reader with it, and only mind the *Diatribiſt*, Firſt, That till he hath more *ſolidly* proved the *obſervation* of this *Feſtival* among us to be *ſuperſtition*, than hitherto he hath done, 'twill be great *uncharitableneſs* thus to accuſe it, and greater *injuſtice* to deſtroy the *innocent* for this (if it were *true*, yet but) *accidental* and *removable* crime imagined to be *adherent* to it.

2. And ſecondly till he hath written as full a *tract* of *profaneneſs*, as he hath done of *Superſtition*, and been more ſucceſsful in his *evidences* that this *Feſtival* is guilty of it, ſhewed that that is derived from *ſuper ſtatutum* alſo, or evinced the ſame thing by ſome more ſenſible way of *probation*, 'tis but a *pitiful begging* of the *queſtion*, thus *irrationally* to *accumulate crimes* on *innocency*, to add the *Profaneneſs* to the *Superſtition*, to ſuppoſe the *Feſtival* able to work *miracles*, to *reconcile* the moſt *contrary extremes* (as if in the vein of *declaiming*, he ſhould call the ſame man firſt *Papiſt*, then *Socinian*) for ſuch he knows are *Superſtition* and *Profaneneſs*.

3. Inſtead of which, it were much more *ſeaſonable* for him ſadly to *inquire*, which is moſt liable to the charge of *profaneneſs*, the ſetting apart a *feſtival* from *common uſes* to the *commemorating* the *birth* of *Chriſt* in *Prayer*, *Praiſes*, *Euchariſt*, hearing the *word* read and *preached*, and *profiting* by all theſe; or the *faſtidious* refuſing to join with the *Church* of *God* in all or any of theſe *offices* at that time, following the *Plough*, or attending the *Shop* inſtead of it.

4. And I ſhall with the ſame *ſeriouſneſs* deſire him to review his words, *p.* 147. Where in *anſwer* to my mention of *diſuſing* the *Creeds* and *Catechiſm*, he ſaith, in a *parentheſis*, that the *Creed* is ſtill to be retained in and with the *Catechiſm*] and demand whether he doth not know, that the ſame *Tempeſt* that carried away the *Feſtivals*, ſwept away (more than one) the *three Creeds* received from the *ancient Church* and retained in our *Liturgie*, and together with them the *Church Catechiſm*, of which, he knows, I ſpake?

5. And then what truth can be in his *parentheſis*, unleſs it be only this, that theſe are ſtill retained in *our Books* (which they have joined to *condemn*) though they be not retained in *their offices*, but ſolemnly *ejected* by them? Such *equivocal anſwers* or *reſponſes* as theſe, he knows from what *oracles* they were wont to be *delivered*, and therefore ſhould not be imitated.

SECT. XII.

The Diatribiſts change of my words, his cauſleſs practiſe of himſelf, and cenſure of others.

Numb. 1. HIS fourteenth Section is ſomewhat of the ſame making, for when I ſpake of that *deeper knowledge of ſome, which was ſome degree above the vulgar ignorance*, and yet was *obſervable* to be *impatient of ſound doctrine, to be ready to imbrace any thing that was novel, and contrary to the ancient Faith and Principles*] he anſwers, that the *impatience of ſound doctrine, and readineſs to imbrace any thing that is novel, is not to be found in thoſe of deep or ſound knowledge.*

2. But why ſhould he there inſert the word [*ſound*] can he imagine that I ſpake of thoſe of *ſound knowledge*, when I ſpake of *impatience* of *ſound doctrine*? 'Twas viſible enough that I ſpake of thoſe, which while they *leſs ſeemed to want ſuch helps* as *Chriſtmaſs ſervices* and *ſermons* to *teach* them the *ſound doctrine* of *Chriſt*, did yet moſt really *need* them to cure the *vanity* of their *own minds*, and their *itch* of any thing that was *novel*.

3. By this 'tis alſo manifeſt, how little *temptation* he had to break out into thoſe *Eulogies* of himſelf and his *friends*, to which certainly I never *conſtrained* him by thoſe words that belonged not to the *Paſtors*, but only to their *auditors*, who when they have attained to ſome meaſure of *knowledge* above the more *ignorant*, are yet experimented to be very *fickle* and apt to fall off into *new doctrines*.

4. However, let him not *flatter* himſelf as he doth, that thoſe that *ejected* theſe *Feſtivities* under *pretence* of *Reforming abuſes* of *ſuperſtition* and *profaneneſs*, are the men *only or chiefly that propugn and maintain*

maintain ſound doctrine, when, as he goes on very *glibly, thoſe that were the greateſt favourers of thoſe Feſtivals, are fallen into Arminianiſm,* &c. *or do little appear to maintain the truth.*

I wonder what a *Phariſee* could have ſaid more in his *ſolemneſt Magnificat*; He, forſooth, and ſuch 5.
as he, are the men that *only or chiefly propugn and maintain ſound doctrine,* and who can doubt it, when he hath thus affirmed it of *himſelf?* and *all others* are but as this *Publicane,* for ſo this *new ſtyle* of *Arminian* bears proportion with that *antient*; and whoſoever will not think as this *Diatribiſt* doth, that *Feſtivals* are forbidden in the ſecond and the fourth *Commandments,* that will favour *ſlaviſh fear,* or *mercenary obedience,* or ſuſpect that *grace* may be *received in vain,* muſt preſently fall under that *condemnation*; and then, the beſt that can be ſaid of them is, that they do *little appear to maintain the truth.*

SECT. XIII.

His ſecond change of my words. Gedeons *golden Ephod not appliable to Feaſts.*

SO again when I had mentioned the *deſigns* of this *ſolemnity,* no other than to *teach* us what we *Numb.* 1.
have *received* in *Chriſt,* and aſſiſt us to render *God a pious publick acknowledgment* of it, He is pleaſed not to *underſtand* this, but to interpret it (contrary to the expreſs words) of the *deſign* in the firſt *inſtituters* of this piece of *ſervice* to *Chriſt Jeſus.*

And to what purpoſe was this *change?* why, to make the *example* of *Gedeon's golden Ephod* appli- 2.
cable to it, *in the making of which,* ſaith he, *though Gedeon's deſign was very fair, to leave a monument of his victory, yet it proved a ſnare to him and his houſe and all Iſrael.*

From which notable *example,* no doubt, it follows that every *Feſtival,* or what ever elſe is deſigned 3.
as a *publick pious acknowledgment of the Chriſtians thankfulneſs to God,* is to be lookt on as a *ſnare* to *all* the *people* of *God,* and ſo upon all *reaſons* of *piety,* to be *aboliſhed.*

And there were no way of reſiſting this *concluſion* thus inferred, if our *common notions,* or *Logick* 4.
had not warned us, that *particular premiſes* would never induce a *concluſion,* and that *examples* are not always *argumentative,* For then indeed the *Lords day* which is ſuppoſed to have been *deſigned* for all theſe *good ends,* muſt upon the ſame *account* be *aboliſht* alſo.

SECT. XIV.

Strictures on his ſixteenth Section. Our Feſtivals unfitly compared with the Romiſh. How obſervation of Feſtivals may be a duty of the fifth Commandment. The fourth Commandment no way contrary to Chriſtian Feſtivals. Venial ſins. All miſtakes not ſins. Chemnitius *not producible againſt me.*

HIS ſixteenth Section is long, in making good his *charge* of *Superſtition* and *Will-worſhip* againſt *Numb.* 1.
this *Feſtival,* And it is certain that I have been *large* enough on theſe *ſubjects* already, as far as any thing that he could *ſuggeſt,* appeared to have the leaſt *force* either againſt *ceremonies* in *general,* or *particularly* this of *Feſtivals,* and therefore I ſhall not ſtill bind my ſelf and the Reader to that *ungrateful penance* of drawing the ſame *Saw* for ever, Yet if any thing ſhall now be afreſh *objected,* I ſhall not omit to take *notice* of it.

As firſt, When to free it from all *appearance* of *Will-worſhip,* I ſay that *thoſe that retain the uſage,* 2.
obſerve it in obedience to the Laws of the Church, he hath great diſpleaſure to this, Firſt, Becauſe I *ought firſt to have proved that they which inſtituted that Feſtival had a Lawful power to do it,* adding, that *the Papiſts may uſe the ſame argument for obſervation not only of their Holy days, but of their invocation of Saints, adoration of images, and the Maſs it ſelf.*

But to this I anſwer, Firſt, That my *not proving* of this, was founded in my *ſuppoſing* it. And the 3.
reaſon of that *ſuppoſition* elſewhere competently *explained,* that as *Magiſtrates* in *general,* ſo *particularly* the *Governours* of a *Church* have an *inveſtiture* of *power* from *Chriſt* to the *Apoſtles,* whoſe *ſucceſſors* they are, to *ordain* and *inſtitute* ſuch *circumſtances* of the *publick worſhip* of *God,* as are *times* and *place* and *geſture* and the like, in order to *decency, uniformity,* and the *benefit* of their *Churches.*

And ſecondly, That this *Diatribiſt* can again think fit to *compare* this, with the *Papiſts obſerving* 4.
their own *holy days,* &c. is interpretable as a far greater *kindneſs* to them, than I have ever been *guilty* of; For the plain inference is this, Firſt, The *Church* may command in *lawful* things, therefore it may as well do ſo in *unlawful.* Secondly, There is no more *unreaſonableneſs* in *beſainting* all thoſe that are gotten into the *Romiſh Legend* and *Calendar,* and conſecrating ſeveral days to the *commemorating* of them, than in *commemorating* the *birth* of *Chriſt* himſelf. Thirdly, It is as *lawful* to *invoke* all the *Romiſh Saints,* as publickly to *pray* to and *praiſe Chriſt* on the 25th day of *December.* Fourthly, It is as ſafe to adore *images,* and the very *bread* in the *Maſs,* as to *adore* and *commemorate Chriſt* on that day. What could *paſſion,* or *intereſt,* or ἀμετεία ἀνθολικῆς, or τὸ δυλεύφ ὑποθέσιν, have *ſuggeſted* more unadviſedly than this?

His ſecond *diſlike* and *exception* is, that having *formerly founded times or days deſigned to publick wor-* 5.
ſhip, on the equity of the fourth Commandment, I ſhould now devolve the obſervation of this feſtival to obedience to the laws of the Church, and ſo reduce it as a *duty to the fifth Commandment,* and upon this, as an eſpecial *advantage,* he is pleaſed to *expatiate.*

But the matter is *clear* enough, and was ſo, till he had taken pains to *involve* it. The *difference* is 6.
very *conceivable* and *intelligible* betwixt *time* or times for *Gods ſervice* generally conſidered, and this or that *particular time.* That *God* ſhould have ſome *times* aſſigned for his *ſervice* is of the very *law* of *Nature,* and ſo much of *morality* there is *fundamental* to the *poſitive precept* of the *weekly Sabbath* in the

fourth *Commandment*: Nay farther, the fourth *Commandment* being given to the *Jews* for the obſervin g *one* day in *ſeven*, as a *fit* and moderate *proportion* of time to be required of every *Jew*, it might equitably be inferred, that a *Chriſtian* ſhould at leaſt ſet a part *one* day in *ſeven* for our great *Chriſtan* purpoſes, the *firſt* day of the *week* on which *Chriſt roſe* from the *dead*. And accordingly I ſuppoſe it *inſtituted* by the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*.

7. But then as among the *Jews* beſide the *weekly ſabbath* required by the fourth *Commandment*, they had many other times of *feſtivity*, and *faſting*, ſome appointed by *God* himſelf in the time of the Θεοκρατία, others inſtituted by *men*, and yet conſtantly obſerved by *Gods people* and accepted by *God*, and ſome approved by *Chriſt* himſelf, and all this without any *prejudice* to the fourth *Commandment*, though not by any force of that; ſo now ſtill under the *Goſpel* nothing hinders, but that the *Church* of *God*, by the *power* left to, and depoſited with them, may ordain *Chriſtian feaſts*, and *faſts*, and obedience be paid thereto by all dutiful *meek* ſons of the *Church*, and this obedience be in them that are thus under *authority*, no act of *Will-worſhip* or *ſpontaneity*, but of *honour* and *obſervance* to this *ordinance* of the *Church*, and ſo a *duty* of the fifth *Commandment*.

8. As for that which he adds in this matter, that *we Chriſtians are by Chriſt reduced to the fourth Commandment, as for one day of ſeven to be holy, ſo for our allowance of ſix daies for our own works, Firſt*, It hath not the leaſt *appearance* of truth in it, for where did *Chriſt reduce* us to the *fourth Commandment*? and tis viſible what the conſequence muſt be in *affirming* it, even an *obligation* to the *Jewiſh Sabbath*, for that certainly was the *ſubject* of the fourth *Commandment*.

9. *Secondly*, It is no way pertinent to the matter in hand; for ſuppoſing *Chriſtians* allowed *ſix* daies for their *own works*, tis yet viſible that ſome of theſe *ſix* may by the *free* act of particular *men* be *uſed*, or by the *power* of the *Chriſtian Church* be ſet apart to *Chriſtian uſes*, as well as ſome days were (not only by *God* himſelf, but) by the *Governors* of the *Jews*, *Judas Maccabeus*, and others, ſet apart for the publick *ſervice* of *God* in the *old Teſtament*, at which time 'tis by all confeſt that the *fourth Commandment* was in force, in all parts of it.

10. A ſecond *exception* I ſhall note in this *Section* p. 157. when upon theſe words of mine concerning the *poſſible miſtake* of the *day*, that *that will be pardonable in thoſe that verily think they are not miſtaken, and that in them that do perform the buſineſs of the day as compleatly on a miſtaken day as on the true, the excuſe of blameleſs ignorance will waſh away greater errors than this*,] he preſently replies, *Does not this ſound ſomewhat like the Papiſts doctrine of venial ſins?* and upon that occaſion is put in mind of *Bellarmines defence againſt the peril of Idolatry in the Maſs, in caſe the bread be not tranſubſtantiated*: And then he asks, *Can any ignorance be blameleſs againſt the Law of God, or waſh away any error without the blood of Chriſt?*

11. But to this the anſwer is obvious, and the *fallacy* preſently diſcoverable, For *Firſt*, He that talks of *venial* or *pardonable ſins*, muſt not be preſumed to exclude the *blood* of *Chriſt*; thoſe ſins are *pardonable* under the *Goſpel*, for which that λύτρον was paid, and ſuch are all *ſins* that are *reconcileable* with true *repentance*, or the *ſincerity* of a *regenerate* ſtate.

12. But then *Secondly*, I am no way aſſured that it is a *ſin* ſo much as of *ignorance*, to *miſtake* in the *day* of *Chriſts birth*; every *miſtake* is not a *ſin*, but only that which is a *breach* of ſome *law*, and therefore I ſuppoſe it is, that the *Diatribiſt* was compelled to ſay, *Can any ignorance be blameleſs againſt a law of God?* But then I profeſs not to know any *law* of *God*, againſt which it is a *ſin* (though but of *ignorance*) to *miſtake* that *day* for the *annual day* of *Chriſts birth*, which really is not the *day*.

13. And I now deſire to be informed, of which of the *ten Commandments*, or any other *law* of *Gods* in the *Old* or *New Teſtament*, this is a *breach*. When he tells me this, I ſhall attend him more *diligently* to the *remainder* of this *Section*, and anſwer his inſtance of ſo *weighty* conſideration about the very day of the *Jews paſſover*, of which he acknowledges that the *very day was as ſtrictly commanded as the buſineſs it ſelf*, and ſo the *error* muſt be an *error* againſt a *law*, whereas he as certainly knows, that this *day* of *Chriſts birth* is by none ſo much as pretended to be ſo *commanded*.

14. What remains concerning *Chemnitius*'s charge of *Superſtition*, on *Papiſts* obſervation of their *holy days*, is all anſwered before it be produced, by this one conſideration, that *Chemnitius*, as a *Lutheran*, is by the *Diatribiſt* confeſt to allow this and other *Feſtivals*; For then hath he granted all that I contend for, who undertook not to be *advocate* for the *Legend* or *Calendar* of the *Papiſts*.

SECT. XV.

Of riot. Chriſtian joyes no way contrary to our Feſtivals. Riot as ſeparable from Chriſtmas as the Lords day. Heathen cuſtoms cannot be objected. Gods judgments vainly urged for arguments. The charge of want of hoſpitality on thoſe that retain feſtivities. The hoſpitality at Chriſtmas a pledge of it all the year after. Reformation of exceſs, without abolition of the Feſtival. Attempt to reform, previous to abolition. The Agapæ no example for aboliſhing Feſtivals. Cures for diſeaſes; exciſions only for deſperate ſpreading evils. No cards on Chriſtmas day, as much ſtrictneſs on Chriſtmaſs, not more ſacredneſs than on the Lords day. No deſign of making the Lords day no inſtitution of the Apoſtles. Neither Superſtition nor hypocriſy in abſtaining from Cards on Chriſtmas day.

Numb. 1. WHAT now follows in the *Seventeenth Section* and ſo on to the 27. is all to the head of *Riot*, which I was careful to remove from this *Feſtivity*, And firſt having diſclaimed it as *more intolerable in a Chriſtian than in a Jew*, and that upon this account, that *Spiritual joyes* are his *eminent if not only portion under promiſe*, His anſwer is, that *theſe are not limited to one or twelve days in a year, but are daily joyes, every day is a Chriſtmaſs to a godly heart, Rejoyce in the Lord always*, &c.

2. But he that thus anſwered, could not but know, that the *weekly Lords day* is ſet apart for a *Chriſtian Feaſt* dedicated particularly to theſe *Spiritual joyes*; and that this was very reconcileable with the *text* that ſaid once and again, *Rejoyce always*, and how then can this be oppoſed to any *annual Feſtival*?

Beſides,

Beſides, all that I had to ſay, was, that the *Chriſtian joys* ſhould principally be *Spiritual*, and this 3.
not as a proof of the *lawfulneſs* of *Feſtivals*, but of the *unlawfulnſs* of *riots*, and the *Diatribiſts* anſwer is wholly to that other head, to which that was never deſigned as a *medium*.

To which I might *thirdly* add, that that *text* to the *Philippians* is an *exhortation* to *rejoycing in tri-* 4.
bulations, in the *ſaddeſt* as well as the *cheerfulleſt* ſeaſons, and ſo the *always* is to be limited by the *context*; And then the application of it here, was ſtill ſo much leſs *pertinent*.

In the Second place, my eighteenth *Section* being deſigned to ſhew how *ſeparable* all *riot* was from 5.
this *Feſtival*, by the nature of *Chriſtian dainties*, *inſtruction*, *prayer*, *praiſes*, *alms*, and the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper* (none of which were capable of *luxury*) and *Feſtivity* and *Hoſpitality*, which were clearly *ſeparable* from it; His anſwer is, *Firſt*, that *theſe two laſt are thus ſeparable from riot, but very hardly*; And I ſhall only demand, Are the *leaſure* and *ceſſation* from *buſineſs* on the *Lords day*, experimented to be more *eaſily ſeparable* from it? Is it more *ordinary* for the ſame men to be *drunk* upon *Chriſtmas day*, than upon all, or upon any one *Sunday* in the *year*? And have not *preachers* and *magiſtrates* been as *induſtrious* to caſt out this *profane* Spirit on the *Lords* day, and been as *unſucceſsful* in their *indeavours*? And ſhall this be any *argument* for the *abolition* of that *day*?

Next, ſaith he, *the heathen uſages in it* (*almoſt yielded* Section 2.) *as they imply that the feſtival* 6.
was inſtituted to gratify the heathen, ſo God to ſhew his diſlike of them, hath ſuffered them to be attended with two extreams of true worſhip, ſuperſtition and profaneneſs. But to this I ſay, firſt, that the *heathen uſages* were no way *yielded Section* 2. but only an *argument* uſed *ad homines* that ſo affirmed. *Secondly*, If there were *heathen uſages* in it, thoſe would no way imply the *Feſtival* to have been *inſtituted* to *gratify* the *heathens*; It was *inſtituted* to the honour of *Chriſt*, and the *heathens* were far enough from being *gratified* with that, and 'tis *ſufficient* if the *converted heathens*, among whom it was *inſtituted* by their *converters*, did of themſelves aſſume ſome of their *Gentile cuſtoms* by them thought *innocent* in the *celebration*.

Thirdly, 'Tis great *preſumption* and *intruſion* into *Gods ſecreteſt Counſels*, to ſay that *Gods ſuffering* 7.
this Feſtival to be attended with ſuperſtition or profaneneſs, was to ſhew his *diſlike* if not *deteſtation* of it; For who revealed this *counſel* of *Gods* to this *Diatribiſt*? Beſides, how eaſily might this *argument* be retorted on the *Lords day* by a *Jew*, and all the *riot* and *unprofitableneſs* of *hearers* on that day, be made an *evidence* of *Gods diſlike*, if **not** *deteſtation* of the ſetting apart of this *day* to his *ſervice*? What impiety of any *Sect* would want *arguments* to ſupport it, if ſuch as theſe might be admitted? Nay, laſtly, the matter of the preſent debate being only that of *riot*, what had *ſuperſtition* or *profaneneſs* (either or both) to do with that?

His ninteenth *Section* is the accuſing thoſe *who keep up and cry up the cuſtom of the feſtivity, yet have* 8.
taken liberty to lay aſide hoſpitality and charity not only at the time, but all the year long. To which it is ſufficient to *anſwer*, that then it ſeems, their *hoſpitality* is not the occaſion of *riot* to any, and that is a *competent* means of *vindicating* the *feſtivity* ſo far from that part of the *accuſation*, which now we have before us.

But then *Secondly*, It were perhaps worth *examining*, what degree of truth there is in the *ſuggeſtion*, 9.
and in what inſtances it is founded; ſomething like this, he had once *ſuggeſted* before, and I had then *thought* that it was not worthy taking notice of; But now the returning of it again more ſolemnly, makes me ſuſpect there may be ſomewhat in it; And having no other *clue* to introduce me into his *ſecrets*, and the *charity* and *hoſpitality* of thoſe that have caſt off the *feſtivals*, and with it their *obedience* to the *Church*, beyond thoſe that have retained both, having never been ſo *notorious*, that I could take *cognizance* of it, and the writing a *Diatribe* againſt all *free-will oblations* in a *Chriſtian* being no vehement *indication* that thoſe in whoſe *defence* it was written, were very *eminent* in the *exerciſe* of thoſe virtues, I began to pitch upon one thing that might of late have yielded ſome ſhew of truth to his *obſervation*, *viz.* that the *condition* of many mens worldly plenty hath been ſo *changed* of late, that the men have been forced to *abate* ſomewhat of the *degree* of that *charity* and *hoſpitality* that formerly they had both *ability* and *will* to exerciſe, and that theſe fall out to be the men that *retain obedience* to the *Church* of *England*, and ſo *keep up and cry up the feſtivals of the Church*, though they are not able to *keep up* the *good cheer* of it in that degree, which formerly they have done.

And if the *Diatribiſt* was willing to take notice of this *turn* of the *tyde*, and being himſelf one 10.
of the *proſperous* party, that had caſt off *obedience* and *feſtivals*, but retained *hoſpitality* and *charity*, was willing to compare himſelf with others who being *deprived* of all their *revenues*, were not likely to hold up their *hoſpitality*, then ſure this is a way of *anſwer* which might ſoon be *retorted*, if *juſtice* were allowed to take place, and every man were *re-inveſted* in his own again.

In the mean, thoſe that are deprived of *ability*, to be *charitable* on one ſide, as to be *occaſions* of 11.
riot on the other, if they muſt be *reproacht* for their defects in one, ſhould not in *reaſon* be accuſed for *exceſs* in the other: And that is all I ſhall reply to this *anſwer*.

Unleſs to the *ſecond* part of it I reply in a word, that the *hoſpitality* attendant on this *Feſtival*, 12.
was never by me defined or imagined, and is with no *juſtice* by him ſuppoſed to be a *miſers feaſt*, nor know I any the leaſt *neceſſity* that it ſhould be followed with a *neglect* of *charity all the year after*, but rather that it be lookt on as a *copy* which the whole *life* of a *Chriſtian* is to tranſcribe from this manner of *ſolemnizing* the *birth* of *Chriſt*, as a *firſt-fruits* of this *duty* then paid, as a *pledge* of the *future* harveſt, as a *ſolemn entrance* on that *duty* then, which in ſome degree is to be *exerciſed* all the year after.

In this twentieth *Section*, having in the firſt part of it deſired no more of me, than that in *caſe of* 13.
notorious abuſe I will believe there is place and ſeaſon for reformation (which I moſt *willingly* yield, being, as he knows, as *inclinable* and deſirous as he or any man, that all *exceſſes* ſhould be *reformed*, and never *indured* among *Chriſtians*, of all other men in the *world*) his *concluſion* hath very fairly taken in one *term* more than was in the *premiſſes*, and to *reformation* of *exceſs*, annexed of the *Feſtivity* it ſelf, meaning evidently, according to the *modern ſtyle*, *abolition* by *reformation*; For elſe, after all his *dexterities*, it will not do his *buſineſs*.

For that all *exceſs* ſhould be *aboliſhed*, that the *Feſtivity* ſhould be drained from all ſuch *unchriſtian* 14.
mixtures, and reformed in that meeker ſenſe, was viſibly the deſign of the *Section* to which this of his

was

was *confronted*; And that, it ſeems, will not ſerve the turn; but as if *reformation* were never *reformation*, unleſs like the breaking in of the *Ocean*, it ſweep and carry away all before it, as if our *Dictionaries* were to be changed, and that word were to be *gloſſed* by nothing but *vaſtation* and *depopulation*, all that I had ſaid of *reformation* of *exceſſes* ſignifies nothing with him, unleſs the *Feſtivity* it ſelf be *reformed* alſo, and that juſt as *Epiſcopacy* was to be *reformed*, by being *turned* out of the *Church*.

15. And all the reaſon which is offered for this (viz. *becauſe the Feſtivity hath ordinarily been attended with ſuch miſchiefs without the leaſt attempt of reformation*) if it have any the leaſt *truth* in it, is viſibly a *reaſon* for the *contrary*; For is it not madneſs to *deſtroy* the *vineyard*, before any the *leaſt attempt* hath been made to *dreſs* or *manure* it, to *cut down* the *tree* before ever it was once *digged* about? were it *reconcileable* with any *tolerable ſobriety*, to *aboliſh* the *Lords day* upon any, much more upon *ſuch* an *account* as this of *riot* and *drunkenneſs* ordinarily attending it, without ever giving the *offender* the *firſt* or *ſecond admonition*, without ever *attempting* to *reform* it? Certainly the *rules* of *ſober* diſcipline are directly the *contrary*, to *attempt* and diligently *indeavour* the *reformation* of the *exceſs*, and never to proceed to *ſeverer* remedies, till the *evil* is experimented to be not only *obſtinate* but *deſperate*, and yet then too, to divide betwixt the *nocent* and *guiltleſs*, and not involve both in the ſame *condemnation*; And *arguments* muſt ſure be very *ſcanty*, when thoſe come to be uſed for the *affirmative*, which were proper only for the *negative*; And yet thus is it at this time with the *Diatribiſt*.

16. But his twenty firſt Section offers us an *example* of this *deſtructive*, *exterminative reformation*, S^t *Paul's diſcipline on the feaſts of charity by way of deſtruction and abolition, when they began to be* abuſed to ſurfeiting *and drunkenneſs*, 1 Cor. 11. 17. But herein are good ſtore of *miſtakes*; For firſt, If that place to the *Corinths* be examined, it is moſt evident that it was the *Lords Supper*, into which that *exceſs* was crept, and accordingly, as he tells them, *v.* 20. that *this is not to eat the Lords Supper*, ſo for the *reforming* of what was amiſs, he tells them what the *inſtitution* of *Chriſt* was in it, and there expreſly ſets down the *firſt inſtitution* of the *Lords Supper*, *In the night he was betrayed he took bread*, v. 24. *&c.* And then I muſt demand, did St. *Paul deſtroy* and *aboliſh* this *feaſt* wherein theſe *abuſes* were obſerved? if he did, he *aboliſht* the *Lords Supper*, and then here is indeed an *inſtance* home to his purpoſe: But if he did not, why did the *Diatribiſt* tender us this *inſtance*, when he knows that *drunkenneſs* and moſt unworthy behaviour at the *Sacrament*, never ſuggeſted to the *Apoſtle* the leaſt thought of *aboliſhing* or *diſuſing* the *Sacrament*.

17. But then ſecondly, To grant him the utmoſt that he can wiſh in this matter, *viz.* that there were *two* parts of this δεῖπνον κυριακὸν, *Lords Supper*, one in taking a *morſel* of *bread*, and *taſting* the *wine*, in *commemoration* of *Chriſt's body* and *blood*, another in *eating* and *drinking* together more *liberally*, after the former was done, and that this latter is it, which is meant by *Agapæ* in St. *Jude*, and that this latter was taken away out of the *Church*, upon the too common *unreformable abuſes* of it; yet ſtill this is nothing of advantage to the *Diatribiſt*; For ſtill this will but conclude, that the *carnal external* part of the *Feſtivity*, the *eating* and *drinking* part, ſhould fall under this *diſcipline*, not the *Spiritual* more *Chriſtian* part, and 'tis evident one of theſe is as *ſeparable* from the other, as the *Sacrament* from the *Agapæ*.

18. And thus much was willingly yielded to his hands in that Section to which his *inſtance* of the *Love-feaſts* was oppoſed, and 'tis certain no more can *rationally*, by any *analogie*, be concluded from it.

19. Nay thirdly, It was not poſſible any inſtance could have been brought more fitted for *my* turn (and ſo I hope, not for *his*) than this of the *Agapæ*. For when this *diſorder* at *Corinth* had brought this attendant on the *Chriſtian feſtival*, under ſome *cenſure*, it was thus *reformed*, (as appears in *Juſtine Martyrs Apologie*, where he ſets down the whole *courſe* of the *office*.) The *offerings* were not *leſſened* by this means, but otherwiſe *diſpoſed* of, and that which was not *eaten* at the *Lords Table*, was kept in a *common bank* for the *poor*, the *Stranger*, the *Fatherleſs* and *Widow*, and a very competent *proviſion* was made for all by this means.

20. And ſo truly in like manner, if upon a juſt *inquiry* it be found that the *Chriſtmaſs liberality* and *hoſpitality* ſtill ends in *riot*, and that there is no hope of *reſtrain* to be laid upon it, as it runs in that *channel*, It is moſt obvious and eaſie for every *ſober Chriſtian* to turn the *ſtream* another way, to lay aſide for *relief* of the *poor*, that which was uſually laid out in the *extraordinary entertainments* at this time, and as that is the utmoſt, to which the *ſeverity* uſed on the *Agapæ* can extend, or ſuggeſt, ſo it is the very thing which was propoſed Section twenty, but it ſeems cannot yet ſatisfie this *Diatribiſt*.

21. What in the twenty ſecond Section he cenſures in me as *pretty untempered mortar*, will not, I believe, be found ſo, in any *ſober judging*. 'Tis only this, that *though the eating and ſporting part of this feſtivity be ſtrictly to be kept within bounds, and as ſtrictly to be reformed wherein it hath been diſcerned to exceed* (this had been ſet down before, and was now *ſuppoſed*) *yet for abolition of all hoſpitality and recreation*, or ἄνεσις *remiſſion* (as *Nazianzen* ſtyles it) *at theſe times, it was to be looke on as a laſt remedy, and ſo not proceeded to, till the diſeaſe were univerſally ſpreading* and *obſtinate* againſt all *cure*, for whileſt it were lower than ſo, it was ſtill but the *ſeaſon* of *reformation*.

22. From whence that the *Diatribiſt* ſhould think fit to infer it my ſenſe (that he might accuſe me) *that leſs or leſs general abuſes need no reformation*, there can be no tolerable account rendred, but only this, that his *ears* have been ſo accuſtomed to the new *dialect*, that of *exterminative reformations*, that he cannot think the word ſignifies any thing elſe, by whomſoever it is uſed, but (that which indeed it never ſignifies in any *propriety* of *ſpeech*) *extirpation* and *abolition*. In a word, I think there is no neceſſity of *exciſion*, till the part begin to *gangrene* or *corrupt* and *ſpread*, yet I can admit of *medicines* long before, and heartily adviſe *timely* prudent *applications*, as ſoon as ever the *patient* begins in the leaſt meaſure to be *diſtempered*.

23. His twenty third Section is the accuſing of thoſe that uſed *cards on the Lords day after the evening ſervice*, and the upbraiding their *ſuperſtition* that they will not *touch cards or dice on Chriſtmas day*; and the anſwer is ſufficient, that as I ſpake not a word of them that did thus, ſo I never heard of any that thus made a *difference* betwixt *Chriſtmaſs day* and the *Lords day*, but that if they uſed that *liberty* on the

the *latter*, they uſed it on the *former* too; However if by the *Diatribiſt* it were deemed *criminous* in the *one*, I ſhould have hoped he might have been gratified by hearing it was *abſtained* from in the *other*: For my own part I never allowed my ſelf the *liberty* on either, and know not that I ever ſaw it uſed, and therefore I am ſure there is nothing farther to be replied to by me in that Section. I as heartily wiſh a devout, conſcientious, profitable *obſervation* of the *Lords day*, as of any other *Feſtivity*, and cannot juſtly fall under the *Diatribiſts* cenſure for any thing I have ſo much as intimated in this matter.

And this I ſay the rather, becauſe Section 24. this is charged upon my *doctrine* as a *crime*, and a 24.
part of *ſuperſtition*, that the *day* hath been accounted *more ſacred than the Lords day*, and the proof brought out of my twentieth Section, where ſaith he, I call it *moſt ſacred*, and out of my twenty fourth Section, where I ſay *it hath been kept if not much more, yet certainly as ſtrictly as any Lords day in the year.*

But here is *miſpriſion* in each of theſe; The phraſe *moſt ſacred* Section 20. doth not at all belong 25.
to the *day*, (much leſs to the *preferring* it before the *Lords day* in reſpect of *ſacredneſs*) but only to a *Chriſtian Feſtivity*, as that is made up of *prayer*, *praiſes*, *Euchariſt*, *charity*, *hoſpitality*, &c. All which being put together, I hope I could not offend in ſtyling it *moſt ſacred*, ſuch as the *extravagant*, *irrational riots* of men ought not to *aſſault* and *pollute*.

And for the ſecond, there is no ſuch word as *ſacred* to be found in that twenty fourth Section, all 26.
that is ſaid is, that *in this nation the day of the birth of Chriſt hath been kept* (*if not much more*) *certainly as ſtrictly as any Lords day in the year*, and this interpreted moſt clearly by the following words) *in frequenting the ſervices of the Church, in the uſe of the Liturgie, Sermon, Sacraments*, &c. And I cannot imagine how this manner of *ſtrict obſerving* of it, can be *criminous* in it ſelf, or to the *prejudice* of the *Lords day*, on which 'tis no news to ſay that the *Sacrament* of the *Lords Supper*, which I make an *ingredient* in the *ſtrictneſs* of the *celebration*, and that which denominates it *more ſtrict*, is not conſtantly *celebrated*; and yet ſure no *fault*, that it is conſtantly *celebrated* on *Chriſtmaſs* day.

However the *ſtrictneſs* of *obſerving* is one thing, and the *ſacredneſs* is another; Any private *faſt* 27.
may be more ſtrictly obſerved, more, or more *ſevere ſtrictneſs* of *duty* allotted to it, than to the *Lords* day, and yet the *Lords* day, as ſet apart by the *Apoſtles* of *Chriſt*, in reſpect of that *inſtitution*, and of the *reſurrection* of *Chriſt*, to the *commemorating* whereof it was *conſecrated*, be *eſteemed* and lookt on as *moſt ſacred*. I need to ſay no more of that.

As for the *ground* which he pretends from his own knowledge, to aſſign of my thus ſpeaking; *viz.* 28.
that we may *make the Lords day and Feſtivals to be founded on the ſame authority*, *viz.* of the *Church*, this he muſt very much diſſemble his *knowledge*, if he confeſs not to be a *miſtake* alſo.

For in the *margent* he grants that I ſay that the *Apoſtles* inſtituted the *Lords day* §. 31. and ſo cer- 29.
tainly I do (though I know not in what words of *Scripture* that *inſtitution* is ſet down.) But, ſaith he, there be other words, §. 57. which ſpeak of the *Lords day* by the *ſame authority appointed*. To which I anſwer that the words there uſed [*though the Lords day be by the ſame authority appointed*] belong not at all to the *ſtating* of this *queſtion*, and being introduced in that form [*though*, &c.] they are not any *affirmation* that the *Lords day* is not *inſtituted* by any *higher authority* than *Chriſtmaſs day*, but only a *conceſſion* of what was asked by the *Quæriſt*, without ſo much as *examining* or *inquiring* into the *utmoſt* of the *authority* by which it ſtood. Of this I had ſufficiently expreſt my ſenſe, §. 31. as the *Diatribiſts margent* confeſſes from me, *viz.* that the *Apoſtles* inſtituted the *Lords day*, whereas in that fifty ſeventh Section, I ſpeak as plainly of *Chriſtmaſs day*, that it hath its *authority* from the *inſtitution* and *uſage* of the *Univerſal Church*; And if when the matter is ſo clear, and my meaning ſo expreſs both for the *one* and the *other*, I muſt yet be accuſed for the *contrary*, and this be affirmed from the *Diatribiſts knowledge* to be my ground, *viz.* a *deſign* to make the *Lords day* and *Feſtivals* to be founded on the *ſame authority*, and that by him ſpecified, *viz. of the Church*; 'Tis certainly moſt viſible, that either this is a *calumny* in the *Diatribiſt*, or elſe that the word *Church* muſt be ſo taken as to comprehend that part of it, of which the *Apoſtles* were *rulers* in perſon, and then what harm hath been in that *ſpeech* thus interpreted, the *Church* of the *Apoſtles* inſtituted the *Lords day*, and either they *perſonally*, or their *ſucceſſors* uſed and delivered down the other *Feſtivals*, the *Feſtival* of *Eaſter* being derived undoubtedly from the *Apoſtles*, *Philip* and *John*, *Peter* and *Paul*, as hath already clearly appeared out of the *difference* betwixt *Victor* and *Polycrates*; And other *Feſtivals* by the paſſages of the *Martyrdom* of *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, *i. e.* by evidence of *ſtory* being demonſtrated to be little later, though of *Chriſtmaſs* this do not ſo expreſly appear to me as to be any where *affirmed* by me.

But there is yet more of this captious diſcourſe behind, upon my ſaying that 'tis *not uſual to touch* 30.
cards or dice on Chriſtmas day, and this muſt *add either to our ſuperſtition or hypocriſie*, *our ſuperſtition, if they be lawful, in that they forbid them on that day, that God hath not forbidden them*; *Hypocriſie, if they be unlawful, in abſtaining then, and yet uſing them on other days.* But we ſhall ſoon be extricated from the power of this *Dilemma*, by affirming, Firſt, That thoſe *ſports* uſed *moderately*, as *diverſions*, and no way *abuſed* by our *inordinacy*, are not by any *argument* that ever I met with, proved to be *toto genere*, or *abſolutely unlawful*, and ſo that they may be uſed for *divertiſement* on other *days*, and particularly on the following days of that *Feſtivity*; and yet ſecondly, that they are no way *neceſſary*, and ſo that no man *offends*, that *abſtains* from them on *all other* days, and employs himſelf better *conſtantly*.

From whence it is neceſſarily *conſequent* alſo, that he that hath *fed* on the *body* and *blood* of *Chriſt*, 31.
and *conſecrated* himſelf in an *extraordinary* manner to *commemorate* the *myſterie* of our *redemption* on *Chriſtmaſs day*, and agreeably thereto, deſires to ſpend it ſo much more *ſtrictly* than other days, as not to *admit* thoſe *ſports* (which are *lawful* on *other* days) to divide any part of that, can never be *criminous* in ſo doing.

As for any thing of *riot* (but ſuch is not all *lawful divertiſement*) on the *following days*, he knows 32.
they are no way pleaded for by me, and if any be *guilty* of them, as the *ſhame* thereof is due to the *offenders*, not to the *feſtival*, which is *innocent* and *laudable*; ſo 'tis too well known that the *Lords day* it ſelf hath not been ſecured from the ſame unhappy *adherences*.

And

33. And it might as well be charged on that, that the *heathens* worſhipt the *Sun* on that day, and that *revelling* upon it, are fitter for ſuch *heathen feaſts* than for *Chriſtians*, as the *Diatribiſt* could ſuggeſt in this place, that *the Saturnalia were celebrated about the ſame time that Chriſtmas was, and that the exceſſes of the following dayes are ſervices fitter for the revels of* Bacchus *and* Saturn, *or the birth day of* Herod, *than for the feſtivity of a ſpiritual Saviour*. All this is *true*, and *equally* granted by *both* parties, and ſo hath no *propriety* or *pertinency* to the *diſpute* between us.

SECT. XVI.

Chriſtmaſs, if of the ſame original with Eaſter, certainly Apoſtolical. However, of the practice of the Primitive Church. All rendring of motives no λόγῳ σοφίας.

Numb. 1. MY twenty ſeventh Section was *introductory* to a diſcourſe more *general*, to ſhew by what *authority*, *feſtivals* in *general*, and *particularly* this of *Chriſtmaſs*, pretends to ſtand in the *Catholick Church*, which I acknowledged not to be by any *inſtitution* of *Chriſts*, but to have had the *beginning* from the *Apoſtles* or the *ſucceeding Church*.

2. To the view hereof he now proceeds, and briefly ſets to it, to diſprove each of theſe *originals*, beginning firſt with that of the *Apoſtles*. And of this he thinks he need ſay no more, than to *appeal* to the ſame *arguments* which he had uſed againſt the *Apoſtles inſtitution* of *Eaſter*, §. 6. *viz.* Firſt, The no mention of ſuch *inſtitution* in the *Scripture*; Secondly, The *expreſs words of* Socrates, *that neither* Chriſt *nor his* Apoſtles *commanded the feaſt of* Eaſter *to be obſerved*.

3. But to both theſe it is certain that I owe no *return*, having now paid it ſo *punctually* in the fourth Section, where beſide clear *anſwers* to the *Diatribiſts* arguments, I added *evidences* undeniable that the *feaſt* of *Eaſter* was *obſerved* by the *Apoſtles*, And I cannot doubt but they will be of force with him, when he ſhall take leiſure to *weigh* them; And then if the caſe ſhall be acknowledged the ſame betwixt *Eaſter* and *Chriſtmaſs*, that of the *reſurrection* and this of the *birth* of *Chriſt* (as the *Diatribiſt* ſeems to acknowledge, in tendring no one argument more againſt the *Apoſtolicalneſs* of *Chriſtmaſs*, than he had before produced againſt the *inſtitution* of *Eaſter* by them) then it is evident my *affirmation* muſt aſcend *higher* than it ever meant to have done, and not proceed *disjunctively*, that this *feaſt* of the *nativity* is derived *either* from the *Apoſtles* or the *ſucceeding Church*, but leaving out the *latter* part of the *partition*, fix upon the *former*, that, being yielded to have the ſame *original* with *Eaſter*, it is certainly *derived* from the *Apoſtles*, from whence it appears that of *Eaſter* is *derived*.

4. To which purpoſe we have already produced ſome *evidences* which may juſtly pretend to ſome force, at leaſt *ad hominem*, to him that hath no more againſt this, than againſt all other *Chriſtian feſtivals*, viz. thoſe from the *martyrdoms* of *Ignatius* and *Polycarp*, written by thoſe that were *preſent* at them, and ſo lived ſoon after the *Apoſtles*.

5. That of *Polycarps* recorded in that *famous Epiſtle* of the *Church* of *Smyrna*, I have ſet down at large, and made my *inferences* from it, §§. 33. and 34. of that *treatiſe* of *Feſtivals*; To which I have here formerly added that other *parallel teſtimony* from the acts of *Ignatius*.

6. So that now I hope I may ſafely reſume my former *affirmation*, without all *diffidence*, that other *Feſtivals* beſide that of the *weekly Lords day*, were derived to us, ſome certainly from the *Apoſtles*, others from the *Church* immediately ſucceeding the *Apoſtles*; In one of which ranks though I have no reaſon to doubt but this of the *Nativity* of *Chriſt* is to be placed, yet becauſe we have not thoſe *evidences* of the *fact* which we have for *Eaſter* and others, I ſhall not build upon any degree of *uncertainties*, nor affirm more than what that *treatiſe* hath ſhewed out of the *ancient Fathers*, that this *feaſt* is deduced to us early from the *firſt antiquity*.

7. And againſt this I am ſure neither *Socrates* nor my Lord of *Falkland* (who is joined next to him) hath *ſuggeſted* any thing; and then what was thus done by them, muſt not in *equity* fare the worſe for my adding the mention of a motive or incitement that might reaſonably *recommend* it to them, which is therefore preſently ſtyled λόγῳ σοφίας, *a ſhew of wiſdom*, as if all *reaſonable* motives were to be blaſted under that *title*, as all *uncommanded performances* here are ſaid to be by the expreſs words of the ſecond *Commandment*, and *Col.* 2. 23. But ſure we have formerly ſpoken enough of this *arguing*.

SECT. XVII.

The Encænia, *a religious feaſt inſtituted by the Jews, and approved by Chriſt, vindicated from all his exceptions. Marriage-feaſts. Religious feaſts cannot be unlawful, if civil be lawful. The feaſt of Purim a religious feaſt.*

Numb. 1. THE twenty ninth Section proceeds to conſider what I had ſaid of the *Encænia* among the *Jews*, the *feaſt* of *dedication* not *inſtituted* by *God* in the *Law*, but in *commemoration* of the *purging* of the *altar* by *Judas Maccabeus*, and yet this *obſerved* by the *Jews*, and approved by *Chriſts preſence* at it, *Joh.* 10. 23.

2. To this the *Diatribiſt anſwers*, that *there may be many miſtakes in this*; And truly it matters not how *many* there *may* be, as long as there appears not to be any *one*.

3. Firſt then his anſwer is, that *there were three feaſts of dedication, and I cannot but know that learned men*

men are divided of which it's here meant. But how can this firſt *anſwer* be of any *avail*, when I that took notice, as he confeſſes, of the *three*, made it evident that the place was meant of the *third*, that *inſtituted* in the *Maccabees*, and the *Diatribiſt* cannot deny but *it's probable ſo it was*, and offers not to *anſwer* the *proofs*, or to *pretend* ought for either of the *two* former againſt this.

His Second anſwer is, that *granting it to be the laſt, yet there are reaſons to think it was not a religious* 4.
Feſtival but a civil, as the feaſt of Purim ſeems to be, Eſth. 9. 21, 22. But it is not *imaginable* the *Diatribiſt* ſhould thus think, or be perſwaded by theſe *reaſons*.

His *reaſon* is from the words 1 *Mac.* 4. 59. They *ordered it ſhould be kept yearly with mirth and glad-* 5.
neſs, adding that *though it be ſaid* v. 56. *they offered burnt-offerings, yet that was* v. 53. *according to the law, and ſo was worſhip commanded.*

Now truly this I thought had been ſufficient *proof*, that this was a *religious feaſt*, and it was great 6.
ſurprize to me to ſee it brought to infer the *contrary*: For what greater evidence can there be brought of a *religious feaſt*, than this, of which out of the *Story* he hath ſet down a conſiderable *portion*, but lies in the *Maccabees* more *completely* thus.

Now on the 25th *day of the Ninth Month (which is called the Month Caſleu) in the* 148th *year, they roſe* 7.
up betimes in the morning and offered ſacrifice according to the law upon the new altar of burnt-offering which they had made; look at what time and what day the heathen had profaned it, even upon that was it dedicated with ſongs and citterns, harps and cymbals; Then all the people fell upon their faces worſhipping and praiſing the God of heaven who had given them good ſucceſs, and ſo they kept the dedication of the altar eight days, and offered burnt-offerings with gladneſs; and ſacrificed the ſacrifice of deliverance and praiſe, &c. and then *v.* 59. *Moreover Judas and his brethren with the whole congregation of Iſrael ordained that the days of the dedication of the altar ſhould be kept in their ſeaſon from year by the ſpace of eight days from the* 25th *day of the Month Caſleu with mirth and gladneſs.*

And now I ſhall ask the *Diatribiſt*, Is there any reaſon to think this was not a *religious feſtival*, 8.
nay is it poſſible for him to give any *account*, why in ſetting down the paſſages of it, he ſhould omit the *peoples falling upon their faces, worſhipping and praiſing the God of heaven, and ſacrificing the ſacrifices of deliverance and praiſe*, together with *Judas* and his *brethren* and the *congregation* (which is not *God*, as hath hitherto been pretended it ought to be, from the ſecond and fourth *Commandment*) *ordaining that it ſhould be ſo kept* for the future *from year to year?*

Do not thoſe paſſages take away all poſſibility of doubting, either of the *religiouſneſs* of the *Fe-* 9.
ſtival, or the *inſtitution* by *man* and not by *God?* And is there now againſt all this, any force in the words *v.* 53. [*according to the law*] which the *Diatribiſt* confronts to the mention of *burnt-offerings*, as an *anſwer*, or *reaſon*, why that which was *kept* with *burnt-offerings*, was yet no *religious feaſt?* May not *burnt-offerings according to the law*, ſuch as the *Moſaical law* approves of, yea and commands to be uſed for *burnt-offerings*, be uſed in a *religious feaſt?* what was ever ſuggeſted by any *diſputer* with leſs *appearance* of *truth* or *probability?* He knows that in the *free will-offerings* there were yet *laws* given by *Moſes* according to which they were to *offer*, and why ſhould it not be ſo in a *feaſt ordained* by *Judas?* would he imagine that *illegal offerings* ſhould have been ſought out for it, to conſtitute it a *religious feaſt*.

Here ſure was matter of *conviction* to the *Diatribiſt*, I ſhall not inquire why it did not *prevail* with 10.
him. Only of this I am ſure, that if this *one* inſtance had been permitted to appear, what indeed it is, and now is viſibly *demonſtrated* to be, a *religious feaſt inſtituted* by the *Church* of the *Jews*, and not by *God*, and yet *approved* by him, there can never need any farther *evidence* to confute and demonſtrate the *vanity* of all his *three Diatribæ* of *Superſtition*, *Will-worſhip*, *Feſtivals*, his ſuggeſtions from *ſuper ſtatutum*, from *additions* to the *word*, from the ſecond and fourth *Commmandments*, from *Col.* 2. whether as it mentions *Will-worſhip* or the *Commands* of *men*.

Our *Chriſtmaſs Feſtivity*, ſuppoſing the utmoſt that he can *wiſh*, that it was not obſerved by the 11.
Apoſtles, but *inſtituted* by the *Church*, be it *two* or *three hundred years* after *Chriſt*, being perfectly anſwerable to this of the *dedication*, and ſo *demonſtrated*, by *analogy* with that, to be approved by *Chriſt*.

And therefore it was but neceſſary that this *evidence* ſhould by all convenient means be rendred *un-* 12.
effectual; All the *unhappineſs* of it was, that the matter would not yield any ſuch, and ſo the *Diatribiſt* was to content himſelf with ſuch as we have now *diſcovered*.

And becauſe he could not but foreſee it poſſible, that they would be thus *diſcovered*, and that *yet it* 13.
will be (more than) ſaid *that it was a religious feaſt and ſo obſerved*, he therefore hath a third *anſwer* in reſerve, *Then* ſaith he, *it may be fairly ſuggeſted that they went beyond their commiſſion in making this feaſt annual and perpetual, which neither* Solomon *nor* Zorobabel *did theirs for ought we read.*

Here are again the clear *ſymptoms* of a *deſperate cauſe*, that fain would *catch* at ſome *ſupports*, but 14.
is *forſaken* of all. 'Tis evident *Judas* and his *brethren* and the *whole congregation* ordained that it ſhould be *kept* thus *from year to year*, 1 *Mac.* 4. 59. and as evident that it was ſo *obſerved* by the *Jews* even in *Chriſts* time, and as evident ſtill that *Chriſt* was *preſent* at that *feaſt* (and ſo *approved* of, and *confirmed* it) *Joh.* 10. 23. And yet ſaith he, *it may be fairly ſuggeſted that they went beyond their commiſſion in making this feaſt annual*; what again could have been ſaid more *unluckily* than this, more *contrary* to *expreſs* evidence in every degree of it?

Add to this ſecond, that even both of the two other *feaſts* of *dedication*, at the *erecting* the *Temple* 15.
in *Solomons*, and *reedifying* it in *Zorobabels* time, if they were *annual*, were fully *parallel* with this, and that they were ſo, was by this *Diatribiſt* affirmed to be the *opinion* of *learned* men, in this very *page*, who, ſaith he, *interpreted the place of* John 10. *ſome of the one, ſome of the other of theſe*, which 'twere *ridiculous* for them to do, if it were not *annual*.

Nay laſtly, ſuppoſing theſe two were never obſerved above *once a piece*, I ſhall now demand, why 16.
might they not as *lawfully* be *celebrated often*, or *annually* and *ordinarily*, as for *one turn* and *extraordinarily?* If the *firſt* offended not, by being *ſuper ſtatutum*, how could the *ſecond* or *hundredth* or *thouſandth* repetition render it *criminous?* 'Tis not imaginable what reaſon can be given for this, that what was *lawful* laſt year, ſhall be *impious* this year; what ground of ſo great difference, that one ſhould be *approved*, the other *condemned*, one not only *innocent* but *commendable*, and the other (*i. e.* the ſame *received* into *conſtant annual practice*) *repudiated* and *rejected*.

17. And yet in this, it ſeems, all the *difference* lies all this while, *extraordinary days of thanksgiving* for *one* turn ſaith he, he *accounts lawful to be done by the higher powers*, and ſo *extraordinary days of humiliation*; From whence I conclude, that if King *Lucius* 1400. years ago kept *Chriſtmaſs day* for *one* turn and no more, and ſo *Good Friday* alſo, he had the *Diatribiſts* leave to do it very *freely* and *lawfully*; But if when he had done ſo *once*, he ſhall offer to do it *again*, the next *year*, then Mr. *C.* muſt needs write *Triplicem Diatriben* againſt him.

18. What he yet farther adds as a *laſt miſtake* in me, will be ſoon found of the ſame rank with the former. *Another miſtake*, ſaith he, *is this, that that feaſt was approved and confirmed by Chriſts preſence at it*, *whereas*, ſaith he, *the text produced ſayes no ſuch thing, but only thus*, *It was at* Jeruſalem (*mark that, not at the Temple*) *not elſewhere, the feaſt of the dedication*, *and* v. 22. *Jeſus walked in the Temple, ſo he did other days, any day when no feaſt was*, &c.

19. I wiſh we were at an end of this kind of *arguing*, for it will not eaſily be *parallel'd* in any *Diatribiſt*; All that is by me affirmed from the *text*, is, that *Chriſt was preſent at it*, the reſt is my *deduction* from thence, and I hope I have not *offended* therein. For is not that an evidence of *Chriſts approbation*, and ſo *confirmation* of it? would *Chriſt* have been *preſent* at an *unlawful*, nay (as this muſt be by the *Diatribiſts divinity*) *ſuperſtitious deteſtable* feaſt, wherein the ſecond and fourth *Commandments* were directly *violated* by the very *keeping* of it, and never have reprehended it? would he not have *ſcourged* it and diſpatcht it out of the *Temple*, as he did that *huckſtering* cuſtom of *buying* and ſelling there, and expreſt as great *impatience* againſt ſuch *ſuperſtitious* violations, as thoſe other *profanations* of his *Fathers houſe*? would not his *preſence* at the *Feaſt* have had the *ſcandal* of *ſuperſtition*, if the *Feaſt* it ſelf had had that *crime* in it?

20. What now he appoints to be *markt*, that this *Feaſt was at* Jeruſalem, *not at the* Temple, is very ſtrange. For if it were a *religious Feaſt* (as hath already appeared it was,) from the *ſtory* of the *inſtitution* in the *Maccabees*) then ſure it was in the *Temple*, and ſo at *Jeruſalem*, where the *Temple* was. And what if *Jeſus walkt in the Temple* on *other* days, *when no feaſt was*, doth it therefore follow that now it was not the *Feaſt*, when he *walked* there, and when the *text* ſaith expreſly that it was the *Feaſt*? This is a new ſort of *arguing* ſtill, and this may be reiterated *more turns than one*, and yet nothing *amiſs* in it.

21. What hath thus far been ſaid by him of the *Encænia*, is appliable, ſaith he, to my ſecond *inſtance* among the *Jews*, the *feſtivities* of *marriage*. For *marriage* it ſelf, ſaith he, is a civil thing and not *religious*. But I ſhall not *engage* farther in new controverſies, having enow before me already (elſe ſure *marriage* might be approved to be *religious*) I ſhall only need to demand on this head of diſcourſe, what the *difference* is, between a *civil*, and a *religious feſtivity*? I ſhall ſuppoſe only this, that in the one the *publick ſervices* of the *Church*, among *Chriſtians*, *prayers*, *Pſalms*, *Sermon*, *Euchariſt*, (ſome or all of them) are uſed, as among the *Jews*, *ſacrifices*, &c. adding to theſe *feſtival* diet alſo, whereas the other is made up only of the *latter*.

22. And then ſuppoſing one of theſe (as the *Diatribiſt* granteth) *lawful* among the *Jews*, and ſo among *Chriſtians* at the *celebration* of *marriages*, I ſhall demand how it is poſſible, the other ſhould be *unlawful*? Can the *ſervices* of the *Church* being added, make that *criminous*, which was *innocent* before? 'Tis poſſible indeed for a *profane mixture* (ſuch as *riot*, &c.) to *defame* and *pollute* that, which is moſt *ſacred*; but have the *ſacred* offices of the *Church* that ſame *accurſed* force in them, to make that which was but *civil* before, *ſacrilegious* and *impious*? This is another rarity, that I had not formerly been *acquainted* with.

23. But before I leave this matter I muſt take in, what he hath in like manner *affirmed* of the *feaſt* of *Purim* among the *Jews*, of which though having made mention in the *Practical Catechiſm*, I added no more in the *Treatiſe* of *Feſtivals*, yet there cannot be any thing more *pertinent* to our preſent *debates*, this being without any direction from *God*, voluntarily *inſtituted* by the *Jews* not only for *one* turn, but as an *eſtabliſhment* among them, on the 14th and 15th *day* of the *month Adar yearly*, *Heſt.* 9. 21. Now of this he takes notice by the way, §. 29. (treating of the *Encænia*) and ſaith of it as of the other, that it *ſeems not to be a religious feſtival, but a civil*; But this again without the leaſt ſhew of *probability*.

24. I ſhall need go no farther than the *text* to demonſtrate it, *Heſt.* 9. There *v.* 16. the *Jewes had reſt from their enemies*, and thereupon *v.* 17. *on the* 13th *day, and* 14th *of the month Adar reſted they, and made it a day of feaſting and gladneſs*, and v. 18. *The Jews that were at Shuſhan aſſembled together on the* 13th *day, and the* 14th *day thereof; and on the* 15th *they reſted and made it a day of feaſting and gladneſs*, and v. 19. the *Jews of the villages made the* 14th *day of the month Adar a day of gladneſs and feaſting, and a good day, and of ſending portions one to another*; Here I cannot but ſuppoſe that a *day* of *reſt*, of *aſſembly*, of *feaſting*, and *gladneſs*, a *good day* (*i. e.* in their ſtyle, a *feſtival day*) a *day* of *hoſpitality* and *charity*, *ſending* of portions (μερίδες, ſuch as in a *ſacrifical feaſt*) will to any impartial reader paſs for an *indication* of a *religious feaſt*.

25. And as theſe *days* were *obſerved* for the *firſt* turn, ſo they are *eſtabliſht* for a *yearly obſervation*, v. 21, 22. *And the Jews ordained, and took upon them, and upon their ſeed, and upon all ſuch as joined themſelves to them, ſo as it ſhould not fail, that they would keep theſe two days according to their writing, and according to their appointed time every year*, v. 27.

26. What could be more expreſs for the *religiouſneſs*, and for the *eſtabliſhment* for *continuance*; and this ſtill a *feaſt inſtituted* by the *Jews*, and not by *God* himſelf, and ſo as clear an *inſtance*, on our ſide of the matter conteſted, as is imaginable.

SECT.

SECT. XVIII.

How the compariſon holds between the Lords day and Chriſtmas day. Inſtitution, uſage Apoſtolical for Feſtivals. No law in Scripture for the Lords day.

NOW follows his view of what I had ſaid of the *Lords day*, not *inſtituted* by *Chriſt*, or *God* himſelf, but by the *Apoſtles*, without any mention in the *New Teſtament* of any *preſcription* or *law* for the *obſerving* of it. *Numb.* 1.

To this he is very glad to *proceed*, hoping for ſome great *advantage* from it; let us ſee what the *ſucceſs* will prove. 2.

And firſt, ſaith he, *there want not learned men who think that Chriſt did deſign the day.* But I muſt demand whether he can imagine that thoſe *learned* men were in the right in this, or have herein *expreſt* any of their *learning?* If he cannot think they have, why doth he *loſe* time and gain nothing by the *mention* of them? If he can, why doth he not ſo much as offer their *grounds* of thus *opening*, when he knows nor *Scripture* nor *antiquity* ſaith any thing of it, and when it were as tolerable in any *oppoſer* to offer his opinion alſo, that *Chriſtmaſs* day was by *Chriſt* himſelf deſigned alſo. 3.

But then ſecondly, ſaith he, *if the Apoſtles did inſtitute it, that's more than he dare ſay of Chriſtmaſs day.* And what if it be? Doth that *prejudge* the *obſerving* of *Chriſtmaſs*, ſuppoſing it certain (as I do ſuppoſe) that it was either of the *Apoſtles* or the *ſucceeding Church?* Suppoſe ſome *feaſts* of the *Jews* inſtituted by *God* or *Moſes*, others by the *Church* of the *Jews*, and not by *Moſes*, as the *Purim* and *Encænia*, Are not theſe *latter* as lawfully to be kept to all *poſterity* of the *Jews*, as thoſe *former?* 4.

But then ſecondly the *parallel* that I ſet betwixt the *Lords day* and *Chriſtmaſs day*, was only this, that as neither of them was found *preſcribed*, or by *law commanded* in *Scripture*, ſo the *want* of ſuch *law* ſhould be no *prejudice* to the *one*, more than to the *other*, as long as by ſome other way it appeared of the *one*, that it was derived from the *Apoſtles* or the *ſucceeding Church*, as of the other, that it came *immediately* from the *Apoſtles*; It being evident, that if the *Apoſtles uſage* gave to one a *divine authority*, the *uſage* of the *ſucceeding Church* muſt be next to that, though not *divine*, and the latter *lawful*, yea and *obligatory*, as *well*, though not in ſo high a degree, as the former, as the *Encænia* were as *lawful*, as the *Paſover*, and were *obligatory* alſo, though not by the ſame *authority*. By this it appears that there is *certain obligation* for the obſerving of *Chriſtmaſs*, though there ſhould be no *certainty* of the *Apoſtles inſtituting it.* 5.

Next he demands, *If the Lords day was inſtituted by the Apoſtles of Chriſt, do not their inſtitutions carry in them divine preſcription or Law?* I *anſwer*, that if by *inſtitution* be meant *giving Law* for the *obſervation* of it, then there is no doubt of his *propoſition*, the *predication* being *identical*, *inſtitution* in this ſenſe, is *preſcribing*, or *giving Law*. 6.

But 'tis poſſible that *inſtitution* of the *Lords day* by the *Apoſtles*] may ſignifie another thing, *viz.* that the *Apoſtles practice*, *aſſembling* weekly on the *Lords* day, ſhould have the force of an *inſtitution*, or a *Law* with the *ſucceeding Church*, though indeed the *Apoſtles* gave no *Law* for it, or if they did, no ſuch *Law* appears from them. 7.

The *examples* of the *Apoſtles* are the only way of conveying ſome *uſages* to us without any their *preſcript Law*; And accordingly in this ſenſe alſo I conſent to the *Diatribiſt*, that their *inſtitutions* carry in them *divine preſcription* or *Law*, and ſo I ſhall no way *contend* with him in this matter. 8.

Only upon theſe *grounds*, I ſhall demand, that whatſoever elſe ſhall be in the *ſame* manner *derived* to us, through all ages of the *Church*, from the times of the *Apoſtles* themſelves, may be acknowledged alſo to carry a *divine impreſſion* upon it. And then, to omit *Epiſcopacy* (which he cannot but know, hath perfectly as much to be ſaid for it in every reſpect, as the *Lords day*) I ſhall inſiſt only on the *feaſt* of *Eaſter*, which hath been demonſtrated to be *derived* from the *Apoſtles*, and ſo is an *inſtance* of all that I pretend in the point of *Feſtivals*, leaving *Chriſtmaſs* day to the *equity* of *proportion*, and the other *evidences* that are produced for the *antiquity* of it. 9.

Next he proceeds to what I farther ſay, of the *no Law*, that appears in *Scripture* for the *Lord's day*. In order to which I ſaid, that *if any thing of that nature be ſought there, it will rather appear to belong to the annual, than weekly feaſt of the reſurrection*, naming 1 *Cor.* 5. 8. ἑορτάζωμεν *let us keep the feaſt*, and the mention of Κυριακὴ, *the Lords day*, Rev. 1. 10. *by ſome thought to belong to the annual day alſo.* 10.

Againſt theſe he urgeth ſome *authorities* of ſome *ancient* and *modern* writers, which, ſaith he, *do not ſeem to underſtand theſe places thus.* And though 'twere no impoſſible thing to anſwer thoſe *teſtimonies*, yet I ſhall never *diſcourage him* in that very reaſonable courſe of *appeal* to the *judgment* of the *Fathers*, and other ſuch *Learned* men, but yielding him all he deſires of both theſe places, I muſt only deſire him to remember, that this will no whit *advantage* him or *prejudice* me, unleſs he can bring out of the *Scripture* ſome *other places*, which are more *apodictical* evidences of *Apoſtolical Law* for the *weekly Lords* day, than theſe are for the *annual*; For the matter is clear, all that I was there to *prove*, was no more but this, that there was *no Law* in *Scripture* for either of them. 11.

SECT. XIX.

Aërius's *hereſy that Feſtivals are unlawful.* S. Auguſtine's *teſtimony added to* Epiphanius's. *The Diatribiſts inconſtancy. The teſtimony of the Church of* Smyrna, *an evidence of keeping the days of the Apoſtles martyrdom. The Teſtimony from the Martyrdom of* Ignatius *according with it. Teſtimonies for the antiquity of Feſtivals.*

Numb. 1. IN the thirty ſecond *Section* to *Epiphanius*'s cenſure of *Aërius* as of an *heretick*, for *affirming feſtivals unlawful*, his anſwer is that *all is not hereſie that* Epiphanius *calls ſo, nor all* Aërius's *opinions juſtly cenſured as heretical.*

2. And ſo indeed the *Diatribiſt* is concerned to think, both in reſpect of this and ſome other *intereſts*, that eſpecially of *Epiſcopacy*. But for the averting of ſo great a *crime*, it would well become the *accuſed* to offer ſome *reaſon* for the *clearing* himſelf, and not only to have mentioned the name of *Oſiander* the *Epitomizer* of the *Centuriators*, whoſe words are not affirmed to belong to this particular of *Feſtivals*, and if they did, whoſe *authority* is ſure ſo incompetent to weigh with *Epiphanius* in ſetting down the ſenſe of the *ancient Church*, that in all *reaſon* ſome *evidences* ſhould have been annexed to add *weight* to him.

3. As it is, I muſt not think *ſtrange*, that they which tranſcribe that *affirmation* from *Aërius*, will not allow it to be *hereſy* in him; I will only demand whether S. *Auguſtine* be of any better account with him, *Hær.* 53. he knew what *hereſy* was, and what *Aërius* was *guilty* of, and whether elſewhere he may deſerve to be believed, when in conſort with himſelf and with *Epiphanius*, he ſaith, *Rectè feſta Eccleſiæ colunt, qui ſe Eccleſiæ filios recognoſcunt*, *they that profeſs themſelves ſons of the Church do duely obſerve the feaſts of the Church*, ſetting this of the *nativity* in the front of ſuch, where ſurely thoſe that do not obſerve them, muſt diſclaim their *ſonſhip*, and that is but a *paraphraſe* to expreſs thoſe, whom *Epiphanius* ſtyles *hereticks*.

Serm. 253. *De Temp. Domin.* 1. *Adv.*

4. If he ſhall bring any ſo fair *evidences*, that they that *obſerve feaſts* are *ſuperſtitious*, I ſhall think my ſelf obliged to do more than *deny* the *accuſation*.

5. For the *feſtivities* of *martyrs* mentioned by me in the ſame *Section* he acknowledges they *began betimes*, *as ſuperſtition*, ſaith he, *ever attends religion and devotion*, adding that *though they were intended for good ends, yet they produced in time much ſuperſtition.*

6. But ſure this *anſwer* is very *unſufficient*, and *inconſtant*; *Unſufficient*, for what if it were granted that in a proceſs of *time* theſe *feſtivities* did occaſionally produce ſome *evil*, ſo *Chriſtianity* it ſelf, ſo all things that ſhould have been moſt *for our wealth*, may through the vices of men be perverted into *occaſions of falling*; But what is that to the *antiquity* of *Feſtivals*, which is the only thing that theſe inſtances were required to *teſtify?*

7. And Secondly *inconſtant*, for at firſt theſe *feſtivities* are lookt on as *ſuperſtition attending religion and devotion* (and by the way, if that be applicable to theſe *feſtivities*, that will be a competent *character* of their *antiquity*, for *religion* and *devotion*, were brought in with *Chriſtianity*, and if the *Feſtivities* were the *ſuperſtition* that *attended* that, they will be pretty *ancient*) and yet in the latter part 'tis ſaid of them, that they *produced in time much ſuperſtition*, which latter if it be true, then the former which was *contrary*, is not true, and that is ſufficient to be replied to that *anſwer*.

8. As for his return to §. 33. which is of the ſame matter, that I *preſume too much upon my own reaſon in concluding from the teſtimony of the Church of* Smyrna, *that the days of the death of the Apoſtles themſelves were ſolemnized thus early*, i. e. *before* Polycarps *death*] Sure his cenſure is not *over reaſonable*; For when by thoſe expreſs words of that *Churches Epiſtle* it is firſt apparent, that *Polycarps* death was thus celebrated, ſecondly, That this *Polycarp* was *immediate ſucceſſor* to the *Apoſtles*, and lived in the *ſame* time with them, thirdly, That this *commemoration* of *Martyrs* was before this time uſed in the *Church*, and no new thing now to be done to *Polycarp*; what reaſon of *doubting* can there be, but that at this time the *Apoſtles* having received (many of them) this *crown* of *martyrdom* ſhould be thus *commemorated* ὲν χαρᾷ καὶ ἀγαλλιάσει, *in joy and exultation*, i. e. with a *feſtivity*, when this appears ſo expreſly of *Polycarp*, and that in accord to *former practice*, eſpecially when to that is added the inſtance perfectly parallel of *Ignatius*, yet more *ancient* than *Polycarp*, and the *day* of his death preciſely obſerved by thoſe that were *preſent*, on this very purpoſe, ſay they, *ut ſecundum tempus martyrii ejus congregati communicemus athletæ*, *that they might aſſemble at the day of his martyrdom, and communicate with this champion.*

9. That I produce not *more* or more *expreſs* teſtimonies for the *feſtivals* of the *Apoſtles*, need not ſeem *ſtrange*, the *records* being ſo *few* which remain of thoſe *times*, and my *reading* being ſo ſmall; For the preſent, theſe two may be conſidered being *teſtimonies* of *competent antiquity*, and *force* to prove what I pretend to prove, that *Feſtivities* were obſerved by the *Church* next *ſucceeding* the *Apoſtles*, and why *Polycarp* and *Ignatius* ſhould have that *honour*, when *Peter* and *Paul* were *not* allowed it, I ſtill profeſs not to diſcern *reaſon*, nor conſequently to make any *doubt* of it.

10. Mean while when the *Diatribiſt* is willing to form an *argument* from my *not bringing* of *teſtimonies* §. 33. it is remarkable that §. 34. is wholly paſt over in ſilence by him, which yet produceth the *authorities* of *Gregorius Thaumaturgus*, of *Cyprian*, of *Tertullian*, *ex majorum traditione* (and ſo of thoſe that were much more *ancient* than he) and ſo intirely made up of *teſtimonies* of the *firſt antiquity* concerning the *memories* of the *Martyrs* (which muſt ſure include the *Apoſtles*, as many of them as were thus *crowned*) before any *Churches* were built, wherein to aſſemble and *celebrate* their *Feſtivals.*

11. This ſhews that the *Diatribiſt* had little reaſon to complain of *want*, at that very time when he was thus *overcharged* with *plenty* of *teſtimonies*, and hath not a word to return to any one of them, any more than he doth §. 35. to the mentions of *Origen*, *Cyprian*, and *Chryſoſtom*, deducing the *Chriſtmaſs feſtivity* from the *firſt antiquity*.

SECT.

SECT. XX.

Strictures on §. 35. *The author of the Conſtitutions a competent teſtifier when in accord with others.* Juſtinus's *Edict for Feſtivals reconcileable with the Apoſtolical uſage of them. The* 20000. *ſlain by* Dioclesian *on Chriſtmaſs day. Objections againſt the* 25th *of* December *anſwered. The controverſy in* Chryſoſtom *about the day, not the Feaſt.* Ἀρχαία. ἄνωθεν. *His words full for the Apoſtolicalneſs of both.*

WHAT now follows §. 35, is ſo far from having *weight* in it, that I muſt not *allot* any ſolemn *anſwers* to it, the *lighteſt ſtrictures* will be more *proportionable.* *Numb.* 1.

As when of my mention of the *Author* of the *Conſtitutions* he ſaith, *this will weaken my cauſe the more, becauſe they are generally accounted ſpurious*; This ſure muſt be very *unjuſt*, that what was *confirmed* ſo newly from *Origen*, *Cyprian*, and *Chryſoſtom*, ſhould not only not *gain*, but *loſe* ſtrength by the *addition* of the *Conſtitutions*, which beſides that they are acknowledged *ancient* by all which leaſt believe them *Apoſtolical*, are known to be deſigned to *imitate* that *antiquity* they pretend to, and are never juſtly *rejected*, but when that which they *affirm* is found *diſcordant* to the *affirmations* of other writings of *undoubted antiquity*, which having no place here, there is as little room for the *Diatribiſts cenſure.* 2.

So what he concludes from *Juſtinus*'s *Edict* (which I mentioned) that it was *a proof that the Apoſtles did not inſtitute it*, is already anſwered by ſaying that the *Apoſtles practice* being all that is pretended for the *inſtitution*, the *edict* of the *Emperour* for the *Univerſal obſervation* of it, is very *reconcileable* with that, (and ſo alſo with the *uſage* of the *firſt ages* after the *Apoſtles* in caſe it be devolved no *higher* than theſe) as the ſeveral *decrees* of *Magiſtrates Civil* and *Eccleſiaſtical* for an *univerſal* obſervation of the *Lords day* are ſure perfectly reconcileable with the *Apoſtolical original* thereof. 3.

And this was there evidenced by the 20000. *Chriſtians* that were *burnt* by *Dioclesian* on this day (ſure long before that *Edict* of *Juſtinus* (at which time ſaith the * *Hiſtorian*, πᾶν τὸ χρισάνυμον πλῆθος ἐκ πάσης ἡλικίας τῇ νεῳ ἤθροισε πανηγυρίζοντες τὰ γενέθλια, *all that were called Chriſtians of all ages aſſembled in the Church to celebrate the nativity*; And to that, it ſeems he hath no other return, but his *advertiſement* that *Nicephorus* ſaith it was *Maximinus*, that was thus *bloody*, *Maximanus*, I ſuppoſe he would have ſaid, who *reigned* with *Dioclesian*, and then it comes to the *ſame* paſs, and the truth is acknowledged, which ſoever the *name* were. 4. * *Niceph.* l. 7. c. 6.

So againſt reſolving the *day* of this *feſtival* to be *Decemb.* 25. his proofs are *extraordinary*; *Firſt*, from the *Doctor* himſelf, that it was called *Midwinter day*, which is a *fortnight before*. But that hath already been anſwered, the variation being *evidenced* to be from the want of *exactneſs* in our *Calendars*, not from any *doubt* of the day. 5.

Secondly, From the *opinion of many Divines, that our Lord died when he was* 33. *and half years of age, or near unto* 34, as ſaith he, *the Doctor ſaith*, *Qu.* 1 §. 10. What *Divines* theſe are that thus *calculate*, I am not told, nor how *competent* they are to be *confronted* to the *cenſual Tables*, from whence S. *Chryſoſtom* fetches the *day of his birth*: But the luck of it is, that citation from the *Doctor* was eaſily *conſulted*, and on view of the place, there is no more but this, that *Chriſt preacht the will of his Father three years or four together*, which I thought had ſignified no more than for ſome *uncertain ſpace betwixt three* or *four years*; And if he were *born* in *December* and *died* in *April*, what difficulty is there in this *calculation*? or what needed the *Diatribiſt* to have cited from the *Doctor* the words [*near* 34.] when he knows there is *nothing* to that *ſenſe* ſaid by him? 6.

The third thing (without which his undertaking to mention *many*, will be a *faileur*) *which may make us doubt of the truth of the calculation, is the younger date of the Arabick Codex of the Councils*; But when that *Codex* was dated, he hath not told us; And if it were *later* than I thought, it may yet poſſibly ſpeak *truth*, and ſo that will give us no *reaſon* of *doubting*. 7.

His laſt proof is, that the *Doctor is upon Ifs*, and *'Tis probable*; And I heartily wiſh the *Diatribiſt* would but ſpeak *probably*, and till he doth ſo, that he would not have ſuch *averſions* to the *Doctors Ifs*, I mean, that he would uſe *diffidence*, when he pretends not to *demonſtrate*. 8.

I add nothing to his *returns* about the *Epiphany*, but leave them to be *judged* by the *Sections* to which they are *oppoſed*. 9.

And for the large view of the place in *Chryſoſtom*, and his *diſpute* againſt that *Father*, my *anſwer* is very brief, that all that I attempted to prove from *Chryſoſtom*, was the due *timing* of the *feaſt* on the 25th of *December*, and that being done beyond *controverſy*, I pretend not to derive other *deciſions* from that *teſtimony*, but leave them to ſtand on their own *baſis*. 10.

Only when from ſome words of *Chryſoſtom*, he at length concludes the *authority* of the *Church* in *conſtituting*, *and celebrating this feſtival in all ages much ſhaken*, I muſt remind him that that *Fathers* words which affirm it a *queſtion* at that time, belong not to the *Feſtivity* it ſelf, but only to the * *particularity* of the *day*, whether it were to be kept on the 25th of *December* or on ſome other day, and accordingly his proofs proceed, ὅτι ἔτός ἐστιν ὁ καιρὸς, *that this is the very time*; And though ſome *doubted* whether this were a *new*, or the ἀρχαία *ancient day of the feſtivity*, yet ſaith he, others *defended* it, ὅτι παλαιὰ ἡ ἀρχαία ἐστὶ, ἡ ἄνωθεν τοῖς ἀπὸ Θράκης μέχρι Γαδείρων ἁπάσι καλῶς ἡ διήμεγένετο, *that it was old and antient* (or *original*, ſo ἀρχαία from ἀρχὴ ſignifies, and is all one with * *Tertullians quod ab initio*, as that with *quod ab Apoſtolis*) and from theſe *ancient*, if not theſe *firſt* times (as ἄνωθεν commonly imports, and ſo again in * *Tertullian*, *ordo ad originem recenſus*) it hath been *manifeſt and illuſtrious to all that dwell from Thrace to Gadeira*, from *Eaſt* to *Weſt*, that ſure with him ſignifies, all the *world* over. 11. * Πολὺς περὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης γίνεται λόγος. * l. 1. *contr. Marc.* c. 5. * Ib.

And ſo ſtill this *diſpute*, which ſide ſoever was in the *right*, is founded in a *ſuppoſition* of the *feaſt* it ſelf being ἀρχαία and ἄνωθεν, *original and from the beginning*; And indeed if the *firſt* proof which he offers for it be conſidered, 'tis not imaginable how he ſhould ſay more to the *aſſerting* of the *Apoſtolicalneſs* both of the *Feſtivity* and the day alſo. 12.

That

13. *That this is the ſeaſon,* ſaith he, *on which Chriſt was born, the firſt demonſtration is* τὸ ταχέως οὕτω παι-ταχῇ περιαγγελθῆναι καὶ πρὸς ὕψος ἐπιδῦναι τοσοῦτον, καὶ ἀνθῆσαι τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, *that the feaſt was ſo ſpeedily promulgate every where, and aſcended to ſo great an height, and flouriſht,* adding that *as* Gamaliel *ſaid of the preaching of the Goſpel, that if it were of men it would come to nought, but if of God, ye cannot diſſolve it, leſt ye be found fighters againſt God, the ſame he might ſay confidently* ἐπὶ ἡμέρας ταύτης *of this day* (not of the *Goſpel,* as the *Diatribiſt* afterward ſaith, he *thinks he means,* but cannot really do ſo in this place, againſt ſuch * expreſs words) that ἐπειδὴν ἐκ θεοῦ ᾖ, διὰ τοῦτο οὐ μόνον οὐ καλύεται, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἐπιδίδωσι καὶ λαμπροτέρα γίνεται, *ſeeing,* or *becauſe it is from God, therefore* 'tis *not only not diſſolved, but every year advances, and becomes more ſplendid,* and yet farther adding (in the words recited by the *Diatribiſt,* and by omitting the former, rendred *capable* of being *miſunderſtood*) ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα ἐν ὀλίγοις ἔτεσι τὴν πᾶσαν καθέλαβεν οἰκουμένην, καίτοι σκηνοποιῶν, ἁλιέων, ἀγραμμάτων, ἰδιωτῶν πανταχοῦ διακομιζόντων αὐτό, *ſeeing the preaching* (of *it* certainly, i. e. of the *day,* or elſe it can have no *coherence* with the *feaſt,* or *antecedents,* and whole *contexture*) *in a few years took poſſeſſion of the whole world, though tentmakers and fiſhermen, unlearned and idiots brought it amongſt them.*

* Τοῦτο καὶ γὼ περὶ τ ἡμέρας ταύτης ἔιποιμι ἂν ῥᾴδιον.

14. How far this is now from doing *prejudice* to the *Univerſal obſervation* of this *day* in the *Apoſtles times,* I leave the *Reader,* (and, if he pleaſe, the *Diatribiſt* alſo) to conſider.

SECT. XXI.

The Diatribiſts anſwer to my concluſion. Strictures on ſome paſſages in it.

Numb. 1. WHAT now remains is by way of *reply* to my *concluſion,* that the *faſtidious rejecting or not obſerving the Feſtivals of the univerſal Church muſt be looked on as an act of affected departure from the univerſal Church of Chriſt in all ages, and not only from the reformed Church of* England.

2. *This,* ſaith he, *is an heavy charge, if it can be proved.* And for that I muſt now refer my ſelf to the *premiſſes* in that *treatiſe* and in this defence, nor indeed can it be reaſonable that I deſcend to any other way of *probation* or *vindication,* till this which I have uſed be invalidated; For a *concluſion* being (as this is) deduced from the *premiſſes,* what more can be required to *eſtabliſh* the *concluſion,* than the *confirmation* of the *premiſſes?*

3. And therefore as it is againſt all *laws* of *Diſcourſe,* for the *Diatribiſt* to confute or *deny,* or make *anſwer* to the *concluſion,* any otherwiſe than by *refuting* the *media,* which have *inferred* it; ſo muſt it be in me, to *reply* to ſuch *offers* of *anſwer,* which can never ſignify any thing, as long as my *premiſſes* ſtand in force, eſpecially if it proceed by *denying* thoſe things, which this *vindication* hath undertaken to prove, without offering *anſwer* (as without the *ſpirit* of *divination* it could not) to thoſe *proofs.*

4. For *example,* The *Diatribiſt* here begins with this *affirmation,* that *I have not proved that the univerſal Church of the firſt age hath obſerved any of the Feſtivals;* And I have here evidently proved that *Eaſter* was obſerved by *Philip* and *John* the *Apoſtles,* and from them received by the *Aſiaticks,* or *Eaſtern Chriſtians* and ſo likewiſe by the *Weſtern* from S. *Peter* and S. *Paul,* and ſo ſure there is no farther need of *refuting* this *affirmation.*

5. And the ſame might in like manner *appear* in each inſuing *ſtep* of his *anſwer,* and the *rule* by which he is content to be *judged applied* exactly to the *condemning* him in this very buſineſs of the *Eaſter Feſtivity,* which is of as much force, as if it equally appeared of every other of the *great Feſtivals:* But ſtill this were to *repeat* what hath here been already ſaid, and *vindicated* from all his *exceptions.*

6. In ſtead whereof I ſhall only gather up what hath any thing of *news* in it. And firſt, Let me *admire his candor,* when he *will not ſtick to grant this rule to be good, that whatever doctrine or practice hath the concordant atteſtation of the Churches of the Apoſtolical time, while they were yet alive, it was Apoſtolical*] but withal adds as if he had been too *liberal,* that the *negative is a ſurer rule to judge by,* (as if indeed any *predication* could be ſurer than that which is *identical.*)

7. Next his *argument* againſt the *concordant atteſtation* of the *primitive ancients* concerning *Apoſtolical tradition,* drawn from *Papias*'s *affirmation* of the *Millennium,* had not, I confeſs, formerly been produced, but it falls out that I have * elſewhere ſufficiently cleared it.

* *Qu.* 1. §. 38. and in *the Def. of L.* Falklands *Tract of Infall.*

8. Thirdly, his citation *p.* 197. from the *Pract. Cat.* p. 181. that *Chriſtmaſs was not univerſally ſolemnized till about* 400. *years after* Chriſt, and after (a little more to his *advantage*) *till at leaſt the* 400. *years,* p. 201.] is both as to the *words* and as to the *ſenſe* very much *miſreported;* The place is ready to be ſeen, and lies thus. *The authority by which this feſtival ſtands in the Church, is that of the practice of the Primitive univerſal Church,* and this made appear, firſt, From the *immemorial obſervation* of it, ſecondly, From the *ancient Fathers* ſpeaking of it as an *ancient uſage* (in the notion of ἐθιζόμενα even now given,) thirdly, By the *teſtimonies* not only of the *author* of the *Conſtitutions* (*ancient* though not *Apoſtolical*) but of *Origen,* of *Cyprian,* of *Ammianus Marcellinus,* ſpeaking of *Julian* 1300. years ſince, and mentioning the *Epiphany* as a *known feſtival* of the *Church,* and ſo both that, and *Chriſtmaſs* of a far greater antiquity, than the time of *Julian.* Laſtly, by the words of *Chryſoſtom,* that *though the particular day* December 25. *was not fixt at* Antioch *till his time, yet from* Rome *over all the* Weſt *it had been ſo obſerved from the moſt ancient records of Chriſtianity.* Upon which my *concluſion* is, that *it appears at leaſt to be an Eccleſiaſtical conſtitution very early received over all the* Weſt, *the far greateſt part of Chriſtendom, and within* 400. *years univerally ſolemnized, and this a very competent authority, when withal* 'tis *ſo probable, that it may be more, according to a* * *rule of the Fathers, That very ancient and general uſages, whoſe beginnings are unknown, may be reſolved to be of Apoſtolical inſtitution or practice,* &c.

* *In eis quæ ſcriptura nec jubet, nec prohibet, illud eſt ſequendum quod conſuetudo roboravit, quæ ſine dubio de traditione manavit.* Tertul. de coron. milit. & *Quod univerſa tenet eccleſia, nec concilijs inſtitutum, ſed ſemper retentum eſt, non niſi poteſtate Apoſtolica traditum rectiſſimè creditur.* Aug. de bapt. con. Donat. l. 4. c. 23.

This

This I have thus *tranſcribed* from that place, to *demonſtrate* what *fidelity* there was in this *citation*, 9.
not only in *applying* that to the *Feſtival*, which belonged peculiarly to that *particular day Dec.* 25.
but alſo in affirming from me, that *it was not univerſally ſolemnized till about* 400. *years* and *till at leaſt the* 400. *year* (which leaves it free to be of a *date* yet *later*) when I ſay *'tis ſo probable that it was of Apoſtolical inſtitution or practice, that the feaſt of Epiphany was ſpoken of, as a known feſtival long before that time, and the feaſt of Innocents, attending this of Chriſtmaſs, affirmed by* Origen *to be by the holy Fathers according to the will of God commanded to be for ever celebrated in the Church*, and only added, that *it appears to be at leaſt an Eccleſiaſtical inſtitution very early received over all the Weſt, and the far greater part of Chriſtendom, and within* 400. *years univerſally ſolemnized.*

What can be more viſibly *unjuſt* than this? or what heed can be given to *teſtimonies* thus *tranſ-* 10.
formed into *ſhapes*, which the *writer* never *dream'd* of, and yet from them *concluſions* deduced ſuch as here follow in this place of the *Diatribiſt*, that my *raſh zeal hath carried me beyond the bounds of Reaſon and Religion.*

To which *expreſſion* of his all that I have to ſay is, firſt, That my *concluſion* was inferred out of 11.
premiſſes, not *dictated* by *zeal*; ſecondly, That it affix'd no cenſure on any *perſon*, belonging only to thoſe who ſhould be found *guilty* of it, and ſo was wholly deſigned to ends of *charity*, to *reform*, not to *reproach* any: thirdly, That if there had been any thing of *raſh*, or *bitter* in it, it might have admoniſht the *Diatribiſt* μὴ ἐξομοιοῦσθαι, not to be ſo ſoon *guilty* of greater ſharpneſs; As it is, I muſt only infer, that it ſeems the *guilty* perſon hath the *priviledge* of *accuſing* and *judging* in any form of *language*, and ſo I ſhall not be ſo *unſeaſonable* as to *admoniſh* him of the *injuſtice* of it, at a time when it is ſo *improbable* he will reap profit by it.

There is now nothing behind but his *faſtidious reflections* upon *three Queſtions* which I had return'd 12.
to the *Author* of the ſixteen *Quæres*; But becauſe I ſee he likes not the *Queſtions* in my *terms*, and in his *propoſing* of *four* others, inſerts *particulars*, wholly rejected by me, as that of [*parts of worſhip*] adding [*as it is propounded*, §. 9.] (but I hope not by me ſo *propounded*) of *abuſe* to *ſuperſtition* and *profaneneſs*, &c. I ſhall be as little obliged to *accept* them in his *terms* or *tempted* by the *nature* of the *task* or by the *probability* of the *ſucceſs* of it with this *Diatribiſt*) to begin *new diſputes* at this time; It is not amiſs that we *ſhake hands* for a *while* and *commune* each with *his own heart in ſtillneſs*: And ſo I heartily take my leave of him.

ΕΚΤΕΝΕΣ-

ΕΚΤΕΝΕΣΤΕΡΟΝ.

OR THE

DEGREES of ARDENCY

IN

CHRISTS PRAYER

Reconciled with His *fulneſs* of

HABITUAL GRACE.

In *Reply* to the *Author* of a *Book*, Intituled, *A mixture of Scholaſtical Divinity with Practical.*

Sect. 1. I Was very willing to hearken to the *ſeaſonable* advice of many, and wholly *withdraw* my ſelf *à foro contentioſo*, to ſome more *pleaſing* and *profitable* imployment; but diſcerning it to be the *deſire* of the *Author* of the *Book*, Intituled, *A mixture of Scholaſtical and Practical Divinity*, that I ſhould *reply* to his *examination* of one paſſage of mine againſt Mr. *Cawdrey*, I ſhall make no ſcruple immediately to *obey* him, not only becauſe it may be done in very *few* words, but eſpecially becauſe the *doctrine*, which he affixeth to me, ſeems (and not without ſome *reaſon*) to be contrary to the *truth* of *Scripture*, which I am to look on with all *reverent* ſubmiſſion, and acquieſce in, with *captivation* of *underſtanding*, and ſo not aſſert any thing from my *own* conceptions, which is but ſeemingly *contrary* to it.

2. The propoſition which he *affixes* to me, is * this; *That Chriſts love of God was capable of farther degrees*; and that he refutes, as being *contrary to that point* (a *truth* of *Scripture*) which he had in hand, *viz.* The *dwelling of all fulneſs of habitual grace in Chriſt.*

* Of the fulneſs of Chriſt, *p.* 258.

3. By this I ſuppoſe I may conclude his meaning to be, that I have affirmed *Chriſts love* of *God* (meaning thereby that *habitual grace* of *divine Charity*) to have been *capable of further degrees*, ſo as that *capacity* of *further degrees*, is the *denyal* of *all fulneſs of that habitual grace* already in him.

4. And truly, had I thus *expreſt* my ſelf, or let fall any words, which might have been thus *interpretable*, I acknowledge I had been very *injurious* not only to the *verity* of *God*, but alſo to my *own conceptions*, and even to the *cauſe* which I had in hand, which had not been *ſupported*, but *betrayed* by any ſuch apprehenſion of the *imperfection of Chriſts habitual graces.*

5. This I could eaſily ſhew, and withal how *cautiouſly* and *expreſly* it was *fore-ſtall'd* by me; But to the matter in hand, it is ſufficient, that I profeſs I never thought it; but deem it a *contrariety* to expreſs words of *Scripture*, in any man who ſhall think it, and in ſhort, that I never gave *occaſion* to any man to *believe* it my opinion, having never ſaid it in *thoſe* words which he ſets up to *refute* in me, never in any *other* that may be reaſonably *interpretable* to that ſenſe.

6. *Firſt*, I ſaid it not in *thoſe* words, which he undertakes to *refute*; Theſe are *p.* 258. of his *Book* thus ſet down by him.

"*This point may ſerve for confutation of a paſſage in Dr.* H. *againſt* Mr. C. *to wit, That Chriſts love of* "*God was capable of farther degrees.*]

7. Theſe words I never ſaid, nor indeed are they to be found in the *Paſſage*, which he ſets down from me, and whereon he grounds them; which, ſaith he, is this:

Dr. *Hammond p.* 222. *In the next place he paſſeth to the inforcement of my argument, from what we read concerning Chriſt himſelf, that he was more intenſe in Prayer at one time than another, when yet the lower degree was ſure no ſin, and prepares to make anſwer to it,* viz. *That Chriſt was above the Law, and did more than the Law required, but men fall ſhort by many degrees of what is required. But ſure this anſwer is nothing to the matter now in hand, for the evidencing of which, that example of Chriſt was brought by me,* viz. *That ſincere Love is capable of degrees. This was firſt ſhewed in ſeveral men, and in the ſame man at ſeveral times, in the ſeveral ranks of Angels, and at laſt in Chriſt himſelf, more ardent in one act of Prayer than in another.*

8. Here the *Reader* finds not the words [*Chriſts love of God is capable of further degrees*] and when by *deduction* he endeavours to *conclude* them from theſe words, his *concluſion* falls *ſhort* in *one* word, *viz.* [*further*] and 'tis but this,

That the example of Chriſt will never prove Dr. H. *his concluſion, unleſs it infer, that Chriſts love of God was capable of degrees.*]

This

This is but a *slight* change indeed, yet may be worthy to be taken *notice* of in the entrance (though the *principal* weight of my *answer* be not laid on it) and suggest this *seasonable* advertisement, that he which undertakes to *refute* any saying of *another*, must oblige himself to an *exact recital* of it to a *word*, and *syllable*; Otherwise he may himself become the only *Author* of the Proposition, which he *refutes*. 9.

The *difference* is no more than by the *addition* of the word [*further.*] But that addition may possibly beget in the *Readers understanding*, a very *considerable* difference. 10.

For this proposition [*Christs love of God was capable of further degrees*] is readily interpretable to this *dangerous* sense, that *Christs love of God was not full*, but so far *imperfect*, as to be *capable of some further degrees* than yet it *had*; And thus sure the *Author* I have now before me, acknowledges to have *understood* the words, and accordingly proposeth to *refute* them, from the consideration of *the all-fulness of habitual grace in Christ*, which he could not do, unless he deemed them a *prejudice* to it. 11.

But those *other* words; which though he finds not in my *papers*, he yet not *illogically* infers from them [*that Christs love of God was capable of degrees, more intense at one time than at another*] are not so *liable* to be thus interpreted, but only import that *Christs love of God* had in its *latitude* or *amplitude* several *degrees*, one differing from another, *sec. magis & minus*, all of them comprehended in that *all-full perfect love of God*, which was always in *Christ* so *full*, and so perfect, as not to *want*, and so not to be *capable* of *further degrees*. 12.

The Matter is clear; The *degrees* of which *Christs love of God* is capable, are by me thus expresst, that *his love was more intense at one time than at another*; but still the *higher* of those *degrees* of *intenseness*, was as truly acknowledged to be in *Christs love*, at *some* time, *viz.* in his *agony*, as the *lower* was at *another*, and so *all* the *degrees*, which are supposed to be mentioned of his *love*, are also *supposed*, and *expresly* affirmed to have been *in him* at some time or other; whereas a supposed *capacity of further degrees*, *seems* at least (and so is resolved by *that Author*) to *infer*, that these *degrees* were *not* in *Christ* (the direct *contradictory* to the *former* Proposition) and so that they were *wanting* in him, and the but *seeming* asserting of that *want*, is justly *censured*, as *prejudicial* to *Christs fulness*. Here then was one *misadventure* in his proceeding. 13.

But this is but the *proœmial* part of my *Reply*, there is another more *material* branch of it still behind, which may yet seem *necessary* to be *added*, *viz.* to mind him of (what he well knows) the *distinction* between *habits* and *acts* of *virtues*, or *graces*; and that *love* the *Genus* doth equally *comprehend* both these *species*, and that his *discourse* of *all fulness* belonging to the *habitual grace* of *Christ*, I speak distinctly of *another* matter, *viz.* of the *degrees of* that *grace* discernable in the *several acts* of it. 14.

This *distinction* I thought *legible* enough before, both in the *Tract* of *Will-worship*, and in the *Answer* to Mr. *Caw*. 15.

In the former the * *Refuter* confesseth to find it, *reciting* these words of mine, *It is possible for the same person constantly to love God above all, and yet to have higher expressions of that love at one time than another*. Where the *expressions at one time*, and at *another*, must needs refer to the *several acts* of the same, *all-full habitual love*. Only I guess not what *temptation* he had to choose that *expression*, which he there makes use of, *viz.* 16. * Pag. 259.

[*That there* Dr. H. *minceth the matter, and speaketh more cautelously*] adding [*that what he there saith is nothing to the matter now in hand.*]

Whereas first those of *Will-worship* being the *First papers* written on *that* subject, are sure very *pertinent* to ascertain him of the meaning of the *latter*, written in *defence* of them; and secondly, the *early cautelous* speaking there, might have made *further later caution* unnecessary: and thirdly, I could not be said to *mince* (which to *vulgar* ears signifies to *retract* in some degree what I had said *before*,) and again, *speak more cautiously*, when that was the *first* time of my speaking of it.

Mean-while it is *manifest*, and his own *confession*, that *there these were my words*, and those so *cautious*, that *this* sense of the words which he undertakes to *refute*, could not be *affixt* on them. And this I should have thought sufficient to have preserved my *innocence*, and *forstalled* his *Use* of *Confutation*. 17.

But the *answer* to Mr. *C.* which occasioned it, was, I think, as *cautious* also, First, In the words recited by the *Refuter*, *viz.* that *Christ himself was more ardent in one act of prayer than in another*. Secondly, In the words following in that *answer*, but not *recited* by him, *viz.* that *the sincerity of this or that virtue expresst in this or that performance, is it we speak of, when we say it consists in a latitude and hath degrees*; where the [*this or that performance*] *are* certainly *Acts* of the *virtue*, consisting in a *latitude*, and the having *degrees* (*viz.* in that *latitude*) no way implies him that hath that *virtue* in that *latitude* (viz. *Christ*) to *want* at present; and in that sense to be *capable of farther degrees*. 18.

I am willing to look as *jealously* as I can on any passage of my own, which falls under any mans *censure*; and therefore finding nothing in the words (*set down* by him as the *ground* of the *Refutation*) which is any way *capable* of it, I have reviewed the *whole section*, and weighed every *period*, as *suspiciously* as I could; to *observe* whether I could *draw* or *wrest* that *consequence* from any *other* passage, not *recited* by him. 19.

And I find none in *any* degree *liable*, except it should be this in the † beginning of the *Sect.* Where setting down the *argument*, as it lay in the *Treatise of Will-worship*. I say *'tis possible for the same person which so loves God* (i. e. *with all the heart*) *to love him, and expres that love more intensely at one time than another, as appeared by the example of Christ*. 20. † Pag. 221. n. 1.

If this be thought *capable* of *misapprehension*, by reason of the [and] *disjoining love* from the *expressions* of it, and so the *expressions* belonging to the *acts*, the *love* be deemed to denote the *habitual love*; I must only say, that this is a *misapprehension*, for that by *loving with all the heart*, in *the first* place, I certainly meant the *sincere habit* of *Love*, by *love* in the *latter* place, the *inward acts* of *love*, and by the *expressions* of *love*, the *outward expressions* of those *inward acts*, and of *those acts* only I speak, and of *those expressions*, when I say they are *more intense at one time than another*. 21.

The word *love*, as I said, is a *genus*, equally comprehending the *two species*, *habitual* and *actual* 22.

love, and equally applicable to either of the *species*, to the *acts* as well as *habit* of *love*. And so when I say *love* is *capable* of *degrees*, the meaning is clear, The *generical* word *love* restrained to the *latter species*, *i. e.* considered in respect of the *acts* of *love*, *gradually* differenced one from the other, is in that *respect*, *capable of degrees*, both *inwardly* and in *outward expressions*; that *act* of *love*, that poured out, and expresst it self in the *more ardent prayer*, was a more *intense act* of *love*, than another *act* of the same *habitual love*, which did not so *ardently express* it self.

23. I shall explain this by the *Refuters* own *Confession*. The *death of Christ*, saith he, *was an higher expression of Christs love of us, than his poverty, hunger, or thirst.* To this I subjoin that such as the expression was, such was the *act* of *inward love*, of which that was an *expression*, it being certain that each of these *expressions* had an *act* of *internal love*, of which they were so many *proportionably different expressions*; And from hence I suppose it unavoidably *consequent*, that that *act* of *internal love*, expresst by his *dying* for us, was superiour to those *former acts*, which only expresst themselves in his *poverty*, and so the same person that *loved sincerely*, did also *love*, and *express that love more intensly at one time than at another*, which was the very thing I had said in *another* instance. But this I have added *ex abundanti* more than the *Refuters* discourse *required* of me. Pag. 259.

24. It now only remains, that I consider whether this *Refuter* have in the *process* of his *discourse* added any thing, wherein I may be any whit *concern'd*.

25. And first, saith he, *the falshood of such an assertion is evident from the point there handled and confirmed, the absolute fulness of Christs grace, which by the general consent of the Fathers and School-men, was such, as that it excluded all intensive growth.*

26. But to this the *reply* will be easily *foreseen*, from the *premisses*, that as the point by him *handled and confirmed* was distinctly the *all-fulness of habitual grace in Christ*, so his *proofs* of it by the *consent of Fathers and School-men* belong still to that *fulness of habitual grace*.

27. Witness one for all, *Aquinas Ser. 3. qu. 7. art. 12. ad secundum, licet virtus divina possit facere aliquid majus & melius quàm sit habitualis gratia Christi, non tamen --- though the divine power may make somewhat greater and better, than is the habitual grace of Christ, yet ---* so 'tis plain he speaks of the *fulness* of the *habitual grace*. And *ad tertium. In sapientia & gratia aliquis proficere potest dupliciter; uno modo secundùm ipsos habitus sapientiæ & gratiæ augmentatos, & sic Christus in eis non proficiebat. Alio modo secundùm effectus, in quantum aliquis sapientiora & virtuosiora opera facit, & sic Christus proficiebat sapientia & gratiâ, sicut & ætate, quia secundùm processum ætatis perfectiora opera faciebat,--- & in his quæ sunt ad Deum, & in his quæ sunt ad homines. One may increase in wisdom and grace two wayes, one way according to the habits of them increased, and so Christ increased not; another way, according to the effects, when any doth more wise and virtuous works; and so Christ increased in Wisdom and grace, as he did in age, because according to the process of his age, he did more perfect works, and that both in things belonging to God, and men also.*

28. And thus are the *Schoolmen* understood by the *Refuter* himself, in his producing their *testimonies*, as appears by the *express* words [*habitual grace*, p. 260. lin. *penult*, and *holiness*, and the *Image of God in him*] p. 261. lin. 13. And so 'tis most clear, their *consent* belongs not, even in his *own* opinion, to the matter I had, and have in hand, no way *denying* but *asserting* a *capacity* of *degrees* among the *acts* of *Christs* love of *God*, and the *expressions* of it.

29. *Secondly, He will hear the Doctors objection, and consider of what weight it is.*

Objection? against what? against the *fulness of habitual grace in Christ?* sure never any was by me urged against it. And he cannot now *think* there was. The degrees of *intenseness* observable in the several *acts of Christ's love*, his *praying* more *ardently at one time than another*, was all that I concluded from that *text*, *Luke* 22. 24. and that is nothing to his *habitual love*.

30. But even to this he is pleased to frame *answers* (though I hope his *doctrine* of the *fulness of Christs habitual grace* be no way *concern'd* in it) and to these I shall briefly attend him, as my *last* stage in this no very long voyage.

31. *And first, saith he, the vulgar translation renders* ἐκτενέστερον, *prolixius*; and *if this version be good, then there is no place for the Doctors objection.*

* *Paulus Fagius, Præf. in Vers. Chal. Paraph. in Pentat.*

But though I seek no *advantage* by that *vulgar* reading, yet thinking it a duty of *reverence* to that *version*, to take leave *civilly*, whensoever I *depart* from it (wherein I shall have the suffrage of *Protestants* as *learned* in both the *Languages* * *Hebrew* and † *Greek*, as any) and that I may to the utmost observe the *Refuters* steps, I shall not utterly *reject* it.

† *Joh. Boys Elienſ. vet. Interpr. cum Beza collat.*

32. 'Tis certain ἐκτενὴς doth primarily signifie *extension*, and that properly belongs to *length*, and so the *comparative* ἐκτενέστερον to a *greater degree* of that *length*. And if it be granted, that it so signifie here, there will yet be *place equally for my conclusion*.

33. For in every *act* of *Prayer*, be it but the *shortest* ejaculation, sent out by *Christ*, I suppose (and my *Refuter* must not *doubt* of it) there was some *degree* of *ardency* or *intension*; And then sure according to the *multiplying* of those *acts*, *lengthening* that *prayer*, there must still in *Christ* (I say not in every one of us) be a *proportionable* multiplication of those *degrees*, and so *parallel* to a greater *length*; a greater *intension*.

34. This is *clear*, and I need not add (what else I might) that the very *multiplication* of *more acts* of any *virtue*, supposing it equally *sincere* in the *habit* (and such is the length of Prayer, when it is in Christ) is more *valuable* in the sight of *God* (and that argues it more *excellent*) than the *smaller* number of those *acts* would be, and proportionably more *abundantly rewarded* by him, who *rewardeth* every man not only according to the *sincerity* of his *heart*, but also *secundùm opera*, *according to the multiplied acts or works*, the *more abundant labour* proceeding from this *sincerity*. And so that will suffice for his *first Answer*.

35. *But then*, 2. saith he, *suppose we stick unto our own translation, yet the place may fairly be so interpreted, as that it may no ways advantage the purpose of the Doctor. For* ἐκτενέστερον, *more earnestly, may be considered in reference unto either the object unto whom he prayed, God; or the matter, against which he prayed, the evils with which he conflicted in his agony.*

First then, saith he, *he did not in his agony pray more earnestly than at other times, if we consider his*

prayer

prayer in reference unto the object, unto whom it was, God. The Religion, and inward worship of his prayer, was for degrees always alike equal. His trust and dependance upon God, love of, zeal and devotion towards God, from which all his prayers flowed, were not at one time more intense than at another.

But now secondly, He prayed more earnestly in his agony than at other times, in regard of the matter, against which he prayed, the evils which he encountred with, which if they were not greater, than those that he deprecated in the former prayer, v. 42. *yet at least they made a greater impression upon his humane nature; for they put him into a bloody sweat. Being in an agony, he prayed more earnestly, and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood, falling down to the ground.*

These are the words of his *second answer*, and they are in the second part, the very *distinct confession* 36.
of all that I pretend in this matter (and therefore I need not make any *reflections* on the *first* part of them.) For whatsoever, or how great soever the *occasion* of the *increase* of his *intension* was (which I am willing to believe *proportionable* to the *degree* of the *intension*, a very weighty *occasion* that thus inflamed his *ardency*) yet still, 'tis confest, that on this *occasion*, he now prayed *more earnestly* than at *other times*, that which now approached made a *greater impression on his humane nature*; which what is it, but a *proof* of the point by me asserted, that *Christ* himself was *more ardent in one act of prayer* (this in his *agony*) than in *another*.

As for the *greatness* of the *occasion*, so *confest-ly great* as to *cast him into that prodigious sweat*, falling 37.
ὡσεὶ θρόμβοι αἵματος, *as it were drops of blood*, that may *testifie*, but it cannot *prejudge* the *ardency*, which was occasioned thereby.

'Twas not in *Christ* (he will easily suppose with me) as it is oft discernable in *many* of *us*, that 38.
those which have really no *sincerity* of *love* or *zeal* to *God*, can yet like the *Mariners* in the *tempest*, by some pressing *fear* or danger be awaked to but *formal*, and, be they never so *loud*, but *hypocritically zealous* prayers.

The *ardency* in *Christ* was *sincere ardency*, accompanied with *acts* of *love* and *trust* of the same *tem-* 39.
per; and the heightning it ἐπίτασιν, was an *addition* of *degrees* to that *act* of *ardency*, and so of *prayer*, and proportionably of *love* and *trust* in *God*, above either what there was, or what there was *occasion* for, at *other* times.

Of this I shall hope it is *possible* to find some *instances* among men (of whose *graces* it can be no 40.
blasphemy to affirm, that they are *capable of degrees*) suppose we *a sincerely pious* man, a true *lover* of *God*, and no *despiser* of his *poor persecuted Church*, and suppose we, as it is very supposeable, that at *some* time the *seas roar*, the *tempest* be at its *hight*, and the *waves beat* violently upon this *frail brittle* vessel, may it not be a *season* for that *pious* mans *ardency* to receive some *growth?* for his *zeal* to be *emulous* of those *waves*, and pour it self out more *profusely* at such, than at a *calmer season?* I hope there be some at *this* time among us, in whom this *point* is really *exemplified*; if it be not, it is an effect of *want*, not *fulness* of *love*. But I *need* not thus to *inlarge*; It is not by this *Refuter* denied of the *person* of *Christ*, and that is my *intire* ὅπερ ἔδει δεῖξαι in reference either to Mr. *C.* or to *him*, the *utmost* that I undertook to *demonstrate* then, or to justifie now.

And so I shut up this *hasty* paper, hoping that he which *invited*, and *promised* it a *welcome*, in case 41.
it were given him in a *fair and Scholastical way*, having nothing to accuse in it, as to the *first Epithet*, will *abate* somewhat in reference to the second, and allow it a *friendly*, though being *unqualified*, it pretend not to a more *hospitable reception*.

ΕὐΣΧΗΜΟΝΩΣ, ΚΑΙ ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑΞΙΝ:

OR, THE

GROUNDS OF UNIFORMITY

From 1 *Cor.* 14. 40.

Vindicated from Mr JEANES's *Exceptions* to *One* paſſage in the *View* of the DIRECTORY.

---

1 Cor. 14. 40.

Εὐσχημόνως, καὶ κατὰ τάξιν.

Decently, and according to appointment.

Numb. 1. SINCE the publiſhing that *Anſwer* to Mr *J.* concerning the *degrees of ardency in Chriſt's prayer*, I am advertiſed of *another* paſſage in that *volum*, in which I am concern'd, relating to ſome words of mine in the *view* of the *Directory* pag. 19. on the head of *Uniformity* in *Gods ſervice*, and particularly reſpecting my *rendring* of the *Apoſtle* 1 Cor. 14. 40. *Let all things be done* εὐσχημόνως, καὶ κατὰ τάξιν.

2. Theſe indeed I thus rendred [*decently, and according to order*, or *appointment*] and affirmed the importance of that place to be, that all be done in the *Church according to cuſtom*, and *appointment*, rendring this *reaſon* of the *former*, *becauſe it was implied* in εὐσχημόνως *decently* (*cuſtom being the only rule of decency*, &c.) and of the *latter*, becauſe the *words* do *literally* import this, κατὰ τάξιν, *i. e. according to order* or *appointment*.

3. To the former of theſe he makes his *firſt exception*, thus [*He dares not affirm that this is the immediate ſenſe of the place, but only that it is implied; It cannot be denied but that decency doth imply ſuch cuſtoms, the omiſſion of which neceſſarily infer indecency, but that the omiſſion of ſuch ceremonies as ours doth infer undecency, the Doctor and all his party can never make good; What undecency can the Doctor prove to be in the adminſtration of Baptiſm without the Croſs, as alſo in publick prayers and preaching without a Surplice? But of this ſee farther in* Ames *in the places but now quoted; The Doctor may perhaps look upon him as an inconſiderable adverſary. But we ſhall think his Arguments conſiderable, until the Doctor, or ſome other of his party give a ſatisfactory anſwer unto them. In the mean while let us examine the proof that the Doctor brings for this ſenſe: and it is, becauſe cuſtom is the only rule of decency.*

This propoſition, though very ſtrange, is prooflеſs; and therefore we might as well reject it, as the Doctor dictates it. But I ſhall add a confutation of it from theſe following arguments.

Firſt, *If cuſtom be the only rule of decency, then nothing elſe can be a rule thereof beſides cuſtom; but this is falſe, for the light and law of nature is alſo a rule thereof, and that infallible.*

Secondly, *Nothing can be undecent, that is agreeable unto the only rule of decency. But divers things are undecent, which yet can plead cuſtom; and this is ſo evident, as that I will not ſo much undervalue the Doctors judgment as to endeavour any proofs thereof. It is impoſſible that the only rule of decency ſhould be undecent: But yet it is very poſſible that many cuſtoms ſhould be undecent, and therefore I ſhall conclude, that cuſtom is not the only rule of decency.*

Thirdly, *Laſtly, unto cuſtom, as you may ſee in both* Ariſtotle *and* Aquinas, *the frequent uſage of a thing is required. But now there may be decency or handſomeneſs in the firſt uſage of a thing; and of this decency, cuſtom is not the rule, and therefore it is not the only rule of decency.*

4. The *firſt* thing here charged on me is *timidity*, that *I dare not ſay*, what I ſaid not, and this attended with a *conceſſion* (in a limited ſenſe) of the *truth* of what I did ſay; the *ſecond*, is the *impertinence*, or *unſufficiency* of that, in that *limited* ſenſe, to *prove* what he conceives I would *have* from it, *viz.* that *the omiſſion of our ceremonies doth infer indecency*; And the *proof* of this charge *twofold*, firſt, By way of *queſtion*, founded in *two* inſtances, the *Croſs* in *Baptiſm*, and the *Surplice* in *publick prayer and preaching*; ſecondly, By *reference* to *Ames*, and reſolving to think his *arguments conſiderable*, till a *ſatisfactory anſwer be given them.* And his *third charge* is, my uſing an *unſufficient proof* to prove my *interpretation*, *viz.* this, *becauſe cuſtom is the only rule of decency*] which he *confutes* by three *arguments*.

5. Theſe *three charges* I ſhall now very briefly *examine*, and if I miſtake not, clearly *evacuate*. The *firſt*, by aſſuring him, firſt that I did *dare* to ſay, and indeed *ſaid* (as I then thought, *perſpicuouſly*) the

the full of what I *meant*; but that it was no way incumbent on me, to *ſay* either what I did not *mean*, or what Mr. *J.* or any other ſhould be juſtly able to *charge* of want of *truth* in the leaſt degree. And ſecondly, if what I ſaid, cannot, as he confeſſes, be *denied*, to have *truth* in it in *one* ſenſe, I demand why muſt it be a not *daring* (which is wont to ſignifie *timidity* or *cowardice*) that I affirmed it not in *another* ſenſe, wherein he doth not *conſent* to it?

To make ſhort, and prevent all *poſſibility* of his, or any mans farther *miſtaking* my words, I ſhall 6.
haſten to tell him the full of my *meaning* in that paſſage, that [εὐσχημόνως *decently*] implies [*according to cuſtom*] *viz.* that in ſuch things as theſe, of which then I ſpake, *geſtures*, *habits*, and the *like circumſtances* of *Gods publick ſervice*, wherein the *Apoſtle* preſcribes care of *decency*, 'tis neceſſary to obſerve the *cuſtoms* of the place wherein we live: This I then thought ſufficiently explicated by *exemplifying* in mens *wearing long hair*, which the *Apoſtle* proved *indecent*, by its being *againſt* φύσις, *i. e.* ſaith *Suidas*, χρονία συνήθεια, a *cuſtom* of ſome *continuance* in that place (which yet in *women* there, and in *men* in *other* places, where that *cuſtom* prevail'd not, had nothing *indecent* in it.)

But this *exemplification* of my meaning he thought fit to *conceal* from the Reader, and ſupply that 7.
vacuity only with an *&c.* yet reciting at *length*, to a word, what was *immediately* before, and after it. His deſign in ſo doing I *judge* not, but ſhall endeavour to undeceive the *Reader* for the future, by farther inlarging on it.

All people, I think, in the world have ſome *outward* ſignifications, and *expreſſions* of *Reverence*; 8.
but all have not the *ſame*, but according to *Topical cuſtoms*, ſome *different*, ſome *contrary* to others. We of this, and all our neighbour Nations, expreſs *reverence* by *uncovering the head*; the *Turks* do the *contrary*. Again, among *Chriſtians*, 'tis *cuſtomary* for men *ſo* to expreſs their *Reverence*, but for *women*, ſaith the *Apoſtle*, it is not, but the *contrary*; and ſo ſtill it is among *us*. Nay it was once among ſome *hethens* (that worſhipt *Mercury*) an act of the *higheſt* reverence, even of *adoration*, to *throw ſtones* at their *God*; among others, to *cut themſelves with lances*, when they were a praying to him. And it can be no news to Mr. *J.* that theſe *cuſtoms* were not obſerved by *other* countreys; the *Jews* that *threw ſtones* at *Chriſt*, and the *Dæmoniack* that *cut himſelf* with them, were neither of them *interpretable* to worſhip him.

This therefore was no *dark*, but *viſible* foundation of what I ſaid; In aſſigning any *rite* or *ceremony* 9.
for the *ſervice* of *God*, *decency*, ſaith the *Apoſtle*, was to be obſerved; the only *rule* to judge of that, is, ſay I, to conſider the *cuſtoms* of that *particular* place, of which we conſult. Where *bowing* the *knee*, or *kneeling* on the ground, is cuſtomarily uſed as a *token* of *reverence*, where *putting off* or *keeping off* the *hat*, there the *choice* of ceremonies muſt be made with reſpect to thoſe *particular cuſtoms*; Here 'tis evident that I mean not the *frequent uſage* of that *ceremony*, in *oppoſition* to a *firſt* uſage of it, as Mr. *J.* is willing to *miſtake* me, and found *one* of his arguments on that *miſtake*, but the *ſtanding cuſtom* of the place, by which, as by an *argument* or *evidence*, ſuch a *ceremony* is demonſtrated to be a *reverential* reſpect, and ſo (for the ſervice of *God* to whom all *reverence* is due) *decent* in that place, though in *Nature*, or in the *eſtimation* of all other men, it be not ſo.

Certainly this is ſo *evident* in it ſelf, and ſo undeniably the importance of *my* words, that there can 10.
be no need farther to *inlarge* on it, much leſs to *examine* the weight, or meaning of his *conceſſion*, that *it cannot be denied but that decency doth imply ſuch cuſtoms, the omiſſion of which neceſſarily infers indecency.*]

This ſaying of his ſome *Readers* may look on with *Reverence*, as not readily comprehending the 11.
importance of it; others may chance to *deſpiſe* it under the appearance of a *tautology*. But upon pondering, it will appear that the *Author* had a *meaning* in it, which he deſigned ſhould bring in ſome *advantage* to his cauſe, and without which, he was not likely to *advance* far, or ſucceed in it.

Some *cuſtoms* we know there are, which are ſo highly *decent*, as that the *omiſſion* of them *neceſſarily* 12.
infers indecency; But what are they? why, ſuch as the *law* of (at leaſt *Lapſt*) *nature* preſcribes, *covering of nakedneſs*, and the like; of which 'tis evident among all that have not learnt of *Carneades* induſtriouſly to *raſe* out all *natural* meaſures of *honeſt* and *diſhoneſt*, that the *omiſſion of them infers indecency*, yea and *neceſſarily* infers it, this ſort of *decency* being *natural* to all men, that ever were, or ſhall be in the world, born and educated in what *nation*, or *inured* to what *cuſtoms* ſoever, and this the very *firſt* hour after our firſt parents *fall*, before any *cuſtom* had been *contracted* which might *recommend* it to them.

And as of theſe his *Rule* is true, that the *omiſſion* of *theſe*, *neceſſarily infers* undecency, ſo it is in a 13.
manner proper to theſe, and belongs not to any other ſort of things, whoſe *decency* flows but from ſome *poſitive command* though it be of *God*, or *cuſtome* or *command* of *men*. To ſuch things whoſe *decency* flows from any *command* either of *God* or *man*, this *rule* cannot be *fully* applied, for that *command might* have been *not* given, or there might be a *ſpace* before it was given, or a *people* to whom it was *not* given, and then in *any* of thoſe caſes, the *omiſſion* would not be *indecent* to whom the *law* was *not* given; and ſo it doth not *neceſſarily* and *abſolutely*, but only *dependently* on that *law*, and *conditionally*, *infer indecency*; ſo in like manner the *Rule* holds not in thoſe things, whoſe *decency* is introduced only by *cuſtom*, for that, as Mr. *I.* truly ſaith, *ariſing from frequency of actions*, it muſt again be granted, that there was a *time* when that which now is *cuſtom*, was *new*, and ſo *not cuſtom*, and again there are, or may be *nations*, with whom that *cuſtom* (whatſoever can be inſtanced in) hath not *prevailed*, which *prejudges* ſtill the *neceſſity* ſpoken of, that ſuch *omiſſion* ſhould *infer indecency*.

And ſo we ſee the *ſum* of Mr. *J.* his liberal *conceſſion*, *viz.* that *decency* implies *natural decency*, or 14.
ſuch *cuſtoms*, which are *naturally decent*, and ſo the *omiſſion* of them *naturally indecent*; and if the Doctor or his *party* do not *prove*, or make good, that the *adminiſtration* of *baptiſm without the croſs*, is againſt the *law of nature*, that the *preaching without the ſurplice* bears *analogy* to the *diſcloſing* of *Nakedneſs*, he is utterly *refuted* by Mr. *J.* in his interpretation of εὐσχημόνως, or notion of *decency*.

That this is indeed his *meaning* (though ſomewhat *darkned* in that his *expreſſion*) will appear but 15.
conſequent to the *two* things, which he hath premiſed in this matter, from *Ameſius* his notion of *decency*, p. 64. in *Marg.* 1. that *decency requires not that any ſacred things be inſtituted* de novo, *but only that thoſe things which are inſtituted by God, be uſed in that manner which is agreeable to the dignity of them*; ſecondly,

ſecondly, that as order ſo decency belongs to civil offices, as well as ſacred things, in which, indecorum eſt vitium oppoſitum debito illi modo, qui requiritur ad eorum juſtum finem & uſum conſequendum, indecency is a vice oppoſed to that due manner, which is required to the obtaining the juſt end and uſe of thoſe things. Now if in the former of theſe, the *mode*, he ſpeaks of, as *agreeable to the dignity of thoſe things* which are *inſtituted*, be it ſelf ſuppoſed by him to be *inſtituted* by *men*, then muſt he acknowledge *humane power* of *inſtituting ceremonies*, which being ſo *contrary* to his *deſign*, I muſt reſolve not to be *intended* by him; but rather that as the *ſacred* things are *inſtituted* by *God*, ſo the *mode*, which is *conſentaneous to their dignity*, is *inſtituted* by *God* alſo, and that nothing is *decent in ſacris*, which is not ſo *inſtituted*. And ſo likewiſe on the *ſecond head*, that of *civil offices*. For that *indecency*, which is a *vice* or *ſin*, muſt be contrary to ſome *law* of *Gods*, and ſo alſo that which is *oppoſed to the due manner* which is *required*, and ſo is *neceſſary* either *neceſſitate medii*, or *præcepti* alſo, to obtaining a *juſt end*, this ſure is more than the *omiſſion* of an *indifferent cuſtom*, which may or may not be *continued* without any *offence* againſt *nature*, even the *omiſſion* of ſtrict *univerſal* duty, either *natural decency*, or ſomewhat that bears *proportion* with it.

Now this being thus far explained, it is time to cloſe with Mr. *J.* and mind him, what he cannot but know, that the *decency* which I ſaid *implied cuſtom*, is certainly *another* thing from *natural decency*, and hath place only in thoſe things, the *omitting* of which doth not *neceſſarily infer indecency*. That *omiſſion* which *neceſſarily infers indecency*, *infers* it in *all* that ever did, or *ſhall omit* it; we know in *logick*, that no *propoſition* is *neceſſary*, which is not καθ' ἑκαστα, true in the *whole ſpecies*, of *all*, and every one, and I leave it to his judgment, whether he think the *Dr.* and his *party* (i. e. *Prælatiſts*, I ſuppoſe,) do conceive, that *Adam* (whether in, or out of *paradiſe*) *Noah* in, or out of the *Ark*, &c. were obliged to *pray* in *Surplices*, under pain of *indecency?* And ſo (in his *other* inſtance) that *John Baptiſt*, that *Chriſt*, or (becauſe the *text* ſaith, that he *baptized not*, *but his diſciples*) that thoſe *diſciples*, even before the *death* of *Chriſt*, might not *baptize* any without the *ſign* of the *Croſs*, but under the ſame *penalty?*

16. Nay 'tis already paſt *queſtion*, that Mr. *J.* in his *firſt argument* againſt my *dictate* (as he calls it) ſaith, that the *light and law of Nature is alſo a rule of decency*, and ſo not *only cuſtom*: And if ſo, then *cuſtom* is a *rule* of *decency alſo*, and not *only the Law and light of Nature*, and where *cuſtom*, and not the *light* of *Nature* is the *rule*, there the *omiſſion* of that, doth not *neceſſarily infer indecency*. And of ſuch *decency* alone it is evident that I ſpake, on the *head* of *Uniformity*, (and could not ſpeak *ſenſe*, if I ſpake, either of any *other*, or of the *General notion* of *Decency*, which is competible to any *other*) and from thence it follows demonſtratively, that of that *Decency* of which I ſpake, (though not of that, of which it is *certain* I *ſpake* not) ſtill *Cuſtom is the only rule of decency*.

17. This therefore I hope may ſerve in *anſwer* to his *firſt charge*, that of my *timidity, that I dared not ſay*, what I *ſaid* not; together with a view of his *conceſſion* of the truth of what I did ſay, and the wary *limitation* of that *conceſſion*.

18. *Secondly* then to his *ſecond charge*, the *unſufficiency* of that *limited* truth (which is the *utmoſt* he will yield my propoſition) *to prove what I would have from it.*] It will ſoon appear of how *little* force it is, when firſt, my *meaning* was quite *another* thing from what he affixt to my words, or yielded me in his *limited* conceſſion, as hath already been largely manifeſted; and ſecondly, my *concluſion is* regularly *conſequent* to that which was *alone* my *meaning*. This latter, the *addition* of a few words will clear alſo.

19. My *concluſion deſigned* in that *Section*, was the juſtifying of *Uniformity* of *ceremonies* in the *ſervice of God*, and one of the grounds to ſupport that, the *decency* of thoſe *ceremonies*, wherein all ſhould join, and that *decency ruled*, and judged of by the *cuſtom* of the *place*, in which ſuch or ſuch a *ceremony* was an *uſual* indication, and expreſſion of that *reverence*, which being due from all *inferiours* to their *ſuperiours*, is much more due from all *Chriſtians* to *God*.

20. In theſe it is certain, *cuſtom* is the *rule* and the *only rule of decency*; Neither *Nature* nor *Gods Law* obliges all mankind to *this*, or *that* expreſſion of *reverence*. Several *Nations* have their *ſeveral* manners of doing it; Only *Nature* tells us, that the moſt *reverent* manner of treating is beſt becoming *God*, and that it cannot be decent, to treat God in that manner as we would not do any *ſuperiour* beſide; and *Gods* own expoſtulation about the *offering polluted bread upon his altar*, and of *ſacrificing the lame and the ſick*, Mal. 1. 8. is a *confirmation* of that, *Offer it now*, ſaith *God*, *unto thy governour, will he be pleaſed with thee?*

21. Apply this to a *particular* caſe, to a *Nation*, where 'tis *cuſtomary* to addreſs to *Kings*, *kneeling*, and there the *Analogy* will hold *exactly*, (but not where that is not *cuſtom.*) Among ſuch I may ſay, Did ever any man that had his *limbs* and *health*, offer a *petition* to his *Prince* in the *geſture* of *ſitting*, or *lying* along upon a *table?* and if he did not, then I muſt, I ſuppoſe, regularly conclude from *cuſtom*, the one *rule* of *decency* in ſuch matters, that according to *Gods* arguing, it cannot be *decently* done in *his* ſervice, which is the tendring our *petitions* or *requeſts* to that infinite *Majeſty*. And ſo proportionably in other things.

22. This I did not there apply to the *Croſs in Baptiſm*, and the *Miniſters uſing of the Surplice*, as being not pertinent to that place. *Another head* was ſet apart for thoſe, and proceeded to Section 28. the *Croſs* expreſly named, and the *Surplice* implied under the title of *other ceremonies*, of which it may there be ſeen, what my *concluſion* was, not what is here deem'd *incumbent* on me to *prove*, that the *omiſſion of them infers indecency*, but that ſtanding on thoſe grounds, whereon they are known to ſtand, *Conſcience duly inſtructed cannot think it neceſſary or tending to edification to caſt them cauſleſly out of this Church, or the whole Liturgy for their ſakes.*]

23. And yet if Mr. *J.* ſhall now deſire to know what the grounds of thoſe two *Eccleſiaſtical rites* are, which alone he is pleaſed to name, on perſwaſion, I ſuppoſe, that they were as fit, if not fitter than any others, for the *diſproving* my poſition, of [*cuſtom being the only rule of decency.*] I ſhall now render him a *brief* account of them, ſuch as may in ſome degree *confirm* the truth of it.

24. And *firſt* for the *Croſs* in *Baptiſm*. Firſt, 'Tis known to all, that our *Chriſtian* courſe is a *ſpiritual warfare* under *Chriſt* our *Great General*; Now it is, and always hath been *cuſtomary* over the world,

that

that in a *Militia* there ſhould be ſome *banner*, or *Enſign*, to which every one ſhould *reſort* and fight under it. This hath *cuſtom* made *decent* among all; and ſuppoſing that *cuſtom*, the *omiſſion* of it in an *army*, is *indecent*, yet not ſo, as things *diſhoneſt*, or breaches of the *Law* of *Nature*, are *indecent*.

And the *Croſs* on which *Chriſt* was *crucified*, the *Emblem* alſo of that *ſtate* that every *Chriſtian* enters into, a *conſtant* courageous *patience* for all afflictions, was by the *primitive Chriſtians* thus uſed, as their * *ſymbol* or *Enſigne*, and every man that is *inrolled* in the *Chriſtian Militia*, is by him that *inrolls* him, ſigned with it; and this practice being thus *founded*, and received in the *Church*, S. *Auguſtines* words are worth *remembring*, and cannot be denied to have *truth* in them, † *Signum crucis niſi adhibeatur, ſive frontibus credentium, ſive ipſi aquæ quâ regeneramur*, &c. *nihil rite perficitur*, *unleſs the ſign of the croſs be uſed either to the foreheads of the believers* (who are *Baptized*) *or to the water it ſelf by which we are regenerate*, *it is not duly performed*, i. e. with ſuch *ceremonies*, as by *cuſtom* of the *Church*, the *Rule* of *decency*, belong to it; and, *Crucis ſigno in fronte hodie tanquam in poſte ſignandus es, omneſque Chriſtiani ſignantur* (*de Catechiz. rud.* c. 20. tom. 4. p. 915.) *thou muſt be ſigned now in the forehead with the ſign of the Croſs*, *as the Iſraelites on their door-poſts*, *and ſo muſt all Chriſtians*. In the *forehead* particularly ‖ *in fronte ſigat ubi ſedes pudoris*) *becauſe the ſeat of ſhame is there*, which we render *in token that the baptized ſhall not be aſhamed* —. 25.

* *Signo crucis actio Chriſtiana deſcribitur*. Aug. de Doctr. Chr. l. 4.

† *in Joh.* Tr. 118.

‖ *Tom.* 10. p. 289. B.

Secondly, the uſage of this ceremony of *ſigning* with the *Croſs*, was, we alſo know, frequent in the *Church* (while the *gifts* of *healing* continued) in * *curing diſeaſes*, and *caſting* out *Devils*, ſo that *Athanaſius* frequently affirms of it, † τῷ σημείῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ πάσα μὲν μάγεια παύεται, πᾶσα δὲ φαρμακεία καταργεῖται, καὶ πᾶσα μὲν τὰ εἴδωλα ἐρημοῦται, καὶ καταλιμπάνεται, *by the ſign to the croſs all magick and witchcraft is brought to nought*, *all the Idol Temples laid waſte and empty*. 26.

* See *Aug. de Civ. Dei* l. 22. c 8.

† *De Incarnat. Tom.* 1. *pag.* 84.

So *pag.* 101. *D.* Τῷ σημείῳ τοῦ σταυροῦ καὶ μόνον ὁ ἄνθρωπος χρώμενος ἀπελαύνει τούτων τὰς ἀπάτας. And pag. 102. 6. χρησάσθω τὸ σημείῳ τοῦ λεγομένου παρ' αὐτοῖς σταυροῦ, καὶ ὄψεται πῶς δι' αὐτοῦ δαίμονες φεύγουσι. And *contr. Arian. Or.* 1. *pag.* 285. A. Ὁ πάλαι ὢν δι' ἡμᾶς τὸ σημεῖον ἐν μέσῳ περιφερόμενον ὑποχείριος τάλαι πεινωμένος καὶ καταγνωσθείς. And *Præſente ſigno crucis obmuteſcit Paganitas* Aug. T. 4. 229. B. And 832. B. *Dæmonia nominatâ cruce Chriſti terrentur, ſi impenſius fiat, fugantur. Dii Paganorum metu crucis reſponſa dare non poſſunt.*

And then *Baptiſm* being the *exorciſing* of Devils (the *ancient Catechiſts* we know were called *exorciſts*) the reſcuing a perſon from the *power* of *Satan* into *Gods ſonſhip* and *family*, what can be more proper, or agreeable, or exactly *ſymbolical*, than the uſe of this in *Baptiſm*, according to that of *Tertullian*, *de Reſurr. Carn. Caro ſignatur*, *ut anima muniatur*, *the fleſh or body is ſigned*, *that the ſoul may be defended or fortified*. 27.

And if inſtead of the * *frequent* uſe of it among the *ancients*, even † *before* the cumberſome weight of *ceremonies* came in (ἐν τῷ καιρῷ προσευχῆς καταφραγίζομεν τοὺς τῆς σφραγίδος ταύτης δεομένους, ſaith the *Author* of the *Queſt.* and *Reſp.* aſcribed to *Juſtin Martyr*, *Qu.* 131. *pag.* 364. *in time of prayer we ſign thoſe that have any need of it*, *thoſe that are any way ill affected*) we in this our *Church* retain it only in our *ſolemn entrance* into *Chriſts camp*, in token that we mean *valiantly* to fight under his *banners*, and in *confidence* that he that thus ſigned to *Conſtantine* victory from *heaven* (ἐν τούτῳ νίκα, *in this overcome*)‖ will thus give *grace*, and *ſeal* to us *victory* over our *ghoſtly* enemies; What queſtion can there ever be of the *perfect decency* of this uſage among us? 28.

* *Ad omnem progreſſum frontem crucis ſignaculo terimus.* Tertul. de Cor. Mil. c. 3.

† *Vide Narrat. Hippolyti Apoſtolorum ſucceſſorum* —

χρόνῳ apud Pallad. *Hiſt. Lauſ. pag.* 1049. Ὅλῳ ἑαυτῷ σφραγίσασα τὸ μυχαῖόν σου σταυροῦ ἐξελθεῖν ἀφορῶ —

And then for the *Surplice*: It is no *news* I hope for *ſeveral* ſorts of men to have *ſolemn garments* for *ſolemn* actions, which they do not uſe at *other* times. The *Judges* upon the *Bench*, or the *Lords* at their coming to *Parliament*, are a ſufficient *evidence* of this, who wear not thoſe *robes* in *common* occaſions which there they do, as betokening their *quality* and the *imployments* they are about. And then what is thus *cuſtomary* in *civil* matters (viz. to *difference perſons* and *imployments*, yea and *days* by diſtinction of *garments*) and is allowed to be *decent* therein, this by *analogy* undeniable, is as fitly and *decently* from thence derived to *ſolemn ſacred* actions alſo, ſuch are the *publick offices* of the *Prieſt*; and the *commands* of our *Superiors* being added to this *decency* of the matter, τάξις to εὐσχημόνως, it is, I am ſure, more than *undecent* for *inferiours* to be *obſtinate*, and deny *obedience* to them. In the choice of the *garment* there hath hath been alſo, as near as may be, a *reſemblance* obſerved of thoſe *garments*, which in *Scripture* are mentioned for the like *ſolemnities*, *long*, *ſhining*, i. e. *white robes*, or *garments*; And if the *conſtant* uſage of *other Churches* beſide this of ours, *Eaſtern* as well as *Weſtern* for ſo many *centuries* together, be conſidered, it will be competently able to eſtabliſh an *Eccleſiaſtical cuſtom* alſo, which, in things of this nature, mere *external ornaments*, and *formalities*, is a more *rational* ground, and *rule* or meaſure of *decency*, than any Mr. J. (or *Ameſius* to boot) will readily be able to produce for the *rejecting* of them, or *breaking* and *caſting away* thoſe *bands*, which tied no *harder* a yoke than this upon their *ſhoulders*. 29.

In this caſe I believe (though not in the *garments* themſelves) there is place for that *decency*, the *omiſſion of which neceſſarily infers indecency*, and for ſuch *order* the *breaking* of which muſt ſoon end in ἀκαταστασία (which Mr. J. ſaith S. *Paul* oppoſes to τάξις) *viz.* down-right *confuſion*. 30.

Having ſaid thus much *ex abundanti*, above what was *incumbent* on me, I ſhall flatter my ſelf, that I may now ſpare any *larger* pains, in ſurvey of *Ameſius*'s *arguments*, which Mr. J. is reſolved to think *conſiderable* and to ſpeak very *magnificently* of them, as *proving* that the *text* 1 *Cor*, xiv. 40. *rightly underſtood doth not only not authorize any humane inſtitution of ceremonies*, *but on the contrary plainly condemns them*, *and this*, ſaith he, *was ſo well managed by him*, *that he hath quite beaten out of the field Biſhop* Morton *and his ſecond*, *Dr.* J. Burges. 31.

Here is *triumph* indeed. And I ſuppoſe the *Reader* already diſcerns, what are the *grounds* of it, *viz.* that *Ameſius* acknowledges nothing *decent*, but that, the *omiſſion of which neceſſarily infers indecency*, i. e. as hath been ſhewed, nothing but *natural decency*, the *omiſſion* of which is a *vice contrary to that*, by conſequence, that there is no ſuch thing, as an *indifferent geſture* or *garment*, which either 32.

civil,

civil, or *Eccleſiaſtical cuſtom*, or *obedience* to our *lawful ſuperiours* may render *decent*; that whatſoever ſome *eternal Law* of *Nature* commands not, the doing of that, if it be but wearing ſuch a *garment*, which the *Canons* of any *Church* preſcribe, nay, by *parity* of reaſon, a *cloak* or a *button'd doublet*, is abſolutely *unlawful* by force of 1 *Cor.* xiv. 40.

33. This being the *bottom* of thoſe *arguments* of *Ameſius*, I may ſafely tell Mr. *J.* that they could no otherwiſe beat either *Biſhop Morton*, or Dr. *J. Burgeſs out of the field*, than that they thought them utterly *unworthy* their making *replies* to; He that thinks there is nothing *indifferent*, nothing *lawful*, the *omiſſion* of which is not *ſin*, doth certainly uſe other *dictionaries* than we do, diſcerns no *difference* betwixt *lawful*, and *neceſſary*; and as the *Aſſertors* of *Fatal production* of all things, will not allow a *cauſe* to be *ſufficient* to produce any effect which it doth not *produce*, and ſo *produce*, that it *cannot* not *produce* it, which is to tell me that I *ſit*, and *walk* at the very time, when I *ſtand* ſtill, it being certain, that I am *equally able* to do both thoſe, when yet I *really* do the *third* only; ſo he will not allow any thing *morally poſſible*, which is not *morally neceſſary*, which is certainly the giving *new laws* to words (making the word [*lawful* or *poſſible*] which was wont to be *interpreted* that which *may* or *may not* be done, to ſignifie only that which *muſt* be done, and may not be *omitted*) and not *new* reaſons to confirm *old paradoxes*.

34. This *argument* of *Ameſius* againſt things *indifferent*, that *learned Biſhop* was well acquainted with, by his familiar conferences with Mr. *Hynde* and Mr. *Lapthorne*, two vehement *diſputers* againſt *ceremonies*, and whom the *Biſhop* thought fitter to refute by *trifling* inſtances, of *unbuttoning*, and *buttoning* his *caſſock*; than by more *ſerious* attempts of *conviction*, i. e. in plain terms, to *deſpiſe* and *ſmile* at, than to *dread*; and if Mr. *J.* have really read Mr. *Hooker*, whom he ſomewhere intitles our *Patron of ceremonies*, he may in him remember a diſcourſe of *laws*, which will ſuperſede all *neceſſity*, or benefit of my *farther* inlarging on it.

35. Mean while, to the *reproach* of my great *ſtupidity*, I willingly acknowledge, that it cannot enter into my *underſtanding*, what ſenſe that *text* is capable of, which with the beſt (poſſible) *managery* can be taught *plainly to condemn all inſtitution of ceremonies in the Church*, i. e. by what *proſyllogiſms*, *or ſupplies* or *advantages* of art this *Enthymeme* ſhall be rendred *concludent*, *The Apoſtle commands that all things be done decently and in order*: Ergo, *He condemns all inſtitution of Ceremonies for Gods worſhip*. He that can maintain this *conſequence* not only to be *true*, but (as Mr. *J.* affirms of him) *plain* and *evident*, will be a *formidable adverſary* indeed, much better deſerving that *title*, than one whom he knows not, and therefore honours with it.

36. His *third* and *laſt* impreſſion now remains, wherein he undertakes to prove by three *arguments* that *cuſtom is not the only rule of decency*; and his *firſt argument* is, *becauſe the light and law of nature is alſo a rule of decency*. To this I *anſwer*, that in thoſe things, whereof *alone* he knows I there ſpeak, in the Section concerning *Uniformity*, *i. e.* in things *indifferent*, *geſtures* and other *ceremonies* in *Gods* ſervice, the *Law of Nature* is no *rule* at all, and, I ſuppoſe, he cannot think, I am ſure, he pretends not to *prove*, or ſo much as *affirm*, it is; and therefore though not *ſimply* in *all* ſorts of things, of which I ſpake not, nor can by any *rules* of *diſcourſe* be ſuppoſed to have ſpoken, yet as to the matters then before me, wherein *Eccleſiaſtick Conformity* conſiſted, *cuſtom* and only *cuſtom* was the *rule* of *Decency*.

37. His *ſecond argument* is wholly deceitful, and muſt be diſcovered to be ſo, by reducing it to *rules* of *art*. 'Tis by him variouſly formed into *two* ſeveral *Syllogiſms*. The *firſt* is this.

Nothing can be undecent, which is agreeable to the only rule of Decency.

But divers things are undecent, which yet can plead cuſtom. The concluſion now muſt be, *Therefore cuſtom is not the only rule of decency.*

38. But this is no *regular Syllogiſm*, 'tis in no *mood* or *figure*, nor readily *reducible* to any, and therefore 'twas his only way to *preſume* it *evident*, and never to *endeavour* any *proof* thereof.

39. But he hath thought fit to *vary* this *ſyllogiſm*, and give it in *other* terms, and then one might hope it would be *exactly* form'd. 'Tis thus,

It is impoſſible that the only rule of decency ſhould be undecent.

But yet it is very poſſible that many cuſtoms ſhould be indecent.

Therefore he ſhall conclude that cuſtom is not the only rule of decency.

40. But this is no *ſyllogiſm* neither, being far removed from the *meaſures* that *Logicians* exact, and ſuch as by which I will prove any thing *true*, that is the moſt diſtant from it. For *example*, it is a granted truth, that *Law* is the *only rule of Juſtice*, yet this I ſhall diſprove by a *ſyllogiſm* exactly formed by Mr. *J.* his *model*, Thus,

It is impoſſible that the only rule of juſtice ſhould be unjuſt.

But yet it is very poſſible that many Laws ſhould be unjuſt.

Therefore I ſhall conclude that Law is not the only rule of juſtice.

41. To diſcover this *deceit* then, the *ſyllogiſm* which is now no *ſyllogiſm* muſt be ſomewhat better form'd, according to the rules of *Logick*, and reduced, as near as it can, into a *true ſyllogiſm*. Thus,

Whatſoever is it ſelf undecent, cannot be the only rule of decency.

But cuſtom is it ſelf undecent.

Therefore cuſtom cannot be the only rule of decency.

Here before it can be defin'd whether this be a *regular ſyllogiſm*, or no, it muſt be demanded, *quanta eſt minor*, is the *aſſumption Univerſal* or *particular?* If it be *particular*, then either the concluſion muſt be particular alſo, or elſe 'tis a *falſe ſyllogiſm*. And if the *concluſion* be *particular*, then it infers no more than that *ſome undecent cuſtom cannot be the only rule of decency*, which is willingly granted by me, who do not at all affirm it of *undecent cuſtoms*; But if the *minor* be *Univerſal*, then 'tis a *falſe propoſition*, for certainly *all cuſtoms* are not *indecent*. The ſhort is, *Nature* may be the *rule* of one ſort of *decency*, and *cuſtom* the only *rule* of *another*; yet if the *cuſtom* be in it ſelf *indecent*, then of ſuch *indecent cuſtom* it is not pretended, that it is either *only*, or *at all* the *rule of decency*. And ſo ſtill my *propoſition* may ſtand good, which as it belonged not to *natural decency*, ſo much leſs to what is by

Nature,

Nature, or in it ſelf *undecent*, never imagining it reaſonable, that what *geſtures* were againſt thoſe *Laws* of *Nature*, or *Scripture*, or any other *Law* of *decency*, or rather of *natural comlineſs* and *honeſty*, ſhould by pretence of any *cuſtom* whatever, be introduced into *Gods worſhip*; 'Tis ſufficient that *ſome cuſtoms* may be *decent*, or in themſelves not *indecent*, and that all *decency* in the *ſervice* of *God*, is to be *regulated* and judged of by *conformity* with them: For I ſaid not that *all cuſtoms* were the *rule* of *decency*, but that *ſome were*, and that there was no *other* rule, but *cuſtom*. This, I hope, hath diſcovered the *invalidity* of his ſecond *argument*.

His *laſt argument* [*becauſe there is decency in the firſt uſage of ſome things*] falls upon that *miſtake* of my words, which I diſcourſed of, and *cleared* at the *beginning*; for I never ſaid, that a thing muſt be *cuſtomary*, before it is *decent* in any kind, (knowing unqueſtionably that there is a *natural decency*) but that the *decency* of any *ceremony* in *Gods ſervice*, wherein *God* and *Nature* have *preſcribed nothing* particularly, muſt be regulated according to thoſe *meaſures*, which the *cuſtoms* of any place do allow to be *reverential* among them; Or, in yet plainer words, the *civil cuſtoms* of any *Nation*, by which this or that ſort of *geſture* is rendred a token of *reverence*, are the *only rule*, by which the *decency* of *indifferent geſtures*, &c. is to be judged of, in order to *God's ſervice*. And ſo much for the *laſt argument* alſo, and conſequently for the *firſt* part of his *exception*, that againſt my *interpretation* of εὐχημόνως *decently*. 42.

But there is yet a *ſecond charge* behind againſt my rendring of κατὰ τάξιν, *according to appointment*] which he hath managed in theſe words. 43.

As for the other part of the words, let all things be done in order, Ames *in the place forementioned ſheweth that order requireth not ſuch ceremonies as ours, and he giveth this reaſon, becauſe order requireth not the inſtitution of any new thing but only the right placing and diſpoſing of things which are formerly inſtituted: and this he makes good from the notation of the word, from the definitions of order, which are given by Philoſophers and Divines*, &c. *from the context of the chapter, and from the uſage of the word elſewhere. But the Doctor, that the words may give ſome countenance unto our ceremonies, adventureth upon a new interpretation of them.* 44.

The words κατὰ τάξιν (ſaith he) *literally import according unto appointment*, τάττειν *ſometimes ſignifies to appoint*, as Mat. 28. 16. Act. 22. 10. *and* 28. 23. *And we may hereupon argue à conjugatis, that* τάξις *may be ſometimes rendred appointment. But becauſe it may ſometimes be rendred appointment, will it therefore follow that it muſt be ſo rendred in this place?*

We may ſay *as well as the Doctor, that the words* κατὰ τάξιν *literally import according unto order, as order is taken ſtrictly for the right placing or ranking of things one before, another after, and this we have confeſſed even by* Dr John Burgeſſe *in his rejoinder unto* Ames, p. 78. *a Book publiſhed by the ſpecial command of the late King. Moreover this ſenſe is favoured by the coherence, for* v. 31. *we have a particular inſtance of order in this acception of the word, ye may all propheſie one by one*, &c. *and not all or many ſpeak at once. Secondly, We have the oppoſite of order taken in this ſenſe*, 1. v. 33. *confuſion. Let all things be done in order, then, is as much as, let all things be done without confuſion. And I hope confuſion may be avoided in the worſhip of God without ſuch Ceremonies as ours.*

But we will for once ſuppoſe, though not grant, that the clear importance of the words, is, that all be done in the Church according to cuſtom and appointment. Yet the Doctor hath a hard task to perform, before he can come nigh his concluſion, that the words of Paul *are a proof of the more than lawfulneſs of preſcription of ſuch Ceremonies as ours in a Church: For he muſt prove that cuſtom and order here are taken in ſuch a latitude, as that they include not only the cuſtoms and appointments of the Apoſtolical Churches, but alſo of all the Churches of God in ſucceeding Ages: and the performance of this he will find not to be ſo eaſie, as he may imagine.*

I am ſenſible that I have by this diſcourſe provoked a very learned and formidable adverſary, but it is only love of the truth hath ingaged me in ſo unequal an incounter, and therefore I hope the Doctor will pardon and excuſe my boldneſs. If he can by dint of argument prove the truth to be on his ſide, I ſhall not be ſorry or aſhamed to be overcome by him.

To this my *anſwer* will be very *brief*, Firſt, By giving the *reaſon* of my *rendring*, Secondly, By evidencing, that if the *vulgar* were acknowledged the righter rendring, yet my *concluſion* would very regularly follow thence, and that therefore I have no need to *contend* with any gainſayer, about my *rendring*. 45.

For the *firſt*, it is manifeſt to any that knows but the *Elements* of *Greek*, that κατὰ τάξιν *literally* and *properly* ſignifies [*according to ordination or appointment*] κατὰ ſignifies [*according* to] not [*in*] and τάξις or διάταξις [*an ordinance* or *conſtitution*] millions of times in authors, and εὐτάκτως *orderly*, or *in order*] lying more conſonant with εὐχημόνως, no reaſon can be rendred, why if that had been the *deſigned* meaning, that word ſhould not have been uſed there. 46.

That it may ſo ſignifie, Mr. *J.* acknowledges, and ſo I have obtained all I ſeek in my *firſt* propoſal, which was not, that it *muſt* neceſſarily thus ſignifie, but that this being the *literal* regular rendring of it, I had ſufficient *reaſon* to render it thus. 47.

I proceed then to the *ſecond* thing, that if what he pretends to be *poſſible* alſo, were indeed the *only poſſible*, or (by way of *ſuppoſition*, but not *conceſſion*) if κατὰ τάξιν] did really import no more than [*in order*] as that is oppoſed to *diſorder* or *confuſion*, yet I ſay, it will ſoon appear, that the *Apoſtles* commanding ſuch *order* or *orderlineſs*, and *forbidding* all *confuſion* in *eccleſiaſtical* affairs, muſt by conſequence be interpreted to *command* the *inſtituting* and *obſerving uniformity* of *ceremonies* in a *Church*. This I thus deduce. 48.

Firſt, There is no poſſibility of *worſhipping God externally* and *publickly*, without uſe of ſome *Ceremonies* or *circumſtances* of *time*, *place*, and *geſture*, &c. Secondly, There is no poſſibility of *order* in a *multitude*, without *uniformity* in the ſame *circumſtances*; Thirdly, There *is* as little *poſſibility* of *Uniformity* among many, without either *agreement* one with another, or *direction* of ſome *ſuperiour* to them all, what ſhall by all be *uniformly* performed. Fourthly, The *agreement* one with another, if it be only *voluntary*, and ſuch, as by which none are *obliged*, no way *ſecures* the *end*; but if it be ſuch an *agreement*, that every ſingle perſon is *obliged* to obſerve, then ſtill is that a *law* of that *body*, as 49.

of a *Council*, &c. and as truly ſo, as the *conſtitution* of a *ſingle Prelate* can be thought to be. And ſo the *concluſion* regularly follows, that to the *preſerving* but of *order*, or *orderlineſs* in a *Church*, it is neceſſary, there be *appointment*, what ſhall by all be *uniformly* performed; *confuſion* unavoidably coming in, where no certain rules are preſcribed for *Uniformity*.

50. What can be *denied* in this proceſs, I foreſee not; yet when 'tis granted, one reſerve Mr. *J.* hath ſtill left him. For, ſaith he, *if it were granted that τάξις ſignifies appointment or ordination, yet ſtill it will be incumbent on the Doctor to prove, that this extends not only to the cuſtoms and appointments of the Apoſtolick Churches, but alſo to the Churches of ſucceeding Ages.* And my *anſwer* to this, will *conclude* this whole debate.

51. *Firſt* then I acknowlege, that it is not here *neceſſarily* ordained by the *Apoſtle*, that *all* the *Churches* of *God* in *ſucceeding* Ages ſhould *inſtitute* ceremonies in *worſhip*; for, provided thoſe *ceremonies* were once *inſtituted*, all that this *text* inforces, is *uniform obedience* to them.

52. But then ſecondly, when for many *circumſtances* of *Gods worſhip*, there is no *order* particularly taken by *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*, as in what *geſture publick ſupplication* ſhall be addreſt, in what, *lauds* and *hymns*, and *confeſſion* of the *faith*, &c. and yet the *rule* is given by them, that *all* ſhall be *done accaccording to appointment*, and moreover in other places, that *obedience* be paid to *thoſe ſuperiours* which *watch over our ſouls*; and when thoſe *rules* are not given only to the *perſons* that then lived in the *Church* of *Corinth*, &c. but to all that ſhould ever *live* in that, and *all* other *Churches*, it cannot then be deemed, either that there were no *ſuperiours* deſigned to *ſucceed Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles* in the ordering of his *Church*, or that they ſhould not ἐπιδιορθῶν τὰ λείποντα, *ſet in order the things that were wanting*, ſuch as the *Apoſtles* had left undiſpoſed of, or that *inferiours* ſhould not be bound to *obey* them *uniformly* when they thus gave *orders* to them.

53. When we are *commanded* to *obey our Parents*, *civil* as well as *natural*, by a *law* given by *God* to *Moſes*, or by *Chriſt* to his *diſciples*, can it be ſtrange, that we that lived not in either of *thoſe* Ages, ſhould thereby be *obliged*, when *God* in his providence hath given us *fathers* of *both* kinds (as well as them) regularly *preſiding* over us, and making uſe of that *liberty* that is preſumed in all *Parents*, viz. to give *commands*, and expect *obedience* from their *children?* Certainly it cannot; and as little can it be doubted, either whether our *Eccleſiaſtical Parents* have power to *inſtitute* in things *omitted*, and thereby *remitted* to their care by the *Apoſtles*, or whether we their *obedient children*, that are *commanded* to act κατὰ τάξιν *according to appointment*, ſhould from time to time be diſobliged, and *free* to *diſobey* them in whatſoever they *appoint* us.

54. 'Tis *granted* him, if he pleaſe, that what *Chriſt*, and his *Apoſtles* have already *preſcribed*, ſhould not be *repealed* by thoſe that thus *ſucceed* them; ſhould they raſhly aſſume that *power*, they would not in ſo doing act κατὰ τάξιν, whether *regularly*, or *according to appointment*; but for the τὰ λείποντα in which they have made no *rules*, but left *order* to *Titus*, &c. (*i. e.* by *parity* of reaſon, to the *Biſhops* in every *Iſland*) to make them; here, what *power* is *left* them, may certainly with perfect *ſafety* be *exerciſed* by them, and that *neceſſarily infers* our *obligation* to yield *obedience* to their *exerciſes* of them.

55. This is all the obſervance Mr. *J.* ſeems to expect of me at this time, unleſs his *intimation* to *all admirers of* Mr. *Hooker*, that they ſhould *vindicate their great Patron of Ceremonies*, may paſs for an *admonition* to me, who acknowledge my ſelf a thankful *adorer* of *Gods graces* in that *Godly learned* man, and ſo exact a few lines more above the *regular* account.

Pag. 144.

56. This will detain me no longer than whileſt I mind the *Reader* that in a diſcourſe of the *benefits* which we receive from *Chriſt* in the *Sacrament*, *and otherwiſe*, Mr. *Hooker* undertakes to ſet down how *Chriſt* in his *human nature* is *communicated* to to us, and ſo *preſent with us*; To this end three things he ſhews at large, firſt, that as *nothing created can be unlimited, or receive any ſuch accident from any as may really make it infinite, ſo neither the ſoul nor body of Chriſt, nor Chriſt as man, nor according to his human nature, can poſſibly be every where preſent, no nor the ſubſtance of the body of Chriſt, which neither hath nor can have any preſence but only local.* Secondly, That *this cannot be rendred poſſible either by the grace of Union with Deity, nor by any other poſſible means*, as he at large excellently deduceth it, pag. 300, 301, 302. *Thirdly*, That *it may peradventure be well enough granted in ſome ſenſe, and after a ſort, that Chriſt is every where preſent, as man*, viz. *Firſt, in reſpect of the conjunction of the humane nature with the Deity, which conjunction is extended as far as the Deity, the actual poſition being reſtrain'd and tied to a certain place, and ſecondly by cooperation with Deity, and that in all things.*

Eccl. Pol. l. 5. Sect. 55.

57. Now on this *third* head, (without reflecting on the *two* former, which aſſure us of the *authors* meaning in it) *two* paſſages Mr. *J.* takes hold of, which, if *he know any thing in either philoſophy or ſcholaſtical divinity, are both guilty of a groſs miſtake, and cannot be ſufficiently wondred at by him, that they ſhould fall from ſo learned a pen.*

Pag. 139. *Pag.* 140.

58. But I ſuppoſe there is no great skill in *either* of thoſe *learned* faculties, required, to *diſtinguiſh* betwixt that which *truly* and *properly* is, and that which *may in ſome ſenſe, and after a ſort*, and *in two reſpects only* (neither of which belong to the *propriety* of being) be *well enough granted*, and that with a [*peradventure*] alſo, to have *influence* on all theſe.

59. And what *ſeverity* is this, to require of every *learned* man, that hath moſt largely *refuted* an *adverſary*, to be ſo *averſe* from all thoughts of *peace* and *reconciliation* with him, that he may not allow him to ſpeak *truth*, or but *perhaps* to ſpeak truth *in a ſort*, and in *ſome ſenſe*, and in *two only reſpects?* all which are ſtill more than *intimations*, that he thinks him to be *abſolutely* (and in *ſimplicity* and *propriety* of ſpeaking) in a *groſs errour*, impoſſible even to the *power* of *God* to have truth in it.

60. If any ſhould chance to ſay of an *eloquent* man, that you might *hear an Angel ſpeak in him*, and I ſhould reply, that it might *peradventure be well enough granted in a ſort, or in ſome ſenſe*, that when he ſpake you might *hear an Angel*, aſſuring you at large of my *opinion*, that no bare *man* can truly be an *Angel*, nay that it was impoſſible for *God* himſelf to bring to paſs, that at the *ſame* time he ſhould be an *Angel*, and not an *Angel*, a *man*, and not a *man*, or which is all one, a *bare* man, and yet an *Angel*; or (in fewer words) when *Chriſt* ſaith he is a *door*, and a *vine*, if I ſhould ſay, that *in a ſort* and in *ſome ſenſe*, and that in *two reſpects*, each of theſe had *truth* in them, would Mr. *J.* think

think fit to leave his ſubject, and let looſe for *three* leaves together, and *pawn* all his *Philoſophy* and *Scholaſtical* (not conſidering what the conſequence alſo may be to his *practical*) *divinity*, to *accuſe* and *wonder* at, and never to *give over wondering*, and withal ſolemnly to *refute* this or that *improper figurative* ſpeech, ſo perfectly acknowledged by the *ſpeakers to be* ſuch?

If he have that *great* leiſure, and any *prevalent temptation* thus to lay it out, I ſhall only aſſure him that I have not ſo much of *either*, as to *attend* theſe his *motions*, nor any other *lover* or *admirer of Mr Hooker*, that I know of, and therefore beſeech him *contentedly* to reſt in this *general* return to his charge of that *learned* man, without expecting any more *explicite* or *particular ſurvey* of it. And ſo much for Mr. *H.* alſo. 61.

I have thus without any other *obligation*, than what my deſire to undeceive the *Author* and his *Readers*, laid upon me, paid him now this my *ſecond obſervance*; And may be allowed to think it *time*, that he who hath been ſo liberal of his *uſes* of publick *refutation* of *others words*, ſhould find ſome *vacancy* for one *uſe* of more private (if not *reprehenſion*, yet) *examination* of his *own actions*; And then I ſhall offer to his conſideration, how much more agreeable to the *laws* of *brotherly kindneſs* or *candor* it had been, to have propoſed his *exceptions* in ſuch a manner of *friendly addreſs*, as might have brought him home the ſame *ſatisfaction*, and ſaved others the *importunity* of theſe *uſeleſs*, becauſe *perſonal* debates. When he hath ſincerely obſerved in himſelf the *motive* of his other *diſtant choice*, I have obtained the *end* of my *charity* in mentioning it to him, and have no more to *return* to him at this *time*. 62.

THE END.